De ecclesia

On the Church

John Wyclif

Latin text of Loserth's edition for the Wyclif Society (1886),
with a new English translation and notes

Translated by Wilson Pruitt

Wroot Press · wyclif.wrootpress.com

De ecclesia: On the Church. Latin and English.

John Wyclif's treatise on the church, written between early 1378 and early 1379, in the months after Gregory XI's bulls condemned his teaching and as the Great Schism opened. Wyclif settles what the church is before asking what its bishops may claim of it, then takes up headship, membership, and the privileges and possessions that were being fought over. The Latin of Johann Loserth's edition (1886), with a new English translation and notes: 23 chapters in 159 parts,

The Latin is the Wyclif Society's edition, public domain. The English translation, notes and encoding are by Wilson Pruitt, Wroot Press, and are offered under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 licence (creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Ask before selling this edition. Wroot Press is an imprint of Wroot Labs LLC. A working draft; the web edition, with the glossary and plates, is kept current at wyclif.wrootpress.com, and corrections are welcome.

Contents

Chapter 1 8
Part 1: The prologue: knowing our mother, and what the church is 8
Part 2: The church is the predestinate; no vicar of Christ is its head 10
Part 3: Christ the head; the church is one, in three parts 14
Part 4: One bride; no salvation outside the church; the two swords 18
Part 5: Subjection to the roman pontiff; why the church is called roman 22
Part 6: No christian is head; the pope as head of what he rules; three errors about the church 24
Part 7: The elect are one person; Armagh's objection of many heads 28
Part 8: The heads of the church; the saints are members, not heads; hoping with misgiving 30
Chapter 2 34
Part 1: No vicar of Christ is head of the church: three replies refuted 34
Part 2: The pope is head at most of a particular church 36
Part 3: Subjection to the pope is not of necessity for salvation 40
Part 4: False Christs; Urban VI our head, believed with misgiving 45
Part 5: First objection: subjects must consult scripture; Jerome on the sword that separates heretics 47
Part 6: Explicit and implicit faith; what is owed to prelates and to the canonized 50
Chapter 3 56
Part 1: Third objection: church dues; Gregory on the hypocrite's love of temporal goods 56
Part 2: The hypocrite's three replies: counsels, care for the church, love of the robber 59
Part 3: Three corollaries on suits and the malice of priests; Thomas: Christ head of all men 63
Part 4: Equivocation on church and head; three proofs that Christ is head of all; four senses of saving 67
Part 5: The second and third objections answered: the church's digestion, and unformed faith 69
Part 6: The dove, figure of the Holy Spirit and of the one church 73
Part 7: No one may claim the obedience of all as head; the bride and the hireling 75
Chapter 4 79
Part 1: Three objections: quantity, the presence of all times, and human appointment 79
Part 2: Membership by predestination cannot be lost; the prelates who trust in the temple 82
Part 3: The fourth objection; the foreknown are no part of the bride whom Christ always loves 86
Part 4: The fifth objection; the one church from Abel, of which no foreknown man is a member 90
Part 5: The Roman church is the whole church militant, not the pope and his college 94
Part 6: The gloss's three replies; knowing our mother by faith 98
Chapter 5 102
Part 1: The universal church: equivocations, and why Christ alone is its head 102
Part 2: One body of three churches; a digression on lines; the church seen from afar 106
Part 3: Squaring the circle; the body of the devil 110
Part 4: The church a true continuum; Christ the common term and the mean 114
Part 5: Bernard's eight unities; one form of membership, predestination 118

Part 6: Ten arguments against a doctor's definition of the church 122
Chapter 6 127
Part 1: Objections answered: many heads, virgin and bride, the church as nothing 127
Part 2: Mankind as two men; no member of the devil in the church 131
Part 3: The first difficulty answered: Christ's three weddings, and the temple as figure of the church 135
Part 4: The second and third difficulties; honour due to prelates is judged by their works 138
Part 5: A theriac against exactors; Christ espoused his mother; Christ's humanity as form of the church 142
Part 6: Whether each member of the church is Christ; unity of person rightly understood 146
Part 7: The eucharistic body and the church; the seventh argument: the grace of predestination and mortal sin 149
Chapter 7 155
Part 1: The Westminster sanctuary case: it is lawful to take the fugitives out 155
Part 2: The king's command does not oppose God's law, and the privilege does not cover the case 159
Part 3: No privilege licenses sin, and he who offends against the law cannot claim its aid 161
Part 4: Unjust excommunication, and the three wonders of the laity 165
Part 5: The laity must not consent unexamined; three exhortations to the secular lords 169
Chapter 8 172
Part 1: A digression on the Westminster case; two suppositions; would lying be a virtue? 172
Part 2: A lying God would deceive the whole church; the oath before the king's council; the midwives of Exodus 175
Part 3: Augustine on the midwives; lying cannot defend the church's privileges; what a privilege is 178
Part 4: Corollaries of the definition of privilege; the sons of Zebedee and the cup 182
Part 5: No true privilege outside scripture; the Westminster case; poverty the highest privilege 187
Part 6: Christ's privilege above Caesar's; the lords may relieve the clergy of temporal goods 192
Chapter 9 197
Part 1: Privilege is chiefly in spiritual gifts; exemptions and earthly privileges 197
Part 2: Endowment as alms under condition; to be freed from it is a privilege 201
Part 3: The oldest privilege is poverty; ignorance does not excuse the endowers; the fifth objection 205
Part 4: The saints' example settles nothing; the vineyard turned into a garden of herbs 210
Part 5: Naboth's vineyard and St Thomas; the sixth objection, on the foreknown and privilege; the three pairs of Matthew 24 214
Part 6: The hidden judgment; the sure way of temporal alms; the answer to the sixth objection 219
Chapter 10 222
Part 1: The Westminster privilege: the charters of Edgar and Edward 222
Part 2: The argument from mercy for the privilege; the twofold remission of debt 223
Part 3: The answers from the Lord's prayer, the parable and the jubilee; the clergy as ravens 228
Part 4: Objections to the privilege: a harbour for enemies and criminals 233
Part 5: The king cannot license wrong; excommunicate fugitives; scripture and canon law against the privilege 237
Part 6: The fifth case and the gloss; why offenders forfeit sanctuary; the twofold privilege 241
Chapter 11 245
Part 1: How the Westminster privilege is to be read: its interpreter, its ends, and no privilege against the common law 245
Part 2: Three corollaries: privilege implies reason; punishment as the fugitive's privilege; no courts or fairs in holy places 250

Part 3: Correction as medicine; what immunity is; the first objection answered 254
Part 4: The second objection: who deserves refuge; debtors, the forty days and Westminster; the third objection begun 259
Part 5: Common law and privilege; Christ's privileges and the temporal lord's part; whether sin is a privilege 263
Chapter 12 268
Part 1: The charge of destroying the church's privileges; God cannot take away without recompense 268
Part 2: Every grant implies a condition of worthiness; third objection: privileges to be read mercifully 272
Part 3: Privileges need prudent interpreters; the grant depends on the grantee; unjust mercy 276
Part 4: Occasion given and occasion taken; fourth objection: holy men approved the privilege; the duke's stand 281
Part 5: Custom yields to truth; the basilica is not the bride; satisfaction cannot be remitted; fifth objection: the Westminster dream 286
Part 6: The doctor's double dream; privileges defended by patience; the patron not to be excommunicated 291
Chapter 13 294
Part 1: Temporary alms better than perpetual: the definitions, and the proof that they are more authentic 294
Part 2: No heir is bound to continue his forefathers' alms, and the pope may claim no tribute 298
Part 3: Two objections: the old law's perpetual alms, and the merit of larger and longer alms 302
Part 4: The measure of alms; the third objection, from security; the primitive church and the schisms 306
Part 5: Endowment breeds war; the false security of charters 310
Part 6: The three degrees of clerical heresy 313
Chapter 14 319
Part 1: The endowment of the Roman church; Christ held no civil lordship 319
Part 2: Christ could not hold civil lordship, and did not die to win it for his clergy 321
Part 3: The clergy live on alms and owe spiritual alms in return 326
Part 4: Objections: the patrimony of the crucified and the two swords 330
Part 5: The two swords, and the clergy's civil lordship not founded in scripture 334
Part 6: Objections from rites, from the endowment, and from Nicholas Putanensis 338
Part 7: Silvester received alms, not lordship; the two greatnesses of pope and emperor 341
Part 8: The donation of Constantine would make the pope Caesar's almsman 346
Chapter 15 349
Part 1: May the king take away the clergy's temporal goods? the duty to warn, and the precedents 349
Part 2: A doctor's three conclusions would make the kings of England heretics 353
Part 3: The condition of the first endowment: alms may be withdrawn for contempt 356
Part 4: The third argument: the king must take abused alms and restore them to the church 360
Part 5: Correction as the king's spiritual alms, and the objection of defamation 362
Part 6: May the king correct the clergy? the second and third objections 368
Part 7: The pope's binding and loosing, and the bishop of Rochester 372
Part 8: The shield and triple veil of the curia; the death of Gregory XI 376
Chapter 16 380
Part 1: The first argument for Silvester's endowment, and the form of the donation 380
Part 2: The second and third arguments: merit, venial sin and the temporal lords 384
Part 3: Civil lordship unfit for priests; who is vicar of Christ; the fourth argument 385

Part 4: Leonard against Silvester; the fifth argument: perpetual alms and the colleges 389
Part 5: The case against appropriation; the sixth argument: the captive knight; Ambrose on the church's gold 392
Part 6: Church treasure for the kingdom's need; the seventh argument: lordship held by a community 397
Part 7: The pope may give up lordship; the eighth argument: buying blessedness; the king's inquiry into the clergy's alms 401
Part 8: The fictions that shield the clergy's alms from withdrawal 405
Chapter 17 409
Part 1: The first argument answered: the church before the incarnation 409
Part 2: The church was from the beginning of the world 411
Part 3: The seven women of Isaiah, and three ways of being Christian 415
Part 4: Christ is not a Christian 419
Part 5: Christians before the incarnation, and one faith in many believers 423
Part 6: Defective faith, and three ways of being of the church 427
Part 7: The councils of Christ and the apostles 431
Part 8: The church did not begin at Christ's death; the church as one successive person 433
Chapter 18 437
Part 1: The foreknown, the predestinate in error, and the two churches 437
Part 2: One church militant and triumphant; Cardinal John on *Fundamenta* 439
Part 3: The church spread through the world; the devil head of his members; avarice and the death of Christ 444
Part 4: The devil's four-horse chariot; the abuse of endowment; the betrayers of the truth 448
Part 5: The betrayers of the truth; whether the church is properly virgin, mother and bride 452
Part 6: A multitude has parts; the church from the beginning of the world 456
Part 7: The church before the death of Christ; the argument from the formation of Eve 460
Chapter 19 464
Part 1: Whether the foreknown hold the orders and offices of the church; the character of orders 464
Part 2: The predestinate are priests in the homeland; the foreknown minister the sacraments; first conclusion: clerical litigation should cease 468
Part 3: The church's judges cannot judge suits over temporal goods; the forfeited stipend and the precarial grant 471
Part 4: Errors refuted: judges, oaths and letters of orders; the layman's faith does not hang on his priest 476
Part 5: The layman's eucharist and the danger of signs; fifth conclusion: no cleric may fight for temporal goods 480
Part 6: The doctors' thesis on temporal possession refuted; sixth conclusion: no contending for greatness 483
Part 7: Works, not names; relics and the devil's signs; seventh conclusion: baptism and the foreknown 487
Part 8: Human judgements against the judgement of God; the good born of the wicked 491
Chapter 20 495
Part 1: The song of the valiant woman; her finding, her price and her husband's trust (Prov. 31:10–11) 495
Part 2: The office of the valiant woman: good to her husband, wool and flax, the merchant's ship, rising in the night (Prov. 31:11–15) 499
Part 3: The office of the valiant woman: the field, the girded loins, the lamp, the spindle, the open hand, the double garments (Prov. 31:16–21) 504
Part 4: The office of the valiant woman: her clothing, her husband in the gates, the fine linen and the girdle, wisdom on her tongue; and the beginning of her praise (Prov. 31:22–30) 508
Part 5: The reward of the valiant woman, and the plan of the song (Prov. 31:31) 514
Chapter 21 516

Part 1: The opponent's "without qualification", and prayer for a damned patron 516
Part 2: Bonaventure against suffrages for the damned 519
Part 3: The lying witnesses: Bonaventure on the character of every order 524
Part 4: The second fabrication: Bonaventure on distinct characters in the several orders 527
Part 5: The third fabrication: Aquinas, and the senses of order 531
Part 6: Order as perceptible sacrament, and the many characters in one order 535
Part 7: Order conferred by degrees, and the cleric's propertyless life 540
Chapter 22 544
Part 1: The fourth lie: Hostiensis on suffrages for the damned 544
Part 2: The art of mockery, Hostiensis on the keys, and the fifth lie 546
Part 3: Praying for the damned: Augustine, Gregory and the reason against it 550
Part 4: Three distinctions of prayer, and the case of Gregory and Trajan raised 554
Part 5: Conditional prayer, prayer for the damned in name only, and Gregory and Trajan answered 559
Part 6: The third confirmation answered: mercy in the punishment of the damned, Augustine against the merciful, and the four kinds of the dead 561
Part 7: Exequies: what reaches the dead, Gregory, Chrysostom and Cyprian against mourning, and Augustine on the care of the dead 565
Part 8: The objections answered: burial in holy places, mourning, three conclusions on rites for the dead, and gilds and costly tombs 569
Chapter 23 576
Part 1: Indulgences: what the word means, and the canonists' limits on who may grant them 576
Part 2: The treasury of merits: the common opinion, its foundation, and Thomas and Bonaventure 577
Part 3: The treasury of merits in Bonaventure and the decretists; three arguments for the opinion; how one may make satisfaction for another 581
Part 4: Answers to the three arguments: no one is saved or damned without his own concurrence, and the debt to God is unlike any debt to man 585
Part 5: The pope's claim answered: Christ's Godhead, scripture and Peter rule the church; the first objection, that past merits lie beyond the pope's power . 589
Part 6: Against the treasury: the pope's power would reach heaven, purgatory and hell, and the saints' merits are already assigned by God 592
Part 7: Against the treasury: the saints' suffrages are already assigned, and the clause in the bulls makes them superfluous 596
Part 8: Common arguments: the pope's power would be infinite, and the calculators' cases would empty purgatory and hell 598
Part 9: The cases are imaginary, but so is the power; any priest could make indulgences 602
Part 10: The laity could indulge their prelates; the form of indulgences implies falsehood; the pious fraud rejected 604
Part 11: Thomas's measure of indulgences tested; the first six conclusions 608
Part 12: The last conclusions; sin and punishment in purgatory; merit after death; the end of the treatise 612
Glossary 616
The church 616
Lordship, law, office 617
Logic, disputation, metaphysics 619
False friends and ordinary words that mislead 622

Chapter 1

Part 1: The prologue: knowing our mother, and what the church is

Loserth pp. 1.2–3.13

Occasion. *Written between early 1378 and early 1379 (SEP), in the months after Gregory XI's five bulls of 1377 condemned nineteen articles drawn from* De civili dominio*, and as the Great Schism opened. It is the first of the great ecclesiological treatises, and the others (*De officio regis*,* De potestate pape*) build on its definition.*

The text. *Loserth's edition (1886) prints the treatise from Vienna, ÖNB Cod. Pal. 1294 (A), with Vienna 3929 (A$_1$), which he judges "almost wholly valueless", and Prague, University Library X.D.11 (B), whose early reader's glosses he prints in the apparatus. Dublin, TCD C.1.23 (D) has chapter 7 only. Our Latin is Loserth's printed text, established from three scans of the edition and read on the plates where they disagree. In the printed scripture references the chapter numbers are Wyclif's; the verse numbers are Loserth's.*

The move. *Wyclif does not begin with the pope, the bishops or endowment. He begins with Aristotle's order of knowing: one must know* what *a subject is before one can know its attributes. The church's liberty, privileges and prosperity, which are what the bishops fight about, are attributes. So the bishops cannot argue about them until the church's quiddity is settled. The quiddity is then fixed in a single sentence (5.11–13), and every later question of headship and membership is made to hang on it.*

Where it is answered. *In Hus's* De ecclesia *(1413), whose dependence on this treatise Loserth argued in* Hus und Wiclif *(1884). And at Constance (1415), whose first condemned article of Hus is this definition (DS 1201). In English: extracts only (Penn 2019, criticised on this very paragraph by Thakkar,* Vivarium *58 (2020), 368).*

¶1 1.2–2.23

1.2 *The Catholic Church may be recognized by the faithful How it may be known.*
2.6 *Belief in the Catholic Church is an article in both creeds.*
2.25 *The Church in its best known sense means all who are predestinate. This Church is the spouse of Christ.*

[1]**Quia nonnulli, eciam illi qui videntur esse aliquid discordant in materia de quiditate ecclesie, et fides est ecclesia que deberet in christianis omnibus esse una, decet christianos cognoscere matrem suam. Quomodo queso honoraret quis matrem illam primevam, sicut quilibet christianus tenetur sub pena dampnacionis ex primo mandato secunde tabule, nisi ipsam cognosceret? Aut quomodo ipsam perfecte cognosceret nisi cognoscendo eius quiditatem ac differencias sciretque a mulieribus alienis discernere? Unde inter omnes metaphisicas sub solis circulo non reputo quod sit alia christiano necessarior nec ad observanciam religionis christiane vel ad intelligenciam scripture sacre utilior. Christus enim ex fide est pater noster et dicta ecclesia sponsa sua est autonomatice mater nostra. Illos autem parentes debemus primo omnium honorare, quia recognoscendo eos in necessitatis articulo oportet eorum informacionem, castigacionem et suffragium invocare. Illis autem cultis ad plenum servatur plene christiana religio et de quanto deest eorum honoracio, deest preceptorum servacio, cum non sit possibile christianum delinquere, nisi de quanto subtrahit vel** [2]**minuit honorem vel ministerium debitum istis parentibus. Et hec est racio, quare hoc precipitur in primo mandato secunde tabule tamquam metro et regula omnium aliorum. Quomodo ergo foret catholicus qui ignoraret partem simboli in qua fides matris sue inseritur? Nam credo ecclesiam catholicam dicit utrumque simbolum; nec credo dominis episcopis displicere quod tractetur fides christiana**

Because some, even those who seem to be something,[1] disagree on the question of the quiddity of the church, and [the object of] faith is the church, which ought to be one in all Christians,[2] it befits Christians to know their mother. How, I ask, would anyone honour that primeval mother, as every Christian is bound to do under pain of damnation by the first commandment of the second table,[3] unless he knew her? Or how would he know her perfectly except by knowing her quiddity and differences, and knowing how to tell her apart from strange women?[4] Hence among all the metaphysics under the circle of the sun I do not reckon that there is another more necessary to a Christian, nor more useful for the observance of the Christian religion or for the understanding of holy scripture.[5] For, as faith teaches, Christ is our father, and the said church, his bride, is by antonomasia our mother.[6] Now those parents we ought to honour first of all, because in acknowledging them we must, at the point of need, call upon their instruction, correction and aid. And when they are honoured to the full, the Christian religion is fully kept; and to the extent that honour to them is lacking, the keeping of the commandments is lacking, since it is not possible for a Christian to transgress except to the extent that he withdraws or [2]**diminishes the honour or service owed to these parents. And this is the reason why this is commanded in the first commandment of the second table, as the measure and rule of all the others. How, then, would he be a catholic who**

de quiditate ecclesie, tum quia ipsi maxime tenentur per se et per alios docere populum illam fidem, tum eciam quia contendunt de libertate et prosperitate, de edificacione et destruccione, de privilegiis et defensionibus ecclesie contra hereticos. Sed constat quod loqueretur ut pica qui tractaret de istis passionibus ignorando subiectum, cum secundo posteriorum in principio vere dicitur quod oportet cognoscere questionem, quid est de subiecto, antequam noscatur eius passio. Et error istius ordinis noscendi facit multos errare de fide ecclesie. Quomodo queso cognoscerem in quo staret eius prosperitas vel edificacio, nisi ipsam precognoscerem, cum sequatur: ego cognosco quod procedit prospere, ergo prius nosco illam esse? Adhibeamus ergo diligenciam, ut cognoscamus debite matrem nostram.

was ignorant of the part of the creed in which the faith concerning his mother is set down? For both creeds say "I believe the catholic church";[7] nor do I believe it displeases the lord bishops that the Christian faith concerning the quiddity of the church should be treated, both because they themselves are bound above all, by themselves and through others, to teach the people that faith, and also because they contend about the liberty and prosperity, the building up and the destruction, the privileges and the defences of the church against heretics.[8] But it is evident that one who treated of these attributes while ignorant of the subject would be speaking like a magpie, since at the beginning of the second book of the *Posterior Analytics* it is truly said that one must know the question "what is it?" about the subject before its attribute is known.[9] And error in this order of knowing makes many err about the faith of the church. How, I ask, could I know in what her prosperity or building up consisted unless I knew her beforehand, since it follows: "I know that she is prospering; therefore I first know that she exists"?[10] Let us, then, apply diligence, so that we may duly know our mother.

¶2 2.25–3.13

[2] Quamvis autem ecclesia dicatur multipliciter in scriptura, suppono quod sumatur ad propositum pro famosiori, scilicet congregacione omnium predestinatorum. Illa autem est sponsa Christi, de qua est processus Cantici canticorum; de qua loquitur scriptura Isaie LXI°, 10: Tamquam sponsam decoravit me corona. Hec eciam est mulier fortis, de qua [3] Proverb. XXXI°, 10, et corpus Christi misticum, de quo I[a] Cor. 12°. Ista est Jerusalem, mater nostra, templum domini, regnum celorum et civitas regis magni, que tota inquit Augustinus Enchiridion XLVI°, accipienda est non solum ex parte qua peregrinatur in terra a solis ortu usque ad occasum, laudans nomen domini, et post captivitatem vetustatis cantans canticum novum, verum eciam ex illa que in celis semper ex quo condita est cohesit deo, nec ullum malum sui casus est experta. Hec enim in sanctis angelis beata persistit et sue parti peregrinanti, sicut oportet, opitulatur, quia utraque una erit consorcio eternitatis et nunc est una vinculo caritatis.

And although "church" is said in many ways in scripture, I suppose that for the present purpose it is taken for its best-known [sense], namely the congregation of all the predestinate.[11] And that church is the bride of Christ, of whom the course of the Song of Songs treats; of whom scripture speaks in Isaiah 61:10: "As a bride he has adorned me with a crown."[12] She is also the valiant woman of [3] Proverbs 31:10, and the mystical body of Christ, of which 1 Corinthians 12 speaks. She is Jerusalem our mother, the temple of the Lord, the kingdom of heaven and the city of the great king, "which as a whole", says Augustine in the *Enchiridion*, "is to be taken not only in the part in which she is a pilgrim on earth, praising the name of the Lord from the rising of the sun to its going down, and, after the captivity of her old state, singing a new song, but also in that part which in heaven has always, since it was founded, cleaved to God, and has experienced no evil of its own fall. For this part persists blessed in the holy angels, and helps its pilgrim part, as it should, because both will be one in the fellowship of eternity, and are now one in the bond of charity."[13]

Notes

1. Gal. 2:6 (Vg *ab iis autem qui videbantur esse aliquid*; DR "But of them who seemed to be some thing"): Paul's phrase for the Jerusalem leaders, turned here on the church's present authorities. Wyclif has the present *videntur*; we translate his Latin.

2. ***et fides est ecclesia que deberet in christianis omnibus esse una***. Literally "and faith is [the] church which ought to be one in all Christians". The construal is doubtful. (a) We take the clause to mean that the church is an object of faith, as the creed puts it below (2.6), and take *que* with *ecclesia* (*unam ... ecclesiam*). (b) *Que* may instead go with *fides* ("one faith", Eph. 4:5), giving "and the faith that ought to be one in all Christians concerns the church". Loserth records no variant; the sentence may be disturbed. Our English keeps reading (a) and marks the supplied words.
3. The second table of the Decalogue holds the commandments toward one's neighbour. Its first is "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Exod. 20:12). Wyclif applies it to the church as mother, and at 2.2–3 makes it the "measure and rule" of the rest.
4. ***Mulieribus alienis***, "strange women", is the *mulier aliena* of Proverbs (2:16; 5:3, 20; 7:5; DR 2:16 "the strange woman"). The false church is the woman who must not be mistaken for the mother. ***Differencias*** are differences in the logical sense, the marks that set a species apart in its genus.
5. Penn construed ***non reputo quod sit alia christiano necessarior*** as "none is held to be more necessary than the Christian one". The syntax gives the reverse. No other metaphysics is more necessary *for a Christian*, and *alia* implies that the doctrine of the church's quiddity is itself a metaphysics (Thakkar, p. 368).
6. ***Autonomatice***: Loserth's printed form, while he reports the MSS as *autonomastice* (apparatus to 1.16). Both stand for *antonomastice*: she has the name "mother" pre-eminently, as the one to whom it belongs by right.
7. Apostles' Creed: ***Credo ... sanctam ecclesiam catholicam***. Nicene–Constantinopolitan: ***et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam***. The Latin has *credo ecclesiam*, not *credo in ecclesiam*: one believes *in* God, and believes the church. Hence "I believe the catholic church", not "believe in". The classic statement is Rufinus, *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum* 36 (PL 21:373A–B): ***in praepositio non additur ... sed sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse, non ut Deum, sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam***. Thakkar (p. 368) corrects Penn's "represent a symbol everywhere!" here.
8. ***Tum ... tum eciam***: two separate reasons why the bishops should welcome the treatise. First, they are bound to teach this faith. Second, they are themselves forever disputing the church's liberty, prosperity and privileges, which (the next sentence shows) are attributes of a subject they have not defined. ***Quod tractetur fides christiana de quiditate ecclesie*** means that the faith *about* the church's quiddity be treated. Not Penn's "that the Christian faith is drawn from the quiddity of the church" (Thakkar, p. 368). ***Contra hereticos*** is taken with ***defensionibus*** ("defences ... against heretics"); it could go with ***contendunt*** ("they contend against heretics about ..."), but it stands at the far end of the list.
9. Loserth refers to *APo* I.1 and II.2. The maxim is a scholastic compression, not a quotation. It combines Aristotle's doctrine that learning presupposes knowledge of what a term means (I.1, 71a11–17) with the ordering of the questions "whether it is" and "what it is" before "that it holds" and "why" (II.1–2; the four questions at II.1, 89b23–35). B's margin gives the reference (*2° posteriorum*, apparatus to 2.15). The magpie is the stock image of speech without understanding.
10. ***Cum sequatur***: Wyclif states the inference he means, in quotation form: from "I know that she prospers" to "I first know that she exists". ***Precognoscerem***: Loserth glosses it with Aristotle's *progignōskein* (*APo* I.1, 71a1), pre-existent knowledge.
11. ***Sumatur ... pro famosiori***: "is taken for the best-known [sense]", the language of supposition. ***Congregacio omnium predestinatorum***: the definition on which the treatise rests. It returns as the conclusion at 5.11–13.
12. A conflation. Vg Isa. 61:10 reads *quasi sponsum decoratum corona, et quasi sponsam ornatam monilibus suis* (DR "as a bridegroom decked with a crown, and as a bride adorned with her jewels"). Wyclif puts the bride where the Vulgate puts the bridegroom's crown. We translate his Latin. For the valiant woman, DR Prov. 31:10: "Who shall find a valiant woman?"
13. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 56. Loserth prints the chapter as XLVI, correcting the MSS' XLI (plate checked), and refers to the Maurist edition, vol. VI, p. 217; neither number is the modern 56 (15.56). Wyclif quotes closely. B's margin at 3.10: ***Nota quod angeli sunt pars ecclesie***, "note that the angels are a part of the church".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 1: ***CAP. I.***
  - 3: ***Iª***
  - 3: ***12°***. (degree sign, round) [-MARK]
- 1.16 ***autonomatice***: as printed; apparatus "Codd. autonomastice" (n. 6).
- 3.4 ***Enchiridion XLVI°***: Loserth's correction ("In codd. XLI. Correxi").
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 1.5 B *igitur decet*; 1.18 B *et recognoscendo*; 1.21 B *de quarto*; 2.2 B *Hec racio*; 2.16 B *cognoscere quomodo*; 2.20 B *prius cognoscerem*; 3.5 AA$_1$ *que*, B *peregrinat*.

Part 2: The church is the predestinate; no vicar of Christ is its head

Loserth pp. 3.14–6.15

¶1 3.14–6.15

3.14 *How faith concerning the Church follows immediately on faith concerning the Holy Spirit.*

[3]**Hec est sancta ecclesia catholica quam confitentur christiani immediate post fidem in spiritum sanctum propter tria: primo quia secundum Augustinum est summa creatura. Ideo immediate ponitur post trinitatem increatam. Secundo quia amore spiritus**

This is the holy catholic church which Christians confess immediately after faith in the Holy Spirit, for three reasons.[1] First, because according to Augustine she is the highest creature;[2] therefore she is placed immediately after the uncreated Trinity. Second, because by the love of

3.23 *Note. This Holy Church contains none who are reprobate.*
4.15 *The virtue of the sacramental food.*
5.14 *First conclusion. No Pope should presume that he is the Head of this Church.*
5.23 *No one can know whether he is predestinate.*
5.27 *Augustine.*
6.10 *The House of God.*

sancti Christo in matrimonio perpetuo copulatur. Et tercio quia posita trinitate oportet ipsam habere templum vel domum quam inhabitet. Oportet dico ex necessitate supposicionis atque de congruo. Ista autem ecclesia secundum partem peregrinantem non habet aliquem prescitum partem sui, sicut non [4]**habet secundum partem triumphantem, dum est huiusmodi, aliquem miserum vel quomodolibet maculatum, ut ostendit Augustinus, III° de doctrina christiana XXXII°, ubi, postquam ostenderat quod corpus Christi et caput eius Christus sunt una persona, increpat Tyconium in secunda sui regula qua vocat ecclesiam corpus domini bipartitum. Non inquit ita debuit appellare; non enim revera corpus domini est quod cum illo non manebit in eternum. Ideo vocat fideles ad tempus sed prescitos ad dampnacionem ecclesiam similatam ex ypocritis. Potest autem ista sentencia demonstrari ex scriptura Johannis VI°, 54, ubi dicitur Judeis et per idem cuilibet viatori: Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Sed nemo potest esse membrum corporis Christi, nisi fuerit membrum vivum: ergo nemo potest esse de illo corpore, nisi manducaverit corpus Christi. Quomodo queso potest continuari cum nervis capitis, nisi fide formata in caput crediderit? Quod est ipsum manducare, ut exponit Augustinus omelia XXV[a]. Habet autem iste cibus contrarie ad cibos corporales virtutem assimilandi sibi manducantem secundum quatuor digestiones, de quibus Rom. VIII°, 30, scilicet predestinacionem, vocacionem, iustificacionem et glorificacionem. Quamvis enim sic manducans moritur temporaliter, non tamen eternaliter, cum Christus, resurreccio et vita in finali iudicio vivificat omnia membra sua, quia leo rugiens suscitat suam ecclesiam. Caritas autem que nunquam excidit est vinculum** [5]**continuans membra illius corporis; foret ergo contra racionem, vel quod sponsus in persona propria, vel quod alius ex permissione sua laniaret sponsam suam divisione eterna. Ymmo claudit contradictorium, si bene inspicitur; cum Jeremie XXXI°, 3, sibi dicitur: In caritate perpetua dilexi te. Ista igitur et non lapides est mater nostra per orbem terrarum confitens caput suum. Quomodo queso tam potens, tam sciolus et tam benivolus, sicut est increata trinitas, eternaliter eligeret sibi sponsam quam finaliter repudiaret? Patet ergo ex fide et signacione quid nominis ecclesie catholice quod ipsa est omnes predestinati presentes, preteriti et futuri. Ex istis sequuntur alique conclusiones. Prima, quod nullus vicarius Christi debet presumere asserere se esse caput ecclesie sancte catholice, ymmo nisi habuerit specialem revelacionem, non assereret se esse aliquod membrum eius. Patet ex hoc quod capitalem illius ecclesie oportet esse super omnes angelos**

the Holy Spirit she is joined to Christ in perpetual marriage. And third, because, the Trinity being posited, it must have a temple or house which it may inhabit: "must", I say, by necessity of supposition and by congruity.[3] And this church, in its pilgrim part, has no one foreknown as a part of itself,[4] just as, in its triumphant part, [4]**it has no one wretched or in any way stained, while he is such,[5] as Augustine shows in *On Christian Teaching* III.32. There, after showing that "the body of Christ and its head, Christ, are one person", he rebukes Tyconius over his second rule, in which he calls the church the Lord's bipartite body. "He ought not", he says, "to have called it so; for what will not remain with him for ever is not truly the Lord's body." Therefore he calls those who are faithful for a time but foreknown to damnation a simulated church, made of hypocrites.[6] And this teaching can be demonstrated from the scripture of John 6:54, where it is said to the Jews, and by the same token to every wayfarer:[7] "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." Now no one can be a member of the body of Christ unless he is a living member; therefore no one can be of that body unless he has eaten the body of Christ. How, I ask, can he be joined to the sinews of the head unless he has believed in the head with formed faith? And that is what eating is, as Augustine expounds in Homily 25.[8] Now this food, contrary to bodily foods, has the power of assimilating the eater to itself[9] according to four digestions, of which Romans 8:30 speaks: namely, predestination, calling, justification and glorification.[10] For although one who eats in this way dies in time, yet he does not die eternally, since "Christ, the resurrection and the life", at the final judgement gives life to all his members, because the roaring lion raises up his church.[11] Now charity, which "never falleth away", is the bond** [5]**joining the members of that body; it would therefore be against reason that either the bridegroom in his own person, or another by his permission, should tear his bride apart by an eternal division. Indeed, if it is well considered, it implies a contradiction,[12] since it is said to her in Jeremiah 31:3: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love."[13] This, then, and not stones, is our mother, confessing her head throughout the world.[14] How, I ask, would one so powerful, so knowing and so benevolent as the uncreated Trinity is,[15] choose eternally for itself a bride whom it would finally repudiate? It is clear, therefore, as faith teaches and from the signification [of the term], what the name "catholic church" [means]: that she is all the predestinate, present, past and future.[16]**

beatos, cum ipsi sint membra illius ecclesie, quod soli Christo potest competere inter omnes predestinatos, ut patet Hebr. 1°, 4. Nam Rom. 1°, 4, dicitur Christum esse predestinatum; et sic ecclesia est solum numerus predestinatorum. Sicut igitur homo sine speciali revelacione non assereret sine formidine se esse predestinatum, sic nec assereret se esse membrum, et per consequens, non caput illius ecclesie. Unde Augustinus super psalmum CXXXI^{um} postquam ostenderat quod nullum preterquam domum suam exaudit Deus ad vitam eternam: Ille inquit ad domum Dei [6]pertinet qui est in caritate compaginatus lapidibus vivis; qui autem caritatem non habuerit, finalis perseverancie ruinam facit, sed domus stat. Et post docet quod nemo debet ex pretense potestatis vicaria pompare vel minari quod ab eo dependet status ecclesie, sicut fecerunt Judei ex filiacione et merito Abrahe, quia filiis imitacione virtutum et non filiis carnis degenerantibus promittitur hereditas. Et sic est indubie quoad Christi vicarios. Itaque inquit Augustinus in hiis est domus Dei quos predestinavit et prescivit perseveraturos, de quibus dictum est: Ubi steterunt sedes eius. Et hii qui non perseverant, non sunt ipsi ecclesia, non ipsi pertinent ad illud modo tabernaculum et tunc domum, sed solum in hiis qui perseveraverint usque in finem.

From these some conclusions follow. The first: that no vicar of Christ ought to presume to assert that he is head of the holy catholic church; indeed, unless he has had a special revelation, he should not assert that he is any member of it.[17] This is clear from the fact that the head of that church must be above all the blessed angels, since they are members of that church; and this can belong to Christ alone among all the predestinate, as is clear from Hebrews 1:4.[18] For in Romans 1:4 Christ is said to be "predestinated"; and so the church is only the number of the predestinate. Therefore, just as a man without a special revelation would not assert without misgiving that he is predestinate,[19] so neither would he assert that he is a member, and consequently not that he is head, of that church. Hence Augustine on Psalm 131, after he had shown that God hears no one unto eternal life except his own house:[20] "He belongs", he says, "to the house of God [6]who is fitted together in charity with the living stones; but he who has not had the charity of final perseverance falls in ruin, but the house stands."[21] And afterwards he teaches that no one ought, on the ground of the vicarship of a pretended power, to make a show or to threaten that the state of the church depends on him, as the Jews did on the ground of their sonship to Abraham and his merit; because the inheritance is promised to sons by the imitation of virtues, and not to degenerate sons of the flesh. And so it is, without doubt, as regards the vicars of Christ.[22] "So then", says Augustine, "the house of God is in those whom he predestined and foreknew would persevere, of whom it is said, 'Where his seats have stood.'[23] And those who do not persevere, they are not the church, they do not belong to that which is now a tabernacle and will then be a house; but [it is] only in those who will have persevered to the end."[24]

Notes

1. In the Apostles' Creed the article on the church immediately follows *credo in Spiritum Sanctum*. Wyclif gives three reasons for the order. B's margin (apparatus to 3.14): *Nota quare immediate post fidem in spiritum sanctum ponitur fides de sancta matre catholica*.
2. *Summa creatura*: not identified by Loserth, and not yet traced.
3. *Ex necessitate supposicionis*: conditional necessity. *Given* that the Trinity is posited as dwelling somewhere, it must have a house. *De congruo*: by fittingness, not by strict necessity. The double qualification keeps the church from becoming something God is absolutely compelled to have.
4. *Prescitus*, "foreknown": Wyclif's term for those whom God foreknows will be damned. It is the counterpart of *predestinatus*, and it is not the same word as *reprobus* (though Loserth's side-note at 3.23 says "reprobate"). The claim is that no one who will finally be damned is a *part* of this church, whatever his office or present standing. See the glossary.
5. *Dum est huiusmodi*: the subject of *est* is ambiguous. It could be the triumphant part ("while it is such") or the wretched person ("while he is such"). We follow the early reader of MS B, whose gloss Loserth prints (apparatus to 3.24). He takes it of the person: the predestinate still wayfarers, "involved in miseries and stains", will later be parts of the church triumphant, but are not counted such *while* they are so involved, "and therefore it is said pointedly, *while he is such*".

6. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.32.45, on Tyconius's second rule, *de Domini corpore bipartito*; the first rule (III.31.44) is the one on Christ and his body as one person. Augustine proposes *de Domini corpore vero atque permixto, aut, vero atque simulato*, "the Lord's true and *simulated* body", the source of Wyclif's *ecclesiam similatam*. Augustine has *quod cum illo non erit in aeternum*; Wyclif's *manebit* stands for his *erit* (PL 34:82). Loserth: *Opp.* III.1, p. 58.
7. *Per idem*, "by the same token": the saying to the Jews applies by parallel argument to every Christian (Thakkar, p. 365). Loserth glosses *viator* "a traveller on earth" (cf. *De civ. dom.* I, p. 4).
8. Augustine, *Tractates on John* 25–26: *crede, et manducasti* (25.12; PL 35:1602). Loserth corrects the MSS' XXVI to XXV and refers to *Opp.* III.2, p. 489.
9. The reversal of ordinary nourishment echoes Augustine, *Confessions* VII.10.16: *nec tu me in te mutabis sicut cibum carnis tuae, sed tu mutaberis in me* (PL 32:742; our identification, not Loserth's).
10. *Digestiones*: the metaphor of eating continues. The chain of Rom. 8:30 is the four stages by which the food assimilates the eater. Wyclif gives the nouns; DR has the verbs ("whom he predestinated ... called ... justified ... glorified"). B's margin: *Christus (sic) digestio*.
11. John 11:25 (DR "I am the resurrection and the life") with 6:40 (Loserth). The lion is the bestiary lion, whose cubs are born dead and are raised on the third day by their father's roar (Ps.-Hugh, *De bestiis*, PL 177:150C, *tertia die ad rugitum patris excitatur*; in the *Physiologus* form, PL 177:57C, the father breathes on them). The *leo rugiens* of 1 Pet. 5:8 is the devil; Wyclif gives the phrase to Christ.
12. *Claudit contradictorium* is stronger than *contra racionem* just before, and the step up (*ymmo*) is the argument: given Jer. 31:3, it is not only unreasonable for Christ to lose a member of his bride but impossible.
13. DR's wording; the Latin is *in caritate perpetua*, so the bond just named ("charity") is the very word of the prophecy.
14. *Non lapides*: the church is not the stone buildings. *Per orbem terrarum confitens* echoes the Te Deum, *Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur Ecclesia*.
15. *Sciolus* without contempt (the glossary). Power, knowledge and goodness are the three attributes appropriated to Father, Son and Spirit.
16. *Ipsa est omnes predestinati*: singular verb, plural predicate. The church *is* the predestinate, not a body in which they hold membership, and the English keeps the identity. *Ex fide et signacione* pairs the two grounds: what faith teaches, and what the term signifies. The definition as Hus restated it heads the articles condemned at Constance (sess. XV, 6 July 1415, art. 1, *Unica est sancta universalis ecclesia, quae est praedestinatorum universitas*; DS 1201).
17. *Nullus vicarius Christi*: the quantifier governs the whole: no vicar, the pope included (A's margin: *Nullus papa debet se presumere esse caput huius ecclesie*). *Assereret* (imperfect subjunctive) is potential: "he should not assert", "would not assert".
18. *Capitalem*: literally "the capital [one]", the one who is head. Heb. 1:4: Christ "made so much better than the angels". Rom. 1:4: "Who was predestinated the Son of God in power". *Numerus* is the number, the full count, of the predestinate.
19. *Sine formidine*: *formido* is the schools' "fear of the opposite", the doubt that attends opinion as against knowledge. Hence "without misgiving", not "without fear".
20. *Ostenderat*: Loserth's correction (B *ostenderet*, AA$_1$ *ostenderit*). Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 131; Loserth: *Opp.* IV.2, p. 1477.
21. *Qui autem caritatem non habuerit, finalis perseverancie ruinam facit*. We take *finalis perseverancie* with *caritatem*: "the charity of final perseverance". It could instead hang on *ruinam*: "he falls in ruin from final perseverance". Either way the person falls and the house stands. *Finalis perseverancie* is Wyclif's addition: Augustine has only *ruinam facit; et illo ruente domus stat* (PL 37:1722). *Compaginatus lapidibus vivis*: 1 Pet. 2:5.
22. *Vicaria*: Loserth's correction of the MSS' *vicarie* (apparatus to 6.4); *ex pretense potestatis vicaria*, "on the ground of the vicarship of a pretended power". *Pompare*, "to make a show". The last sentence is Wyclif's application of Augustine to the vicars of Christ. *Filiis imitacione virtutum*: cf. John 8:39, Rom. 9:8.
23. Ps. 131:7: Vg *adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes ejus* (DR "where his feet stood"). The print has *sedes*, "seats"; Loserth records no variant. We translate the print; *sedes* may be a slip for *pedes*, which Augustine reads here (*Enarr. in Ps.* 131.13, PL 37:1722). Loserth: Augustine, *loc. cit.*, p. 1480.
24. *Prescivit perseveraturos*: here the verb is neutral ("foreknew would persevere"), of the predestinate, not the technical *prescitus* of 3.24. *Modo tabernaculum et tunc domum*: the tabernacle of the wayfaring church now, the house of the homeland then (Ps. 131:7 *tabernaculum*).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 3: *non* (side-note text glued in OCR)
  - 4: *III°*
  - 4: *Christi*
  - 4: *XXV^{a}*
  - 5: *fide* (f with crossbar, clear)
  - 5: *nullus* (15 is the line number)
  - 5: *vicarius*
  - 6: *pertinet* (first word of line, italic)
  - 6: *Christi*
  - 5: *domum*
- 4.21 *omelia XXV^{a}*: Loserth's correction ("In codd. XXVI. Correxi").
- 5.28 *ostenderat*: Loserth's correction (n. 20). 6.4 *vicaria*: Loserth's correction (n. 22).
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin against the plates: 4.10 stray stop after *similatam*; 4.24 *3o → 30*; 5.21 *numerUS → numerus*; 5.27 *CXXXI"°" → CXXXI^{am}*.
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 3.5 AA$_1$ *que*, B *peregrinat*; 4.8 B *reverencia corpus* (for *revera*); 4.16 B *Igitur nemo*; 5.1 B *foret igitur*; 5.10 B *Patet igitur*; 5.29 B *preter domum*.

Part 3: Christ the head; the church is one, in three parts

Loserth pp. 6.16–10.15

¶1 6.16–10.15
6.29 *The whole Church is widowed.*
7.1 *The Church is distributed through the whole world.*
7.4 *Augustine.*
7.12 *The Head of the Church is Christ.*
7.19 *Second conclusion. The Catholic Church is only One and not many.*
7.27 *The three parts of the Church.*
8.6 *The three parts into which the consecrated host is broken signify the three parts of the Church.*
8.18 *Mark this.*
8.22 *Christ, as man, visited all.*
9.11 *Peter's privilege of binding and loosing remains where it is rightly exercised.*
9.21 *The begetting of children to the Church.*
10.4 *The unity of the Church proved out of many passages of scripture.*

[6] Unde sicut Deus iuravit David, quod de fructu ventris sui (scilicet Christum, qui fuit natus de ventre virginis, et per consequens, de illo homine manu forti) poneret super sedem suam: ita iuravit filiis suis, sub condicione tamen, si custodierint testamentum et testimonia Christi. Ne inquit Augustinus aliquis minaretur promissis Dei et in potestate sua ponat quod promisit Deus, ut impleretur, ideo iuravit, annectens condicionem, ne iam glorieris de promissis et dimittas te non custodire; tunc eris filius David, si custodieris: si autem non, non eris filius David. Filiis David promisit Deus; noli dicere filius sum David, si degeneras; sola vidua sedebit in ecclesia benedicta. Tota ecclesia una vidua est, cuius membra sunt pauperes saturati, quia deserti sunt in hoc seculo, quod non desponsant hereditarie sed relinquunt, non sperant in diviciis honoribus vel amicis, sed si habent contempnunt sperando pure in domino. [7] Quid igitur valet dicere quod solum isti qui sunt Rome sunt ecclesia vel caput ecclesie? Tales enim uruntur luna per noctem, ut exponit Augustinus psalmo CXX°. Quisquis inquit putaverit ecclesiam in una parte esse et non eam cognoverit diffusam toto orbe terrarum et crediderit eis qui dicunt: Ecce hic est Christus et ecce illic, sicut loquitur evangelium Mathei XXIV°, cum ille totum orbem terrarum emerit quoad valorem precii et ille in proximo scandalizatur et uritur a luna. Ad quid igitur oportet contendere circa caput ecclesie? Ipsa inquit Augustinus caro Christi est caput ecclesie, id est, humanitas secundum quam Christus predestinatus est, ut dicit fides scripture Ephes. I°, IV° et V° capitulis et expressius Col. 1°, 18, dicit quod Christus est caput tocius ecclesie. Et istam conclusionem declarat bene dicta decretalis extravagans Bonifacii VIII que sic incipit: Unam sanctam. Igitur inquit ecclesie unius unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita quasi monstrum. Secunda conclusio sequens ex quiditate matris ecclesie est quod tantum est una, sic quod non multe ecclesie catholice. Demonstratur sic: Eo ipso quod est ecclesia universalis sive catholica, ipsa continet in se omnes predestinatos. Non est possibile quod sit nisi una talis, igitur non est possibile quod sit nisi una universalis ecclesia. Nam secundum philosophos universale est quoddam totum atque perfectum cui [8] nichil deest. Unde sicut iuxta Aristotelem primo de celo omnia primo super tria ponimus: sic non dicimus ecclesiam catholicam nisi que in se continet ista tria: partem in celo triumphantem, partem in purgatorio dormientem et partem

Hence, just as God swore to David that of the fruit of his womb (namely Christ, who was born of the womb of the virgin, and consequently of that man "strong of hand") he would set [one] upon his seat,[1] so he swore to his sons, yet under a condition: if they keep the testament and the testimonies of Christ. "Lest anyone", says Augustine, "should threaten on the strength of God's promises, and put in his own power what God promised, that it should be fulfilled, therefore he swore, attaching a condition: lest you now glory in the promises and let yourself off keeping [them]. Then you will be a son of David, if you keep [them]; but if not, you will not be a son of David."[2] To the sons of David God made the promise; do not say "I am a son of David" if you are degenerate. Only the widow will sit, blessed, in the church.[3] The whole church is one widow, whose members are the poor who are filled, because they are forsaken in this world, which they do not wed as an inheritance but leave; they do not hope in riches, honours or friends, but if they have them they despise them, hoping purely in the Lord. [7] What then is it worth to say that only those who are at Rome are the church, or the head of the church? For such are "burned by the moon by night", as Augustine expounds on Psalm 120.[4] "Whoever", he says, "thinks that the church is in one part, and does not know her as spread through the whole world, and believes those who say 'Lo here is Christ, and lo there', as the gospel of Matthew 24 speaks, although he bought the whole world as regards the value of the price, he is scandalized in his neighbour and is burned by the moon."[5] To what end, then, must there be contention about the head of the church? "The very flesh of Christ", says Augustine, "is the head of the church", that is, the humanity according to which Christ was predestinated, as the faith of scripture says in Ephesians chapters 1, 4 and 5; and more expressly Colossians 1:18 says that Christ is head of the whole church.[6] And this conclusion is well set out by the decretal extravagant of Boniface VIII which begins thus: *Unam sanctam*. "Therefore", it says, "of the one church [there is] one body, one head, not two heads like a monster."[7]

The second conclusion, following from the quiddity of mother church, is that she is only one, so that there are not many catholic churches. It is demonstrated thus. By the very fact that she is the universal or catholic church, she contains in herself all the predestinate. It is not possible that

in terris militantem. Et in figuram illius dicunt doctores hostiam vel sacramentum eucaristie dividi in tres partes: Primam immersam sacramento liquido dicunt signare ecclesiam triumphantem, que insorpta et inebriata est intuicione divine essencie, ut loquitur caput ecclesie Cantic. V° 1, exhilarans cives et commensales suos. Inebriamini inquit carissimi. Due autem alie partes in manu domini et merito ecclesie expurgande signantur per illas duas partes quas sacerdos tenet in manibus: Maior supposita signat ecclesiam militantem et minor innixa supposite signat ecclesiam in purgatorio expectantem. Ipsa enim innititur suffragiis militantis ecclesie. Et pro istis duabus partibus geminamus preces agno qui est caput ecclesie, ut misereatur nobis. Sed pro tercia parte ad cuius locum et requiem aspiramus petimus, ut idem agnus triplicis nature donet finaliter nobis pacem. Et hinc (ut ostendi alias) dictus sponsus secundum humanitatem suam visitavit tria loca ecclesie, scilicet umbilicum nostre habilitabilis, triginta tribus annis in Judea et Jerusalem conversando, limbum in quo patres purgati sunt, morsellum sue ecclesie in anima extrahendo; sed tercio finaliter ascendens in celum cepit captivitatem quam post triumphum coronavit ad dei dexteram collocando. [9]Ista ergo est triplex pars unius universalis ecclesie sive catholice, licet quotlibet sint particulares ecclesie, quia tot quot sunt homines predestinati. Et hinc credo quod in simbolo ecclesie confitentur se credere unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam. Apostoli enim sunt modo in celo in eadem personalitate qua vixerunt in terris, et sunt modo partes plene purgate eiusdem matris ecclesie, auctoritate quorum sui vicarii iam regunt adolescentulam modo querentem sponsum ecclesie; et sic loquitur decretum XXIV, q. I. Manet inquit Leo papa Petri privilegium ubicunque ex ipsius equitate fertur iudicium. Ipse enim residet in celis videns et procurans quod deus liget et solvat. Unde supradicta decretalis sic loquitur: Unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et ipsam apostolicam urgente fide credere cogimur et tenere. Unde unitatem illius ecclesie probat ex scriptura multiplici, primo per illud Canticorum VI°, 8: Una est columba mea, perfecta mea: una est matri sue, electa genitrici sue. Ista columba secundum concordem sanctorum sentenciam est mater ecclesia, cuius mater, quia creatrix est trinitas vel divina essencia, cuius genitrix et fotrix est patris sapiencia et ipsa mater virgo et sponsa humanitatis Christi sui capitis. Ex quibus parentibus spiritualiter, et per consequens, gignicione virginea filii ecclesie procreantur, iuxta quod loquitur apostolus 2ª Cor. XI°, 2, Despondi vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo. Cum ergo in tota scriptura non ponitur vel una sillaba sine sensu, non restat quid pertinencius

there be more than one such; therefore it is not possible that there be more than one universal church.[8] For according to the philosophers the universal is a certain whole and perfect thing, from which [8]nothing is lacking. Hence, just as according to Aristotle in *On the Heavens* I we first apply "all" to three, so we do not call [a church] catholic unless it contains in itself these three: the part triumphant in heaven, the part sleeping in purgatory, and the part militant on earth.[9] And in figure of this the doctors say that the host, or sacrament of the eucharist, is divided into three parts. The first, immersed in the liquid sacrament, they say signifies the church triumphant, which is absorbed and inebriated with the vision of the divine essence, as the head of the church speaks in the Canticle 5:1, gladdening his fellow citizens and table-companions: "Be inebriated", he says, "my dearly beloved."[10] And the other two parts, which are to be purged in the hand of the Lord and by the merit of the church, are signified by those two parts which the priest holds in his hands: the larger, placed beneath, signifies the church militant, and the smaller, resting on the one beneath, signifies the church in purgatory, waiting. For it rests on the suffrages of the church militant. And for these two parts we double our prayers to the Lamb, who is the head of the church, that he may have mercy on us. But for the third part, to whose place and rest we aspire, we ask that the same Lamb of threefold nature may finally grant us peace.[11] And hence (as I have shown elsewhere) the said bridegroom, according to his humanity, visited three places of the church: namely, the navel of our habitable [world], living thirty-three years in Judea and Jerusalem; limbo, in which the fathers were purged, drawing out a morsel of his church in his soul; but third, finally ascending into heaven, he took captivity captive, which after the triumph he crowned, placing it at the right hand of God.[12] [9]This, then, is the threefold part of the one universal or catholic church, although there are any number of particular churches, for there are as many as there are predestinate men.[13] And hence I believe that in the creed of the church they confess that they believe "one holy catholic and apostolic church".[14] For the apostles are now in heaven in the same personality in which they lived on earth, and are now fully purged parts of the same mother church; by their authority their vicars now rule the young maiden who is now seeking the bridegroom of the church.[15] And so the decree speaks in [Causa] 24, q. 1: "Peter's privilege remains", says Pope Leo, "wherever judgement is given in accordance with his equity."[16] For he sits in heaven, seeing and procuring that God binds and looses. Hence the aforesaid decretal speaks thus: "We are compelled,

signaret hoc adiectum una [10]in libro sapientissimi Salomonis nisi unitatem ecclesie catholice excludentem pluralitatem. Unde spiritus sanctus in patre Salomonis David sic orat in Christo psalmo XXI°, 21, Erue a framea Deus animam meam et de manu canis unicam meam. Quem textum secundo per decretalem allegatam beatus Augustinus sic exponit tractatu secundo eiusdem psalmi: Framea inquit gladius est, et per gladium mortem intelligi voluit. Unicam meam dixit ecclesiam. Canes sunt qui ceco more latrant nec intelligunt contra quos, eciam cum nichil eis fit, latrant contra viantes, licet velint eis proficere. Et utinam nostri possessionati non sint tales qui conspirant contra catholicos, tangentes eorum potestatem, fastum et ablacionem temporalium solummodo ad medelam.

faith urging us, to believe and to hold one holy catholic church, and that apostolic." Hence it proves the unity of that church from manifold scripture: first by that [verse] of the Canticle 6:8: "One is my dove, my perfect one is but one; she is the only one of her mother, the chosen of her that bore her."[17] This dove, according to the concordant teaching of the saints, is mother church: whose mother, because creatress, is the Trinity or the divine essence; whose genetrix and nurse is the Father's wisdom; and she herself is mother, virgin and bride of the humanity of Christ, her head.[18] From these parents, spiritually, and consequently by a virginal begetting, the sons of the church are procreated, according to what the apostle says in 2 Corinthians 11:2: "I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." Since, therefore, in the whole of scripture not one syllable is set down without sense, nothing remains that this adjective "one" [10]in the book of the most wise Solomon could signify more pertinently than the unity of the catholic church, excluding plurality. Hence the Holy Spirit, in David the father of Solomon, prays thus in Christ in Psalm 21:21: "Deliver, O God, my soul from the sword: my only one from the hand of the dog." This text, which the decretal cites second, the blessed Augustine expounds thus in the second treatise on the same psalm: "The sword", he says, "is a blade, and by the blade he meant death to be understood. 'My only one' he called the church. Dogs are those who bark in blind fashion and do not understand against whom; even when nothing is done to them, they bark against those on the road, although these wish to do them good."[19] And would that our possessioners were not such as conspire against catholics who touch on their power, their pride and the removal of their temporal goods, only for [their] healing.[20]

Notes

1. Ps. 131:11–12 (Loserth), reported indirectly. DR "of the fruit of thy womb I will set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant, and these my testimonies...". Wyclif's *testimonia Christi* for Vg *testimonia mea*. *Sedem* is kept as "seat" to match *sedes* at 6.9. *Manu forti*: the etymology of "David" as "strong of hand" (Jerome, *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*, PL 23:847A, *David ... manu fortis*).
2. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 131 (Loserth, *loc. cit.*). *Minaretur promissis Dei*: "threaten on the strength of God's promises" (ablative of ground, as *ex ... vicaria ... minari*, 6.4). *Dimittas te non custodire*: "let yourself off keeping [them]". Where the quotation ends is not marked; we close it after the second *filius David*.
3. *Sola vidua sedebit in ecclesia benedicta*: *benedicta* may agree with *vidua* (our reading, after Ps. 131:15 *viduam ejus benedicens benedicam*, DR "Blessing I will bless her widow") or with *ecclesia* ("in the blessed church"). *Pauperes saturati*: the same verse, "I will satisfy her poor with bread". *Tota ecclesia una vidua est* is Augustine's phrase on that verse (*Enarr. in Ps.* 131.23, PL 37:1726; A's margin *Tota ecclesia est vidua*).
4. Ps. 120:6, DR "nor the moon by night", which Augustine reads of those deceived about the church. A reads *CX*. Loserth: Aug. *Opp.* IV, p. 1381. The question mark: the print's *ecclesie.'* is read as a question.
5. Matt. 24:23, DR "Lo here is Christ, or there"; Wyclif has *et ecce illic*. *Cum ille ... emerit*: *ille* is Christ, the buyer of the whole world (*cum* concessive: the man is scandalized although Christ bought the world); the second *ille* is the man, and *et ille* opens the main clause. *In proximo*: "in his neighbour", taking offence at Christians outside his one part.

6. ***Ipsa caro Christi est caput ecclesie***: Augustine, ***Enarr. in Ps.*** 120.12, PL 37:1615, the passage of n. 4: ***quia ipsa caro Christi caput Ecclesiae est***. B's margin cites Eph. 1, 4, 5 and Col. 1; Col. 1:18 DR "And he is the head of the body, the church". ***Fides scripture***: the faith of scripture (cf. the glossary ***ex fide***).
7. Boniface VIII, ***Unam sanctam*** (1302): ***Igitur ecclesiae unius et unicae unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum*** (Friedberg II, 1245–46; Wyclif omits ***et unicae***). Loserth: ***Extrav. comm.*** 1.8.1 (our modern form of his "Lib. I. Tit. VIII ... cap. I"). A later hand in A_1's margin objects: ***Scias quia istam decretalem falsificat, nichil enim ibi de predestinatis***, "know that he falsifies this decretal, for there is nothing there about the predestinate; but the decretal proves that to be subject to the Roman pontiff is of necessity for salvation".
8. The minor premiss carries no connective in the Latin: "such" (***talis***) is a church that contains all the predestinate, and there can be only one such whole.
9. Aristotle, ***De caelo*** I.1, 268a: "all" is first said of three (of two we say "both"). Loserth quotes the Greek (***to gar tria panta einai***). ***Dormientem***: the church sleeping, the souls in purgatory (the glossary, ***ecclesia dormiens***). ***Totum atque perfectum cui nichil deest***: Aristotle, ***Physics*** III.6, 207a8–10.
10. ***Insorpta***: Loserth's print; read as ***absorpta***, "absorbed". ***Inebriata***: Loserth's correction of the MSS' ***debriata***. Cant. 5:1, DR "be inebriated, my dearly beloved". The triple fraction is the ***Triforme est corpus Christi*** tradition (Amalarius; Gratian, ***De cons.*** D.2 c.22), though Wyclif's assignment of the parts differs: Amalarius, ***De eccl. off.*** III.35 (PL 105:1154D–1155A), and Gratian, ***De cons.*** D.2 c.22 (PL 187:1740A), read them as the risen body, the body still walking on earth and the body lying in the tombs, where Wyclif makes the two parts held in the hands the church militant and the church in purgatory.
11. The Agnus Dei: ***miserere nobis*** twice, then ***dona nobis pacem***; the two petitions for mercy go to the two parts still to be purged, the prayer for peace to the third. ***Agnus triplicis nature***: the threefold nature is not explained; B's margin: ***Christus dicitur agnus tripliciter***.
12. ***Habilitabilis***: as printed (B breaks off at ***umbili-***); read as ***habitabilis***, "the habitable [world]", whose navel is Jerusalem (Ezek. 38:12, Vg ***umbilici terrae***). ***Conversando***: "living" (cf. the glossary ***conversacio***). ***Cepit captivitatem***: Eph. 4:8 (Ps. 67:19), DR "he led captivity captive". ***Ut ostendi alias***: not identified.
13. ***Tot quot sunt homines predestinati***: each predestinate person is a particular church; the universal church is one whole of three parts.
14. The Nicene–Constantinopolitan Creed. ***In simbolo ... confitentur***: Loserth's text; the MSS have ***quo in simbolo***, and AA_1 ***confitetur***.
15. ***Adolescentulam***: the church militant as the maiden of the Song (Cant. 1:2 ***adolescentulae***), seeking the bridegroom (Cant. 3:1–2). ***Sui vicarii*** are the apostles' vicars; their rule depends on ***auctoritate quorum***, the apostles' authority.
16. Gratian, ***Decretum*** C.24 q.1 c.5 (Loserth), from Leo I, Sermon 4.3 (PL 54:151A–B). ***Ex ipsius equitate***: Peter's equity, not the judge's. The next sentence is Wyclif's: Peter "procures" that God binds and looses; the binding is God's.
17. ***Unam sanctam***, opening words (Friedberg II, 1245–46). Cant. 6:8, DR; Wyclif's ***matri sue*** for Vg ***matris suae***.
18. Three relations: the Trinity is the church's ***mater*** as creatress; the Father's wisdom (the Son) her ***genitrix et fotrix***; and the church herself is mother, virgin and bride of Christ's humanity. ***Fotrix***: "nurse", one who cherishes.
19. Augustine, ***Enarr. in Ps.*** 21, ***enarratio*** II (Loserth: ***Opp.*** IV, p. 98). ***Secundo per decretalem allegatam***: ***Unam sanctam*** cites Ps. 21:21 after Cant. 6:8. ***Licet velint eis proficere***: we take the subject as the travellers (***viantes***); it could be the dogs ("although they mean to do them good").
20. ***Tangentes*** agrees with ***catholicos***: the catholics who touch on the possessioners' power, pride and the taking away of their temporal goods, ***solummodo ad medelam***, only as a remedy. It could agree with the possessioners ("touching their power"), but the sentence then loses its point.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 7: ***Quid*** (first word after folio mark 128d)
  - 7: ***Rome***
  - 7: ***Christus***
  - 7: ***I°***
  - 7: ***Col*** (15 is the line number)
  - 8: ***in***
  - 8: ***insorpta*** (print has insorpta) [NW]
  - 9: ***ubicunque*** (hyphenated ubi-/cunque across line)
  - 9: ***solvat*** (leading 1 is margin fragment)
  - 9: ***2ª***
  - 10: ***framea*** [NW]
  - 8: ***deest***
  - 007: ∅ ('ales' already inside neighbour 15 Tales) [DELX]
  - 7: ***XXIV°***, [-VERSE]
- 8.9 ***inebriata***: Loserth's correction ("Codd: debriata. Correxi").
- 9.4 ***in simbolo ... confitentur***: Loserth's text (n. 14).
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin against the plates: 7.2 ***ecclesie.'*** → ***ecclesie?***; 7.5 ***orbe.***; 7.6 ***est'***; 7.20 alinea letter ***F***; 8.1 ***nich.il***; 8.6 ***[in fisuram*** → ***in figuram*** (the print's reading); 8.17 ***Pro*** → ***pro***; 8.29 stray ■.
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 8.8 B ***immensam***, ***dignare***; 8.13 B ***expungnande***; 8.15 B ***et quatuor innixa***; 9.16 B ***et tenemur***; 9.28 B ***cum igitur***; 10.5 B ***carnis***.

Part 4: One bride; no salvation outside the church; the two swords

Loserth pp. 10.16–14.16

¶1 10.16–11.10
11.21 *Third conclusion. Outside the Holy Catholic Church there is no salvation or remission of sins.*

[10]**Scivit autem Christus ecclesiam suam in pace pretensa per antichristianos ypocritas amarissime persequendam. Tercium testimonium scripture est unitas arche, de qua Gen. VI°, 16°, legitur quod in tempore diluvii in cubito consummatur. Que ad sensum misticum figurat sanctam matrem ecclesiam que in brachio domini conservatur et unico fine mandatorum que est caritas consummatur. Quartum testimonium est dictum apostoli Ephesiorum IV°, 5, asserentis quod unus deus, una fides; ex cuius unitate sequitur quod sit correspondenter una lex, unum regnum sive familia que indubie est universalis ecclesia. Quintum testimonium est de una tunica inconsutili, que non sine misterio ex testimonio Johannis XIX°, 23, remanserat indivisa. Correspondenter oportet esse unicam Christi ecclesiam infringibilibus vinculis caritatis contextam iuxta illud apostoli Rom. VIII°, 35. Quis nos separabit** [11]**a caritate dei? Sextum testimonium est illud Johannis X°, 16: Fiet unum ovile et unus pastor, quod ovile oportet confiteri eandem matrem ecclesiam. Quotlibet sunt scripture et raciones docentes istam sentenciam, ut sicut primus Adam terrenus sine bigamia habuit unicam sponsam carnaliter, sic secundus Adam sine bigamia possibili necessario habet unicam sponsam spiritualiter. Et illum sensum exponit apostolus ex scriptura Genes. II°, 24, ut patet ad Ephesios V°, 31, de Christo et sua ecclesia.**

And Christ knew that his church, in a pretended peace, would be most bitterly persecuted by antichristian hypocrites.[1] The third testimony of scripture is the unity of the ark, of which we read in Genesis 6:16 that at the time of the flood it is finished in a cubit. In the mystical sense it figures holy mother church, which is preserved in the arm of the Lord and is finished in the single end of the commandments, which is charity.[2] The fourth testimony is the saying of the apostle in Ephesians 4:5, asserting "one God, one faith"; from whose unity it follows that there is correspondingly one law, one kingdom or household, which without doubt is the universal church.[3] The fifth testimony is from the one seamless coat, which not without mystery, on the testimony of John 19:23, had remained undivided. Correspondingly there must be one only church of Christ, woven together with the unbreakable bonds of charity, according to that [word] of the apostle in Romans 8:35: "Who shall separate us [11]**from the charity of God?"[4] The sixth testimony is that of John 10:16: "There shall be one fold and one shepherd"; which fold must be confessed to be the same mother church. There are any number of scriptures and reasons that set out this teaching: that, as the first Adam, earthly, without bigamy had one only bride carnally, so the second Adam, without possible bigamy, necessarily has one only bride spiritually.[5] And the apostle expounds that sense from the scripture of Genesis 2:24, of Christ and his church, as is clear in Ephesians 5:31.**

¶2 11.11–12.7
12.5 *Church is like Noah's ark.*
12.8 *The reprobate are as limbs cut off from the body.*
12.12 *So says Augustine*
12.18 *and Bede.*

[11]**Unde racio potest capi de textu apostoli I[a]. Timothei III°, 2, et ad Titum 1°, 7, ubi ex isto fundamento dat legem, quod oportet tam episcopum quam diaconum esse unius uxoris virum. Oportet enim Christi clericum in monogamia consequi caput suum. Unde credo cum decretali fideli non verti in dubium quin foret hereticum pertinaciter negare quod Christus sponsus ecclesie, quem dignatus est vocare sponsam suam, sit monogamus racione unitatis ecclesie sponse sue. Et patet secunda conclusio. Tercia conclusio est quod extra sanctam ecclesiam catholicam non est salus vel remissio peccatorum. Hec est conclusio predicte decretalis in terminis cuius sensum arbitror esse de salute perpetua post hanc vitam, et de remissione peccati contracti, data vita spirituali per graciam. Et tunc conclusio proxima per se est nota: quia nemo potest habere talem salutem nisi vel Christus**

Hence a reason can be taken from the text of the apostle in 1 Timothy 3:2 and Titus 1:7, where on this foundation he lays down the law that both bishop and deacon must be "the husband of one wife". For a cleric of Christ must follow his head in monogamy.[6] Hence I believe, with the faithful decretal, that it is not to be called into doubt that it would be heretical to deny pertinaciously that Christ, the bridegroom of the church, which he deigned to call his bride, is monogamous by reason of the unity of the church his bride.[7] And the second conclusion is clear.
The third conclusion is that outside the holy catholic church there is no salvation or remission of sins. This is the conclusion of the aforesaid decretal in [its own] terms, and I judge its sense to be of perpetual salvation after this life, and of the remission of contracted sin, spiritual

vel aliquod eius membrum, sed eo ipso quod sic est infra predictam ecclesiam: ergo conclusio; et ad hoc vadunt exempla. Sicut enim tota generis humani posteritas fuit primo virtualiter et materialiter in primo carnali coniugio, sic tota christianorum posteritas est virtualiter in Christo [12]et ecclesia, et per consequens, in primo spirituali coniugio. Solis enim ex deo sic natis dedit potestatem filios dei fieri, et per consequens, iuxta argumentum apostoli coheredes. Iterum, sicut extra navem Noe non remansit bestia salvata in diluvio: sic extra navem ecclesie non restat homo salvandus post spirituale naufragium.

life being given through grace.[8] And then the conclusion just stated is known of itself: for no one can have such salvation except either Christ or some member of his; now by that very fact one is thus within the aforesaid church; therefore the conclusion.[9] And the examples go to this. For just as the whole posterity of the human race was first virtually and materially in the first carnal marriage, so the whole posterity of Christians is virtually in Christ [12]and the church, and consequently in the first spiritual marriage. For to those alone so born of God he "gave power to be made the sons of God", and consequently, by the apostle's argument, joint heirs.[10] Again, just as outside Noah's ship no beast remained saved in the flood, so outside the ship of the church no man remains to be saved after the spiritual shipwreck.

¶3 12.8–12.17

[12]Iterum, sicut membrum non vivit prescisum a corpore: sic nec natura humana per reprobacionem precisa a capite. Et ad hoc sunt quotlibet leges, ut XXIII^{a}, q. VII^{a}, sub auctoritate Augustini ad Vincencium decretum sic loquitur: Quemadmodum si prescindatur membrum ab hominis vivi corpore, non potest tenere spiritum vite: sic homo qui prescinditur de Christi iusti corpore, nullo modo potest tenere spiritum iusticie. Et tota ista sentencia patet XXIV^{a}, q. I, per multa capitula.

Again, as a member does not live cut off from the body, so neither does human nature live cut off from the head by reprobation.[11] And to this there are any number of laws, as in [Causa] 23, q. 7, where a decree, under the authority of Augustine to Vincentius, speaks thus: "Just as, if a member is cut off from the body of a living man, it cannot keep the spirit of life, so a man who is cut off from the body of Christ the just can in no way keep the spirit of justice."[12] And this whole teaching is clear in [Causa] 24, q. 1, through many chapters.

¶4 12.18–14.16
13.1 *Fourth conclusion. Both swords or powers belong to the Church.*
14.4 *Eight cases in which an ecclesiastic is subject to secular judgment or correction.*

[12]Unde ex dictis Bede sic loquitur unum decretum: Quicunque ab unitate fidei vel societatis Petri quovismodo semetipsos segregant, tales nec vinculis peccatorum absoluti sunt nec ianuam regni celestis possunt ingredi. Item aliud decretum captum ex dicto Bede super primam canonicam Johannis: Omnis qui recedit et non permanet in doctrina Christi, Deum non habet; qui permanet in doctrina, hic et filium et patrem habet. Ex talibus dictis sanctorum et decreto ecclesie duce racione scripture patet tota predicta sentencia, et quod precipue timendum est, patet quod nullus christianus, sed precipue Christi vicarius non est membrum ecclesie, nisi perseveranter secutus fuerit Christum in moribus et doctrina. [13]Quarta conclusio eiusdem decretalis est quod intra predictam ecclesiam est uterque gladius vel potestas scilicet corporalis vel temporalis et spiritualis; quorum uterque debet ad caput ecclesie et eius vicarium pertinere. Patet ex hoc quod dictum corpus, cum sit per se sufficiens, habet in se plenitudinem potestatis. Cum ergo utraque potestas sit necessaria matri ecclesie, patet conclusio. Et hoc figuratum est Luce XXII°, 38, quando apostolis respondentibus Ecce duo gladii hic Christus dixit

Hence one decree, from the sayings of Bede, speaks thus: "Whoever in any way separate themselves from the unity of the faith or of the fellowship of Peter, such are neither absolved from the bonds of sins nor can they enter the gate of the heavenly kingdom."[13] Again, another decree, taken from a saying of Bede on the first canonical [epistle] of John: "Whosoever revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that continueth in the doctrine, the same hath both the Son and the Father."[14] From such sayings of the saints, and from the decree of the church, with the reason of scripture as guide, the whole aforesaid teaching is clear; and, what is especially to be feared, it is clear that no Christian, and especially no vicar of Christ, is a member of the church unless he has followed Christ perseveringly in conduct and doctrine.[15]

[13]The fourth conclusion of the same decretal is that within the aforesaid church is each sword or power, namely the bodily or temporal and the spiritual; each of which ought to belong to the head of the church and to his vicar. This is clear from the fact that the said body, since it is sufficient of itself, has in itself the plenitude of power.[16] Since, therefore,

non superfluum vel diminutum sed satis est. Unde ad denotandum quod uterque gladius fuit Petro pertinens, consequenter dixit Christus Petro percucienti servum pontificis: Mitte gladium tuum in vaginam. Ex quo innuitur ad sensum misticum quod uterque gladius sit in potestate ecclesie, materialis pro ecclesia sed per laicos exercendus, spiritualis vero pro puniendis peccatis per episcopum exercendus. Et sic licet gladius materialis sit in manu regum et militum, hoc tamen erit ad motum et secundum prudenciam sacerdotum. Oportet enim gladium materialem esse sub alio sicut ordo militaris est sub sacerdocio. Et ista est exposicio beati Bernardi, libro secundo ad Eugenium et ad illum sensum loquuntur quotlibet doctores et decreta concorditer. Unde XXIII^{a} q. V^{a}, Principes, sub auctoritate beati Isidori III° de summo bono, cap. LIII°, dicit canon quod intra ecclesiam principes seculi habent potestatem, ut per eandem potestatem disciplinam ecclesiasticam muniant. Ex qua conclusione patet, primo quod dicti principes sunt pars dicte ecclesie, cum [14]aliter non essent ad suum propositum intra ecclesiam. Patet secundo quod ipsorum est cohercere rebelles ecclesie, ubicunque requiritur potencia civiliter coactiva. Unde notat Johannes de Deo octo casus in quibus ecclesiasticus subicitur iudicio vel correccioni seculari: Primus casus est cum clericus est incorrigibilis; secundus est cum propter ambicionem clericus est intrusor, eciam papa; tercius est quando fidem vult subvertere, quartus quando est falsarius, quintus quando facit scisma, sextus quando contempnit excommunicacionem, septimus quando potestas ecclesie deficit, et octavus dum principes seculi petunt tributum ab ecclesia. Et fundat ista per leges multiplices. Cum ergo in nullo istorum casuum debet secularis corrigere nisi conformiter ad scripturam, et per consequens, auctoritate summi pontificis: patet supradicta conclusio.

both powers are necessary to mother church, the conclusion is clear. And this was figured in Luke 22:38, when, the apostles answering "Behold, here are two swords", Christ said not "too many" or "too few", but "It is enough".[17] Hence, to denote that each sword belonged to Peter, Christ then said to Peter as he struck the high priest's servant: "Put up thy sword into the scabbard." From this it is intimated, in the mystical sense, that each sword is in the power of the church: the material, for the church but to be wielded by laymen; the spiritual, for the punishing of sins, to be wielded by the bishop. And so, although the material sword is in the hand of kings and knights, yet this will be at the motion and according to the prudence of priests.[18] For the material sword must be under the other, as the order of knighthood is under the priesthood. And this is the exposition of the blessed Bernard, in the second book to Eugenius, and in that sense any number of doctors and decrees speak concordantly.[19] Hence in [Causa] 23, q. 5, [the canon] *Principes*, under the authority of the blessed Isidore, *On the Highest Good* III, chapter 53, the canon says that within the church the princes of the world have power, so that through that same power they may fortify ecclesiastical discipline.[20] From this conclusion it is clear, first, that the said princes are part of the said church, since [14]otherwise they would not be within the church for its purpose.[21] It is clear, second, that it is theirs to coerce the rebels of the church, wherever civilly coactive power is required. Hence John of God notes eight cases in which [an ecclesiastic is subject to secular judgement or correction:[22] the first case is when a cleric is incorrigible; the second is when through ambition a cleric is an intruder, even a pope; the third is when he wishes to subvert the faith; the fourth when he is a forger; the fifth when he makes a schism; the sixth when he despises excommunication; the seventh when the power of the church fails; and the eighth when the princes of the world seek tribute from the church. And he grounds these on many laws. Since, therefore, in none of these cases ought a secular to correct except in conformity with scripture, and consequently by the authority of the supreme pontiff, the above-mentioned conclusion is clear.[23]

Notes

1. AA$_1$ read *antichristinos*. *Pace pretensa*: a peace that is only pretended, as the possessioners' just named. *Autem* continues the thought of the last sentence ("and"), not a new premiss.
2. Gen. 6:16, DR "in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it"; Wyclif reports it in the passive. *Consummatur* (both times): Loserth's correction of the MSS' *consumatur*. The *cubitus* (forearm, cubit) yields the *brachium domini*; the single end is 1 Tim. 1:5, DR "the end of the commandment is charity".
3. Eph. 4:5, Vg *unus Dominus, una fides* (DR "One Lord, one faith"); Wyclif has *unus deus*, and we translate his Latin.

4. Rom. 8:35, Vg *Quis ergo nos separabit a caritate Christi?* (DR "Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ?"). Wyclif has *a caritate dei*, as in 8:39; we translate his Latin, so *caritas* is "charity" (the glossary). John 19:23, DR "the coat was without seam".
5. *Bigamia*: in canon law, a second marriage (successive, not simultaneous), which barred a man from orders; hence the step to the clerical rule in the next paragraph. *Sine bigamia possibili*: for the second Adam a second bride is not even possible.
6. 1 Tim. 3:2 (bishop), 3:12 (deacons, *unius uxoris viri*), Titus 1:6–7 (the presbyter, then the bishop). DR 1 Tim. 3:2 "the husband of one wife". *Consequi*: "follow", imitate.
7. *Quem dignatus est vocare sponsam suam*: the masculine *quem* has no fitting antecedent; we translate as if *quam* (the church), likelier than "Christ, whom [the church]..." (Latin doubt reported). *Cum decretali fideli*: *Unam sanctam*, called "faithful" because on this point it agrees with scripture.
8. *Unam sanctam*: *extra quam nec salus est, nec remissio peccatorum* (Friedberg II, 1245–46); Wyclif paraphrases. B's margin asks why Wyclif adds *contracti*: outside the church there is remission neither of contracted nor of uncontracted sin. *Contractum* is presumably sin incurred, original or actual, as against its penalty.
9. *Proxima*: the conclusion last stated (the third). *Sed* brings the minor premiss ("now"). *Eo ipso quod sic est infra predictam ecclesiam*: we take *eo ipso* as "by that very fact" (of being Christ or his member), and *quod sic est infra* as the content; read strictly, "by the very fact that he is thus within the church" would make the premiss circular.
10. John 1:12–13 (DR "he gave them power to be made the sons of God ... born ... of God"); the apostle's argument is Rom. 8:17, *coheredes autem Christi*.
11. *Prescisum ... precisa*: "cut off" (*praecisus*), not *prescitus*, "foreknown", though in Wyclif's spelling the words lie close. *Reprobacio*: reprobation. Loserth's side-note says "the reprobate".
12. Gratian, *Decretum* C.23 q.7 c.4 (Loserth; our modern form), from Augustine, *De correctione Donatistarum* (*Ep.* 185) 9.42, PL 33:811, not the letter to Vincentius (*Ep.* 93): Gratian's rubric runs on from a Vincentius canon, and Wyclif follows it.
13. Gratian, *Decretum* C.24 q.1 c.27 (Loserth), from Bede, homily on Matt. 16 (*Hom.* XVI, PL 94:223B).
14. Gratian, *Decretum* C.24 q.1 c.24 (Loserth). The words are 2 John 9 (DR above), not the first epistle; Wyclif names Bede's commentary *super primam canonicam*. He has *filium et patrem*, Vg *Patrem et Filium*: Bede's own order (*Filium et Patrem dicit habere*, *In II Ioh.*, PL 93:122A); we keep it.
15. *Nullus christianus ... non est membrum ... nisi*: the *non* is pleonastic after *nullus*; read with it strictly, the sentence would say the opposite of the argument. The sense is "no one is a member unless". *Duce racione scripture*: B reads *duce Romane*.
16. *Plenitudo potestatis*: the canonists' formula for papal power, here given to the self-sufficient body, the church. *Per se sufficiens*: "sufficient of itself".
17. Luke 22:38, DR "Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said to them: It is enough." *Non superfluum vel diminutum* follows *Unam sanctam*, *non respondit Dominus nimis esse, sed satis* (Extrav. comm. 1.8.1; Friedberg II 1245). John 18:11 (Loserth), DR "Put up thy sword into the scabbard."
18. *Unam sanctam* reads, as Loserth notes, *sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*, "at the nod and sufferance of the priest"; Wyclif's text has *ad motum et secundum prudenciam sacerdotum*. We translate the print.
19. Bernard, *De consideratione* IV.3.7 (PL 182:776B–C): the two swords are in book IV, not the second book Wyclif names.
20. Gratian, *Decretum* C.23 q.5 c.20 *Principes* (Loserth), from Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) III.51.4 (PL 83:723B). Gratian's inscription has *c. 55*; Wyclif's *cap. LIII* matches neither.
21. *Ad suum propositum*: "for its purpose", the canon's purpose of fortifying discipline. It could be the princes' own purpose.
22. Johannes de Deo, a Spanish canonist at Bologna (Loserth, citing *Trialogus*, ed. Lechler, p. 251). B's margin: *Johannes de Deo. Octo casus ...*.
23. *Auctoritate summi pontificis*: "by the authority of the supreme pontiff". Following on "in conformity with scripture ... and consequently", the high priest may be Christ (Heb. 4:14), whose authority scripture carries, or the pope. Wyclif does not say which.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 10: *Christus*
  - 10: *pretensa* (hyphenated pre-/tensa across line; H is alinea letter)
  - 10: *16°*
  - 11: *16*
  - 11: *unum*
  - 11: *II°*
  - 11: *Iª*
  - 11: *III°*
  - 11: *Christi*
  - 11: *Christus*
  - 12: *bestia* (trailing b is the margin letter)
  - 12: *XXIIIª*
  - 12: *VIIª*
  - 12: *XXIVª*
  - 13: *Quarta*
  - 13: *Vª*
  - 13: *quod* (30 is the line number)
  - 14: *quibus* (qui-/bus hyphenated across line; print then has ecclesiasticus, which the pivot lacks)

- **14: *seculari* (secu-/lari hyphenated; 'correction' is side-note text)**
- **13: *eiusdem***
- **14: *coactiva.* (hyphenated coac-/tiva.; tiva. absent from output, so whole word) [-MARK]**

- **14.5 *ecclesiasticus*: lost from the established Latin at the line break *qui*-|*bus*; restored from the plate (n0051).**
- **10.20, 10.23 *consummatur*: Loserth's correction ("Codd: consumatur. Correxi").**
- **OCR scars corrected in the Latin against the plates: 10.32 *separa&bit*; 11 *3i* → *31*; 12.4 stray *like* (side-note bleed); 13.25–26 *XXIII%*, *111°* → *XXIII[a]*, *III°*.**
- **Variants noted but not affecting the English: 11.24 B *arbitri*; 13.7 A *nostri ecclesie*; 13.28 B *ecclesiasticam immitit*; 14.8 B *tercio quando*; 14.12 B *cum principes*.**

Part 5: Subjection to the roman pontiff; why the church is called roman

Loserth pp. 14.17–16.34

¶1 14.17–15.16
14.17 *Fifth conclusion. Submission to the Pope is necessary to Salvation.*
14.26 *As, wherever the Pope is, there is the Roman Church: so wherever is one of the faithful, there too is the Roman Church.*
15.11 *Local name at Oxford.*
15.23 *For three reasons the Church of Christ is called the Romish Church.*

[14] **Quinta conclusio est ista: Subesse Romano pontifici omni humane nature est de necessitate salutis. Patet ex hoc quod nemo potest salvari, nisi meritorie subsit Christo; sed ipse est Romanus pontifex sicut est caput universalis ac cuiuslibet particularis ecclesie: ergo conclusio. Nam columba dicitur modo viatrix, quia secundum partem, igitur per idem: ipsa est Romana ecclesia, quia secundum partem. Non enim est racio, quare ipsa modo peregrinatur vel tribulatur nisi quod secundum partem. Et per idem ipsa inhabitat Romam, Angliam et quemcunque locum fidelem Nam si ubicunque papa fuerit, ibi est Romana ecclesia, quia eadem ecclesia que Rome edificatur** [15] **per apostolos succedens ex quibuscunque fidelibus, per idem ecclesia Romana sic est in Anglia et ubicunque fuerit fidelis christianus, quia sancta ecclesia catholica; que non potest stringi secundum se totam in Roma vel cetu pape et cardinalium; sed distenditur per tria loca sancta, scilicet celum, locum peregrinacionis et purgatorium. Unde nimis erronee concipiunt qui fingunt quod ubicunque fuerit dominus papa, ibi est Roma, quia superflue equivocaretur in nomine civitatis, sicut pueri vocant Oxonie Romam monticulum Belli Montis; sed ubicunque dominus papa fuerit, ibi est ecclesia Romana, sicut fuit Jerusalem tempore Christi, in Constantinopoli tempore sinodi, ut patet XXII dist. Sacrosancta, in Antiochia tempore cathedracionis sancti Petri et post in Roma tempore predicacionis et passionis Petri et Pauli.**

The fifth conclusion is this: to be subject to the Roman pontiff is, for every human nature, of necessity of salvation.[1] This is clear from the fact that no one can be saved unless he is meritoriously subject to Christ; now he is the Roman pontiff, as he is head of the universal church and of every particular church: therefore the conclusion.[2] For the dove is now called a wayfarer because [she is so] in part; therefore, by the same token, she is the Roman church because [she is so] in part. For there is no reason why she is now a pilgrim or in tribulation except that [she is so] in part.[3] And by the same token she dwells in Rome, in England and in any faithful place. For if wherever the pope is, there is the Roman church, because [it is] the same church which is built at Rome [15] **by the apostles, continuing out of any faithful whatever, then by the same token the Roman church is thus in England and wherever there is a faithful Christian, because [it is] the holy catholic church; which cannot be confined, in its whole self, to Rome or to the company of the pope and cardinals, but is spread out through three holy places, namely heaven, the place of pilgrimage, and purgatory.[4] Hence those conceive too erroneously who imagine that wherever the lord pope is, there is Rome; for the name of the city would be made equivocal to no purpose, as boys at Oxford call the little hill of Beaumont "Rome".[5] But wherever the lord pope is, there is the Roman church, as it was at Jerusalem in the time of Christ, in Constantinople at the time of the synod, as is clear in [Distinction] 22, *Sacrosancta*, in Antioch at the time of St Peter's taking his chair, and afterwards in Rome at the time of the preaching and passion of Peter and Paul.[6]**

¶2 15.17–16.34
16.19 *We must be careful how we use local names for the Church.*

[15] **Et sic intelligitur dictum pape post Luce XI°, 20. Profecto pervenit in vos regnum dei et illud Luce XVII°, 22: Regnum dei intra vos est; ubicunque enim fuerit corpus, illic congregabuntur aquile. Quamvis enim ecclesia cepit a Judea et Christus caput ecclesie fuit**

And so the pope's saying is understood, after Luke 11:20, "doubtless the kingdom of God is come upon you", and that of Luke 17:21, "the kingdom of God is within you"; for "wheresoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles be gathered together".[7] For although the church

martirizatus in Jerusalem, tamen racionabiliter vocata est ecclesia Christi secundum quandam preeminenciam propter tria: Primo quia Christus scivit gentes sub Romano imperio loco Judeorum infideliter discredencium inserendas, sicut dixit apostolus Rom. XI°, 23. Secunda causa est, quia maior multitudo martirum ibi triumphavit quam in alia civitate; sic enim [16]ubi homo nascitur ex utero et triumphat gloriose, nomen abhinc contrahit. Cum ergo persona universalis ecclesie secundum multas partes suas ibi nascebatur, segregata ex utero synagoge, et ibi triumphavit crescens in gentibus: ideo fuit consonum quod caperet nomen a civitate metropoli gencium que est Roma. Tercia causa est, ut notetur quod non locus sive antiquitas sed fides formata fundet Christi ecclesiam. Nam quoad personam et quoad tempus prius fuit ecclesia Christi in sedibus prioribus et ad sensum istum dicitur II° Mach. V°, 19, quod non locus gentem sed gens locum sanctificat. Et hinc credo derelictum licere vocare Christi ecclesiam nomine cuiuscunque loci quem fideles inhabitant, sicut Christus vocatur Nazarenus propter concepcionem, et potest catholice vocari David Bethlehemiticus propter nativitatem, et sic de aliis civitatibus que possent licite dici sue propter inhabitacionem vel propter factum aliud notabile vel passionem. Notando tamen quod vocando ecclesiam quamcunque nomine loci hoc potest intelligi dupliciter, vel appropriate quoad habitacionem illius loci vel secundum partem, et in hoc sunt quotlibet gradus secundum amplitudinem parcium ecclesie. Non enim est bona causa vocare matrem nostram Romanam ecclesiam propter fastum aut complacenciam imperatoris dotantis ecclesiam nec propter extollenciam domini pape pompantis de parte imperii ex suo primatu sive dominio nec tercio, ut credatur quod ad ipsum oportet omnem christianum recurrere et de necessitate salutis ipsum capitalem recognoscere, sed propter causas topicas supradictas. Cum enim Romana ecclesia sit terminus institutus preter fundacionem in scriptura sacra, satis est habere racionem probabilem cavendo semper de deduccione perfida.

began from Judea, and Christ, the head of the church, was martyred in Jerusalem, yet the church of Christ has reasonably been called [Roman] by a certain pre-eminence, for three [reasons].[8] First, because Christ knew that the gentiles under the Roman empire were to be grafted in, in place of the Jews who faithlessly disbelieved, as the apostle said, Romans 11:23.[9] The second cause is that a greater multitude of martyrs triumphed there than in any other city; for so, [16]where a man is born from the womb and triumphs gloriously, he takes his name from there. Since, therefore, the person of the universal church, in many of her parts, was born there, separated from the womb of the synagogue, and triumphed there, growing among the gentiles, it was therefore fitting that she should take her name from the city that is the metropolis of the gentiles, which is Rome.[10] The third cause is that it may be noted that not place or antiquity but formed faith founds the church of Christ. For as to person and as to time the church of Christ was earlier in earlier sees; and in this sense it is said in 2 Maccabees 5:19 that not the place sanctifies the people, but the people the place.[11] And hence I believe it has been left [open] that it is lawful to call the church of Christ by the name of any place which the faithful inhabit,[12] as Christ is called a Nazarene by reason of [his] conception, and can catholicly be called "David the Bethlehemite" by reason of [his] birth; and so of other cities which could lawfully be called his by reason of dwelling, or of some other notable deed, or of [his] passion.[13]

Yet it is to be noted that, in calling any church by the name of a place, this can be understood in two ways: either appropriately, as to dwelling in that place, or according to part; and in this there are any number of degrees according to the extent of the parts of the church.[14] For it is not a good cause to call our mother the Roman church on account of the pride or the complaisance of the emperor who endowed the church, nor on account of the exaltation of the lord pope, who makes a display of his share in the empire by his primacy or lordship, nor, third, so that it should be believed that every Christian must have recourse to him and, of necessity of salvation, acknowledge him as chief; but for the topical causes stated above. For since "the Roman church" is a term instituted beyond [any] foundation in holy scripture, it is enough to have a probable reason, always guarding against a perfidious deduction.[15]

Notes

1. The fifth conclusion is the closing sentence of *Unam sanctam* (Loserth, at 14.18; *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1, our modern form), which reads *humanae creaturae* (Friedberg II, 1245–46); Wyclif's *nature* is translated as printed.
2. *Ipse ... sicut est caput*: Christ is the Roman pontiff inasmuch as he is head of every church; the conclusion is granted only by moving its subject from the pope to Christ. *Sed* brings the minor premiss ("now").
3. The dove is the church (Song 6:8, *una est columba mea*). *Quia secundum partem*: the church is a wayfarer, a pilgrim and in tribulation only in her earthly part, and by the same token "Roman" only in part. AA_1 lack the words from *igitur* to *partem* (14.22); the print follows B.
4. *Nam si ..., per idem ...*: the inference runs from the curial maxim (wherever the pope is, there is the Roman church) to Wyclif's own (wherever a faithful Christian is). B lacks *quia — ecclesia* (14.29). The three places are the church triumphant, militant and sleeping.
5. *Bellus Mons*: Beaumont, a royal palace, later destroyed, in the north suburb of Oxford (Loserth, after Wood's *History of the City of Oxford*). *Equivocaretur*: "Rome" would become an equivocal name for wherever the pope stands.
6. Gratian, *Decretum* D.22 c.2 *Sacrosancta* (Loserth; our modern form; PL 187:123A): the canon names Rome, Antioch and Alexandria; Constantinople is in Gratian's dictum and cc. 3–4; B's margin: *22ª distinccione*. *Cathedracio*: Peter's taking the chair at Antioch.
7. *Dictum pape post*: we take it as the curial saying just corrected (wherever the pope is, there is the Roman church), understood "after" these texts; the phrase is doubtful (Latin doubt reported). The MSS have Matt. 12 (12:28 has the same words); Loserth corrected to Luke 11:20. The print's verse "22" for Luke 17:21 is Loserth's; B lacks *Luce 17*. The last clause is Matt. 24:28 (cf. Luke 17:37); Wyclif lacks Vg *et*, "also", and we omit it.
8. The print supplies no predicate name; "[Roman]" is from the side-note and A's margin (*Propter tres causas ecclesia Christi vocata est Romana ecclesia*). *I3o"* (15.21) is the folio mark (fol. 130) left in the Latin. B's reader objects to *a Judea*: the church began from Abel, "as the blessed Gregory thinks".
9. Rom. 11:23 (MSS *Rom. IX*; Loserth's correction), DR "shall be grafted in": a reference to the grafting of 11:17–24, not a quotation.
10. The comparison joins birth and triumph: a martyr is named from the place of his triumph, and the church, "born" at Rome out of the synagogue and triumphing there, is named from Rome. B *ad nomen* (16.2).
11. 2 Macc. 5:19, DR "God did not choose the people for the place's sake, but the place for the people's sake"; Wyclif's *non locus gentem sed gens locum sanctificat* is the proverbial form, and we translate his Latin. *Sedibus prioribus*: Jerusalem and Antioch, above.
12. *Derelictum*: "sic in codd." and in Hus, *De ecclesia* (Loserth). We construe "left [open]", not settled by scripture; the word is doubtful (Latin doubt reported).
13. We keep Christ as subject: he "can be called 'David the Bethlehemite'", as David's son born in Bethlehem. The Latin could also mean "David can be called the Bethlehemite", but *sue* ("his" cities) follows Christ throughout.
14. *Appropriate*: "properly", of a church named from where it dwells; not the canonists' *appropriacio*. *Secundum partem*: named from one of its parts.
15. *Dotantis*: the emperor of the endowment (Constantine, unnamed). B *excellenciam* (16.25) for *extollenciam*; B *nec estimo ut*, "nor do I think that" (16.28), for *nec tercio, ut*. *Capitalem*: "as chief", the word of *capitalis dominus*. *Causas topicas*: dialectical, probable grounds, hence "a probable reason" next. B *de seduccione perfida* (16.34).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 14: *tifici* (second half of pon-/tifici hyphenated across line (pon- is pos 118))
  - 15: *dominus* ('Local' is side-note text glued)
  - 15: *Christus*
  - 15: *Romano* (leading 1 is margin line-number fragment)
  - 16: *Christi*
- OCR scars (not the print's) corrected in the Latin against the scans and plates: 14.17 *pon-i, tifici*; 14.27 *fidelem»*; 15.21 *i3o"* (folio mark); 15.27 *mar2tirum*; 16.19 *be* (margin letters).
- 15.17 Luke 11:20: MSS *Matth. XII*, Loserth's correction. 15.26 Rom. 11:23: MSS *Rom. IX*, Loserth's correction.
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 15.7 A *errone*, B *erronie*.

Part 6: No christian is head; the pope as head of what he rules; three errors about the church

Loserth pp. 17.1–20.17

¶1 17.1–19.9

17.1 *Sixth conclusion. No Christian should assert that he is head even of a local Church.*

17.19 *None of the apostles called himself head or spouse of the Church.*

[17] Ex istis colligitur, cum solus Christus sit caput tocius ecclesie que non est pars ad aliam iuxta primam conclusionem, oportet concedere quod sicut nullus christianus debet presumere se esse caput universalis ecclesie, sic nec debet sine timore et sine speciali revelacione asserere quod sit caput cuiuscunque particularis ecclesie. Prima pars patet ex conclusione prima; si enim quis sit caput talis universalis ecclesie,

From these things it is gathered, since Christ alone is head of the whole church, which is not a part relative to another (according to the first conclusion), that it must be granted that, just as no Christian ought to presume that he is head of the universal church, so neither ought he, without fear and without special revelation, to assert that he is head of

17.26 *A Head must be predestinate,*
18.6 *which no one can know himself to be.*
18.21 *Augustine says that a wicked man is not the head of his wife.*
19.18 *Seventh conclusion. The Pope, if he is predestinate and does his pastoral office, is head of so much of the Church, as is under his government.*
19.31 *Some deny that there is a Church;*

tunc est melior angelis effectus, ymmo omni beato spiritu creato, quod soli Christo potest competere secundum apostolum Heb. 1°, 4. Oportet enim ipsum esse primogenitum ex multis fratribus, et per consequens, capitaneum ex dignitate iuris primogeniture. Unde si aliquis christianus foret cum eo caput universalis ecclesie, cum ipsa non potest esse monstrum, habens ex equo duo capita, ut dicit secunda conclusio, oporteret concedere quod est Christus, vel aliter quod Christus foret ipso inferior et humile membrum eius. Ideo apostoli confessi sunt concorditer se esse servos istius capitis et humiles ministros ecclesie sponse sue, nunquam autem presumpsit aliquis apostolorum asserere quod fuit caput vel sponsus dicte ecclesie, quia hoc foret antichristiane adulterari cum regina celi, zelotipando dominum Jesum Christum; quod foret nimis grave, cum Exodi XX°, 5, vere dicitur quod ipse sit fortis zelotes Et secunda pars patet ex hoc quod caput est nomen dignitatis atque officii dignitatis quoad predestinacionem eternam, qua Christus ordinavit prepositos (qui presunt secundum legem suam in ecclesia militante) habere mansiones superiores racione sui regiminis in ecclesia triumphante, quia si prepositi omnino deficiant ab officio ministrandi subditis sensum scripture [18]et motum ad sequendum caput ecclesie, tunc non sunt caput in civitate Dei, sed in civitate diaboli capitis perimendi, quia Sap. VI°, 6, vere dicitur: Durum iudicium hiis qui presunt fiet. Cum ergo nos miseri ignoramus si sumus ad celestem Jerusalem predestinati, (quod tamen ex speciali revelacione habuerunt sancti) patet quod nimia presumpcio foret nobis pertinaciter asserere quod sumus capita cuiuscunque particularis ecclesie que foret pars sancte matris ecclesie, quia notum est ex concordi testimonio sanctorum quod nullus prescitus est vel membrum ipsius ecclesie. Quomodo ergo presumeret aliquis nostrum asserere quod sit caput, cum Eccl. IX°, 1, vere dicitur quod nemo talis scit, utrum sit dignus amore vel odio quoad predestinacionem vel reprobacionem. Insuper si respicimus ad sensum et motum quos in subditos influimus et ex alio latere ad speculum scripture iuxta quam totam vitam nostram regularemus, eligeremus pocius vocari servi et ministri ecclesie quam capita, cum notum sit, si non facimus officium capitatis, non sumus capita, quia secundum Augustinum in libello suo De Decem Cordis maritus perversus non est caput uxoris sue, multo magis prepositus ecclesie qui pure haberet a Deo dignitatem huiusmodi, si a Christo degenerat. Unde postquam Augustinus ostenderat quod femina vere christiana debet dolere de fornicacione viri non propter carnem sed propter caritatem et castitatem debitam viro Christo, dicit consequenter quod Christus loquitur in cordibus feminarum bonarum, ubi vir non audit

any particular church.[1] The first part is clear from the first conclusion; for if anyone is head of such a universal church, then he is "made better than the angels", indeed than every blessed created spirit, which can belong to Christ alone, according to the apostle, Hebrews 1:4. For he must be "the firstborn" out of many brethren, and consequently the captain by the dignity of the right of primogeniture.[2] Hence if some Christian were, with him, head of the universal church, since she cannot be a monster having two heads on an equal footing, as the second conclusion says, it would have to be granted that he is Christ, or else that Christ would be inferior to him and a lowly member of his. Therefore the apostles confessed with one accord that they were servants of that head and lowly ministers of the church, his bride; but none of the apostles ever presumed to assert that he was head or bridegroom of the said church, for this would be to commit adultery, antichristianly, with the queen of heaven, provoking the Lord Jesus Christ to jealousy; which would be too grave, since in Exodus 20:5 it is truly said that he is "mighty, jealous".[3]

And the second part is clear from the fact that "head" is a name of dignity, and of the office of dignity, with respect to eternal predestination, by which Christ ordained that superiors (who are set over [others] according to his law in the church militant) should have higher mansions, by reason of their rule, in the church triumphant;[4] for if superiors wholly fail in the office of ministering to their subjects the sense of scripture [18]and the motive to follow the head of the church, then they are not head in the city of God, but in the city of the devil, the head that is to be destroyed; for in Wisdom 6:6 it is truly said: "A severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule."[5] Since, therefore, we wretches are ignorant of whether we are predestinate to the heavenly Jerusalem (which the saints nevertheless had by special revelation), it is clear that it would be too great a presumption for us to assert pertinaciously that we are heads of any particular church which would be part of holy mother church; for it is known from the concordant testimony of the saints that no foreknown [person] is even a member of that church.[6] How then would any of us presume to assert that he is head, since in Ecclesiastes 9:1 it is truly said that no such man knows whether he is "worthy of love, or hatred", as to predestination or reprobation?[7] Moreover, if we look to the sense and motion which we pour into our subjects, and on the other side to the mirror of scripture, by which we should rule our whole life, we would choose rather to be called servants and ministers of the church than heads; since it is known that if we do not do the office of headship we are not heads.[8] For according to

dicens: Dole de viri tui iniuriis sed noli imitari, quin pocius ipse te imitetur in bono. Nam [19]in eo quod male facit noli eum putare caput tuum sed me Deum tuum. Et probat hoc debere fieri. Si inquit in hoc quod male facit caput est, et consecuturum est corpus caput suum, eunt ambo in precipucium. Ut autem christianus non sequatur malum caput suum, teneat se ad caput ecclesie Christum, huic debens castitatem suam, huic deferens honorem suum, absens sit vir privatus, presens sit vir matri ecclesie coniugatus.

Augustine, in his little book *On the Ten Strings*, a perverse husband is not the head of his wife; much more [is this so of] a superior of the church, who would have such a dignity purely from God, if he degenerates from Christ.[9] Hence, after Augustine had shown that a truly Christian woman ought to grieve over the fornication of her husband, not on account of the flesh but on account of the charity and chastity owed to the husband Christ, he says next that Christ speaks in the hearts of good women, where the husband does not hear, saying: "Grieve over your husband's wrongs, but do not imitate [them]; rather, let him imitate you in good. For [19]in that in which he does evil, do not think him your head, but me, your God." And he proves that this ought to be done: "If," he says, "he is head in that in which he does evil, and the body is to follow its head, both go over the precipice."[10] And so that a Christian should not follow his evil head, let him hold to the head of the church, Christ, owing to him his chastity, bearing to him his honour; let the private husband be absent, let the husband wedded to mother church be present.[11]

¶2 19.10–19.30

[19]Patet ergo quod, sicut infinitum maiorem honorem debemus patri spirituali domino Jesu Christo et sponse sue ecclesie que est regina, assistens a dexteris eius (ut dicitur Psal. XLIV°, 10) quam alicui parenti nostro carnali, sic nemo est parens vel proles huius celestis coniugii, nisi faciat debitum quod in predestinacione divina est deputatum isti officio. Nam esse caput vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie est inseparabiliter nomen officii. Ex istis septimo sequitur quod dominus papa, si predestinatus est et exercet pastorale officium, est caput tante militantis ecclesie quantam regit, ut si sic regit capitaliter secundum legem Christi totam iam militantem ecclesiam, tunc est eius particularis capitaneus sub archicapite, domino Jesu Christo. Hoc autem debet supponi in domino Romano pontifice, nisi factum doceat evidenter oppositum, cum clerus iam peregrinans consensit in eum ut capitaneum. Verumptamen non est in potestate alicuius christiani constitucione, eleccione vel acceptacione statuere quod dominus papa sit caput vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Nam hoc consistit in predestinacione et gracia Dei nostri.

It is clear, therefore, that, just as we owe infinitely greater honour to our spiritual father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and to his bride the church, who is queen, standing at his right hand (as is said in Psalm 44:10), than to any carnal parent of ours, so no one is parent or offspring of this heavenly marriage unless he renders the due which in divine predestination is assigned to that office.[12] For to be head or member of holy mother church is inseparably the name of an office. From these things, in the seventh place, it follows that the lord pope, if he is predestinate and exercises the pastoral office, is head of as much of the church militant as he rules; so that, if he thus rules as head, according to the law of Christ, the whole church now militant, then he is its particular captain under the arch-head, the Lord Jesus Christ.[13] And this ought to be supposed in the lord Roman pontiff unless the fact evidently shows the opposite, since the clergy now on pilgrimage consented to him as captain. Nevertheless it is not in the power of any Christian, by constitution, election or acceptance, to establish that the lord pope is head or member of holy mother church. For this consists in the predestination and grace of our God.[14]

¶3 19.31–20.17
20.6 *Others say that there is a Church, but that it is not a thing (i. e. is only a concept);*

[19]In ista vero materia sunt quotlibet subterfugia, ut unus dicit quod nulla mater ecclesia potest esse; sed [20]iste videtur michi infideli deterior, cum nedum negat fidem scripture et fidem ecclesie de credulitate qua oportet christianum credere ecclesiam sanctam

But in this matter there are any number of subterfuges: as one says that there can be no mother church; but [20]this man seems to me worse than an unbeliever, since he not only denies the faith of scripture and the faith of the church concerning the credence by which a Christian

20.11 *Others, that the Church will not exist until the day of judgment.*

catholicam, sed de facto non est filius illius celestis coniugii, sine cuius gignicione non possumus esse filii Dei, et Per consequens, nec heredes regni. Alii autem dicunt quod sancta mater ecclesia est eciam ecclesia, sed non est aliquid, et sic nec mulier nec corpus Christi mysticum nec regina Sed isti; (ut tetigi alias) debent negare magnam partem fidei scripture, decreta ecclesie Romane et simbolum fidei christiane. Tercii vero dicunt quod universalis ecclesia non est nec erit ante diem iudicii, sed multi fuerunt et multi sunt qui erunt tunc partes eius, sed nec habet nec habuit partes aliquas, eo quod nec est nec fuit, cum tunc foret universitas predestinatorum qui erunt in die iudicii. Quod est impossibile, cum multi eorum sint generandi.

must believe the holy catholic church, but in fact he is not a son of that heavenly marriage, without whose begetting we cannot be sons of God, and consequently not heirs of the kingdom.[15] And others say that holy mother church is also a church, but is not anything, and so is neither a woman nor the mystical body of Christ nor a queen. But these (as I have touched on elsewhere) must deny a great part of the faith of scripture, the decrees of the Roman church and the creed of the Christian faith.[16] And a third [party] say that the universal church is not, nor will be before the day of judgement; but many have been and many are who will then be its parts; but it neither has nor has had any parts, because it neither is nor was, since [only] then would it be the totality of the predestinate who will be at the day of judgement. Which is impossible, since many of them are yet to be begotten.[17]

Notes

1. The sixth conclusion (so the margins of the MSS). *Que non est pars ad aliam*: the universal church, which is not part of any other church. *Sine timore*: "fear", not the *formido* of assent. B reads *primam questionem* for *conclusionem* here and at 17.7 and after.
2. Heb. 1:4, DR "Being made so much better than the angels". Rom. 8:29, Vg *primogenitus in multis fratribus* (DR "amongst"); Wyclif has *ex multis*, and we translate his Latin. *Capitaneus*: "captain", kept apart from *caput* (glossary proposal). AA_1 *omnino beato* (17.9); AB lack *esse* (17.11).
3. Exod. 20:5, DR "mighty, jealous"; B lacks *vere* and glosses it in the margin. The MSS have *antichristine* (17.23). The queen of heaven is the church (Ps. 44:10, ¶2); *zelotipando*, "provoking to jealousy", keeps the marriage figure. *Zelotes* stands at line-end without stop before *Et* (plate reading).
4. *Nomen dignitatis atque officii dignitatis*: we keep the repeated *dignitatis* ("the office of dignity"); it may be a doubling for "of dignity and of office". *Prepositi*: "superiors" (the glossary), here everyone set over others in the church, not only heads of houses. *Mansiones*: John 14:2. A *sue regiminis* (17.30).
5. *Diaboli capitis perimendi*: we take *capitis perimendi* in apposition to the devil, "the head to be destroyed"; B *capitatis perimendi* (18.2). Wisd. 6:6, Vg *iudicium durissimum*, DR "a most severe judgment"; Wyclif has *durum*, and we translate his Latin.
6. *Prescitus*: those God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). *Vel*: "even". AA_1 lack *ecclesie — membrum* (18.9–11), which would leave the sentence without its ground. B *quantum ex speciali* (18.6).
7. Eccles. 9:1, Vg *nescit homo utrum amore an odio dignus sit*; Wyclif's *nemo talis scit* paraphrases, and the DR words are used only where the Latin agrees.
8. *Capitatis*, "headship", is not classical; B *capitis* (18.19). *Sensum et motum*: the figure of the head, from which sense and motion flow into the body, picking up *sensum scripture et motum* at 17.32–18.1.
9. Augustine, *Sermo* 9 (*De decem chordis*), capp. 3 and 11 (PL 38:77, 83–84; Loserth: Opp. V.1, 50, 56, his "9" is §11). *Pure*: "purely", that is, only from God and not by election.
10. Augustine, *Sermo* 9.11 (PL 38:83–84), abridged and reworded: Augustine has *Dole; sed ipsum noli imitari ... eunt ambo per praeceps*. *Precipucium* for *precipicium*; B *tum ambo* (19.4). Cf. Matt. 15:14, "both fall into the pit". B's margin: an evil prelate is not to be imitated or obeyed in what he does ill.
11. Wyclif turns the counsel to the wife into a rule for any Christian (*christianus ... suam*), so we write "him ... his"; the closing pair keeps the marriage figure: the private husband absent, Christ, wedded to mother church, present. B *hinc debens* (19.7).
12. Ps. 44:10, DR "The queen stood on thy right hand"; a reference, not a quotation. *Debitum*: "the due", which in the figure of marriage is also the marriage debt (1 Cor. 7:3).
13. The seventh conclusion (AB margins). *Capitaliter*: "as head". Even ruling the whole church militant, the pope would be a "particular" captain, because the church militant is a part of the church.
14. *Clerus iam peregrinans*: the clergy of the church on its pilgrimage, the electors. The last sentence limits the seventh conclusion: election makes a captain, not a head or member.
15. *Infideli deterior*: 1 Tim. 5:8, DR "worse than an infidel". *De credulitate qua*: we take *de* as "concerning". A's margin: "against those who deny that the church exists". B *igitur oportet* (20.3).
16. *Est eciam ecclesia, sed non est aliquid*: they grant the name "church" and deny that it is a thing (side-note 20.6); B *aliquis*, "anyone" (20.8). *Regina Sed isti;* (20.7) is the print's pointing. B lacks *autem* (20.6).
17. *Quod est impossibile ...* completes the third party's argument (the church cannot exist now, since many of its members are not yet born); Wyclif's answer opens the next part. B *nunc non est* (20.12).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 17: *Christo*
  - 17: *fortis zelotes* (print has 'fortis zelotes.' at end of line 25 before Et (two words, italic))
  - 18: *motum*
  - 19: *in* (130b is the folio mark)
  - 19: *quod*
  - 19: *precipucium* (precipu-/cium hyphenated across line)
  - 19: ∅ ('if' is the side-note (if he is predestinate), not main text)
  - 19: *Christi*
  - 19: *iam* (i with dot, not l) [NW]
  - 19: *ut* ('Some' is side-note text)
  - 19: *unus* (leading a is the margin letter) [NW]
  - 20: *negat* (130c is the folio mark)
  - 20: *dicunt* (trailing b is the margin letter) [NW]
  - 20: *regina*
  - 20: *Sed*
  - 20: *isti*
  - 20: *sed*
  - 20: *iudicii,* [-MARK]
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin: 19.13 *diciturPsal.XLIV0*; 19.29 *caputvel*; 20.7 *tetjgj*. Still as in the established Latin: 20.4 *Per* (capital), 20.7 *regina Sed isti;* (pointing).
- 17.23 *antichristiane*: MSS *antichristine*.
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 18.4 B *cum igitur* (and passim); 18.19 B *capitis* (note 8); 20.13 A *culti sunt* (OCR of the apparatus unclear).

Part 7: The elect are one person; Armagh's objection of many heads

Loserth pp. 20.18–22.5

¶1 20.18–22.5
20.32 *All the elect are one person and that is the Church.*
21.2 *Gregory.*
21.14 *If a Christian could be head of the Church he would be above Christ.*
21.27 *Objection made by Armachanus;*
22.1 *One head may be subordinate to another.*

[20]Sed oportet sic opinantes negare maiorem partem scripture sacre et specialiter magnum sacramentum de Christo atque ecclesia de quo loquitur apostolus Ephesiis V°, 32. Immo oportet sic loquentem negare omnem particularem ecclesiam, cum particulare non dicitur nisi in comparacione ad totale et universale. Ideo negata universali et totali ecclesia neganda foret quelibet particularis ecclesia, vel aliter dicendum foret quod Deus cognoscit mille universales ecclesias: quod esset summe hereticum, quia nedum sentiret contra ecclesiam sed omnino destrueret ecclesiam et singulas leges eius. Sic ergo error in logica scripture quem diabolus introducit ad cecandum mentes fidelium, facit filios eius prorumpere in conclusiones multas blasphemas ex quibus mater ecclesia perturbatur. Nam sancti doctores dicunt concorditer quod omnes electi a principio mundi usque ad diem iudicii sunt una [21]persona que est mater ecclesia, ut patet per beatum Gregorium XXIII° Moralium primo capitulo supra illo Job XIX°, 25, Scio quod redemptor meus vivit. Sciendum inquit quod redemptor noster unam personam se cum sua ecclesia quam assumpsit exhibuit. De ipso enim dicitur: Qui est caput Christus. Rursumque de eius ecclesia scriptum est: Et corpus Christi quod est ecclesia. Et sequitur: Quod Christum inquit, et ecclesiam unam personam

But those who hold this opinion must deny the greater part of holy scripture, and especially the great sacrament of Christ and the church, of which the apostle speaks in Ephesians 5:32.[1] Indeed, one who speaks so must deny every particular church, since "particular" is said only in comparison to the total and universal. Therefore, if the universal and total church is denied, every particular church would have to be denied; or else it would have to be said that God knows a thousand universal churches: which would be supremely heretical, since it would not only think against the church but would utterly destroy the church and each of its laws.[2] So, therefore, the error in the logic of scripture which the devil brings in to blind the minds of the faithful makes his sons break out into many blasphemous conclusions, by which mother church is troubled.[3] For the holy doctors say with one accord that all the elect from the beginning of the world to the day of judgement are one [21]person, which is mother church, as is clear through the blessed Gregory, *Moralia* XXIII, the first chapter, on Job 19:25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." "It is to be known," he says, "that our Redeemer has shown himself one person with his church, which he assumed. For of him it is said: 'who is the head, even

credimus, hoc eciam unius persone actibus significari videamus. Et idem dicit XIX° Moralium cap. IX et IV° Moralium cap. IX. De illa siquidem ecclesia cuius Christus est caput (secundum testimonium huius sancti pape) suppono quod fiat nobis sermo. Et patet quod, si christianus foret caput illius ecclesie, tunc vel haberet multa capita quod negat decretalis, vel aliter christianus foret Christo superior. Non enim est color quod quilibet qui est caput partis ecclesie sit caput illius ecclesie, quia tunc nedum dominus papa sed quilibet uxoratus et omne caput bestie foret caput ecclesie, et sic (ut sophiste concedunt) ecclesia haberet monstruosissime caput et membra quotlibet asinina; quod foret nimis sophisticum. Videamus ergo racionem secundum quam Christus dicetur singulariter caput tocius sponse sue post diem iudicii, et patebit luce clarius quod nemo alius potest esse caput illius ecclesie. Sed obicitur per dominum Ardmacanum libro VII°, De Questionibus Armenorum cap. VI, ubi videtur tenere quod idem corpus habet multa capita subordinata, [22] sicut idem populus habet multos dominos, unum subordinatum alteri (sicut patet in materia civili). Et sic videtur dicere quod eadem ecclesia habet multa capita ordinata secundum inferius atque superius.

Christ'. And again of his church it is written: 'and the body of Christ, which is the church'." And he goes on: "What we believe," he says, "that Christ and the church are one person, let us see signified also in the acts of one person."[4] And the same [Gregory] says [this] in *Moralia* XIX, chapter 9, and *Moralia* IV, chapter 9. It is of that church, indeed, whose head is Christ (according to the testimony of this holy pope), that I suppose our discourse to be.[5]

And it is clear that, if a Christian were head of that church, then either it would have many heads, which the decretal denies, or else a Christian would be superior to Christ. For there is no colour [for saying] that whoever is head of a part of the church is head of that church; for then not only the lord pope but every married man, and every beast's head, would be head of the church; and so (as the sophists grant) the church would most monstrously have a head and any number of asinine members; which would be too sophistical.[6] Let us see, therefore, the reason according to which Christ will be called singularly the head of his whole bride after the day of judgement, and it will be clearer than light that no one else can be head of that church.[7] But it is objected, by appeal to the lord of Armagh, in book 7 *On the Questions of the Armenians*, chapter 6, where he seems to hold that the same body has many subordinate heads, [22] as the same people has many lords, one subordinate to another (as is clear in civil matters). And so he seems to say that the same church has many heads, ordered as lower and higher.[8]

Notes

1. Eph. 5:32, DR "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church"; a reference, not a quotation. *Sic opinantes*: the third party at the end of the last part, who say the universal church is not yet. B's margin: *Eph. V*.
2. *Sentiret ... destrueret*: the subject is the one who so speaks (or his saying); the escalation is from thinking against the church to destroying it.
3. *Filios eius*: the devil's sons (cf. John 8:44), not the sons of the faithful. *Error in logica scripture*: an error in construing scripture's own terms, here "universal" and "particular" church.
4. Gregory, *Moralia* XXIII.1 (Loserth: Opp., ed. Maur., I, 731); PL 76:251C–D, XXIII.1.2. Loserth notes that the MSS read *cum sua* where Gregory has *sancta* ("with holy church"), as the PL confirms; we translate the print. *Et sequitur* skips a clause of Gregory's. Job 19:25, Vg *Scio enim* (Wyclif lacks *enim*); Eph. 4:15, DR "who is the head, even Christ"; Col. 1:24, Vg *pro corpore eius, quod est ecclesia*, here *corpus Christi*, and we translate the Latin. *Et sequitur* is not an inference: "and he goes on". B's margins: *Ecclesia est persona*.
5. *Moralia* XIX.9 and IV.9: Wyclif's references, which do not locate the doctrine; it is stated at XIX.14.22 (PL 76:110C, *Christum et Ecclesiam unam esse personam*). *Suppono ... sermo*: Wyclif fixes the subject term of his argument.
6. *Decretalis*: *Unam sanctam*, the decretal of the chapter's second conclusion, which denies the church two heads "like a monster" (Friedberg II, 1245–46). *Color*: a plausible ground (the glossary). The reductio: if heading any part sufficed, every husband (head of his wife) and every beast's head would head the church. *Sophisticum*: the sophists' kind of conclusion, absurd but granted.
7. *Dicetur* is future: after the judgement, when the church is wholly triumphant, Christ alone will be called its head; the reason for that will show who is head now.
8. Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh (d. 1360), *Summa de quaestionibus Armenorum* (Loserth identifies him, citing a Vienna MS); book 7, c. 6 is Wyclif's reference, not independently checked. *Obicitur per*: "it is objected, by appeal to" (cf. the glossary *arguitur per*). A and B margins: *Obieccio. Ardmacanus*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):

- **20: *a* (print: 'electi a principio mundi'; the a stands before principio)**
- **20: *principio* (box word is principio (read with 9.1 a / 9.3 ∅ = 'a principio mundi'))**
- **20: ∅ (nothing between principio and mundi; principio is pos 256)**
- **21: *persona* (130d is the folio mark)**
- **21: *Qui***
- **21: *Quod***
- **21: *unam***
- **20: *iudicii***
- **20: *V°, 32.* (print has verse 32 after chapter (confirmed on leaf n0057)) [-VERSE]**

- **21.5 *cum sua*: so the MSS; Loserth: "recte: sancta" (note 4).**
- **Variants noted but not affecting the English: 21.8 B *qui est*; 22.1 B lacks *multos*.**

Part 8: The heads of the church; the saints are members, not heads; hoping with misgiving

Loserth pp. 22.6–25.22

¶1 22.6–25.22
22.9 *The Church has two heads, Christ's divinity and his humanity;*
22.15 *as there are two Paracletes,*
22.17 *and yet one.*
23.1 *No local Church is the great universal Church.*
23.21 *Gregory.*
23.22 *What the Church is.*
23.27 *The Saints are only members of holy Church, not heads.*
24.3 *Gregory.*
24.5 *Different virtues were specially displayed in different patriarchs,*
24.19 *yet none of them presumed to call himself head of the Church.*
25.1 *We should know,*
25.2 *a. what is the quidity of the Church; b. our ignorance as to what God has predestined;*
25.8 *c. to believe ourselves predestined without venturing to assert it.*

[22]**Hic dicitur quod idem corpus ecclesie habet multa capita, ut quelibet particularis ecclesia habet ad minimum tria capita, scilicet divinitatem, Christi humanitatem et capitaneum illius ecclesie. Ecclesia autem universalis que est totum corpus Christi misticum habet duo capita, scilicet caput extrinsecum que est divinitas et caput intrinsecum que est Christi humanitas, et modo ineffabili divinitas et humanitas Christi sunt duo capita tocius ecclesie et cum hoc eciam unum caput: Sicut filius et spiritus sanctus sunt unus paraclitus, intelligendo principative vel essencialiter, et tamen sunt duo paracliti, intelligendo personaliter (cum Joh. XIV°, 16 dicitur: Ego rogabo patrem et alium paraclitum dabit vobis): sic iste due nature sunt duo capita ecclesie, et tamen sunt personaliter unum caput. Particulares autem ecclesie, sicut fuit pusillus grex cui presidebat sanctus Petrus, non erant nisi iuvencule tocius matris ecclesie, sicut exponit Gregorius XIX° Moralium cap. VIII, declarans etatem ecclesie quomodo in principio fuit soror parvula, carens uberibus predicacionis. Unde sic infert: Universe quippe ecclesie que unam catholicam faciunt adolescentule vocantur. Unde beatum Petrum et alias particulares ecclesias vocat membra illius ecclesie quam leenam nominat, Christum vero leonem (ut** [23]**declarat XXVIII° Moralium cap. XI), dicens quod, sicut membra corporis non sunt ipsum corpus, sic particulares ecclesie non sunt illa sancta ecclesia, sed (ut docet apostolus i° Cor. XII, 12) membra eius. Istis positis dico quod nec dominus Ardmacanus nec aliquis doctor catholicus debet asserere quod aliquis christianus sit caput universalis sed particularis ecclesie, cum non sit color: Hoc caput est illius ecclesie, ergo hoc est caput illius ecclesie; nec est color: Si hoc est caput partis illius ecclesie, ergo hoc est caput illius ecclesie. Sic enim omnis vir foret caput Dei, sicut omnis prelatus inferior foret**

To this the answer is that the same body of the church has many heads, so that any particular church has at least three heads, namely the divinity, the humanity of Christ, and the captain of that church.[1] But the universal church, which is the whole mystical body of Christ, has two heads, namely the extrinsic head, which is the divinity, and the intrinsic head, which is the humanity of Christ; and in an ineffable way the divinity and the humanity of Christ are two heads of the whole church and, with this, also one head: just as the Son and the Holy Spirit are one Paraclete, understanding [it] as principle or essentially, and yet are two Paracletes, understanding [it] personally (since in John 14:16 it is said: "I will ask the Father: and he shall give you another Paraclete"), so these two natures are two heads of the church, and yet are personally one head.[2] And particular churches, such as was the "little flock" over which St Peter presided, were nothing but young girls of the whole mother church, as Gregory expounds in *Moralia* XIX, chapter 8, declaring the age of the church, how in the beginning she was a "little sister", lacking the breasts of preaching.[3] Hence he infers thus: "For all the churches which make up the one catholic [church] are called young maidens."[4] Hence he calls the blessed Peter and the other particular churches members of that church which he names the lioness, Christ being the lion (as [23]**he declares in *Moralia* XXVIII, chapter 11), saying that, as the members of the body are not the body itself, so particular churches are not that holy church but (as the apostle teaches, 1 Corinthians 12:12) its members.[5]**

These things laid down, I say that neither the lord of Armagh nor any catholic doctor ought to assert that any Christian is head of the universal [church], but [only] of a particular church; since there is no colour [in]:

caput sue matricis ecclesie. Sed apostolus contradicit istis arguciis, I° Cor. XI, 3, dicens: Volo autem vos scire quod omnis viri caput est Christus, caput autem mulieris vir, caput vero Christi Deus. In quo dicto patet ordo capitum et deteccio illarum fallaciarum. Quia aliter eque diceret econtra quod caput Christi et Dei foret tam vir quam mulier. Ecclesia itaque catholica, secundum beatum Gregorium super illo Matthei XXIII°, 34: Ecce mitto ad vos sapientes et scribas, est vinea domini plantata a principio mundi usque ad finem fructificans, quotquot sanctos gignit tot palmites producit. Et sicut nemo est naturaliter caput matris sue sed pars nisi Christus: sic nullus aliorum sanctorum est caput matris ecclesie sed membrum. Sic enim dicit beatus Gregorius (ubi supra) quod beatus Job, beatus Petrus et ceteri precones matris ecclesie sunt os eius, et breviter, quilibet [24]aliorum sanctorum proporcionaliter ad analogiam virtutis sue et proprietatis membri corporalis est pars sancte matris ecclesie. Unde beatus Gregorius IV° Moralium cap. XXXII narrat quomodo a principio mundi Deus ordinavit sponse sue patriarchas secundum virtutum principia tamquam membra radicalia ecclesie inserenda, ut patet de innocencia Abel, de mundicia Enoch, de castimonia coniugali Isaac, de tolerancia Jacob, de spe Noe, de obediencia Abrahe, de paciencia Job, de castitate Joseph, de mansuetudine Moysi, de fiducia Josue, de humilitate David, de zelo Helye, et sic discurrendo per omnes species virtutum; que secundum etatem seculi habuerunt in excessu notabili aliquos patriarchas eorum principia in quorum labores sponsus ordinavit posteros intrare (ut dicitur Johannis IV°). Nec solum isti sed omnes eorum imitacionis filii sunt eadem membra sancte matris ecclesie quod, si alicui desit virtutis officium, deerit sibi indubie quod sit sancte matris ecclesie membrum. Nullus autem eorum unquam presumpsit dicere quod sit caput et dominus matris sue, quia indubie, si aliquis homo sit caput tocius generis christiani (quod est sancta mater ecclesia), tunc ipse est Christus, quia solus Christus est huius generacionis principium; alii autem in ipso sunt palmites. Necesse ergo est hodie seminare istam fidem ecclesie, cum multi ex ignorancia occasione male accepta, dormiendo in nocte ignorancie uruntur a sancta matre ecclesia que est pulchra ut luna. Uruntur dico secundum inferiorem hominem pravitate heretica, quia omnes qui dicunt: Ecce hic, et ecce illic est Christus caput ecclesie, solum eius vicarium demonstrantes. [25]Oportet autem volentes proficere vel iudicare in ista materia primo cognoscere quiditatem sancte matris ecclesie ad modum loquendi scripture sacre et sanctorum qui sensum eius elucidant. Oportet secundo cognoscere materiam predestinacionis divine, quanto sit nobis incognita. Et tunc tercio possunt discernere,

"This head is of that church, therefore this is the head of that church"; nor is there colour [in]: "If this is head of a part of that church, therefore this is head of that church."[6] For so every man would be head of God, as every lower prelate would be head of his mother church.[7] But the apostle contradicts these quibbles, 1 Corinthians 11:3, saying: "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man: and the head of Christ is God." In which saying the order of heads is plain, and the exposure of those fallacies. For otherwise he would equally say, conversely, that the head of Christ and of God would be both man and woman.[8] The catholic church, then, according to the blessed Gregory on that [word] of Matthew 23:34, "Behold I send to you wise men and scribes", is the vineyard of the Lord, planted from the beginning of the world and bearing fruit to the end: as many saints as it begets, so many branches it puts forth.[9] And as no one is by nature head of his mother but a part, except Christ, so none of the other saints is head of mother church but a member. For so the blessed Gregory says (in the place cited) that blessed Job, blessed Peter and the other heralds of mother church are her mouth; and, briefly, each [24]of the other saints, proportionally to the analogy of his virtue and of the property of a bodily member, is a part of holy mother church.[10]

Hence the blessed Gregory, in *Moralia* IV, chapter 32, relates how from the beginning of the world God ordained for his bride patriarchs according to the beginnings of the virtues, as root members to be grafted into the church: as is clear of the innocence of Abel, the cleanness of Enoch, the conjugal chastity of Isaac, the endurance of Jacob, the hope of Noah, the obedience of Abraham, the patience of Job, the chastity of Joseph, the meekness of Moses, the confidence of Joshua, the humility of David, the zeal of Elijah, and so running through all the species of virtues;[11] which [virtues], according to the age of the world, had in notable excess certain patriarchs as their beginnings, into whose labours the bridegroom ordained that those who came after should enter (as is said in John 4).[12] Nor only these, but all the sons of their imitation are the same members of holy mother church; so that, if the office of virtue is lacking to anyone, it will without doubt be lacking to him that he is a member of holy mother church.[13] But none of them ever presumed to say that he was head and lord of his mother; for without doubt, if any man is head of the whole Christian race (which is holy mother church), then he is Christ, since Christ alone is the beginning of this generation; and the others are branches in him.[14] It is therefore necessary today to sow this

si sit sanum vel stolidum quod asseramus absque formidine nos esse membra sancte matris ecclesie, hoc est, de numero predestinatorum. Debemus autem hoc sperare et credere sed cum formidine de gracia perseverancie: ideo talis fides habet formidinem annexam quam non habet fides qua credimus nos esse in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, cum casus futuri sit nobis incercior quam actus caritatis vel habitus pro presenti. Unde gentilitati inserte loco Judeorum in ecclesia dicit apostolus Rom. XI°, 20. Noli altum sapere, sed time. Timor ergo de casu a finali perseverancia stat cum spe, et cum caritas secundum presentem iusticiam foras mittit timorem de peccato habito pro presenti, videtur tamen quod omnis homo debet habere pro suo tempore specialem revelacionem, quia aliter non foret in firma spe excuciente omnem timorem.

faith of the church, since many, out of ignorance, on an occasion wrongly taken, sleeping in the night of ignorance, are burned by holy mother church, which is "fair as the moon". They are burned, I say, according to the lower man, by heretical depravity: for all who say "See here, and see there is Christ, the head of the church", pointing only to his vicar.[15]

[25] And those who wish to make progress or to judge in this matter must first know the quiddity of holy mother church, after the manner of speaking of holy scripture and of the saints who elucidate its sense. They must, second, know the matter of divine predestination, how far it is unknown to us. And then, third, they can discern whether it is sound or stupid that we should assert without misgiving that we are members of holy mother church, that is, of the number of the predestinate.[16] And we ought to hope and believe this, but with misgiving about the grace of perseverance: therefore such faith has misgiving annexed, which the faith by which we believe ourselves to be in grace according to present justice does not have, since a future fall is more uncertain to us than the act or habit of charity for the present.[17] Hence the apostle says to the gentiles, grafted into the church in place of the Jews, Romans 11:20: "Be not highminded, but fear." Fear, therefore, of a fall from final perseverance stands with hope; and although charity according to present justice "casteth out fear" of sin had for the present, yet it seems that every man must have, for his time, a special revelation, since otherwise he would not be in a firm hope that shakes off all fear.[18]

Notes

1. ***Hic dicitur***: the answer to Armagh's objection (A's margin: ***Responsio***). A reads ***deitatem*** (22.8) and ***deitas*** (22.12–13), "the Godhead"; the glossary keeps ***deitas*** and ***divinitas*** apart, and we translate the print. ***Capitaneus***: "captain" (glossary proposal).
2. John 14:16 DR. ***Principative vel essencialiter***: as one principle, in the one essence, against "personally", as two persons. B ***principative et*** (22.16); B lacks ***eciam*** (22.13). B's margin calls the divinity the extrinsic and Christ's humanity the intrinsic head.
3. Luke 12:32, DR "little flock"; Song 8:8, DR "Our sister is little, and hath no breasts". Gregory, ***Moralia*** XIX: Wyclif's cap. 8, Loserth's cap. 12 (the Maurist number; PL 76:108A–B; Opp. I, 613). ***Iuvencule***, "young girls", is kept apart from Gregory's ***adolescentule***.
4. Gregory's sentence glosses Song 1:2, DR "young maidens have loved thee"; wording as PL 76:108B.
5. Lion and lioness: Wyclif's ***Moralia*** XXVIII.11; the passage is XVIII.35.56 (PL 76:68C–69A), as Loserth gives; XXVIII.10–11 has no lion. ***Beatum Petrum et alias particulares ecclesias***: Peter is counted as a particular church. 1 Cor. 12:12 is a reference, not a quotation.
6. ***Non est color***: "there is no colour", no plausible ground (glossary: ***color***). ***Caput universalis sed particularis***: we supply "[only]": no one should claim headship of the universal church, only of a particular one. Latin has no article, so the two inferences pass from "a head belonging to that church" and from "head of a part" to "the head of that church"; these are the ***fallacie*** named next. A reads at 23.7–8 ***Nec si hoc est caput illius partis ecclesie, ergo***; B has the clause in the margin.
7. ***Matrix ecclesia***: a cathedral or metropolitan church, kept apart from ***mater ecclesia***, "mother church", of which the whole sentence makes a pun. The inference to "head of God" runs by 1 Cor. 11:3 read backwards, as the next sentences say.
8. 1 Cor. 11:3 DR, which agrees with Wyclif's Latin. ***Deteccio***: "exposure". B's margin: ***Econtra***.
9. Gregory, ***Hom. in Ev.*** I.19 (Loserth: Opp. I, 1510), the homily on the vineyard (Matt. 20:1; PL 76:1154B), paraphrased; Wyclif ties it to Matt. 23:34. There Vg has ***prophetas, et sapientes, et scribas*** (DR "prophets and wise men and scribes"); Wyclif lacks ***prophetas***, and we translate his Latin. ***Palmites***: "branches", as in John 15:5.

10. ***Ubi supra*: not the homily, which has no "mouth"; Peter as the lioness's mouth is *Moralia* XVIII.35.56 (PL 76:68D, *hujus leaenae ori*); Job as "mouth" is not found. A's margin: the members of holy church, the bride of Christ, are the saints alone. B *sunt* (23.29).**
11. **Gregory, *Moralia* IV.32.63 (PL 75:671C–672A; Loserth: Opp. I, 132), on the just from the world's beginning (Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob); the virtues are named after the Preface 6.13 (PL 75:524B–C), with David's humility and Elijah's zeal from X.6.9 (PL 75:925A–B); Joseph's chastity is Wyclif's. Loserth notes that the MSS have *cap. X* and that he has corrected it. AA$_1$ lack *de spe Noe ... de paciencia Job* (24.9–10); the print follows B. *Radicalia ... inserenda*: the figure of grafting from Rom. 11, used again at 25.15.**
12. ***Que ... eorum principia*: we take *que* as the species of virtues, with *eorum* loosely for *earum*; B *quo secundum* (24.13). John 4:38, DR "you have entered into their labours".**
13. **B *in dubio*, "in doubt" (24.18–19, 24.21), for *indubie*. *Imitacionis filii*: sons by imitation, not by descent.**
14. **B *prescripsit* (24.20) for *presumpsit*. *Principium ... palmites*: John 15:5, "I am the vine: you the branches", taken up from the vineyard above.**
15. **Song 6:9, DR "fair as the moon"; the burning moon is Ps. 120:6, DR "nor the moon by night": those who take scandal from the church are, as it were, moonstruck. *Secundum inferiorem hominem*: in the lower, fleshly man. The *quia* clause has no main verb, and we leave it incomplete. Luke 17:23 (Loserth), DR "See here, and see there"; Wyclif adds *est Christus* as in Matt. 24:23, and we translate his Latin.**
16. **A and B margins: *Triplex epilogus*. B's reader asks whether Christ, head of the universal church, should also be called its member. A$_1$ *qui secundum sensum* (25.4); B lacks *membra* (25.8). *Formido*: the misgiving that qualifies assent (the glossary).**
17. ***Casus futuri*: a future fall from grace. *Secundum presentem iusticiam*: justice as one now has it. B's margin restates the point: the wayfarer believes with misgiving that he is a member of the church, but believes without it that he is now in grace.**
18. **Rom. 11:20 DR. 1 John 4:18, Vg *perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem* (DR "perfect charity casteth out fear"); Wyclif lacks *perfecta*. *Videtur tamen*: the chapter closes on a difficulty, not a conclusion. B *fiat cum spe* (25.18). Loserth notes that Hus, *De ecclesia*, capp. 1–3, draws on this chapter.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **22: *Christi***
  - **22: *16***
  - **23: *declarat* (131a is the folio mark)**
  - **23: *I°***
  - **23: *Christi***
  - **24: *dominus***
  - **24: *Christus***
  - **24: *Christus***
  - **25: *Rom. XI°* (token spans 'Rom. XI°' (tight space); degree sign present)**
- **Print form noted: 23.4 *i° Cor.* (lower-case numeral; 23.14 has *I° Cor.*).**
- **24.3 *Moralium cap. XXXII*: the MSS have *cap. X*; Loserth's correction.**
- **Variants noted but not affecting the English: 24.6 AB lack *secundum*; 25.9–10 B *hoc sapere*.**

Chapter 2

Part 1: No vicar of Christ is head of the church: three replies refuted

Loserth pp. 25.24–28.7

¶1 25.24–26.7
25.24 *Objection: Our exposition is not what Pope Boniface intended.*
26.1 *He meant to claim the obedience of all princes to the Pope.*
26.8 *Answer: We must not attribute such blasphemy to the Pope.*
26.20 *It is urged 1. that Christ and his successive vicars make up one Head.*
26.23 *This denies the headship of Christ,*

[25]**Contra dicta obicitur probando, primo quod prima conclusio ad sensum expositum non est de intencione domini Bonifacii nec alicuius sui successoris, cum ex illo capitulo Maioritatis et obediencie intenditur quod** [26]**omnes principes seculi secum conversantes debent parere sibi et cuicunque pape qui fuerit pro tempore ut capiti sancte matris ecclesie. Ex quo videtur innuere quod ipse et quicunque papa sit caput universalis ecclesie. Et eodem modo videtur quod intelligit Romanam ecclesiam singulariter illam in qua ipse presidet cum cardinalibus cui sit necessarium obedire.**

Against what has been said it is objected, by proving, first, that the first conclusion, in the sense expounded, is not the intention of the lord Boniface, nor of any of his successors, since from that chapter *Of greatness and obedience* it is maintained that [26]**all the princes of the world living with him must obey him, and whatever pope there may be for the time, as the head of holy mother church.[1] From this he seems to imply that he himself, and whoever is pope, is head of the universal church. And in the same way he seems to understand by the Roman church, singularly, that one over which he presides with the cardinals, which it is necessary to obey.**

¶2 26.8–26.19

[26]**Hic dicitur quod nullus papa citra Christum potest catholice illud intendere: ideo non debet supponi in domino papa tanta blasfemia. Nam iuxta secundam conclusionem unica est talis ecclesia cuius caput est Christus, et non habet in terris multa capita, ne sit monstrum. Cum ergo nullus Christi vicarius sit Christus, sequitur quod nullus Christi vicarius sit caput illius ecclesie. Antecedens istius consequencie ponitur in dicta decretali secundum quamlibet eius partem. Nec videtur catholicum quod dicta decretalis sit in hoc impossibilis vel improvide posita quoad logicam vel metaphysicam.**

To this the answer is that no pope short of Christ can catholicly maintain that; therefore so great a blasphemy ought not to be supposed in the lord pope.[2] For according to the second conclusion there is only one such church, whose head is Christ, and it does not have many heads on earth, lest it be a monster. Since, therefore, no vicar of Christ is Christ, it follows that no vicar of Christ is head of that church. The antecedent of this inference is laid down in the said decretal, according to each of its parts. Nor does it seem catholic that the said decretal should in this be impossible, or set down improvidently as regards logic or metaphysics.[3]

¶3 26.20–28.7
27.1 *and of each individual pope.*
27.5
2. that each Vicar of Christ is by participation Christ. But a. there would be a thousand heads.
27.9 *b. the vicar could not assert that he was Christ*
27.14 *c. every member of Christ would be a head.*
27.24
3. that we speak of the militant Church of

[26]**Sed hic posset responderi tripliciter: primo quod Christus et tota successio suorum vicariorum sunt unum caput aggregative, sed nullus eorum per se. Verumtamen non credo aliquem catholicum sani capitis hoc sentire, quia tunc negaretur Christum esse caput universalis ecclesie, sed unum aggregatum cuius Christus foret pars, et sic integrum corpus Christi non haberet Christum caput; quod reputo non minus hereticum quam blasfemum. Similiter, cum Christus sit caput tocius multitudinis vicariorum suorum et ipsi caput tocius residui, videtur quod ipse sit archicaput tocius ecclesie et nullus eorum. Vocatur enim caput matris ecclesie quod non communicat cum membris corporis in natura alia singulari, quia aliter haberet** [27]**ecclesia nimis magnum et monstruosum caput; quod repugnaret**

But here one could reply in three ways. First, that Christ and the whole succession of his vicars are one head aggregatively, but none of them by himself. Yet I do not believe that any catholic of sound head holds this, since then it would be denied that Christ is head of the universal church, but [the head would be] one aggregate of which Christ would be a part, and so the whole body of Christ would not have Christ as head; which I reckon no less heretical than blasphemous.[4] Similarly, since Christ is head of the whole multitude of his vicars, and they head of the whole remainder, it seems that he is the arch-head of the whole church, and none of them. For that is called the head of mother church which does not share with the members of the body in another singular nature, since otherwise

which each pope is head.

27.27 *But the Church would be always changing its individuality,*

perfeccioni opificis, et si caput eius foret tale aggregatum, insuper nullus papa foret caput illius ecclesie. Si dicatur secundo quod quilibet Christi vicarius est participacione ipse Christus, instatur tripliciter: primo per hoc quod talis participacio non tolleret distinccionem personarum et capitum, et sic mater ecclesia haberet mille capita. Secundo per hoc quod foret temeraria presumpcio vicarium Christi cui non fit revelacio asserere quod sit Christus, quia tunc verificaretur illud Luce XVII°, 23, de Antichristo dictum: Ecce hic et ecce illic. Sed Christus precipit: Nolite ire neque sectemini. Tercio per hoc quod iuxta hanc evidenciam quilibet christianus qui est membrum Christi foret caput universalis ecclesie. Et sic ecclesia foret nimis monstruosa, quia haberet quodlibet membrum caput, et per consequens, nullum aliud membrum. Vocatur enim caput universalis ecclesie persona capitalis vel principalis ecclesie quod notum est vicario Christi non posse competere, quia tunc foret super omnes angelos vel creaturas beatas in celo. Ideo tercio dicitur quod loquimur de tota ecclesia militante cuius quilibet papa est caput. Contra hunc sensum instatur tripliciter: primo videtur quod sunt tot ecclesie quot persone ecclesie, et per combinacionem longe plures, et per consequens, non foret tantum una ecclesia ad sensum decretalis in secunda conclusione expositum. Nam ista ecclesia foret iste persone fideles, que sunt omnino alie quam persone viantes tempore Petri: ergo et omnino alia ecclesia; et per idem, cum ista ecclesia individuatur ab istis personis, [28] videtur quod quantumcunque corrupta vel gravata sit, erit de ecclesia, et per consequens, quicunque prepositus ecclesie foret nimis multociens viduatus et desponsatus ultra bigamiam, trigamiam et quemcunque gradum a nobis cognitum, et cum ecclesia non sit per accidens ecclesia, videtur quod mortua huic mundo manet ecclesia, sed triumphans.

[27] the church would have too great and monstrous a head;[5] which would be repugnant to the perfection of the maker; and if its head were such an aggregate, moreover, no pope would be head of that church.[6]

If it is said, second, that every vicar of Christ is by participation Christ himself, it is objected in three ways. First by this, that such participation would not take away the distinction of persons and of heads, and so mother church would have a thousand heads. Second by this, that it would be rash presumption for a vicar of Christ to whom no revelation is made to assert that he is Christ, since then that [word] of Luke 17:23, said of Antichrist, would be verified: "See here, and see there." But Christ commands: "Go ye not after, nor follow them."[7] Third by this, that on this evidence every Christian who is a member of Christ would be head of the universal church. And so the church would be too monstrous, for it would have every member as head, and consequently no other member. For that is called the head of the universal church [which is] the capital or principal person of the church; which, it is known, cannot belong to the vicar of Christ, since then he would be above all the angels or blessed creatures in heaven.[8]

Therefore, third, the answer is that we speak of the whole church militant, of which each pope is head. Against this sense it is objected in three ways. First, it seems that there are as many churches as there are persons of the church, and by combination far more, and consequently there would not be only one church in the sense of the decretal expounded in the second conclusion. For this church would be these faithful persons, who are wholly other than the persons on the road in Peter's time: therefore also a wholly other church. And by the same token, since this church is individuated by these persons, [28] it seems that, however corrupted or weighed down it may be, it will be of the church; and consequently any superior of the church would be widowed and wedded too many times, beyond bigamy, trigamy and any degree known to us; and since the church is not a church by accident, it seems that, dead to this world, it remains a church, but triumphant.[9]

Notes

1. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam* (1302), which stands under the title *De maioritate et obedientia*; Loserth: *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1 (our modern form of his "lib. I, tit. VIII, cap. I"; the title is Friedberg's Tit. VIII, II, 1245). *Capitulo Maioritatis et obediencie* names the decretal by that title; *maioritas* is "greatness" (the glossary). *Prima conclusio*: the first of the conclusions drawn in ch. 1 from the decretal. *Secum conversantes*: "living with him", i.e. his contemporaries, as again on pp. 29 and 37. A has *conversantes parere*; A_1 *parerent*, corrected in the margin. A's margin at 25.24: *Nullus papa nec aggregatum ex papis est capud ecclesie.*

2. ***Citra Christum***: "short of Christ", i.e. any pope other than Christ himself, whom Wyclif can call the church's true pontiff (cf. p. 30, ¶2 of 02-b). ***Intendere***: "maintain" a thesis (the glossary); the objection's ***intenditur*** (25.27) is answered in the same word.
3. The antecedent is "no vicar of Christ is Christ" together with "the one church has one head, Christ". ***Unam sanctam*** names that head as ***Christus videlicet et Christi vicarius Petrus, Petrique successor*** (Friedberg II, 1245–46): the first reply below (one aggregate head) answers to that phrase. ***Impossibilis***: self-contradictory, the logician's sense.
4. ***Aggregative***: as an aggregate (a whole of parts), opposed to ***per se***, "by himself". ***Sani capitis***: "of sound head", a play on ***caput***. ***Sed unum aggregatum***: we supply "the head would be"; the ***sed*** corrects ***Christum esse caput***.
5. ***Vocatur enim caput … in natura alia singulari***: the head is one that does not share a further individual nature with the members, i.e. it is not one more member among them. B reads ***in natura aut***, which does not mend the phrase. B's margin: ***Quid vocatur caput matris ecclesie?***
6. ***Opificis***: "of the maker", Christ as the church's maker; the aggregate head would mar his work. AA_1 lack ***si caput … aggregatum*** (27.2–3).
7. Luke 17:23 (DR), with the Vulgate except ***ecce hic et ecce illic*** for ***Ecce hic, et ecce illic***. Wyclif reads it ***de Antichristo***, of false Christs (cf. 17:24–25). ***Participacione***: by participation in Christ's being, as every member participates; hence the third objection.
8. ***Persona capitalis vel principalis***: "the capital or principal person", the head-person in rank; ***quod*** refers to that position. A's margin: ***Caput universalis ecclesie quid vocatur***.
9. 27.33 ***individuatur***: Loserth's reading; he notes the MSS' form (***iudīatur***, OCR) and that "the place here is certainly corrupt". 27.32 the MSS have ***et alia*** (Loserth adds ***omnino***). 28.1 ***quantumcunque***: Loserth's text; the MSS have ***quacunque***. ***Gravata***: "weighed down"; with ***corrupta*** it seems to mean the persons' passing away in death. ***Bigamia*** is the canon-law sense, a second marriage (a bar to orders): every change in the persons widows the church's superior and weds him again. ***Prepositus ecclesie***: whoever is set over the church, here the pope.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 25: ***CAP. II.***
  - 26: ***omnes***
  - 26: ***principes***
  - 26: ***catholice***
  - 26: ***caput*** (trailing b is the margin letter)
  - 27: ***ecclesia*** (131c is the folio mark)
  - 27: ***instatur*** (print has instatur (in-, not m)) [NW]
  - 27: ***tripliciter*** [NW]
  - 27: ***conclusione*** (conclu-/sione hyphenated; 131d is the folio mark)
- OCR scars, read on plate n0064 and corrected in the Latin: 26.8 ***ic*** for ***Hic*** (drop initial lost); 26.20 ***quodl*** for ***quod***; 27.2 ***opmcis*** for ***opificis***; 27.7 ***aprimo*** and 27.26 ***asensum*** (Loserth's alinea letter ***a*** glued: ***primo***, ***sensum***); 27.7 ***tollereta.*** for ***tolleret*** (the side-note's "a." glued).
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 25.26 AA_1 ***tamen ex***; 26.33 B ***in natura aut***.

Part 2: The pope is head at most of a particular church

Loserth pp. 28.8–32.8

¶1 28.8–30.11
28.8 *and there would be as many churches as there were popes.*
28.22 *Nor is it certain that a Pope is head of his contemporaries, for he may be reprobate.*
29.12 *It may be said that Christ is immanent in second causes and so obedience is due to the Pope as Christ's agent.*
29.22 *The Church would not be universal, and sO would contradict the decretal.*

[28]**Si dicatur secundo quod manet continue eadem ecclesia propter unitatem capitis scilicet pape, non tollitur quin adhuc tot sunt ecclesie quot erant pape; quod est contra decretalem. Similiter, querendo de quiditate illius ecclesie, patet, cum sit date persone, ipsa non dependet ab ipso capite in racione ecclesie, cum decapitata ab isto capite manet eque sancta et sana; cum tamen iuxta responsionem hoc caput et hec ecclesia consequerentur se in morte et vita (nam sequitur expositorie: iste persone sunt hec ecclesia que durabit per totam vitam illius hominis): ergo iste persone sic durabunt, et per idem desinent, isto papa mortuo, quod nec oportet de ecclesia materiali nec spirituali, cum stat quod iste sit primus mortuus, tota ecclesia sua superstite. Nec oportet quod iste sit capitaneus omnium istorum in viacione, quia stat quod sit prescitus, aliis in ampliori gracia eciam secundum**

If it is said, second, that the same church remains continuously because of the unity of the head, namely the pope, this does not remove [the consequence] that there are still as many churches as there were popes; which is against the decretal.[1] Similarly, inquiring into the quiddity of that church: it is clear, since it is [certain] given persons, that it does not depend on that head in its character as a church, since, beheaded of that head, it remains equally holy and sound. And yet according to the reply this head and this church would follow each other in death and in life (for it follows expositorily: these persons are this church, which will last through the whole life of that man): therefore these persons will so last, and by the same token will cease when this pope is dead; which need not be so either of the material or of the spiritual church, since it

29.29 *No pope knows whether he is a member of the Church.*
30.12 *There were churches before the Incarnation that had no pope at their head;*
30.18 *therefore the Church, that contains them, is under no pope.*

presentem iusticiam et finaliter perseverantibus ac viam oppositam viantibus. Similiter, eadem ecclesia apostolica cui Petrus presidebat manet modo et manebit continue, ut dicit ista opinio cum decreto. Iste ergo papa non potest esse caput super ista totali ecclesia, quia tunc haberet ex equo tot capita quot papas, et per consequens, talis ecclesia successiva non capit suam unitatem ab isto papa, cum habuit unitatem eandem quam modo, antequam ipse fuerit, sicut et habebit post eius corrupcionem. [29] Quomodo ergo caperet esse suum a membro tam accidentali, cum more fluminis labentis ecclesia illa habet nunc unum et nunc alium in facie seculi presidentem? Nulla ergo istarum viarum et specialiter ista verificat quod quicunque fuerit Romanus pontifex, sit caput universalis ecclesie cui oportet omnem christianum de necessitate salutis obedire. Si dicatur tercio quod manet eadem ecclesia hominum a principio mundi usque ad novissimum electum (sicut dicit beatus Gregorius, XIX° Homiliarum, cum aliis sanctis), et illa capit unitatem a capite Deo et capite Christo qui a principio mundi manet in causis secundis, et habet membra fidem eius tenencia et quicunque fuerit papa pro tempore suo, oportet quod tota pars illius ecclesie secum conversans sit sibi subiecta ut capiti et abbati. Et ista responsio est subtilior quam priores. Sed non videtur mihi salvare decretalem ad sensum expositum sed pocius infringere illum sensum; quod videtur multipliciter. Nam primo patet quod preter istam ecclesiam oportet ponere aliam superiorem ex omnibus angelis et hominibus compositam cuius ista est pars. Et per consequens, ista non est universalis ecclesia, cum sit particularis, quia aliter forent due; quod est contra conclusionem secundam dicte decretalis. De totali autem que est omnes ecclesie extra quam non est salus nec possunt esse multe tales est nobis sermo. Item, quilibet Christi vicarius est filius talis ecclesie, quomodo igitur pater vel caput? Item, quilibet nostrum sicut et istorum paparum ignorat si sit membrum talis ecclesie: omnino ergo non debet presumere quod sit capitaneus omnium illorum propter apostolos et alios sanctos ignotos qui secundum aliam formam dominati sunt sue ecclesie. [30] Item, cum sancti pape post mortem non perdunt dignitatem capitalis regiminis sue ecclesie, videtur quod manent capita ecclesie sue in patria; illa enim dignitas foret illis laureola. Nam sicut nullum membrum ecclesie potest desinere esse membrum ecclesie, sic videtur quod nullum caput cuiuscunque particularis ecclesie potest desinere esse caput eiusdem ecclesie, et per consequens, sunt mille particulares ecclesie, quarum capita sunt multorum paparum capita. Non ergo est verum quod unica est mater ecclesia cuius oportet quemcunque Romanum pontificem esse caput.

can be that he is the first to die, his whole church surviving.[2] Nor need this [pope] be the captain of all these in their wayfaring, for it can be that he is foreknown, while others are in ampler grace, even according to present justice, and finally persevere, and are on the road the opposite way.[3] Similarly, the same apostolic church over which Peter presided remains now and will remain continually, as this opinion says, with the decree. This pope, therefore, cannot be head over this total church, since then it would have equally as many heads as popes; and consequently such a successive church does not take its unity from this pope, since it had the same unity as now before he existed, as it will also have after his corruption.[4] [29] How then would it take its being from a member so accidental, since, after the manner of a gliding river, that church has now one, now another, presiding in the face of the world? None of these ways, then, and this one especially, verifies that whoever is Roman pontiff is head of the universal church, whom every Christian must obey of necessity for salvation.

If it is said, third, that the same church of men remains from the beginning of the world to the last elect (as the blessed Gregory says, *Homilies* 19, with other saints),[5] and that it takes its unity from the head God and the head Christ, who from the beginning of the world remains in second causes, and has as members those holding his faith; and that, whoever is pope for his time, the whole part of that church living with him must be subject to him as head and abbot:[6] this reply is subtler than the former ones. But it does not seem to me to save the decretal in the sense expounded, but rather to break that sense; which is seen in many ways. For first it is clear that besides this church one must posit another, higher one, composed of all angels and men, of which this is a part. And consequently this is not the universal church, since it is particular; for otherwise there would be two, which is against the second conclusion of the said decretal. But our discourse is of the total church, which is all the churches, outside which there is no salvation, and of which there cannot be many.[7] Again, every vicar of Christ is a son of such a church: how then [is he] father or head? Again, each of us, as also each of these popes, is ignorant whether he is a member of such a church: he ought, then, by no means to presume that he is captain of all of them, because of the apostles and other unknown saints who, according to another form, have exercised lordship over their church.[8] [30] Again, since holy popes after death do not lose the dignity of the chief rule of their church, it seems that they remain heads of their church in the homeland; for that

dignity would be an aureole for them.[9] For just as no member of the church can cease to be a member of the church, so it seems that no head of any particular church can cease to be head of that same church; and consequently there are a thousand particular churches, whose heads are the heads of many popes. It is not true, then, that there is only one mother church, of which every Roman pontiff must be head.

¶2 30.12–31.2
31.13 *The better opinion is that the Pope is head of a local Church.*
31.23 *Note this.*
31.27 *No pope should assert that subjection to him is needful to salvation;*

[30]Item, tempore ante incarnacionem fuerunt multe particulares ecclesie quarum quelibet iam est eadem ecclesia, sed triumphans que quondam fuit militans, et illarum nullus Romanus pontifex fuit caput preter Christum; nec dubium quin ille ecclesie distinguuntur ab universali ecclesia et ab aliis particularibus ecclesiis: ergo multe sunt particulares ecclesie, et per consequens, una universalis ecclesia ex eis collecta; que sub iurisdiccione nullius Petri vicarii tamquam capitis sunt subiecte. Non enim patet evasio, loquendo de predestinatis fidelibus (de quorum numero non est Christus), quin ecclesie ille differunt ab invicem, sicut multitudines illarum personarum distinguuntur ab invicem, et si ecclesia dicit aggregata per accidens, tunc illa aggregata distinguuntur tam secundum subiecta quam secundum formas aggregatas longe plus quam Petrus albus et Petrus musicus. Si enim Deus servasset totam ecclesiam militantem tempore viacionis Christi usque hodie conversantem in Anglia et creasset novas ecclesias, sicut de facto fecit in Francia et alibi, tunc distinguerentur. Quare ergo modo non distinguuntur? Notemus ergo ecclesiam quam talis primo et per se regit, et invenietur quod [31]non sit unica columba Christi, quia bene est isti, si sit abiectum membrum illius ecclesie.

Again, in the time before the incarnation there were many particular churches, each of which is now the same church, but triumphant, that once was militant; and of these no Roman pontiff was head except Christ. Nor is there doubt that those churches are distinguished from the universal church and from the other particular churches: therefore there are many particular churches, and consequently one universal church gathered from them; and these are subject to the jurisdiction of no vicar of Peter as head.[10] For no escape is evident, speaking of the predestinate faithful (of whose number Christ is not), from [the conclusion] that those churches differ from one another as the multitudes of those persons are distinguished from one another; and if "church" signifies things aggregated by accident, then those aggregates are distinguished, both according to their subjects and according to the aggregated forms, far more than white Peter and musical Peter.[11] For if God had preserved the whole church militant of the time of Christ's wayfaring, living until today in England, and had created new churches, as in fact he did in France and elsewhere, then they would be distinguished. Why, then, are they not distinguished now? Let us note, then, the church which such a [pope] rules first and of itself, and it will be found that [31]it is not the one dove of Christ; for it is well with him if he is an abject member of that church.[12]

¶3 31.3–31.12

[31]Conformiter arguitur contra quamcunque opinionem in ista materia, querendo sollicite de quiditate illius ecclesie. Nam ista ecclesia que complete viat pro tempore Christi non potest esse alia quam ista eadem ecclesia, et sic de qualibet alia ecclesia singulari. Ex quo patet quod continue est alia et alia ecclesia, vians ad alietatem personarum ex quibus componitur; non enim valet negare sillogismum expositorium nec ei similem, nisi subsit plana diversitatis racio exprimenda etc.

In conformity [with this] it is argued against any opinion in this matter, by inquiring carefully into the quiddity of that church. For that church which is wholly a wayfarer in the time of Christ cannot be other than that same church; and so of every other singular church. From which it is clear that it is continually another and another church, on the way according to the otherness of the persons of which it is composed; for it is not valid to deny an expository syllogism, nor one like it, unless a plain ground of diversity underlies it, which must be stated, etc.[13]

¶4 31.13–31.18

[31]**Ideo dicunt doctores periciores quod dominus papa non est caput universalis sed particularis ecclesie, dum tamen perseveranter vixerit tamquam papa, sicut dicit septima conclusio capituli proximi; et sic videtur concedendum quod de possibili sit papa ipso superior hic in terris.**

Therefore the more expert doctors say that the lord pope is head not of the universal but of a particular church, provided, however, that he has lived perseveringly as a pope [should], as the seventh conclusion of the preceding chapter says; and so it seems it must be granted that there may possibly be one superior to the pope himself here on earth.[14]

¶5 31.19–31.32

[31]**Posito quod unus alius perfeccius doceat et regat plurem populum conformiter legi Christi, sicut potest esse de summo sacerdote ecclesie Asiane, videtur tamen mihi quod non debemus contendere circa illud de inesse, quod iste quicunque conversans nobiscum sit talis, sed supponere excellenciam Romani pontificis super aliis eciam quoad Deum, quia certum est quod non est superior nisi fuerit superior quoad Deum. Ex quibus videtur mihi quod nullus Romanus pontifex cui non sit facta specialis revelacio assereret vel opinaretur quod subesse sibi sit de necessitate salutis cuiuslibet christiani. Nam (ut logici arguunt) multi sunt christiani pro suo tempore qui non subsunt sibi, sicut nec ipsemet qui est precipuus christianus.**

Supposing that some other teaches more perfectly and rules a larger people in conformity with the law of Christ, as may be the case with the high priest of the Asian church, it seems to me nevertheless that we ought not to contend about that as a matter of fact, [namely] that this one, whoever he is, living among us, is such; but [ought] to suppose the excellence of the Roman pontiff over others even with respect to God, since it is certain that he is not superior unless he is superior with respect to God.[15] **From which it seems to me that no Roman pontiff to whom a special revelation has not been made would assert, or hold as an opinion, that to be subject to him is of necessity for the salvation of every Christian. For (as the logicians argue) there are many Christians in his time who are not subject to him, as neither is he himself, who is the chief Christian.**[16]

¶6 32.1–32.8

32.1 *Nor even declare that he is predestinate,*

[32]**Item, iuxta sepe dicta non sic assereret quod sit predestinatus, eo quod non est de substancia fidei catholice quod iste sit predestinatus. Ideo si assit sibi firma spes de hoc, oportet quod ex dono supernaturali fiat sibi specialis revelacio, sed si non sit predestinatus, non est capitaneus in ecclesia sancta Dei. Ergo non sic assereret quod subesse sibi tamquam capiti ecclesie sit de necessitate salutis cuiuslibet christiani.**

Again, according to what has often been said, he would not so assert that he is predestinate, because it is not of the substance of the catholic faith that this man is predestinate. Therefore, if he has a firm hope of this, it must be that a special revelation is made to him by a supernatural gift; now if he is not predestinate, he is not captain in the holy church of God. Therefore he would not so assert that to be subject to him as head of the church is of necessity for the salvation of every Christian.[17]

Notes

1. The second objection to the third reply (the first ends at 28.7). *Non tollitur quin*: "this does not remove [the consequence] that"; *tollere* here is not the disputation's "dispose of an objection". A reads *unitatis*; A, *erunt pape*.
2. *Cum sit date persone*: the church is these given persons, so it does not depend on the pope *in racione ecclesie*, in what makes it a church. *Sequitur expositorie*: by an expository syllogism, one whose middle term is singular ("these persons"); the reply ties the church's life to the pope's, which the facts deny: he may die first. *Materiali ... spirituali*: the church as building and as people.
3. *Prescitus*: "foreknown", Wyclif's term for one God foreknows will be damned (explained at its first occurrence in the work). *Secundum presentem iusticiam*: according to the grace they now have, as against final perseverance. *Viam oppositam viantibus*: the others go the opposite way to the foreknown pope, to the homeland. Loserth's side-note gives "reprobate" for *prescitus*.
4. *Ista opinio cum decreto*: the defenders' view, which they hold together with "the decree", most likely *Unam sanctam* (not identified further). *Successiva*: a whole whose parts succeed one another, like time or a river (the glossary), hence *more fluminis labentis*. *Corrupcionem*: his death, in the philosophers' sense of a thing ceasing to be.
5. Gregory, *Hom. in Evang.* 19.1, the church *ab Abel iusto usque ad ultimum electum* (PL 76:1154B). Wyclif's reference (the MSS): *XXIII Moral. cap. I*; Loserth corrects to *XIX Homiliarum* and cites Greg. *Opp.* I, p. 1510. B's margin: *Gregorius electum*.

6. ***Manet in causis secundis***: Christ remains at work through second causes, so that the pope is his instrument (B's margin repeats the phrase; Loserth's side-note: "immanent in second causes"). ***Membra fidem eius tenencia***: "members holding his faith". ***Abbati***: the pope as abbot of the community, a monastic figure for headship.
7. ***Aliter forent due***: if this church were universal there would be two universal churches, it and the higher one of angels and men. B reads ***forent secundo*** (29.23–24). ***De totali autem***: adversative, against the particular church just conceded.
8. ***Propter apostolos ... dominati sunt sue ecclesie***: the unknown saints who ruled their church "according to another form" (another form of rule) may be the true heads, so the pope cannot presume he is captain of them all. ***Dominari***: here neutral, "exercise lordship".
9. ***Capitalis regiminis***: "chief rule", the rule proper to a head. ***Laureola***: the theologians' aureole, the special crown of martyrs, virgins and doctors (the glossary). If the dignity lasts, dead popes stay heads.
10. ***Nullus Romanus pontifex ... preter Christum***: Christ is the only "Roman pontiff" who was head of the churches before the incarnation. ***Que ... sunt subiecte***: the many particular churches. ***Petri vicarii***: "vicar of Peter", the pope as Peter's vicar. 30.20 ***iurisdiccione***: Loserth's correction (MSS ***ittrediccione***, OCR).
11. ***Ecclesia dicit aggregata per accidens***: we take ***dicit*** as "signifies" (the logician's sense) with the neuter plural ***aggregata*** as object, matched by ***illa aggregata*** next. ***Petrus albus et Petrus musicus***: the stock example of things accidentally one (the same subject under two accidental forms); churches differ by subjects and forms, so far more. B ***distinccionem ab invicem*** (30.23).
12. ***Talis***: such a pope. ***Columba***: the "one dove" of Cant. 6:8, which ***Unam sanctam*** cites for the church's unity (ch. 1). ***Bene est isti***: it is well with him if he is so much as an abject member: he is not its head.
13. ***Viat*** and ***vians*** are the verb of ***viator***. ***Ad alietatem personarum***: the church is a different wayfaring church as its persons are different. The expository syllogism (n. 2) cannot be denied unless a ground of diversity is shown. A reads ***querendo querendo*** (31.4).
14. ***Septima conclusio capituli proximi***: Loserth refers to p. 19, l. 18. B reads ***capituli XXI*** for ***proximi***. ***Dum tamen ... tamquam papa***: we take the perfect subjunctive as conditional ("provided he has lived"). A and B's margins: ***Conclusionis responsio***.
15. ***Iste quicunque conversans nobiscum ... talis***: we take it as the pope among us, whoever he is, being the superior teacher and ruler; the alternative ("that the Asian priest is such") has no ***nobiscum***. ***Summo sacerdote ecclesie Asiane***: unidentified, perhaps a hypothetical eastern patriarch. B ***circa idem***.
16. ***Ut logici arguunt***: the pope is himself a Christian not subject to himself, so the universal ***cuiuslibet christiani*** fails. A's margin at 31.27: ***Ha, ha***; A and B: ***Conclusio***.
17. The argument: no one may assert he is predestinate without revelation; only the predestinate is captain in the church; so the pope may not assert that subjection to him as head is necessary to salvation. ***Sic***: "so", i.e. as of faith. ***Assit sibi firma spes***: we read "has a firm hope", i.e. certainty.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 28: ***expositorie*** [NW]
  - 28: ***viacione*** (print has viacione) [NW]
  - 30: ***fuit*** (f with crossbar)
  - 30: ***vicarii***
  - 30: ***Christus***
  - 31: ***abiectum***
  - 31: ***Christi***
  - 31: ***Christi***
  - 32: ***assit*** (print has assit) [NW]
  - 30: ***Item***
  - 31: ***non*** (132a folio mark glued; reading is non)
  - 32: ***sepe***
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin: 28.8 ***eademb*** for ***eadem*** (alinea letter ***b*** glued); 31.27–28 ***lsalutis*** for ***salutis*** (stray ***l***).
- 29.10 ***XIX° Homiliarum***: Loserth's correction of the MSS' ***XXIII Moral. cap. I*** (n. 5).
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 28.9 A ***unitatis***; 28.10 A_1 ***erunt pape***; 30.6 A ***sicut videtur***; 30.10 B ***est unum***; 30.11 A ***quemcunque***; 31.22 B ***circa idem***.

Part 3: Subjection to the pope is not of necessity for salvation

Loserth pp. 32.9–36.24

¶1 32.9–36.4
32.9 God can give grace otherwise than through him.
32.18 The Church is in greater freedom now than

[32]Item, stat christianum habere graciam a Deo cum hoc quod non credat esse aliquem talem papam, eo quod non oportet Deum uti eo ut ministro, dando quamcunque graciam. Et per idem, stat ipsum cum aliis paribus mori in gracia sine tali subieccione recognita; quo

Again, it can be that a Christian has grace from God while he does not believe that there is any such pope, because God need not use him as minister in giving any grace whatever. And by the same token, it can be that he, with others like him, dies in grace without such subjection being

under the old law, yet even then obedience to the chief priest was not needful to salvation.
33.1 *Such subjection would bind men to do impossibilities.*
33.10 *Christians are none the less such in the interval between two Popes.*
34.7 *The influence of the Pope depends on how far he is pleasing to God.*
35.8 *The early Christians were not thus subject to the Pope.*
36.5 *St. Paul teaches that it does not matter through whom Faith is received.*

facto foret salus facta christiano sine subieccione huiusmodi. Ergo illa non est de necessitate salutis cuiuslibet christiani. Antecedens videtur satis possibile de communi lege. Item, in maiori libertate est christianitas posita tempore legis gracie quam fuit posita tempore ante legem vel tempore sinagoge, sed tunc non oportuit omnem salvandum subici summo sacerdoti, levitico vel primogenito, sed suffecit servando iusticiam credere jn dominum Jesum Christum: ergo multo magis extenso merito Christi Jesu secundum legem perfecte libertatis. Minor patet de Job gentili, de bragmannis et multis aliis philosophis qui sine sensibili obediencia facta sacerdoti tali ex fide et iusticia operum sunt salvandi. Quare ergo non sic possent Greci et Indy subditi sancto Thome? Immo sic fuit de Paulo et multis conversis suis tempore sancti Petri. Non enim facit ista extravagans decretalis, ut christianitas ligetur servilius quam perante, ut patet de extravagante Clementis sequente in qua ostenditur quod rex Francie non exinde fuit sibi plus subditus quam perante. [33]Item, nemo fit perplexus ex lege Christi obligatus ad impossibile, sed hoc contingeret data ista sentencia: ergo oportet ipsam esse mendacium. Minor probatur per hoc quod multi infantes statim post baptismum mortui non habent prudenciam, ut taliter subsint pape, nec virtutes infuse inclinant ad talem subieccionem, sicut inclinant ad subieccionem domino Jesu Christo. Et idem videtur de multis fidelibus adultis in diversis insulis qui neque si est huiusmodi papa audierunt. Similiter, pro tempore intercidente inter mortes paparum sunt christiani eque fideles ut ante vel post, et cum tunc non sunt sic subditi, sequitur quod talis subieccio non sit de necessitate salutis cuiuslibet christiani. Stat autem infantem in illo meditulio temporis nasci, baptizari et mori quem oportet concedere salvari, licet non sit subiectus tali Romano pontifici. Similiter, si ecclesia militans indigeret tantum influxu huius pape, videtur quod decapitata sentiret saltem in effectu subtraccionem suffragii; sic enim periret sancta mater ecclesia eciam interduo, nisi haberet influenciam domini Jesu Christi. Et si solum per accidens iste influit, quomodo est hoc de necessitate salutis ecclesie? Similiter, tunc ad perversionem domini pape necessitaretur totus populus christianus perverti, cum tunc deficeret sibi salus; sed maioris partis ecclesie potestati non subest quod papa sit moraliter bonus: ergo nec quod ipsa sit moraliter bona. Nemo enim potest dicere quod a papa prescito ut membro diaboli dependet salus cuiuslibet christiani, nec aliquis finget quod papa in quantum huiusmodi sit confirmatus in gracia. Similiter, supposito quod papa decrepitus cedat papatui et succedat alius minus bonus, sicut videtur multis probabiliter fuisse de Celestino et Bonifacio VIII° qui [34]edidit hoc decretum,

acknowledged; and that done, salvation would have been accomplished for a Christian without subjection of this kind. Therefore it is not of necessity for the salvation of every Christian. The antecedent seems possible enough by the common law.[1] Again, Christianity is placed in greater freedom in the time of the law of grace than it was placed in the time before the law or in the time of the synagogue; now at that time it was not necessary that everyone to be saved should be subject to the high priest, levitical or firstborn, but it sufficed, keeping justice, to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ: therefore much more [so now], the merit of Christ Jesus being extended according to the law of perfect liberty.[2] The minor is clear from Job the gentile, from the Brahmans and many other philosophers, who without perceptible obedience rendered to such a priest are to be saved by faith and the justice of works. Why, then, could not the Greeks and the Indians subject to St Thomas be so? Indeed, so it was with Paul and many of his converts in the time of St Peter.[3] For this extravagant decretal does not bring it about that Christianity is bound more servilely than before, as is clear from the extravagant of Clement that follows, in which it is shown that the king of France was not thereby more subject to him than before.[4] [33]Again, no one is made perplexed by the law of Christ, bound to the impossible; now this would happen given this teaching: therefore it must be a lie. The minor is proved by this, that many infants who die immediately after baptism do not have the prudence to be subject to the pope in this way, nor do the infused virtues incline to such subjection, as they incline to subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ. And the same seems [true] of many adult faithful in various islands, who have not heard even whether there is a pope of this kind.[5] Similarly, in the time intervening between the deaths of popes there are Christians equally faithful as before or after; and since then they are not so subject, it follows that such subjection is not of necessity for the salvation of every Christian. And it can be that an infant is born, baptized and dies in that middle space of time, whom one must grant to be saved, although he is not subject to such a Roman pontiff. Similarly, if the church militant needed the inflow of this pope so much, it seems that, beheaded, it would feel at least in effect the withdrawal of the suffrage; for so holy mother church would perish even in the interval, unless it had the influence of the Lord Jesus Christ. And if he flows in only by accident, how is this of necessity for the salvation of the church?[6] Similarly, then, upon the perversion of the lord pope the whole Christian people would be necessitated to be perverted, since then salvation would fail it; now

tunc videtur ex vi communionis sanctorum quod, si sit talis salutis dependencia, salus Bonifacii pocius dependet a spirituali suffragio Celestini quam econtra, quia aliter introitus vulpinus in illud officium necessitaret Deum ad mendicandum a vulpe tali suffragium sue ecclesie. Videtur ergo quod Jnfluencia domini pape non sit nisi per accidens necessaria de quanto racione meriti sui est gratus Deo et utilis ecclesie pro qua orat; et talis necessitas ex supposicione, ex vi communionis sanctorum est in quocunque membro ecclesie, plus tamen in papa quam in aliis, si dictis et nomini facta compensent, vivendo similius vite Christi; et conformiter dicitur de subieccione et obediencia, quod ipsa debet extendi generaliter ad omnes, eciam ad discolos et tyrannos, sed precipue ad dominum papam, sicut ipse debet esse spiritualiter subiectus et obediens sue ecclesie, et sic obediencior atque in servitute subieccior quam aliquis subditorum. Confirmatur ex fide scripture Act. X°, de Cornelio cuius oraciones Deus accersivit ante colloquium cum papa Petro veniente ad eum pedestri et hospitante in domo corriarii; cuius diffinicio fuit talis: Non est personarum acceptor Deus, sed in omni gente qui timet eum et operatur iusticiam acceptus est illi. Nec dubium quin, si Deus misisset alium, eque fuisset Cornelius salvatus, ut patet de eunucho baptizato a Philippo (de quo Actorum VIII° cap.) et de gentibus conversis a Paulo et Barnaba (de quo Actorum XV°). Non enim diffinierunt apostoli ut gentes obedirent Petro, sed quod gracia spiritus sancti et domini Jesu Christi sufficit ubique terrarum cuilibet christiano. [35]Item, cum non sit pertinens isti responsioni loqui de subieccione nisi de subieccione civili quali subditus subicitur domino seculari, videtur responsionem istam innuere quod oportet omnem christianum, si vult esse filius ecclesie, esse sic subiectum domino pape. Quod videtur falsum, cum nec Christus nec aliquis eius apostolus exegit talem subieccionem, sed manifeste prohibuit (ut patet Luce XXII°). Cum ergo multi christiani tunc temporis ante dotacionem ecclesie consecuti sunt salutem, ut oportet ex fide credere de sanctis martyribus qui non fecerunt talem subieccionem Romano pontifici, cum omnibus eis suffecit ad salutem fides formata et caput Christi: videtur quod inducere aliam subieccionem necessario fiendam Christi vicario sapit heresim. Christus enim in detestacionem subieccionis huiusmodi lavit pedes discipulorum suorum et tergebat lintheo quo se succinxit, Joh. XIII°. Petrus eciam post ascensionem fuit missus a sociis cum Johanne in Samariam (ut patet Act. VIII° et Gal. II°), sicut pacienter sustinuit ut debuit reprehensionem a Paulo (ut patet Gal. II°). Iste autem non sunt exacciones subieccionis civilis a subditis, sed pocius humiliacionis penes quas attenditur eorum

it is not in the power of the greater part of the church that the pope be morally good: therefore neither [is it in its power] that it itself be morally good.[7] For no one can say that the salvation of every Christian depends on a foreknown pope as a member of the devil, nor will anyone feign that the pope as such is confirmed in grace.[8] Similarly, supposing that a decrepit pope resigns the papacy and another, less good, succeeds, as seems to many probably to have been the case with Celestine and Boniface VIII, who [34]issued this decree, then it seems, by force of the communion of saints, that, if there is such a dependence of salvation, the salvation of Boniface depends rather on the spiritual suffrage of Celestine than the reverse; since otherwise a fox-like entry into that office would necessitate God to beg from such a fox the suffrage of his church.[9] It seems, then, that the influence of the lord pope is necessary only by accident, in so far as by reason of his merit he is pleasing to God and useful to the church for which he prays; and such necessity on supposition, by force of the communion of saints, is in every member of the church, yet more in the pope than in others, if his deeds answer to his words and his name, by living more like the life of Christ. And in conformity [with this] it is said of subjection and obedience that it ought to be extended generally to all, even to the froward and to tyrants, but especially to the lord pope; just as he ought to be spiritually subject and obedient to his church, and so more obedient, and more subject in servitude, than any of his subjects.[10] It is confirmed from the faith of scripture, Acts 10, about Cornelius, whose prayers God summoned [to himself] before the conversation with Pope Peter, who came to him on foot and lodged in the house of a tanner; whose definition was this: "God is not a respecter of persons. But in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh justice is acceptable to him."[11] Nor is there doubt that, if God had sent another, Cornelius would have been saved equally, as is clear of the eunuch baptized by Philip (of whom Acts ch. 8) and of the gentiles converted by Paul and Barnabas (of whom Acts 15). For the apostles did not define that the gentiles should obey Peter, but that the grace of the Holy Spirit and of the Lord Jesus Christ suffices everywhere on earth for every Christian.[12]

[35]Again, since it is not pertinent to this reply to speak of subjection except of civil subjection, such as that by which a subject is subject to a secular lord, this reply seems to imply that every Christian, if he wishes to be a son of the church, must be so subject to the lord pope. This seems false, since neither Christ nor any apostle of his exacted such subjection, but [Christ] manifestly forbade it (as is clear from Luke 22).[13] Since,

maioritas, et sic vixerunt multi pape martyres in maximo cremento ecclesie. Dotatio ergo ecclesie non introduxit novum articulum fidei, ut sit necessarium ad salutem cuiuslibet christiani sic subici Romano pontifici. Confirmatur ex fide scripture: Nam Act. IV° diffinit Petrus quod Christus factus est in caput anguli et non est in aliquo alio salus. Nec enim est aliud nomen sub celo datum hominibus in quo nos oporteat salvos fieri. Cum ergo nomen [36] cuiuscunque christiani pontificis sit aliud quam nomen huius capitis, sequitur quod in nullo tali nomine oportet ecclesiam salvari. Loquitur autem scriptura de nomine reali cui oportet credendo subici.

then, many Christians at that time, before the endowment of the church, attained salvation, as one must believe as faith teaches of the holy martyrs who did not render such subjection to the Roman pontiff, since formed faith and Christ the head sufficed all of them for salvation: it seems that to bring in another subjection, necessarily to be rendered to the vicar of Christ, savours of heresy. For Christ, in detestation of subjection of this kind, washed the feet of his disciples and wiped them with the towel with which he had girded himself, John 13. Peter also, after the ascension, was sent by his fellows with John into Samaria (as is clear from Acts 8 and Gal. 2), just as he patiently bore, as he ought, rebuke from Paul (as is clear from Gal. 2).[14] And these are not exactions of civil subjection from subjects, but rather of humiliation, by which their greatness is measured; and so lived many martyr popes in the greatest growth of the church. The endowment of the church, therefore, did not bring in a new article of faith, that it should be necessary for the salvation of every Christian to be so subject to the Roman pontiff. It is confirmed from the faith of scripture: for in Acts 4 Peter defines that Christ "is become the head of the corner", and that there is not salvation in any other. "For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved." Since, then, the name [36] of any Christian pontiff is other than the name of this head, it follows that the church must be saved in no such name. Now scripture speaks of a real name, to which one must be subject by believing.[15]

¶2 36.5–36.24

[36] Secundo confirmatur ex textu apostoli I. Cor. 1° et 111° capitulis, ubi apostolus recitat inter carnales conversos fuisse contenciones et scismata. Unus inquit dicit: Ego quidem sum Pauli, ego autem Apollo, ego autem Cephe. Et post ostendit quod non refert per quorum apostolorum ministrum convertantur, cum tamen credant in fundamentum ecclesie quod non potest poni aliud preter id quod positum est, Christus Jesus. Sicut autem non refert per quam lucernam illuminetur domus ad hoc quod operarius faciat opus suum per quod acquirat stipendium, sic non refert per quem Christi ministrum, sacerdotem vel laicum, christianus accipiat lumen fidei, ut mereatur salutem perpetuam. Nec dubito quin nullus Christi vicarius presumeret asserere quod necesse est, ut lumen fidei cuilibet christiano per ipsum veniat et sic salus; quia hoc esset nedum asserere ipsum confirmatum in gracia et doctrina, sed parificare ipsum cum Christo, cum nonnisi per ipsum Deus posset communicare virtutem sue ecclesie.

Second, it is confirmed from the text of the apostle, 1 Cor. chapters 1 and 3, where the apostle recounts that among the carnal converts there were contentions and schisms. "One", he says, "says: I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I of Cephas." And afterwards he shows that it does not matter through the minister of which apostles they are converted, provided they believe in the foundation of the church, other than which none can be laid but that which is laid, Christ Jesus.[16] And just as it does not matter by what lamp a house is lit, for the workman to do his work, by which he earns his wage, so it does not matter through what minister of Christ, priest or layman, a Christian receives the light of faith, so as to merit everlasting salvation. Nor do I doubt that no vicar of Christ would presume to assert that it is necessary that the light of faith, and so salvation, should come to every Christian through him; for this would be not only to assert that he is confirmed in grace and doctrine, but to make him equal with Christ, since [then] God could communicate virtue to his church only through him.[17]

Notes

1. ***Stat***: "it can be", i.e. the case is consistent (the logician's ***stat quod***), as below. ***Cum hoc quod***: "while", together with the fact that. ***De communi lege***: by God's common law, his ordinary way of giving grace, as against a privilege.
2. ***Summo sacerdoti, levitico vel primogenito***: under the synagogue the levitical high priest; before the law the firstborn, who held the priesthood. ***Lex perfecte libertatis***: Jas. 1:25, DR "the perfect law of liberty". ***Multo magis***: we supply "[so now]"; the clause is elliptical.
3. ***Ex fide et iusticia operum***: "by faith and the justice of works", not the formula ***ex fide*** (the participle ***salvandi*** governs). ***Bragmannis***: the Brahmans, the virtuous gentiles of the Alexander legend (B ***bergmanis***). ***Indy subditi sancto Thome***: the tradition that the apostle Thomas evangelized India (Latin ***Passio Thomae***, e.g. Orderic Vitalis, ***Hist. eccl.*** II, PL 188:158A). A reads ***omnem omnem*** (32.21).
4. ***Extravagans Clementis sequente***: Clement V, ***Meruit*** (1306), which declares that ***Unam sanctam*** brings no prejudice to the king and kingdom of France; Loserth: ***Extrav. comm.*** 5.7.2 (our modern form of his "lib. V, tit. VII, cap. II"). ***Sequente***: we take it as following ***Unam sanctam*** in time. ***Perante***: "before" (late Latin).
5. ***Perplexus***: bound to sin, or here to fail, whichever way one turns (the glossary). ***Virtutes infuse***: the infused virtues given at baptism. ***Neque si … audierunt***: "have not heard even whether".
6. ***Meditulio temporis***: "the middle space of time", the vacancy. ***Interduo***: as printed; not a classical word. We take it as "in the interval" (between two popes), from the vacancy just named; ***interdiu*** ("by day") and ***interdum*** ("at times") give poorer sense. A Latin doubt. ***Influxu***: the head's inflow into the body, the figure of Christ's headship.
7. The argument: if salvation depended on the pope, a perverse pope would necessitate the people's perversion; but the church cannot make the pope good, so (on this teaching) it could not make itself good. B reads ***nunciaretur*** for ***necessitaretur*** (33.24–25, apparatus).
8. ***Prescito***: A reads ***scito***, corrected in A_1's margin to ***prescito*** (apparatus to 33.29). ***Membro diaboli***: the foreknown are members of the devil, as the predestinate are members of Christ.
9. ***Introitus vulpinus***: the tale that Boniface VIII came into the papacy "like a fox", having induced Celestine V to resign, summed up in the saying ***intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, mortuus est ut canis***, whose medieval source we have not traced. A reads ***Celestii*** (34.3). ***Mendicare***: "to beg". ***Hoc decretum***: ***Unam sanctam***.
10. ***Per accidens … de quanto***: the pope's influence is needed only "in so far as" he is pleasing to God by merit. ***Necessitas ex supposicione***: conditional necessity (the glossary, ***necessitas supposicionis***). ***Si dictis et nomini facta compensent***: "if his deeds answer to his words and name" (the name of ***papa***, father). B reads ***vi oracionis*** (34.10) and ***obieccione*** (34.14).
11. ***Accersivit*** (AB ***accercivit***), "summoned": the print, translated as it stands (the house rule: Loserth's text unless it will not construe; A_1 alone never outweighs it). God calls the prayers up to himself (cf. Acts 10:4, "are ascended for a memorial"). A_1 reads ***acceptavit***, "accepted". ***Papa Petro***: Wyclif's barb, the "pope" who came on foot. ***Corriarii***: the tanner Simon (Acts 10:6). Acts 10:34–35 (DR; Loserth), without the opening ***In veritate comperi quia***; ***diffinicio***, Peter's "definition".
12. Acts 8:26–39 (the eunuch) and Acts 15 (the council's decision on the gentiles); B's margin cites ***Act. VIII.*** B lacks ***apostoli*** (34.29).
13. ***Isti responsioni***: the reply at the beginning of the chapter, as Loserth notes. AA_1 lack ***nisi de subieccione*** (35.2), which changes nothing in the sense. Luke 22:25–26, DR "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them … But you not so". A's margin: ***Papa non exigeret ab aliquo civilem subieccionem***.
14. John 13:5, DR "wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded"; Wyclif ***quo se succinxit***. The sending to Samaria is Acts 8:14; Gal. 2 has Peter with John among the "pillars" (2:9) and Paul's rebuke at Antioch (2:11). ***Fuit missus a sociis***: sent by his fellow apostles, not sending them.
15. Acts 4:11–12 (DR), with Wyclif's order ***in aliquo alio*** and ***nos oporteat*** for the Vulgate's ***in alio aliquo*** and ***oporteat nos***. ***Penes quas attenditur eorum maioritas***: their greatness is measured by their humiliations (cf. Luke 22:26). ***Nomine reali***: the name as the thing named, the person of Christ, not the sound.
16. 1 Cor. 1:12 (DR), which the Vulgate opens ***unusquisque vestrum dicit***; Wyclif's ***Unus … dicit***, and ***ego autem Cephe*** for ***ego vero Cephae***. 1 Cor. 3:11 is given indirectly, DR "For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid: which is Christ Jesus". ***Ministrum***: Loserth's print; AB ***ministerium***, A_1 ***misterium*** (36.16).
17. ***Nedum … sed***: "not only … but". ***Parificare***: "make equal". ***Cum nonnisi per ipsum***: on that assertion God could give grace to the church only through the pope. A reads ***uter lumen*** (36.19).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 32: ***credere*** (cre-/dere hyphenated across line)
  - 32: ***dominum***
  - 33: ***influenciam*** [NW]
  - 33: ***Christi***
  - 34: ***Celestini***
  - 34: ∅ ('of' is side-note text (The influence of the Pope))
  - 34: ***subieccior*** [NW]
  - 35: ***fiendam*** (print has fiendam) [NW]
  - 36: ***ubi***
  - 36: ***parificare*** [NW]
  - 35: ***responsioni*** (clear e in print) [NW]
  - 34: ***X°***, [-VERSE]
- Loserth's page-foot for p. 33 (apparatus and his English note on Celestine V) had been read into the Latin as two paragraphs; removed from the established text, and the chunk rebuilt to its true paragraphs (… ***Bonifacio VIII° qui*** | ***edidit hoc decretum***, 33.34–34.1).

- **OCR scar corrected in the Latin: 32.15 stray *is* (the line number 15).**
- **Print forms noted: *jn* (p. 32), *Indy* (p. 32), *Jnfluencia* (p. 34).**
- **33.c18 *interduo*: a Latin doubt (n. 6); not settled on the plate.**

Part 4: False Christs; Urban VI our head, believed with misgiving

Loserth pp. 36.25–38.24

¶1 36.25–38.24
36.25 *Those who thus set themselves above the apostles, imply that they are Christ.*
37.11 *Concerning the Catholic Church a Christian has only to believe that it is the whole body of the predestined.*
37.26 *God is to be praised for the election of Urban VI,*
38.12 *who will doubtless reject this false sense of the decretal.*

[36] **Tercio confirmatur ex prophecia Christi Matth. XXIV° 5, quam necesse est impleri. Multi inquit venient in nomine meo, dicentes: Ego sum Christus, et multos seducent. Cum ergo quicunque de se sic opinatus fuerit supra sanctos apostolos dicit implicite quod est Christus, videtur quod de quocunque tali (ut exponit Augustinus) verificatur Christi necessaria prophecia, et per consequens, supponendum est quodcunque** [37] **dogma huius esse (ut dicit Christus) dogma falsum ecclesie seductivum. Unde iuxta seriem prophecie Christi ista blasphemia presupposita erit seminarium preliorum etc. Ex istis videtur mihi nimis temerarium asserere quod aliquis papa in decretali sua intenderit dictum sensum; sed sive Christus immediate sive quicunque eius discipulus ubicunque terrarum a spiritu sancto missus converterit in virtute Christi quamcunque personam vel populum, sufficit sibi cum finali perseverancia ad salutem. Et satis est sibi pro fide articuli de ecclesia catholica, ut credat fide formata quod sit una universitas fidelium predestinatorum, salvanda virtute meriti Christi, licet non expressius et particularius descenderit ad aliquem eius vicarium. Nec oportet credere vel implicite quod iste quicunque Romanus pontifex sit caput cuiusquam particularis ecclesie, nisi Deus ipsum predestinaverit, quia aliter oporteret fidem catholicam esse falsam et christianum fateri mendacium. Et ita, sicut non est de substancia fidei credere explicite quod iste Bonifacius, Clemens vel Urbanus sit predestinatus vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie, sic nec est de necessitate salutis omnium christianorum secum conversancium, ut explicite credant ipsum esse caput cuiusquam ecclesie, nisi facta et vita evangelica evidencius moveant ad credendum. Sed benedictus dominus matris nostre qui nostre peregrinanti iuvencule diebus istis providit caput catholicum, virum evangelicum Urbanum sextum qui rectificando instantem ecclesiam, ut vivat conformiter legi Christi,** [38] **ordinatur ordinate a se ipso et suis domesticis. Ideo oportet ex operibus credere quod ipse sit caput nostre ecclesie, cum mediate vel immediate influit motum tendendi sursum ad corpus Christi, ubi congregabuntur et aquile; et in facto docet mediate vel immediate mundana spernere et sapide sentire celestia. Ista autem fides de nostro capite tam graciose**

Third, it is confirmed from Christ's prophecy, Matt. 24:5, which must of necessity be fulfilled: "For many", he says, "will come in my name saying, I am Christ. And they will seduce many." Since, then, whoever has so held of himself [that he is] above the holy apostles says implicitly that he is Christ, it seems that of any such man (as Augustine expounds) Christ's necessary prophecy is verified; and consequently it is to be supposed that every [37] **dogma of his is (as Christ says) a false dogma, seductive of the church.[1] Hence, according to the sequence of Christ's prophecy, this blasphemy, once presupposed, will be a seed-bed of battles, etc.[2] From these things it seems to me too rash to assert that any pope meant the said sense in his decretal; but whether Christ immediately, or any disciple of his anywhere on earth sent by the Holy Spirit, has converted any person or people in the power of Christ, it suffices him, with final perseverance, for salvation. And it is enough for him, for faith in the article about the catholic church, that he believe with formed faith that it is one whole body of the predestinate faithful, to be saved by virtue of the merit of Christ, although he has not descended more expressly and particularly to any vicar of his.[3] Nor is it necessary to believe, even implicitly, that this Roman pontiff, whoever he is, is head of any particular church, unless God has predestined him, since otherwise the catholic faith would have to be false, and a Christian to confess a lie. And so, just as it is not of the substance of faith to believe explicitly that this Boniface, Clement or Urban is predestinate or a member of holy mother church, so neither is it of necessity for the salvation of all Christians living with him that they explicitly believe him to be head of any church, unless deeds and evangelical life move them more evidently to believe.[4]**

But blessed be the lord of our mother, who in these days has provided for our young girl, a pilgrim, a catholic head, an evangelical man, Urban VI,[5] who, in setting right the present church, so that it may live in conformity with the law of Christ, [38] **is set in due order, beginning with himself and his household.[6] Therefore one must believe from his works that he is head of our church, since mediately or immediately he infuses the motion**

et legitime nobis dato est credenda cum quadam formidine de corona sue finalis perseverancie. Ideo necesse est nobis fructuosa oracione pulsare Deum continue, ut ipse semper vacet nobis et eligat caput tale. Nec dubito quin ipse detestaretur hunc sensum decretalis predicte quod sit de absoluta necessitate salutis cuiuslibet christiani subesse sibi in mundanis honoribus vel servicio seculari, cum non querit nostra sed nos, volens instar apostoli aliquem fructum spiritualem in nobis sicut in ceteris gentibus impertiri. Nec dubium quin nos omnes tenemur subesse sibi de quanto tamquam verus Christi vicarius mandat magistri sui consilia et non ultra. Et sic licet omnes christiani tenentur esse subiecti invicem in timore, sibi tamen (in quantum talis) est necessarium ex supposicione subici, cum regit tam evangelice tantum gregem. Et ex istis potest colligi sensus decretalis catholicus.

of tending upward to the body of Christ, where the eagles also will be gathered; and in deed he teaches, mediately or immediately, to spurn worldly things and to savour heavenly things with relish.[7] And this faith about our head, so graciously and lawfully given to us, is to be believed with a certain misgiving about the crown of his final perseverance. Therefore it is necessary for us with fruitful prayer to knock at God continually, that he may always attend to us and choose such a head.[8] Nor do I doubt that he [Urban] would detest this sense of the aforesaid decretal, that it is of absolute necessity for the salvation of every Christian to be subject to him in worldly honours or secular service, since he seeks not ours but us, wishing after the pattern of the apostle to impart some spiritual fruit in us, as in the other gentiles.[9] Nor is there doubt that we are all bound to be subject to him in so far as, as a true vicar of Christ, he commands the counsels of his master, and no further. And so, although all Christians are bound to be subject one to another in fear, yet to him (in so far as he is such) it is necessary on supposition to be subject, since he rules so great a flock so evangelically. And from these things the catholic sense of the decretal can be gathered.[10]

Notes

1. Matt. 24:5 (DR), the Vulgate with *inquit* added. B's margin: *Math. 24. Ut exponit Augustinus*: Loserth refers to Augustine, Sermon 292, *in natali Ioannis Baptistae* (*Opp.* V, pt. 2, p. 1172 ff.; PL 38:1323, §6); B's margin: *Augustinus. Dogma huius*: Loserth glosses *huius* as *cuiuscunque talis* (36.30), "of any such man". *Supra sanctos apostolos* depends on *opinatus*: whoever thinks himself above the apostles.
2. *Seminarium preliorum*: the next words of the prophecy, Matt. 24:6, "wars and rumours of wars", which Wyclif cuts short with *etc.*
3. *Intenderit*: "meant" (of a sense), not "maintained". *Pro fide articuli de ecclesia catholica*: the creed's article on the church (cf. 9.4). *Universitas*: "one whole body", the totality of the predestinate (Loserth's side-note: "the whole body"). *Descenderit*: the believer's faith need not come down to a particular vicar. A and B's margins: *Conclusio*; *Nota bene articulum fidei credendum de ecclesia catholica*. B *expressimus* (37.14).
4. *Vel implicite ... explicite*: the pair of implicit and explicit faith (the glossary). *Bonifacius, Clemens vel Urbanus*: Boniface VIII, author of the decretal; Clement, either Clement V (author of *Meruit*, 32.33) or Clement VII, elected against Urban in September 1378; Urban VI. We do not decide. B *de obediencia fidei* (37.20).
5. *Nostre peregrinanti iuvencule*: A_1's *nostre*, which Loserth prints; AB *nostri*. The church militant is the pilgrim young girl (*iuvencula*, kept apart from the Song's *adolescentula*, "young maiden", p. 9). Urban VI (Bartolomeo Prignano, archbishop of Bari) was elected on 8 April 1378 and crowned on Easter Sunday, 18 April (Loserth's note). A and B's margins: *Nota de Urbano VI.*
6. *Ordinatur*: Loserth's emendation, translated as printed (the house rule: his text unless it will not construe): "is set in due order", *a se ipso* "beginning with himself". The MSS have *orditur*, "begins" (his note "In codd. orditur"), which gives nearly the same sense. *Ordinate*: "in due order": reform begins at home.
7. *Ubi congregabuntur et aquile*: Luke 17:37 (Loserth; also Matt. 24:28), DR "thither will the eagles also be gathered together"; Wyclif makes *corpus* the body of Christ. B *influit modum* (38.3–4); AA_1 *sapida sentire* (38.6). B's margin: *Ecce quomodo Urbanum esse caput nostrum dicit esse fidem credendam cum formidine.*
8. *Formido*: the "misgiving" that qualifies assent (the glossary): Urban's headship is believed, but his final perseverance is not certain. *Ut ipse semper vacet nobis et eligat caput tale*: we take *ipse* as God, who chooses the head; it could be Urban ("that he may always give himself to us"), but *eligat caput* then has no fit subject.
9. *Non querit nostra sed nos*: 2 Cor. 12:14, DR "For I seek not the things that are yours, but you". *Aliquem fructum ... sicut in ceteris gentibus impertiri*: Rom. 1:13, DR "that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles", with *impertiri* from Rom. 1:11, "that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace". The *ipse* here is Urban.
10. Eph. 5:21 (Loserth), DR "Being subject one to another, in the fear of Christ"; Wyclif drops *Christi*. *Sibi tamen*: Loserth's text; the MSS have *sibi tam* (38.21). *Mandat magistri sui consilia*: "commands the counsels of his master", i.e. hands on Christ's precepts and counsels. *Ex supposicione*: on the supposition that he rules evangelically. AA_1 *regem* for *gregem* (38.23).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 36: ∅ ('thus' is side-note text (Those who thus))
  - 37: *dogma* (133a is the folio mark)
  - 37: *ecclesia* (133b is the folio mark)
  - 37: *una* (following a is side-note text)
  - 37: *meriti*
- 38.1 *ordinatur*: Loserth's emendation, translated; the MSS' *orditur* in n. 6.
- 37.27 *nostre*: A_1; AB *nostri*. 38.21 *sibi tamen*: Loserth's correction (MSS *sibi tam*).

Part 5: First objection: subjects must consult scripture; Jerome on the sword that separates heretics

Loserth pp. 38.25–42.9

¶1 38.25–41.6
38.25 *Objection: Subjects will have to consult Scripture before obeying the Pope. Answer:*
38.29 *They ought to do so.*
39.24 *St. Jerome on the sword sent by Christ.*
41.13 *The life and teaching of Christ are the glass, by which heretics may be discerned.*

[38]Sed contra ista instatur tripliciter: Videtur enim primo quod subditi debent consulere scripturam sacram in quocunque quod papa mandaverit. Quantum ad istud, concedi debet conclusio, cum nemo debet parere sibi plus quam alii, nisi in quantum est superior Christi vicarius, et per consequens, nisi in quantum obeditur principalius Jesu Christo; sed in omni obediencia [39]Jesu Christo debet christianus consulere legem suam; ideo in omni obediencia christiani in quantum huiusmodi debet obedienciarius consulere legem Dei; et ideo ordinarunt iura ecclesie quod lex scripture tam generaliter et tam precipue a sacerdotibus et specialiter maioribus debet sciri, ne turbentur aut musitent quid et qualiter ad mandatum superioris debeant respondere. In ista scola instructa est legio Thebayca et omnes martyres, immo in illa scola instructi sunt omnes qui monitis non sapientibus caritatem Dei et proximi contradicunt iuxta illud Christi Matth. X°, 37: Qui amat patrem vel matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus; et istam leccionem docent apostoli Act.V°, 29, dicentes quod obedire magis oportet Deo quam hominibus. Ideo dicit Christus Matth. X°, 35: Non veni pacem mittere in terram sed gladium. Veni ergo separare hominem adversus patrem suum, et filiam adversus matrem suam, et nurum adversus socrum suam, et inimici hominis domestici eius. Amiciciam enim carnalem propter Deum venit Christus dissolvere, quia ille qui videtur esse familiaris homini quoad mundum est hostis suus ut plurimum quoad Deum (ut dicitur Michee VII°). Beatus Jeronymus super illo capitulo videtur exponere textum evangelii ad hunc sensum quod Christus venit ad separandum hereticos ab ecclesia quam illudunt. [40]Simulant enim ex palliata ypocrisi quod sint filii Dei per graciam adopcionis et filie ecclesie matris sue pro cuius iuribus tantum zelant. Dicamus inquit scriptum de hereticis; non enim nostram salutem sed sua querunt lucra, et deceptum gregem pedibus suis conterunt. Pater heretici est Deus qui creavit eum, et mater ecclesia; socrus ad literam

But against these things it is objected in three ways. For it seems, first, that subjects ought to consult holy scripture in whatever the pope has commanded.[1] As to this, the conclusion must be granted, since no one ought to obey him more than another, except in so far as he is a superior vicar of Christ, and consequently except in so far as Jesus Christ is obeyed more principally [through him]; now in every obedience [39]to Jesus Christ a Christian ought to consult his law; therefore in every obedience of a Christian, as such, the one who obeys ought to consult the law of God. And therefore the laws of the church have ordained that the law of scripture must be known so generally and so especially by priests, and specially by the greater ones, lest they be troubled or hesitate over what and how they ought to answer to a superior's command.[2] In this school the Theban legion and all the martyrs were taught;[3] indeed, in that school all are taught who oppose admonitions that do not savour of the charity of God and of neighbour, according to that word of Christ, Matt. 10:37: "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me"; and this lesson the apostles teach, Acts 5:29, saying that "we ought to obey God rather than men". Therefore Christ says, Matt. 10:35: "I came not to send peace upon earth, but the sword. I came therefore to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law; and a man's enemies, they of his own household."[4] For Christ came to dissolve carnal friendship for God's sake, since he who seems to be a man's intimate as regards the world is for the most part his enemy as regards God (as is said in Micah 7).[5] Blessed Jerome, on that chapter, seems to expound the text of the gospel in this sense: that Christ came to separate the heretics from the church, which they mock. [40]For out of cloaked hypocrisy they feign that they are sons of God by the grace of adoption, and daughters of the

est mater alterius coniugum. Ast uxor nati dicitur esse nurus, cum ergo Christus secundum humanitatem sit sponsus anime, imo tocius ecclesie; et cum hoc conceptus de spiritu sancto tamquam matre sua iuxta illud quod allegat Jeronymus.... Tulit me mater mea in uno capillorum meorum (caro enim est capillus anime), patet quod spiritus sanctus, cum sit mater Christi sponsi ecclesie, est socrus anime que vendicat esse sponsa Christi, quia mater mariti. Et ex eadem consideracione anima pretendens se esse uxorem filii spiritus sancti dicitur nurus eius. Heretici ergo qui pretendunt se esse nuros spiritus sancti quem vendicant socrum suam, separantur ab eo per Christum detecta eorum fallacia, et ita cum universalis ecclesia sit domus domini Jesu Christi, et per consequens, omnes heretici qui sunt facietenus in ecclesia sunt pretense eius domestici, patet quod omnes illi sunt illi homini patrifamilias inimici. Huius inquit Jeronymus inimici sunt qui putantur in domo Christi esse, hoc [41]est, in ecclesia et palliantes a capite non recedere contra caput sentiunt. Heretici inquit cum ante crediderint scripturis que a spiritu sancto scripte sunt et edite, transferunt se ad novas doctrinas et fermentum phariseorum et mandata hominum, dumque sermonem Dei contempnunt, socrui sue faciunt iniuriam.

church their mother, for whose rights they are so zealous. "Let us say", he says, "what is written of the heretics: for they seek not our salvation but their own gains, and trample the deceived flock under their feet."[6] The father of the heretic is God, who created him, and his mother is the church. A mother-in-law, in the literal sense, is the mother of one of the spouses; "but the wife of a son is called a daughter-in-law".[7] Since, then, Christ according to his humanity is the bridegroom of the soul, indeed of the whole church; and since, with this, he was conceived of the Holy Spirit as of his mother, according to the saying that Jerome cites ... "My mother took me by one of my hairs" (for the flesh is the hair of the soul),[8] it is clear that the Holy Spirit, since he is the mother of Christ the bridegroom of the church, is the mother-in-law of the soul that claims to be the bride of Christ, because [he is] the husband's mother. And from the same consideration the soul that pretends to be the wife of the son of the Holy Spirit is called his daughter-in-law. Therefore the heretics, who pretend to be daughters-in-law of the Holy Spirit, whom they claim as their mother-in-law, are separated from him by Christ, their fallacy being exposed. And so, since the universal church is the house of the lord Jesus Christ, and consequently all heretics who are outwardly in the church are pretended members of his household, it is clear that all of them are enemies to that man, the householder.[9] "Of him", says Jerome, "they are enemies who are thought to be in the house of Christ, that [41]is, in the church, and, cloaking [it so as to seem] not to withdraw from the head, think against the head." "Heretics", he says, "although they first believed the scriptures, which were written and published by the Holy Spirit, go over to new doctrines, and to the leaven of the Pharisees, and to the commandments of men; and while they despise the word of God, they do injury to their mother-in-law."[10]

¶2 41.7–41.31

[41]Christus ergo ex vita et doctrina venit confutare hereticos, ut discernantur a fidelibus et postmodum separentur. Et ita subtiliter et catholice potest intelligi secundum hunc sanctum per filium, filiam et nurum hereticus qui pretense et false se nominat filium Dei patris, filiam matris sue, sapiencie Dei patris et nurum spiritus sancti et sic cognatissimum trinitati. Sed vita et doctrina Christi sunt optimum speculum, ubi possunt hec discerni, cum manifestum sit quod omnis homo et solum talis qui est in vita et doctrina Christo contrarius est hereticus, et omnis christianus et solum talis qui est in vita et doctrina Christo conformis est ut sic ab heresi elongatus. Christus ergo venit non ad faciendum primam separacionem que

Christ, therefore, came by his life and teaching to confute the heretics, so that they may be discerned from the faithful and afterwards separated. And so, subtly and in a catholic sense, according to this saint, by "son", "daughter" and "daughter-in-law" can be understood the heretic, who pretendedly and falsely names himself son of God the Father, daughter of his mother, the wisdom of God the Father, and daughter-in-law of the Holy Spirit, and so most nearly kin to the Trinity.[11] But the life and teaching of Christ are the best mirror, in which these things can be discerned, since it is manifest that every man, and only such a one, who in life and teaching is contrary to Christ is a heretic, and every Christian,

est proprie per peccatum, sed ad faciendum sequentem, ut per eum discernantur heretici et ab ecclesia separentur. Et hec racio quare oportet omnem catholicum cognoscere scripturam sacram. Et certus sum quod, licet prelati nostri ipsam et professores suos dissipant et conculcant, lapides clamabunt, hoc est, seculares domini in sensu scripture a domino illustrati defendent fidem catholicam, quia pharisei volentes obturare ora discipulorum scripturam istam confitencium audierunt divinum responsum: Dico vobis, quia si hii tacuerint lapides clamabunt, Luce XIX°, 40. Magnam enim vim habet veritas scripturarum.

and only such a one, who in life and teaching is conformed to Christ is, as such, removed far from heresy.[12] Christ, therefore, came not to make the first separation, which is properly through sin, but to make the one that follows, so that through him the heretics may be discerned and separated from the church. And this is the reason why every catholic must know holy scripture. And I am certain that, although our prelates scatter and trample it and those who profess it, "the stones will cry out", that is, secular lords enlightened by the Lord in the sense of scripture will defend the catholic faith;[13] for the Pharisees, wishing to stop the mouths of the disciples who were confessing this scripture, heard the divine answer: "I say to you that if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out", Luke 19:40. For the truth of the scriptures has great force.

¶3 42.1–42.9

42.1 *Objection: All respect for the clergy would perish.*

[42]Secundo principaliter obicitur per hoc quod iuxta supradictam sentenciam nullus laicus teneretur credere de sacerdote suo, curato sive episcopo quod sit membrum ecclesie vel vere habens nomen talis officii, et periret omnis honor impendendus prelatis et fides populi laicalis; immo nullus viator teneretur credere Romane ecclesie in canonizando sanctos de privatis provinciis et titubaret cultus ecclesie in solemnizando festa et reliquias sanctorum.

[42]Second, as a principal objection, it is objected, by appeal to this: that according to the teaching given above no layman would be bound to believe of his priest, curate or bishop that he is a member of the church, or truly has the name of such an office; and all honour to be paid to prelates, and the faith of the lay people, would perish; indeed no wayfarer would be bound to believe the Roman church in canonizing saints from particular provinces, and the worship of the church in solemnizing the feasts and relics of the saints would totter.[14]

Notes

1. ***Instatur tripliciter***: three objections follow, the first here, the second at 42.1, the third at 47.7. A and B's margins: ***Obieccio prima***; A: ***Contra dicta***. ***Ista***: the conclusion of 38.12–24, that Urban is to be obeyed only so far as he commands Christ's counsels. ***EnimL*** (38.25) is translated as ***enim***.
2. ***Concedi debet conclusio***: Wyclif grants the objection's claim (AB margin: ***Responsio***), so the "objection" is turned into his thesis. ***Principalius***: the pope is obeyed only as Christ is obeyed in him; "through him" is supplied. ***Obedienciarius***: the one who renders obedience. ***Ordinarunt***: Loserth's correction for the MSS' ***in ordinarunt*** (39.4). ***Iura ecclesie***: the canons ("laws"), not rights; at 40.2 (***pro cuius iuribus***) the sense is "rights". ***Musitent***: "mutter", here "hesitate". A's margin: ***In obediencia ad superiorem consulenda est scriptura sacra***.
3. The Theban legion under St Maurice, martyred for refusing an imperial command against their faith; Loserth refers to Bordier, ***Dissertation critique sur le martyre de la légion thébéenne*** (Amsterdam, 1705). B reads ***concorditer contradicunt*** (39.11).
4. Matt. 10:37 (DR); Wyclif quotes only the first clause and has ***vel*** for the Vulgate's ***aut***. Acts 5:29 (DR), given indirectly. Matt. 10:35 is Wyclif's reference; the quotation begins at 10:34, abridged (***Non veni pacem mittere in terram sed gladium***; Vulg. ***Nolite arbitrari quia pacem venerim ... non veni pacem mittere, sed gladium***), and ***ergo*** stands for the Vulgate's ***enim*** in 10:35. DR wording, adjusted to his Latin; 10:36 has no verb in the Latin. B's margin: ***Math. 10, Act. 5***.
5. Mic. 7:6, DR "and a man's enemies are they of his own household". ***Ut plurimum***: "for the most part" (the glossary). ***Familiaris ... hostis***: Wyclif glosses ***domestici*** of the household's worldly intimacy. A's margin: ***Dissolucio carnalis amicicie***. ***M*** (39.24) before ***Beatus*** is not construed.
6. Jerome, ***Commentarii in Michaeam*** II, on Mic. 7:5–7 PL 25:1221C–1222B (Loserth's "1281" at 39.20 is a slip for 1221; his "pag. 1180" at 40.6 is wrong). ***Dicamus inquit scriptum de hereticis***: Jerome's own words (***et dicamus scriptum de haereticis***, 1221C), "let us say what is written of heretics". B ***quod sint dei*** (40.1); B ***filie matris sue pro quibus viribus*** (40.2); B ***contrivit*** (40.5–6).
7. ***Socrus ... mater alterius coniugum. Ast uxor nati dicitur esse nurus***: a school definition, the second half an elegiac pentameter (***ast uxor nati dicitur esse nurus***), quoted to fix the kinship terms of Matt. 10:35. We end the sentence at ***nurus***, against the print's comma: the ***cum ergo*** clause begins a new period whose main verb is ***patet*** (40.15).

8. ***Tulit me mater mea in uno capillorum meorum***: from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Jerome cites on Mic. 7:6 (***Modo tulit me mater mea, sanctus spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum***, PL 25:1221D–1222A, from the Gospel "which we recently translated"); Wyclif drops ***Modo***. Loserth marks a lacuna in the MSS after ***Jeronymus*** (40.12), printed as dots. B's margin (41.21, misplaced) repeats the quotation. ***Caro enim est capillus anime*** is Wyclif's gloss.
9. B's lower margins (39–40) set out the scheme: ***Deus pater per creacionem ... Ecclesia nurus ... Spiritus sanctus socrus***, against ***Hereticus pretensus filius per adopcionem ... filia secundum pretensionem ... nurus secundum simulacionem***. ***Fallacia***: here deceit; we keep the glossary's "fallacy". ***Illi homini patrifamilias***: the ***homo*** of Matt. 10:36, Christ the householder. B ***et igitur*** (40.21). ***Facietenus***: "outwardly", in face only.
10. ***Huius***: A_1's correction, which Loserth adopts (cf. Jerome, ***l.c.***); AB ***huiusmodi inquit*** (40.25). ***Hoc est, in ecclesia***: Loserth notes the MSS' false ***hoc est ecclesia*** (41.1). B ***transferuntur*** (41.4). ***Fermentum phariseorum***: Matt. 16:6; ***mandata hominum***: Matt. 15:9.
11. ***Filiam matris sue, sapiencie Dei patris***: we take ***sapiencie*** in apposition to ***matris***, so that the mother here is the wisdom of God the Father; B's margin reads it so (***Quomodo hereticus est filius matris sue sapiencie Dei patris***, 41.12). The heretic claims kinship with each person of the Trinity. B ***possunt intelligi*** (41.9).
12. ***Omnis ... et solum talis***: both quantifiers are kept: every such man and only such is a heretic. ***Ut sic***: "as such", in so far as he is conformed. AA_1 ***ubi poterunt discerni*** (41.14); B ***Sed et vita*** (41.13). AB margin: ***Conclusio***; B: ***Nota: quid est hereticus*** (41.18).
13. ***Ipsam***: scripture; ***professores suos***: those who profess it. ***Seculares domini***: the lay lords as defenders of the faith, untagged (not the glossary's ***temporales domini***). B ***catholicam et pharisei*** (41.27); A ***abturare*** (41.28).
14. ***Obicitur per hoc quod***: "by appeal to this, that" (the glossary). ***De privatis provinciis***: saints of particular provinces, as against the universal church. AB margin: ***Secunda obieccio***. B lacks ***iuxta*** (42.1); B ***tenetur*** (42.2). The answer begins at 42.10 (next chunk).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 39: ***Christi***
  - 39: ***Act.V°*** (token prints as 'Act.V°,' (no space); degree sign present)
  - 39: ***Christus***
  - 39: ***Christus***
  - 40: ***Simulant***
  - 40: ***Christus***
  - 40: ***Christi***
  - 40: ***nuros*** (print has nuros) [NW]
  - 41: ***cum*** ('Christ' is side-note text glued)
  - 38: ***obediencia*** (obe- here, 133c diencia at top of p.39; main token holds whole word)
- Corrected in the Latin; plate): 38.25 ***enimL*** (alinea letter); 39.24 ***M*** (alinea letter, not text).
- 40.3 ***scriptum***: a Latin doubt (n. 6). 40.12 ***Jeronymus....***: Loserth's lacuna (n. 8).
- 39.4 ***ordinarunt*** and 40.25 ***Huius***: Loserth's corrections (nn. 2, 10).

Part 6: Explicit and implicit faith; what is owed to prelates and to the canonized

Loserth pp. 42.10–47.5

¶1 42.10–43.23
42.15 *Distinction between explicit and implicit faith.*
43.3 *Whiat men are to think of their priests.*
43.24 *The pastor is bound to show himself by good works a part of the Church.*

[42]Sed constat ex dictis quod neutrum sequitur, sed eius oppositum; pro quo notandum quod fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi per quem creditur, et nunc pro veritate que creditur, ut docet Augustinus XIII°, De Trinitate capitulo II° et III°. Secundo notandum quod alia est fides que est credulitas fidelis explicita et alia fides implicita, ut catholicus habens habitum fidei infusum vel acquisitum explicite credit ecclesiam catholicam in communi, et in illa fide communi credit implicite vel confuse quodcunque singulare contentum sub sancta matre ecclesia, sicut logici vere dicunt quod sciendo ens esse in suo analogo sciunt omnia et singula in communi. Sic (ut sepe dixi) si quicunque christianus habuerit fidem caritate formatam in quantumcunque

But it is evident from what has been said that neither follows, but its opposite.[1] For which it must be noted that faith is taken now for the act of believing by which one believes, now for the habit of believing through which one believes, and now for the truth which is believed, as Augustine teaches, *De Trinitate* 13, chapters 2 and 3.[2] Second, it must be noted that one faith is the faithful man's explicit credence, and another is implicit faith: as a catholic having the habit of faith, infused or acquired, believes explicitly the catholic church in general, and in that general faith believes implicitly or indistinctly every singular thing contained under holy mother church; just as logicians truly say that, in knowing that being is in its analogue, they know all things and each one in general.[3] So (as I have

communi, sufficit cum virtute perseverancie ad salutem. Deus enim qui dedit primam fidem dabit clariorem, nisi fidelis ponat obicem. Non enim exigit Deus, ut omnes filii sui pro omni viacione sua cogitent continue in actu particulari de qualibet fidei particula, sed [43]satis est quod postposita desidia habeant fidem in habitu formatam. Ex istis patet tercio quod quilibet laicus fidelis tenetur credere quod habet Christum sacerdotem suum, rectorem, episcopum atque papam, et sic de aliis sanctis Christi vicariis. Sed accedendo ad difficultatem dicitur: cum actus sunt suppositorum singularium et nostri fideles laici communicant cum suis presbyteris et curatis, necesse est quod habeant fidem de illis: ideo laici tenentur de aliquibus prepositis suis credere saltem implicite quod sunt partes ecclesie et capita sua, et de aliis non tenentur, et utrumque membrum potest subdividi, vel quod tenentur credere sic de illis secundum presentem iusticiam vel simpliciter secundum predestinacionem. Tunc dicitur quod laici non tenentur credere aliter de suo preposito nisi verum. Patet sic: Nemo tenetur quidquam credere, nisi quod Deus movet eum credere; sed Deus non movet hominem ad credendum falsum: ideo non debet credere falsum; licet enim ex fide falsa quandoque bonum proveniat et Deus moveat ad substanciam actus, tamen Deus non sic movet hominem, ut fallatur (ut patet libro sexto, tractatu de mendacio, capitulo —).

often said), if any Christian has faith formed by charity, however general, it suffices, with the virtue of perseverance, for salvation. For God, who gave the first faith, will give a clearer one, unless the faithful man puts an obstacle in the way. For God does not require that all his sons, through the whole of their wayfaring, should think continually in a particular act of each particle of the faith; but [43]it is enough that, sloth set aside, they have faith formed in habit.[4] From these things it is clear, third, that every faithful layman is bound to believe that he has Christ as his priest, rector, bishop and pope, and so of the other holy vicars of Christ. But, coming to the difficulty, the answer is: since acts belong to singular supposits, and our faithful lay people communicate with their presbyters and curates, it is necessary that they have faith about them; therefore lay people are bound, of some of their superiors, to believe at least implicitly that they are parts of the church and their heads, and of others they are not bound; and each member [of this division] can be subdivided: either they are bound to believe so of them according to present justice, or without qualification according to predestination.[5] Then the answer is that lay people are not bound to believe otherwise of their superior than the truth. It is clear thus: no one is bound to believe anything except what God moves him to believe; now God does not move a man to believe what is false; therefore he ought not to believe what is false. For although good sometimes comes from false faith, and God moves to the substance of the act, yet God does not so move a man that he is deceived (as is clear in the sixth book, the treatise on lying, chapter[6]

¶2 43.24–44.7
44.8 *Canonization not a certain proof of sanctity.*

[43]Ex istis patet secundo quod pastor tenetur monere subditos suos per instrucciones operum virtuosorum, ut fidem sibi adhibeant quod sit talis. Patet ex hoc quod aliter acceptando tale officium peccaret mortaliter, ymmo inducendo hostes in ecclesiam domum Dei foret proditor Dei sui. Quando ergo subditus non cognoscit talia fructuosa opera sui prepositi, non tenetur credere quod sit talis. Si autem cognoscit implicite, tenetur proporcionaliter credere, et quando [44] cognoscit explicite, tunc tenetur credere quod sit talis secundum presentem iusticiam et cum formidine ac condicionaliter quod sit talis simpliciter (ut dictum est superius de papa nostro). Non enim oneravit Deus sic suam ecclesiam, ut necessitata sit falsum credere de suis prepositis cum hoc quod non dent materiam sic credendi.

From these things it is clear, second, that a pastor is bound to admonish his subjects by the instruction of virtuous works, so that they may give him credence that he is such [a part of the church].[7] It is clear from this: that otherwise, in accepting such an office, he would sin mortally; indeed, by bringing enemies into the church, the house of God, he would be a traitor to his God. When, therefore, a subject does not know such fruitful works of his superior, he is not bound to believe that he is such. But if he knows them implicitly, he is bound to believe proportionately; and when [44]he knows them explicitly, then he is bound to believe that he is such according to present justice, and, with misgiving and conditionally, that he is such without qualification (as was said above of our pope). For God has not so burdened his church that it is necessitated to believe what is false of its superiors when they give no matter for so believing.[8]

¶3 44.8–46.22
45.10 *Nor do miracles prove sanctity.*
45.23 *Saints do not work miracles, though they may be the occasion of them.*
46.1 *A general trust in the prayers of the Saints would be better than individual honours to them.*
46.23 *Prelates punish more severely breaking of their laws than of Christ's.*

[44] **Ad aliam difficultatem de canonizacione sanctorum patet quod correspondenter quodammodo est dicendum: Quamvis enim sit vehemencior evidencia ex testimonio Romane ecclesie quod persona quam canonizat sit membrum ecclesie triumphantis, et amplior evidencia, si pro sancto Deus operetur miracula, tamen utrobique in tali materia potest esse illusio. Nam sicut ex confessione legum ecclesie ipsa militans decipit et decipitur (ut patet V° decretalium, de sentencia excommunicacionis A nobis) in tantum quod quandoque multos excommunicat qui sunt soluti et valde acceptabiles quoad Deum: sic contingit quod aliquos absolvat et ascribat cathalogo sanctorum cum hoc quod apud Deum sint iustissime condempnati. Ideo absit christianum credere quod de necessitate salutis oportet omnem fidelem credere explicite de isto et quocunque quem ecclesia nostra canonizat, ut eo ipso sit beatus, quia tunc haberemus simbolum nimis longum. Nec debemus explicite credere de quoquam tali quod non sit sanctus, sed excuciendo consideracionem de talibus, adherendo parti nobis probabiliori, credendo cum condicione vel pie cum formidine dubitando; de aliquibus autem sanctis credimus absque formidine eciam explicite quod sunt sancti, ut de apostolis, martiribus et sanctis primitive ecclesie; de aliis autem** [45] **modernioribus qui canonizantur racione parentele, questus vel muneris non oportet nos apponere tantam fidem; nec quemquam canonizatum intendo asserere vel defendere non esse partem ecclesie triumphantis, sed cum quadam formidine dubito, si hoc credo, cum scio quod hoc est possibile; et hoc existente vero credo illud implicite quod ignoro, nec volo contendere ad probandum proterve de quolibet citra Christum quod sit beatus, quamvis de multis hoc credam absque formidine. Nec miracula iam currencia dant omnibus veram fidem, cum potest committi potestas diabolo in penam peccati generacionis adultere signa querentis et fidem necessariam insensibilium dimittentis, ut portentis suis antichristiane inducant plurimos in errorem (de quorum indiciis dictum est libro sexto, sexto capitulo). Solet autem vocari miraculum nunc materialiter quodcunque opus a Deo miraculose factum, et sic sollicitantur multi ad deducendum conclusiones male sonantes, cum quelibet creatura videtur sic esse miraculum quoad Deum. Sed formaliter sumitur miraculum pro operacione Deo propria mirabili creature, et sic beati non faciunt miracula, licet sint quandoque occasio, ut Deus ad instanciam precum eorum seu meriti faciat miraculum. Et tunc dicuntur hii facere tale miraculum subauctentice vel ministratorie sicut solent. Et illa discrecio miraculi est eis abscondita nisi quibus**

To the other difficulty, about the canonization of saints, it is clear that the answer must in a way correspond. For although there is stronger evidence, from the testimony of the Roman church, that the person whom it canonizes is a member of the church triumphant, and fuller evidence if God works miracles for the saint, yet in both cases, in such a matter, there can be illusion. For just as, by the confession of the church's laws, the [church] militant itself deceives and is deceived (as is clear in the fifth book of the Decretals, on the sentence of excommunication, *A nobis*), so far that it sometimes excommunicates many who are loosed and very acceptable as regards God: so it happens that it absolves some and enrols them in the catalogue of the saints, when before God they are most justly condemned.[9] Therefore God forbid that a Christian should believe that it is of necessity for salvation that every faithful man believe explicitly of this man, and of whomever our church canonizes, that by that very fact he is blessed; for then we should have a creed far too long. Nor ought we to believe explicitly of any such man that he is not a saint; but [we ought to proceed] by sifting our consideration of such men, adhering to the side more probable to us, believing with a condition, or piously doubting with misgiving. Of some saints, though, we believe without misgiving, even explicitly, that they are saints, as of the apostles, the martyrs and the saints of the primitive church; but of others, [45] **more modern ones, who are canonized by reason of kinship, gain or gift, we need not lay down so much faith.[10] Nor do I mean to assert or defend of anyone canonized that he is not part of the church triumphant; but I doubt with a certain misgiving, if I believe this, since I know that it is possible; and, if this is true, I believe implicitly what I am ignorant of; nor do I wish to contend wantonly to prove of anyone short of Christ that he is blessed, although of many I believe this without misgiving.[11] Nor do miracles now current give true faith to all, since power can be committed to the devil, in punishment of the sin of an adulterous generation that seeks signs and lets go the necessary faith in imperceptible things, so that by their portents they may in antichristian fashion lead very many into error (of whose marks it was said in the sixth book, sixth chapter).[12] And a miracle is commonly called, now, materially, any work done by God miraculously; and so many are drawn to deduce ill-sounding conclusions, since every creature seems in this way to be a miracle as regards God. But formally a miracle is taken for an operation proper to God, wonderful to the creature; and so the blessed do not work miracles, although they**

Deus revelare voluerit. Et utinam non multiplicarentur tot ceremonie et signa in nostra ecclesia, cum facta sanctorum et omnes ritus alii non sunt laudabiles, nisi de quanto elevant animum ad [46] diligendum dominum Jesum Christum. Et videtur multis quod fides confusa de oracione sanctorum unicius, et per consequens, intencius, securius et melius colligeret in christicolis fidem Christi quam tanta explicita multiplicitas sanctorum in dies introducta. Sic enim confuse cognoscimus de quolibet beato vel dampnato, prescito vel predestinato quod ipse est huiusmodi, cum qua confusa noticia stat dubietas particularis, et ignorancia cum distincta noticia de communi: ex tali itaque canonizacione multiplici ultra ritum veteris testamenti et nostre primitive ecclesie secundum partem prodest et secundum partem obest; et verisimile est multis quod plus nocet, cum multitudo ritus tollens libertatem ecclesie est causa multorum errorum. Et omnis talis sanctus oraret pro nobis efficacius, supposito quod dimisso cultu suo diligeremus amplius Jesum nostrum. Multi enim sunt sancti nobis incogniti canonizatis beaciores qui plus prosunt nobis orando quam dicti sancti quorum festa devocione particulari percolimus, cum secundum dignitatem elemosinarii prosit oracio sanctorum qui plus diligunt eos qui magis diligunt Deum suum.

are sometimes the occasion, so that God at the instance of their prayers or merit works a miracle. And then they are said to work such a miracle sub-authentically, or ministerially, as they commonly are.[13] And that discernment of a miracle is hidden from them, except those to whom God has willed to reveal it. And would that so many ceremonies and signs were not multiplied in our church, since the deeds of the saints and all other rites are not praiseworthy except in so far as they raise the mind to [46] love the lord Jesus Christ. And it seems to many that an indistinct faith about the prayer of the saints would gather the faith of Christ in worshippers of Christ more singly, and consequently more intently, more securely and better, than so great an explicit multiplicity of saints brought in from day to day.[14] For in this way we know indistinctly of anyone blessed or damned, foreknown or predestinate, that he is such; with which indistinct knowledge a particular doubt is compatible, and ignorance [is compatible] with distinct knowledge of the general. So from such manifold canonization, beyond the rite of the old testament and of our primitive church, there is in part profit and in part harm; and it is likely to many that it harms more, since the multitude of rites, taking away the freedom of the church, is the cause of many errors. And every such saint would pray for us more effectually, supposing that, his cult set aside, we loved our Jesus more. For there are many saints unknown to us, more blessed than the canonized, who profit us more by praying than the said saints whose feasts we keep with particular devotion; since the prayer of the saints, who love more those who love their God more, profits according to the worthiness of the almsman.[15]

¶4 46.23–46.23

[46] Est et aliud malum ecclesie, quod superiores nostri plus

There is also another evil of the church: that our superiors

¶5 46.24–47.5

[46] exigunt ut credatur suis approbacionibus et reprobacionibus in cunctis suis iudiciis, quam exigunt ut credatur fides sacre scripture que est fides catholica, et plus persequuntur pro complecione suarum tradicionum, puniendo contravenientes asperius, quam faciunt contra blasphemantes in precipuam fidem Christi, sic quod de eis dici potest illud Psalmi XL[i], 10: Qui edebat panes meos magnificavit super me supplantacionem. Voluptuosus quippe presidens sub pallio pacis ecclesie querit bona pauperum que sunt autonomatice [47] panes Christi, et ille magnificat phariseice tradiciones proprias quibus tyrannice spoliat populum cui dicit verbo et opere quod equivalent vel superant legem Dei. Hoc autem est in effectu supplantacio legis Christi etc.

more require that credence be given to their approvals and reprobations in all their judgments than they require that credence be given to the faith of holy scripture, which is the catholic faith;[16] and they persecute more for the fulfilment of their traditions, punishing those who contravene them more harshly, than they do against those who blaspheme against the chief faith of Christ; so that of them can be said that word of Psalm 40:10: "Who ate my bread, hath greatly supplanted me."[17] For the pleasure-loving president, under the cloak of the church's peace, seeks the goods of the poor, which are by antonomasia [47] the bread of Christ; and he magnifies, like a Pharisee, his own traditions, by which he tyrannically despoils the people, to whom he says by word and deed that they are equal

to or surpass the law of God. And this is in effect the supplanting of the law of Christ, etc.[18]

Notes

1. The answer to the second objection (42.1–9): neither the loss of honour to prelates nor the collapse of canonization follows. *Neutrum sequitur*: "follows" of an inference. AB margin: *Responsio*; A: *Fides*.
2. Augustine, *De Trinitate* 13.2.5–3.6, on *fides quae creditur* and *fides qua creditur*; PL 42:1016–1017; Loserth: *Opp.* VIII, p. 929 (OCR doubtful). B *habitum* (42.13); B's margin: *Fides sumitur tripliciter secundum Augustinum*. Wyclif's second sense (the habit) is not Augustine's.
3. *Confuse*: "indistinctly", the scholastic *cognitio confusa* (knowledge of the general without the particulars), not "confusedly"; so *fides confusa* (46.2) and *confusa noticia* (46.6). *Sciendo ens esse in suo analogo*: knowing *ens*, the analogous term, one knows in general whatever falls under it. B lacks *Secundo* (42.16); B *singulare* (42.21). A's margins: *Fidei distinccio*; *Fides de ecclesia catholica cum caritate sufficit ad salutem*. Hus adds *hominis* after *fidelis* (42.17, Loserth).
4. *Viacio*: the state of the wayfarer, "wayfaring" (cf. *viator*). *Ponat obicem*: the school phrase for the obstacle that blocks grace. *In habitu*: as a habit, against *in actu particulari*.
5. *Actus sunt suppositorum singularium*: the scholastic maxim *actiones sunt suppositorum*: acts belong to individual subjects, so the layman's dealings with his priest require a belief about that individual. *Membrum*: a member of the division, not of the church. *Secundum presentem iusticiam ... simpliciter secundum predestinacionem*: the two senses of being of the church (cf. the *presciti* in present grace). AB margin: *Conclusio*; A: *De prepositis quomodo tenentur subditi credere*; B: *Laici tenentur credere de aliquibus suorum prepositorum quod sunt partes ecclesie*.
6. The sentence breaks off at *capitulo* (43.23), the chapter number wanting, and the parenthesis is never closed. *Libro sexto*: in Wyclif's *Summa theologie* the sixth book is *De veritate sacre scripture*, as Loserth supposes: its chapters 16–18 are the treatise on lying (c. 18 opens *faciendo finem in materia de mendacio*), which Wyclif also cites as *tractatus De Mendacio* at 159 (08-a); B reads *quinto*, and has *tractatu de mendacio* in the margin, not in the text.
7. *Quod sit talis*: that he is a part of the church (Loserth's side-note: "a part of the Church"); *talis* refers back to *partes ecclesie* (43.8). *Monere ... per instrucciones operum virtuosorum*: he teaches by works, not words.
8. *Cum formidine*: the misgiving that qualifies assent (the glossary). *Ut dictum est superius de papa nostro*: 37.26–38.12, on Urban VI. *Oneravit*: B *ornavit* (44.4), which does not suit *ut necessitata sit*. *Cum hoc quod*: "when", "given that".
9. *Decretals* of Gregory IX, *X* 5.39.28 (*A nobis est saepe quaesitum*; Friedberg II, 899–900), form ours: *iudicium ecclesiae nonnunquam opinionem sequitur, quam et fallere saepe contingit et falli*. Loserth's 5.39.21 is another *A nobis*, on general excommunication. A lacks *patet* (44.16); B's margin: *V. decretalium*. A's margin: *de canonisacione sanctorum ab ecclesia Romana quomodo est credendum*.
10. *Excuciendo consideracionem*: *excutere*, "to sift, examine closely". *Apponere tantam fidem*: "lay down", "apply" so much faith. *Racione parentele, questus vel muneris*: kinship, gain or gift, the motives of modern canonizations. A's margin: *De sanctis quomodo est credendum*; B: *Quomodo sciendum est de canonisacione sanctorum modernorum*.
11. *Intendo* of purpose, "I mean". *Dubito, si hoc credo*: we take *si* concessively: even if I believe him blessed, I hold it with misgiving, because the contrary is possible; it might also be read "I doubt whether I believe this". *Citra Christum*: "short of Christ", anyone but Christ himself. B *formidine subito* (45.5).
12. *Generacionis adultere signa querentis*: Matt. 12:39, DR "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign". *Fidem ... insensibilium*: faith in things not perceived (cf. Heb. 11:1). AB *generalis*, A_1 *genera'* (45.12). *Antichristiane*: Loserth's text; the MSS have *antichristine* (45.14); the subject of *inducant* is unexpressed (the devil's agents). *Libro sexto, sexto capitulo*: B *quinto capitulo* (45.16); the place in *De veritate* is unidentified.
13. *Subauctentice vel ministratorie*: as secondary, not principal, authors, or as ministers; God alone is the author of the miracle. B's margins: *Miraculum dupliciter sumitur*; *Miraculum fit a sanctis subautentice*. *Eis*: we take it of men generally; it might be the saints.
14. *Unicius*: comparative of *unice*, "more singly", with one object. B's margins: *De quanto sunt ritus laudabiles* (45.31); *De oracione sanctorum* (46.2).
15. *Secundum partem prodest et secundum partem obest*: impersonal. *Elemosinarii*: the recipient of alms, here the one for whom the saints pray (their prayer is alms); the glossary *elemosinarius*, "almsman". *Qui plus diligunt eos qui magis diligunt Deum suum*: the saints love those more who love God more, so the worthier recipient profits more.
16. The sentence runs on from ¶4 (46.23). *Plus* (46.24) stands at the end of ¶4 in our Latin because the ¶ break is false; restored from the plate. B's margin: *Prelati exigunt quod suis sentenciis adhibeatur fides quarum transgressores vehementer puniunt*. *Superiores nostri*: not the glossary's *prepositi*.
17. Ps. 40:10 (Wyclif's XLI, 10), DR "who ate my bread, hath greatly supplanted me"; the Latin is the Vulgate's, abridged. Wyclif's exposition takes *magnificavit ... supplantacionem* literally, "has magnified supplanting", hence *magnificat* and *supplantacio* below. B *punientes* (46.28); B's margin quotes the verse.
18. *Autonomatice*: Loserth's text, the MSS *autonomastice* (47.1). *Equivalent*: the subject is the traditions. *Legis Christi etc.* (47.5): the print's last words, lost from our transcription at the chapter end and restored from the plate; A adds the written words *Kenmerton psano* (47.5); Loserth identifies Kenmerton (Kemerton) near Tewkesbury, a district that sent supporters to Oldcastle (Walsingham II, 307). On chapter 2, cf. Hus, *De eccl.* fol. 199a ff., 204b, 209b, 212a (Loserth).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 42: *II°*
  - 42: *Secundo notandum quod alia est fides que est credulitas fidelis explicita et alia fides implicita, ut* (print has both lines (p.42 ll.16-17) before catholicus) [GAP]

- **42: *viacione* (print has viacione) [NW]**
- **43: *Christum***
- **45: *Christum***
- **46: *securius* (print has securius (r-i-u), not secunus) [NW]**
- **46: *Christi***
- **46: *Christi***
- **46: *diligendum***
- **46: *Jesum***
- **46: *videtur* (134b folio mark glued)**
- **46: *fides***
- **46: *confusa***

- **OCR scars corrected in the Latin; 45.25 *meriti* read on the plate): 44.8 *sanctorump*, 45.21 *sumiter*, 45.25 *menti* and *hn*, 46.4 *chnsticolis*.**
- **43.23 *capitulo*: the chapter number is wanting (n. 6).**
- **46.24 *plus*: lost at a false ¶ break, restored from the plate.**

Chapter 3

Part 1: Third objection: church dues; Gregory on the hypocrite's love of temporal goods

Loserth pp. 47.7–51.7

¶1 47.7–47.13
47.7 *Objection: This would disable the clergy from enforcing their dues.*
47.14 *Answer. It would be better if dues were less enforced*

[47]**Sed tercio principaliter obicitur per hoc quod, data ista sentencia, tolleretur omnis exaccio debiti ecclesie et extingueretur omnis lex contencionis in clero, cum debitor posset fingere ecclesiasticum non esse dignum vel talem qui sic bona ecclesie vendicaret, et quantum ad excommunicacionem que est ultimum refugium, diceret quod non ligat.**

But third, as a principal objection, it is objected, by appeal to this: that, granted this teaching, every exaction of what is owed to the church would be taken away, and every law of suit among the clergy would be extinguished, since a debtor could pretend that the churchman was not worthy, or not such as might so claim the goods of the church; and as to excommunication, which is the last refuge, he would say that it does not bind.[1]

¶2 47.14–48.22
48.7 *Our pretence of good motives must be tested by our acts and by Scripture.*

[47]**Hic dicitur quod, si lex Dei debite scrutaretur nobis, non tantum contenderemus circa bona ecclesie, cum manifestum sit quod prescitus vel quicunque clericus sine peraccione sui ministerii compensante qui plus propter honorem, voluptatem vel questum seculi contendit, bona ecclesie occupat vel acceptat, quam propter honorem Dei et edificacionem ecclesie, ut sic false aliena vendicat et consumit, et per consequens, licet versucias talium detegere et subtrahendo bona pauperum resistere (ut diffuse dictum est lib. VI, cap....), unde sub auctoritate beati Augustini scribitur in decretis VIII^a^, q. 1: Sunt inquit quidam in ecclesia prepositi de quibus apostolus Paulus dicit: Sua querentes, non que Jesu Christi. Quid est: Sua querentes** [48] **non Christum gratis diligentes, non Deum propter ipsum Deum querentes, temporalia consequentes, lucris inhiantes, honores ab hominibus appetentes. Hec quando amantur a preposito et propter hec servitur Deo, quisquis talis est, mercenarius est, inter filios se non computet. Unde quia omnes confitemur nos principaliter propter honorem Dei et spiritualem profectum ecclesie tales preposituras appetere, ad discernendum si sumus ypocrite, oportet credere operibus nostris, speculo scripture et testimonio sanctorum. Unde Gregorius XXXI°, Moral. cap. IX, et infra, satis explicat istam materiam in tribus conclusionibus; supponens primo quod mens iusti vel veri christiani debet esse tam affectu quam intellectu collecta intrinsecus, sic quod nichil suum exterius derelinquat. Patet ex hoc quod aliter peccaret contra hoc mandatum: Diliges dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde, ex tota anima et ex tota mente. Cum ergo non debet peccare, sequitur quod non debet esse fracta sic in intellectu**

To this the answer is that, if God's law were duly searched by us, we should not contend so much about the goods of the church; since it is manifest that a foreknown man, or any cleric without a performance of his ministry to compensate, who contends for, occupies or accepts the goods of the church more for the honour, pleasure or gain of the world than for the honour of God and the edification of the church, thus falsely claims and consumes what belongs to others; and consequently it is lawful to expose the cunning of such men and to resist [them] by withdrawing the goods of the poor (as was said at length in book 6, chapter ...).[2] **Hence, under the authority of blessed Augustine, it is written in the Decrees, [causa] 8, q. 1: "There are", he says, "certain superiors in the church of whom the apostle Paul says: Seeking their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's. What is 'seeking their own'?** [48] **Not loving Christ freely, not seeking God for God's own sake, pursuing temporal goods, gaping after gains, coveting honours from men. When these things are loved by a superior, and God is served for these things, whoever is such a one is a hireling; let him not count himself among the sons."**[3] **Hence, since we all confess that we covet such superiorships principally for the honour of God and the spiritual profit of the church, in order to discern whether we are hypocrites we must give credence to our works, to the mirror of scripture and to the testimony of the saints.**[4] **Hence Gregory, *Moralia* 31, chapter 9 and following, explains this matter well enough in three conclusions, supposing first that the mind of a just man, or of a true Christian, ought to be gathered within, in affection as much as in**

et affectu circa temporalia, quia ut sic amor uni debitus dispergitur circa multa.

intellect, so that it leaves nothing of its own outside. This is clear from this: that otherwise it would sin against this commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind."[5] Since, therefore, it ought not to sin, it follows that it ought not to be so broken up, in intellect and affection, about temporal goods; for in that way the love owed to one is dispersed about many things.

¶3 48.23–50.7
49.1 *Explanation of Ezekiel's vision.*
49.22 *How we may judge whether priests are worldly:*
49.27 *by eagerness to obtain wealth;*
50.8 *by care to keep*
50.28 *by grief for its loss.*

[48] Isto supposito patet, primo quod sancti dum se intra semet ipsos sic colligunt, occulta tam de statu proprio quam de statu proximi comprehendunt. Patet ex hoc quod lux vera que non potest personas accipere, necessario secundum capacitatem irradiat talem mentem. Et hoc figuratum est Ezechiel VIII, 3, ubi sic legitur: [49] Emissa similitudo manus apprehendit me in cincinno capitis mei et elevavit me spiritus inter terram et celum et adduxit me in Jerusalem in visione Dei iuxta ostium interius quod respiciebat ad aquilonem, ubi erat statutum ydolum zeli ad provocandum emulacionem. Manus missa est operativa volucio divina, cincinnus capitis est collecte cogitaciones mentis quibus habitis mens incomplete trahitur a terrenis, cum nec habet animum omnino celestem nec omnino in terrestribus soporatum, sed inter terram et celum in visione Dei in Jerusalem ducitur, quia zelo caritatis qualis debet esse mater ecclesia contemplatur. Et signanter animus talis adducitur ad ostium interius quod respicit ad aquilonem, quia interna contemplacione intra ecclesiam plus prava quam recta fieri deprehendunt, dum clerici in aquilonis pariete, id est, ad solis sinistrum oculos flectunt et elongata austerna caritate habundant frigore viciorum; cuius causa est globus temporalium quem ecclesia sola specie fidelis adorat; ex hinc enim zelus sponsi ecclesie ad feriendum ypocritas provocatur. Secundo patet ex quo signo perpenditur, si ecclesiastici flagrant terrenis, celestibus pretermissis: cum enim amor sit pondus animi, nec sit possibile hominem moveri libere quo affeccio mentis ipsum non tulerit, patet quod ex operibus debet mentis affeccio iudicari. Si ergo vides quod ecclesiasticus quantum ad perpetuacionem, quantum ad defensionem et quantum ad amissionem temporalium plus insudat, quam facit pro spiritualibus, quis dubitat quin eis magis afficitur? Unde quantum ad perpetuacionem temporalium sic [50] loquitur iste sanctus: postposita quippe cura filiorum sepe eos videas se contra pericula immensi laboris accingere, maria transmeare, adire iudicia, pulsare principatus, palacia irrumpere, iurgantibus populorum cuneis interesse. Cum autem pro spiritualibus acquirendis

This supposed, it is clear, first, that the saints, while they so gather themselves within themselves, grasp hidden things, as much of their own state as of their neighbour's. It is clear from this: that the true light, which cannot respect persons, of necessity shines upon such a mind according to its capacity.[6] And this is figured in Ezekiel 8:3, where it reads thus: [49] "The likeness of a hand was put forth and took me by a lock of my head: and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the vision of God into Jerusalem, near the inner gate, that looked toward the north, where was set the idol of jealousy to provoke to jealousy." The hand put forth is the divine operative will; the lock of the head is the gathered thoughts of the mind, which once had, the mind is drawn incompletely from earthly things, since it has a soul neither wholly heavenly nor wholly asleep in earthly things, but is led between earth and heaven in the vision of God into Jerusalem, because with the zeal of charity it contemplates what mother church ought to be.[7] And significantly such a soul is brought to the inner gate that looks toward the north, because by inward contemplation they discover that within the church more crooked things than right are done, while clerics on the north wall, that is, to the left of the sun, turn their eyes, and, [southern] charity removed far off, abound in the cold of vices; the cause of which is the mass of temporal goods, which the church, faithful in appearance only, worships; for hence the zeal of the church's bridegroom is provoked to strike the hypocrites.[8] Second, it is clear by what sign it is weighed whether churchmen burn for earthly things, heavenly things being passed over: for since love is the weight of the soul, and it is not possible for a man to be moved freely where the affection of his mind has not carried him, it is clear that the affection of the mind must be judged from works.[9] If, therefore, you see that a churchman sweats more over the perpetuating, over the defence and over the loss of temporal goods than he does for spiritual ones, who doubts that he is more attached to them? Hence, as to the perpetuating of temporal goods, thus [50] speaks

non apponunt tantam diligenciam, quis dubitat quin ista temporalia magis amant?

this saint: "For, the care of their sons put aside, you may often see them gird themselves against the dangers of immense labour, cross the seas, go to the courts, knock at the doors of princes, break into palaces, take part in the wrangling throngs of the peoples." But since they do not lay out so much diligence for acquiring spiritual things, who doubts that they love these temporal ones more?[10]

¶4 50.8–51.7

[50]Et quantum ad retencionem, patet idem ex maioritate diligencie quam apponimus pro temporalibus quam pro spiritualibus defendendis. Ypocrita, inquit Gregorius, assumpto sancte conversacionis habitu filiorum custodiam deserit et temporalia queque defendere eciam iurgiis querit. Exemplo suo eorum corda perdere non trepidat et quasi per negligenciam amittere patrimonia terrena formidat. In errorem discipulus labitur et tamen cor ypocrite nullo dolore sauciatur. Ire in iniquitatis voraginem commissos sibi conspicit et hec quasi inaudita pertransit; at si quod sibi leviter inferri temporale dampnum senserit, in ulcionis iram repente ab intimis inardescit. Et mox paciencia rumpitur, mox dolor cordis in vocibus effrenatur, quia dum animarum dampna equanimiter tollerat, iacturam vero rerum temporalium repellere eciam cum spiritus commocione festinat, cunctis veraciter indicat teste mentis perturbacione quid amat. Ibi quippe est grande studium defensionis, ubi est grandior vis amoris. Et quoad amissionem bonorum hominis, est idem indicium, quia indubie quicunque plus dolet de amissione boni fortune quam boni virtutis, ut sic, indicat se plus diligere temporalia quam virtutes, cum sit maxima apud philosophos quod dolor amissi et amor [51]habiti suis temporibus correspondent. Unde Gregorius ubi supra: Quanto magis terrena quis diligit, tanto privari eis vehemencius pertimescit. Qua enim mente in hoc mundo aliquid possidemus, non docemur nisi cum amittimus. Sine dolore namque amittitur quidquid sine amore possidetur, que vero ardenter diligimus habita, graviter suspiramus ablata.

And as to retention, the same is clear from the greatness of the diligence we lay out for defending temporal rather than spiritual things. "The hypocrite", says Gregory, "having put on the habit of a holy manner of life, deserts the keeping of his sons, and seeks to defend all temporal things, even with quarrels. He does not tremble to destroy their hearts by his example, and he fears to lose earthly patrimonies as if by negligence. The disciple slips into error, and yet the hypocrite's heart is wounded by no grief. He sees those committed to him go into the whirlpool of iniquity, and passes these things by as if unheard; but if he feels some temporal loss lightly inflicted on himself, he suddenly blazes up from his inmost parts into the anger of revenge. And at once his patience breaks, at once the grief of his heart runs unbridled into words; because, while he bears the losses of souls with equanimity, but hastens, even with commotion of spirit, to repel the loss of temporal things, he truly shows to all, by the witness of his mind's disturbance, what he loves. For there is great zeal for defence where there is the greater force of love."[11] And as to the loss of a man's goods, there is the same indication: for without doubt whoever grieves more over the loss of a good of fortune than of a good of virtue shows himself, as such, to love temporal goods more than virtues; since it is a maxim among the philosophers that grief for what is lost and love for [51]what is had correspond in their times.[12] Hence Gregory in the place cited: "The more anyone loves earthly things, the more vehemently he dreads being deprived of them. For with what mind we possess anything in this world, we are not taught except when we lose it. For whatever is possessed without love is lost without grief; but the things we love ardently when had, we sigh for heavily when taken away."[13]

Notes

1. The third of the objections announced at 38.25 (the second, 42.1). *Ista sentencia*: that faith in a superior's membership of the church is owed only on the evidence of his works. *Lex contencionis*: legal action, the right of suit by which dues were recovered; *in clero* (print *m clero*, 47.8) is read as *in*. A's margin: *Contra dicta arguitur*.
2. *Hic dicitur*: "To this the answer is" (the glossary). *Prescitus*: one God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). Construal: *qui ... contendit, bona ecclesie occupat vel acceptat* is one relative clause with three verbs, governed by *plus ... quam*; the main verb is *vendicat et consumit*. *Sine peraccione sui ministerii compensante*: without doing the ministry that would earn the revenue.

***Subtrahendo bona pauperum*: withholding tithes and offerings, which are the goods of the poor. *Lib. VI, cap. ...*: the chapter number is wanting (Loserth: *capit. seq. lacuna*, 47.24); the place in *De veritate* is unidentified. A's margin: *Conclusio*.**

3. *Decretum* C.8 q.1 c.19, Loserth's reference, form ours, from Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 46.5, on John 10:12, "the hireling". The apostle's words: Phil. 2:21, DR "For all seek the things that are their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's", here in the participle. *Consequentes*: Augustine's *temporalia commoda consectantes*, "pursuing" (PL 35:1729; Wyclif lacks *commoda*). A's margins: *Augustinus*; *Contra clerum pravum et avarum*.

4. *Speculo scripture* (48.10), "the mirror of scripture", as at 41.13 (*optimum speculum*): the print's reading (plate), which the OCR had cut to *specu*. B *confitemur nec principaliter* (48.7); the MSS *preposito propter* (48.4).

5. Gregory, *Moralia in Iob* 31, Wyclif's chapter 9; Loserth: 31, chapter 12 (or 9), *Opp.* I, 1005; on Job 39: PL 76:583D–585C, §§19–21, Migne chapters XII–XIII. Matt. 22:37 (Loserth's "XIII, 37" is an OCR error), DR; Wyclif has *ex ... ex ... ex* for the Vulgate's *ex ... in ... in* (cf. Mark 12:30). A's margin: *Gregorius*.

6. *Lux vera*: John 1:9. *Personas accipere*: to respect persons (Acts 10:34). Loserth gives Gregory's words for *colligunt*: *mira ac penetrabili acie occulta eciam aliena delicta deprehendunt* (48.24). AB margin: *Prima conclusio*; B *statum* (48.24).

7. Ezek. 8:3 (DR), Wyclif's text the Vulgate's but *provocandum*. Loserth corrects the MSS' *respicit* to *respiciebat* (49.4). *Incomplete*: not wholly, as the next clause explains. AA$_1$ *colore cogitacionis* (49.7); AA$_1$ *inter* (49.15). *Qualis debet esse mater ecclesia contemplatur*: we take *qualis* as an indirect question, "contemplates what mother church ought to be"; it may be "contemplates [with such zeal] as mother church ought to have". A's margin: *cincinnus*.

8. *Austerna* (49.18), as printed (plate), is not a word, and Gregory has no such clause (PL 76:584B: the sentence is Wyclif's paraphrase); we translate *austrina*, "southern", opposed to the north (our emendation); *eterna*, "eternal", is the alternative. *Globus*: here "mass" (of temporal goods), not the glossary's derogatory "band" of persons. *Sola specie fidelis*: the church faithful in outward show only. A's margin: *Pastor negligens continue infra* (49.18).

9. *Amor ... pondus animi*: Augustine, *Confessions* 13.9.10, *pondus meum amor meus*. AB margin: *Secunda conclusio*; B: *Nota optime quomodo vere discernendum est, quis appetit preesse in ecclesia propter honorem Dei et spiritualem profectum animarum*. B *affecto* (49.25).

10. Gregory, *l.c.* (Loserth, 49.7, 49.11, 50.1). *Perpetuacio*: securing temporal goods in perpetuity (Loserth's side-note: "eagerness to obtain wealth"). *Filiorum*: the spiritual sons in the hypocrite's charge.

11. Gregory, *Moralia* 31, chapter 13 (Loserth, 50.10). *Conversacio*: "manner of life" (the glossary); *formidat* is the plain fear of the emotion. B *rei in* (50.16–17); AA$_1$ *at sibi quid*, B *at si quid sibi* (50.18). AB margin: *Gregorius*.

12. *Maioritas*: "greatness" (the glossary). *Boni fortune ... boni virtutis*: the philosophers' goods of fortune against goods of soul. *Maxima*: a maxim; the source is unidentified. A's margin: *Amissio temporalium est minus dolenda quam amissio virtutis* (50.28).

13. Gregory, *Moralia* 31, chapter 13 (Loserth, 51.1). A *in terrena* (51.2); B *Contra enim mente* (51.3). AB margin: *Gregorius*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **47: *CAP. III.***
  - **47: *qui* (134d is the folio mark)**
  - **47: *lib* (print 'lib. VI,') [NW]**
  - **47: *VIII^a***
  - **47: *1* (x-height old-style figure 1 ('q. 1:'), checked on leaf)**
  - **47: *Quid***
  - **48: *non* (first word of page, italic)**
  - **48: *occulta* (zoomed on leaf: second c has an ink speck inside but no e-bar = c) [NW]**
  - **49: *manus***
  - **49: *ubi* (5 is the line number)**
  - **49: *zelo* (italic z) [NW]**
  - **49: *Et* (135a is the folio mark)**
  - **49: *ad* (print 'adducitur ad * ostium')**
  - **50: *loquitur***
  - **50: ∅ ('keep' is side-note text (by care to keep it))**
  - **50: ∅ ('its' is side-note text (by grief for its loss); line starts Et)**
  - **50: *indicat* (30 is the line number)**
  - **51: *habiti* (135a is the folio mark)**
- **Corrected in the Latin: 47.8 *m clero* (OCR for *in clero*); 48.7 *of* (side-note text); 48.10 *specu* (print *speculo*, plate).**
- **48.10 *specu*: translated as *speculo* (our emendation, n. 4). 49.18 *austerna*: translated as *austrina* (our emendation, n. 8). 47.13 *cap....*: the chapter number is wanting (n. 2).**

Part 2: The hypocrite's three replies: counsels, care for the church, love of the robber

¶1 51.8–52.9

51.8 *Hypocrites apply Scripture falsely in their own support.*
52.10 *The hypocrite says: a. These are counsels, not commands; as if the counsels of Christ were not to be followed.*
52.16 *b. He says that but for his care the Church would be defrauded;*
52.24 *but the care would be better bestowed on spiritual things.*

[51]Tercio colligitur quod adulterantes scripturam sacram in ista sentencia sunt ypocrite, quos prophetavit apostolus Timotheo periculosis temporibus in ecclesiam successuros. Pro cuius declaracione suppono factum, quomodo moderni ecclesiastici fingunt secundum tradiciones humanas quod nedum licet eis, sed peccarent mortaliter, omittendo prosequi pro defensione matris ecclesie. Illud meminit beatus Gregorius (ubi supra). Istis, inquit, si forte dicatur: Cur ista agitis qui seculum reliquistis? respondent illico Deum se metuere et idcirco tanto studio in defendendis patrimoniis Christi insudare. Hodie autem superadditur quod bona pro quorum acquisicione, conservacione et repeticione tantum insistimus sunt bona ecclesie et patrimonium Christi: ideo licet pro bono universalis ecclesie conservacioni eorum insistere. Iste autem fucus ex hoc tollitur quod deserendo ipsa pro Christo tam relinquens quam ecclesia ipsa habet, ut dicit Augustinus super Joh. Omelia VI[a]. Ideo, ut dicit beatus Gregorius: Frustra laboravit nullo timore cogente, et ut dicitur Psalmo XIII°, 5: Illic trepidaverunt timore, ubi non [52]erat timor. Ecce, inquit, divina voce precipitur: Si quis tulerit tibi tunicam et voluerit tecum in iudicio contendere, dimitte illi pallium. Et rursum: Si quis quod tuum est tulerit, ne repetas. Paulus quoque apostolus discipulos suos cupiens exteriora despicere, ut valeant interna servare, admonet eos dicens: Omnino delictum est in vobis quod iudicia habetis inter vos, quare non magis iniuriam accipitis quare non magis fraudem patimini?

Third, it is gathered that those who adulterate holy scripture in [the matter of] this teaching are hypocrites, whom the apostle prophesied to Timothy would come into the church in dangerous times.[1] For the explanation of this I suppose as a fact how modern churchmen pretend, according to human traditions, that not only is it lawful for them [to sue], but they would sin mortally by omitting to sue for the defence of mother church. Blessed Gregory recalls this (in the place cited): "If perhaps it is said to these men: Why do you do these things, who have left the world? they answer at once that they fear God, and therefore sweat with such zeal in defending the patrimonies of Christ."[2] And today it is added besides that the goods for whose acquisition, preservation and recovery we press so hard are the goods of the church and the patrimony of Christ; therefore it is lawful, for the good of the universal church, to press for their preservation. But this disguise is taken away by this: that by deserting them for Christ both the one who leaves them and the church itself has them, as Augustine says on John, homily 6.[3] Therefore, as blessed Gregory says: "She hath laboured in vain, no fear constraining her"; and, as is said in Psalm 13:5: "There have they trembled for fear, where there [52]was no fear." "Behold," he says, "it is commanded by the divine voice: If any man take away thy coat and will contend with thee in judgment, let go thy cloak unto him. And again: If any man take away what is thine, ask it not again. Paul the apostle also, desiring his disciples to despise outward things so that they may be able to keep inward ones, admonishes them, saying: There is plainly a fault among you, that you have law suits one with another. Why do you not rather take wrong? Why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?"[4]

¶2 52.10–52.15

[52]Nec valet glosa ypocrite quod hec sunt consilia, non precepta. Si enim sunt Christi consilia et tu in habitu pretendis te super alios Christum diligere, adhereres eius leni consilio, preceptis seculi pretermissis; aliter enim fores ypocrita, offendens in dileccione Dei super omnia.

Nor does the hypocrite's gloss avail, that these are counsels, not precepts. For if they are Christ's counsels, and you in your habit make a show of loving Christ above others, you would adhere to his gentle counsel, the precepts of the world being passed over; for otherwise you would be a hypocrite, offending in the love of God above all things.[5]

¶3 52.16–54.22

53.16 *c. He declares that he acts for the good of the wrong doer:*

[52]Nec valet secundo dicere quod oportet aliquem solicitari circa hec bona, ne ecclesia defraudetur, quia illis relictis pro Christo tu verius haberes hec bona, et sic ecclesia. Ideo vis exponere te periculo dimittendo perfeccionem divini consilii quam acceptando,

Nor, second, does it avail to say that someone must be solicitous about these goods, lest the church be defrauded; for, these being left for Christ, you would more truly have these goods, and so would the church.[6] So you choose to expose yourself to danger by abandoning the perfection

53.25 *This is a better excuse but it is dangerously near to evil.*
53.31 *St. Gregory teaches*
54.5 *that we must care only for the eternal interests of the wrong doer;*
54.15 *otherwise we hurt ourselves more than him.*

Deus non posset de promissione temporalium deficere; nam cum istud officium incumbit laicis, patet quod indigencia ecclesie stat in paucitate procurancium pro spiritualibus bonis ecclesie, sicut fuit de contemplativis, quando crevit ecclesia. Cum ergo istud officium sit alcius, salubrius et ecclesie necessarius, manifestum est quod amor culpabilis temporalium est in causa huius cece eleccionis. Unde Gregorius ibidem capitulo X°: Plus Deo sese amare convincitur qui neglectis hiis que Dei sunt propria tuetur; perdere namque animas hominum ypocrite non timent, et [53]amittere res cum mundo transeuntes quasi districto iudici posituri racionem timent; ac si placatum inveniant, cui desideratis rebus, id est, racionabilibus perditis insensibilia et non quesita conservent. Certum est quod non. Possidere, inquit, in hoc mundo aliquid volumus et ecce veritas clamat: Nisi quis renunciaverit omnibus que possidet, non potest meus esse discipulus. Perfectus ergo christianus quomodo debet res terrenas iurgando defendere quas precipitur non possidere? Itaque cum res proprias amittimus, si perfecte Deum sequimur, in huius vite itinere a magno onere levigamur. Non ergo debemus, periculo nos exponendo, perfecciorem statum relinquere et statum plus periculosum, plus a Christo elongatum et plus tardativum eligere. Nec valet tercia responsio ypocrite qua dicit se propter amorem iniuste occupantis contendere, ne ipse peccet iniusta detencione, sed ut ipse habeat instrumenta virtutum quibus possit ad honorem Dei plus matri sue proficere. Unde pro prima parte dicit beatus Gregorius (ubi supra): Quidam cum nostra rapiunt, solummodo tolerandi sunt; quidam vero servata caritate prohibendi; non tamen sola cura ne nostra subtrahant, sed ne rapientes non sua semetipsos perdant. iste fucus est magis palliatus quam ceteri: nam (sicut alias ostendi) licet inferioribus ecclesie pro bonis fortune contendere, servata caritate utrimque et sancta intencione cum forma procedendi legitima. Ideo debet homo illius responsionis cavere, ne propinquitas ad voraginem periculi preparet ad ruinam. Nam ut dicit beatus Gregorius ibidem: Plus ipsis raptoribus debemus metuere quam inhiare ipsis rebus irracionabilibus [54]defendendis, quia illa non rapta morientes amittimus, cum illis vero et nunc condicionis ordine, etsi corrigi studeant, post percepcionem finalis premii unum sumus. Quis autem nesciat, quia minus ea quibus utimur et plus debemus amare quod sumus? Si ergo pro sua utilitate raptoribus loquimur, iam non nobis que temporalia, sed eciam illis que sunt eterna vindicamus. Qua in re illud est solercius intuendum, ne per necessitatis metum cupiditas surrepat rerum et zelo succensa prohibicio, impetu immoderancie distensa, usque ad odiose turpitudinem contencionis erumpat.

of the divine counsel rather than by accepting [it], [though] God could not fail of his promise of temporal goods; for since this office falls to laymen, it is clear that the church's want consists in the fewness of those who take care for the spiritual goods of the church, as was the case with the contemplatives when the church grew.[7] Since, therefore, this office is higher, more wholesome and more necessary to the church, it is manifest that a culpable love of temporal goods is the cause of this blind choice. Hence Gregory in the same place, chapter 10: "He is convicted of loving himself more than God who, neglecting the things that are God's, protects his own; for hypocrites do not fear to destroy the souls of men, and [53]they fear to lose things that pass away with the world, as men who will render account to a strict judge; as if they would find him appeased, for whom, the things he desired, that is, rational things, being lost, they preserve things without sensation and not sought." It is certain that they will not. "We want," he says, "to possess something in this world, and behold, the Truth cries out: Unless a man renounce all that he possesseth, he cannot be my disciple. How, then, ought a perfect Christian to defend by quarrelling earthly things which he is commanded not to possess? And so, when we lose our own things, if we follow God perfectly, we are relieved of a great burden on the journey of this life." We ought not, therefore, by exposing ourselves to danger, to leave the more perfect state and choose a state more dangerous, further removed from Christ and more apt to delay.[8] Nor does the hypocrite's third reply avail, by which he says that he contends out of love for the one who unjustly occupies [the goods], lest he sin by unjust detention, but so that he himself may have the instruments of the virtues by which he may profit his mother more, to the honour of God.[9] Hence, for the first part, blessed Gregory says (in the place cited): "Some, when they seize our things, are only to be borne with; but some are to be restrained, charity being kept; yet not with the sole care that they not take away what is ours, but that, seizing what is not theirs, they not destroy themselves." This disguise is more cloaked than the others: for (as I have shown elsewhere) it is lawful for the lower [members] of the church to contend for goods of fortune, charity being kept on both sides, and with holy intention, with a lawful form of procedure.[10] Therefore the man of that reply ought to beware, lest nearness to the whirlpool of danger prepare [him] for ruin. For, as blessed Gregory says in the same place: "We ought to fear more for the robbers themselves than to gape after the irrational things themselves, [54]to defend them; for those things, even unseized, we lose in dying, but

Dumque pro terrena re pax a corde cum proximo scinditur, liquido apparet quod plus res quam proximus amatur. Si enim caritatis viscera eciam circa raptorem proximum non habemus, nosmet ipsos peius ipso raptore persequimur graviusque nos quam alter poterat devastamus, quia dileccionis bonum sponte deserentes a nobis ipsis intus est quod amittimus, qui ab illo sola exteriora perdebamus. Sed hanc ypocrita formam caritatis ignorat, quia plus terrena quam celestia diligens contra eum qui temporalia diripit sese in intimis immani odio inflammat.

with these men, both now by the order of our condition and, if they strive to be corrected, after the receiving of the final reward, we are one. And who does not know that we ought to love less the things we use, and more what we are? If, therefore, we speak to robbers for their own advantage, we claim now not for ourselves the things that are temporal, but also for them the things that are eternal.[11] In which matter this must be looked to the more shrewdly: lest, through fear of necessity, the desire of things creep in, and the restraint, kindled by zeal, distended by the impetus of immoderation, break out even into the foulness of hateful contention. And while peace with a neighbour is cut off from the heart for an earthly thing, it appears plainly that the thing is loved more than the neighbour. For if we do not have the bowels of charity even towards the neighbour who robs us, we persecute ourselves worse than the robber himself, and lay ourselves waste more heavily than the other could; because, freely deserting the good of love, what we lose within is from ourselves, we who were losing from him only outward things. But the hypocrite does not know this form of charity, because, loving earthly things more than heavenly, he inflames himself in his inmost parts with monstrous hatred against him who plunders temporal goods."[12]

Notes

1. The apostle's prophecy: 2 Tim. 3:1, DR "in the last days shall come dangerous times" (Loserth's reference, 51.10); Wyclif paraphrases. *Tercio colligitur*: the third thing gathered from Gregory's conclusions (03-a). *In ista sentencia*: we take it as "in [support of] this teaching", the churchmen's claim that follows; it could be "in this sense". AB margin: *Tercia conclusio*; A: *Contra defensores iurium et consuetudinis humane gracia proprie avaricie et victorie* (51.8).
2. Gregory, *Moralia in Iob* 31.12 (§20), PL 76:584D, read this session. Gregory has *Cur ista vos agitis* and *defendendis patrimoniis insudare*; Wyclif adds *in* and *Christi*. The MSS read *ita agitis*; Loserth prints Gregory's *ista* (51.16); B *dicitur, cur certa*. *Prosequi*: to proceed at law, sue. AB margin: *Gregorius* (51.15); B: *Contra eos qui se dicunt contendere debere pro acquirendo bona ecclesie* (51.22); A: *Nota fucum* (51.23).
3. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 6 (Loserth: Opp. III/2, 330 ff.). We read tract. 6.25–26 (PL 35): Augustine there argues that possessions are held by human law, which the Donatists renounce; the claim Wyclif draws, that by leaving goods for Christ one has them, is not there in those words. Construal: *tam relinquens quam ecclesia ipsa habet* has a singular verb for the pair; *ipsa* is the goods. *Fucus*: "disguise", paint laid over the truth. B margin: *Augustinus* (51.25).
4. Job 39:16 (DR), the verse on the ostrich, Gregory's figure of the hypocrite, which he expounds here (PL 76:584D); Loserth also cites Augustine's *Annotationes in Iob* (51.26). Ps. 13:5, DR. Gregory goes on (PL 76:585A) with Matt. 5:40 and Luke 6:30 in his own wording, which Wyclif keeps: Vulgate *et ei qui vult tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam tollere, dimitte ei et pallium* (DR "And if a man will contend with thee in judgment, and take away thy coat, let go thy cloak also unto him"); *qui aufert quae tua sunt, ne repetas* (DR "of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again"). 1 Cor. 6:7, DR, without the opening *Iam quidem* ("Already indeed"), which Gregory has. B margin: *Contra contencionem sacerdotum* (52.3).
5. *Consilia ... precepta*: the evangelical counsels against the commandments. *In habitu*: in the religious habit. *Adhereres*, *fores*: past subjunctives, "you would". *Leni*: "gentle" (cf. Matt. 11:30). AB margin: *Triplex responsio* (52.16, the three replies Loserth's side-notes letter a, b, c); A: *Contra illos qui loquuntur contra consiliorum implecionem*.
6. *Verius* (52.18), "more truly": the plate's reading (the OCR had *venus*). The thought answers *ne ecclesia defraudetur*: goods left for Christ are held more truly, by the one who leaves them and by the church (51.25, n. 3).
7. Construal: *vis exponere te periculo dimittendo ... quam acceptando*: "you choose to expose yourself to danger by abandoning [the counsel] rather than by accepting it", the comparative carried by *quam*; the clause *Deus non posset ... deficere* is taken as concessive (cf. Matt. 6:33). It could be read as a question: "So would you rather expose yourself ...?" *Istud officium* (52.22) is the care of temporal goods, which falls to laymen; at 52.25 *istud officium* is the spiritual office. *Sicut fuit de contemplativis*: the church grew when those who cared for spiritual goods were many. A *provisione* for *promissione* (52.21). AB margin: *Gregorius*; A: *Paupertas cleri iuxta Christi concilia* (52.28).

8. Gregory, *Moralia* 31.13 (§21–22), PL 76:585C–D. Wyclif's "chapter 10" is the old division (Migne's *Vet. X*, at §20). Gregory: *Plus ergo Deo se amare*; *quae ejus sunt*; *Perdere namque hypocritae ea quae Dei sunt, id est animas hominum*; *conservant*; *quas non praecipitur possidere* (Wyclif *precipitur non possidere*); *levigati sumus*. Loserth corrects the MSS' *invenient* to *inveniant* (53.2–3). *Certum est quod non* and the last sentence are Wyclif's. *Racionabilibus ... insensibilia*: rational souls against goods that cannot feel. Luke 14:33 in Gregory's form (Vulgate *qui non renuntiat omnibus quae possidet*, DR "every one of you that doth not renounce all that he possesseth cannot be my disciple"). *Tardativum*: slowing the journey.
9. *Ne ipse peccet ... sed ut ipse habeat*: the first *ipse* is the unjust occupier, the second the hypocrite; *sed* adds his further motive, to have goods as the instruments of the virtues for the profit of "his mother", the church. *Pro prima parte* (53.21): Gregory's words answer the first part, love of the robber. AB margin: *Gregorius* (53.21).
10. Gregory, PL 76:586A, who has *dum eas rapiunt* and *conservata charitate*. *Sicut alias ostendi*: unidentified. *Inferioribus ecclesie*: we take "the lower members", the laity, to whom the care of temporal goods falls (52.22); B's margin reads *Licet inferioribus ecclesie contendere pro bonis ecclesie*. B *utrumque* for *utrimque* (53.27). AB margin: *Conclusio* (53.25).
11. Gregory, PL 76:586A: *Ista namque etiam non rapta*; *post perceptionem muneris* (Wyclif *finalis premii*); *non jam solum nobis ... sed ipsis etiam*: Wyclif lacks *solum*, so his *non ... sed eciam* reads "not for ourselves ... but also for them". *Et nunc ... etsi corrigi studeant*: *etsi*, as printed and as in Migne, is construed *et si*, "and, if", answering *et nunc*. *Metuere* with a dative: to fear for. A margin: *Raptor est a nobis plus amandus quam res arrepta per raptorem* (53.31).
12. Gregory, PL 76:586B, who has *solerter* and *impetus immoderatione*. The MSS read *pro habito* at 54.10; Loserth's *prohibicio* is Gregory's *prohibitio*, the restraint of robbers just named (*prohibendi*). AB *in inani* at the same line (its lemma is not clear from the apparatus). At 54.11 the MSS have *turpitudinis contencionem*; Loserth prints Gregory's order. A *inflammant* (54.22).
How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 51: *VI*[a]
  - 52: *accipitis*
  - 52: *ypocrite*
  - 52: *alios*
  - 52: *consilio* [NW]
  - 52: *fores*
  - 52: ∅ ('that' is side-note text (He says that))
  - 52: *solicitari* [NW]
  - 52: *salubrius* [NW]
  - 53: *amittere* (135c is the folio mark)
  - 53: *voraginem* (30 is the line number)
  - 54: *iam* (zoomed on leaf: dotted i, no crossbar = iam)
  - 54: *zelo* (italic z) [NW]
  - 54: *peius*
  - 53: *mundo*
- 52.18 *venus* → *verius*: OCR scar, read on plate n0089 and corrected in the Latin.
- 53.24 *iste* opens a sentence in lower case.

Part 3: Three corollaries on suits and the malice of priests; Thomas: Christ head of all men

Loserth pp. 54.23–58.16

¶1 54.23–58.16
55.8 *Litigation would be suppressed if the Pope asked rulers to withdraw the pay of those who neglected to minister.*
55.18 *The only needful rule being that men should be appointed for fitness and deposed if they deserve it.*
55.28 *Wickedness of priests troubles the Church.*

[54]Sciendum vero est quod sunt nonnulli quos caritatis gremio nutriens mater ecclesia tolerat, quousque ad spiritualis etatis incrementa perducat, qui nonnunquam et sanctitatis habitum tenent et perfeccionis meritum exequi non valent. Ad dona namque spiritualia minime assurgunt et idcirco hiis qui sibi coniuncti sunt ad tuenda ea que terrena sunt serviunt et nonnunquam in defensionis eiusdem iracundia excedunt. Et istos nomine religiosos declarat iste sanctus papa involvi duplici malicia, primo quia nedum infirmitate sed sciencia contra conscienciam suam peccant, secundo quia fingendo sanctitatem in defendendo [55]bona ecclesie pro facinore querunt laudes. Ex istis conclusionibus huius sancti demonstrabilibus

But it must be known that there are some whom mother church, nursing them in the lap of charity, tolerates until she brings them to the growth of spiritual age; who sometimes both hold the habit of sanctity and are not able to carry out the merit of perfection. For they hardly rise to spiritual gifts, and therefore serve those joined to them in protecting the things that are earthly, and sometimes go too far in the anger of that defence.[1] And these, religious in name, this holy pope declares to be entangled in a twofold malice: first, because they sin not only from infirmity but from knowledge, against their conscience; second, because, feigning sanctity in defending [55]the goods of the church, they seek praise for a crime.[2]

56.1 *'Trouble will not cease until we return to the primitive order.*
56.8 *St Paul prophesied of "lovers of themselves" who care for wealth and not for their priestly duty;*
56.16 *"corrupters of the word", who wrest it to defend lying; "having a seared conscience", who proclaim themselves members of the Church but bring forth no fruit.*
57.5 *Objection: Christ is said by St. Thomas to be the head of all men.*
57.14 *In one sense this Is true as to his deity*
57.20 *and as to his humanity.*
58.11 *But St. Thomas does not say that the whole human race is the mystical body of Christ, but the part that is predestinate.*

perpendere potest ecclesiasticus tam regularis quam secularis, si diligenter examinent conscienciam cum scriptura, palpando intencionem, volucionem et motus anime cum intencione supremi iudicis, quod non tam assidue contenderent pro vocatis bonis ecclesie. Patet secundo: Quomodo dominus papa non foveret sed extingueret lites huiusmodi secundum regulam evangelii: si enim committeretur regnis, provinciis et parrochiis examen vite clericorum, sic quod non ministrarentur eis stipendia subtracto sensibiliter eorum ministerio, viveretur superioribus prepositis tolerabilius et sacerdotibus cum populo melius quam est modo. Defectus autem patronorum et populi posset speculator superior facilius corrigere quam totum onus per se cum falsis testibus litem gignentibus supportare. Nec requiritur alia lex in distribuendo officia sacerdotum nisi cognicio a capite per testes probabiles, quod unus sit rector in ministerio sacerdotali, solicicior habiliorem preponere; de quo si non gauderet, depositus foret, ex ypocrisi ac cupiditate suspectus. Et patet tercio quod causa dissensionis et perturbacionis ecclesie sit malicia sacerdotum. Nam eorum virtuositas maxime pacificaret ecclesiam; ideo ex opposito eorum perversitas maxime perturbat ecclesiam, quia peccatum quod est per se causa perturbacionis ecclesie in ipsis est gravius. Dicunt enim contra fidem quod sunt viri sancte matris ecclesie, licet sint apostatantes partes diaboli, et per consequens, faciunt confusionem in fide, confusionem in sacramentis et subtraccionem spiritualis suffragii a Deo per ipsos instrumentaliter derivandi. [56]Unde confidenter prenostico quod ante correccionem nostram secundum statum primevum non deficiet regnorum perturbacio. Cum igitur apostolus raptus fuit usque ad tercium celum, videns longitudinem cursus ecclesie quoad tempus, latitudinem quoad numerum prelatorum et profunditatem quoad sensum quo clerici sunt in sensu domini profundati, verti non debet in dubium quin prophetavit iuxta exposicionem beati Gregorii de ecclesia in instante, vocans eos ypocritas se ipsos amantes, verbum domini adulterantes et cauterizatam conscienciam habentes (ut patet I.Timotei IV°, 2). Signum autem precipuum foret quod clericus ad modum loquendi apostoli se ipsum diligat, si propter affeccionem proprietatis temporalium dimissa cura presbyteri se ipsum sollicitat. Que enim posset esse maior adulteracio verbi domini quam intelligere ipsum ad sensum diaboli iuxta quem defendatur esse hereticum et blasfemum, ymo quod licet ex auctoritate eius committere leve mendacium? Aut quid posset esse magis periculosum cauterium quam clericum habere conscienciam adustam cupidine, quod cessans ab operibus reprehensibilibus in facie ecclesie propter candentem amorem quem

From these demonstrable conclusions of this saint a churchman, regular as well as secular, can weigh, if they diligently examine their conscience with scripture, feeling out intention, volition and the motions of the soul against the intention of the supreme judge, that they would not contend so assiduously for the so-called goods of the church. It is clear, second, how the lord pope would not foster but extinguish suits of this kind according to the rule of the gospel: for if the examination of the life of clerics were committed to kingdoms, provinces and parishes, so that stipends were not ministered to them when their ministry was perceptibly withdrawn, life would be more tolerable for the higher superiors, and better for priests with the people, than it is now.[3] And the failings of patrons and people a higher watchman could correct more easily than bear the whole burden by himself, with false witnesses begetting suits. Nor is any other law required in distributing the offices of priests than knowledge on the part of the head, through credible witnesses, that one man is [fit to be] rector in the priestly ministry, [the head being] the more careful to set the abler man over [others]; and if [the other] did not rejoice at this, he would be deposed, as suspected of hypocrisy and cupidity.[4] And it is clear, third, that the cause of the dissension and disturbance of the church is the malice of priests. For their virtue would most pacify the church; therefore, conversely, their perversity most disturbs the church, because the sin that is of itself the cause of the church's disturbance is graver in them. For they say, against the faith, that they are men of holy mother church, although they are apostatizing parts of the devil; and consequently they make confusion in faith, confusion in the sacraments, and a withdrawal of the spiritual suffrage that is to be derived from God instrumentally through them.[5] [56]Hence I confidently foretell that, before our correction according to the primitive state, the disturbance of kingdoms will not cease. Since, therefore, the apostle was caught up to the third heaven, seeing the length of the church's course as to time, the breadth as to the number of prelates, and the depth as to the sense in which clerics are sunk deep in the sense of the Lord, it ought not to be called into doubt that he prophesied, according to the exposition of blessed Gregory, of the church at the present instant, calling them hypocrites, lovers of themselves, adulterating the word of the Lord and having their conscience seared (as is clear from 1 Timothy 4:2).[6] And it would be a principal sign that a cleric loves himself, in the apostle's manner of speaking, if, for an affection of ownership of temporal goods, leaving aside the care of a presbyter, he busies himself about himself. For

habet ad temporalia, publicet et defendat sine fructuosis operibus se esse membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Licet enim talis evacuet cauterio suo fluxum viciorum sensibilem, verumptamen diabolus auctor fluxus talis superflui tantum disseminat per meatus ypocritarum absconditos per totum residuum corporis fluxum peccati lubrici, et sic ex simulata consuetudine factus heresiarcha habet [57] in capite, hoc est, in racione cauterium Antichristi. Nulli enim secundum beatum Gregorium, in Registro, secundo capitulo, periculosius vel amplius nocent in ecclesia sancti Dei. Sed redeundo ad difficultatem dimissam obicitur per sanctum Thomam de Christo, conclusione octava, articulo III°, ubi dicit quod Christus est caput omnium hominum, tam fidelium qui uniuntur sibi in actu per graciam, quam infidelium qui sunt solum in potencia eius membra, et post subdividit secundum predestinatos et prescitos qui recedentes ab hoc mundo totaliter desinunt esse membra Christi. Et probat hoc multiplici racione. Quantum ad hoc testimonium sancti Thome, videtur michi quod ipse equivocat vere dicendo quod Christus secundum deitatem est caput extrinsecum tocius humani generis; quod potest dici aggregative unum corpus naturale, cui eciam Christus benefacit sicut et toti mundo secundum humanitatem, cum virtute passionis Christi acquiritur quedam perfeccio secundaria toti mundo. Et sic secundum humanitatem benefacit toti humano generi, cum punit omnes dampnatos, vel ex infidelitate, ut eos qui non considerant in dominum Jesum Christum, vel ex desperacione qua dimissa debuerunt celestibus aspirare, vel tercio de iudicio temerario quo dimisso debuerunt domino Jesu Christo caritative finaliter adherere. Et sic intelligitur triplex causalis Christi Johannis XVI°, 8: Arguet mundum de peccato, de iusticia et [58] de iudicio. De peccato infidelitatis que autonomatice dicitur peccatum, quia non crediderunt in patrem neque in me; de iusticia quam debuerunt habuisse, aspirando cum mediis congruis ad patriam naturalem, quia ad patrem vado; et de iudicio quo temere arbitrantur dogma mundi atque diaboli ardencius diligendum, cum princeps mundi iudicatus est per Christum docentem oppositum. Et sic opposita fidei, spei et caritatis que corresponderent per ordinem trinitati dampnant prescitos in finali iudicio (ut alias diffuse exposui). Non enim vidi in sancto Thoma vel alio doctore probabili quod totum illud genus sed pars eius predestinata sit sancta mater ecclesia, sponsa Christi et universalis vel catholica ecclesia, corpus Christi misticum de quo scriptura loquitur. Et de tali est nobis sermo.

what greater adulteration of the word of the Lord could there be than to understand it in the devil's sense, according to which it is maintained to be heretical and blasphemous; indeed, that by its authority it is lawful to commit a light lie? Or what cautery could be more dangerous than for a cleric to have a conscience burnt by cupidity, so that, ceasing from works reprehensible in the face of the church, he, on account of the glowing love that he has for temporal goods, publishes and maintains, without fruitful works, that he is a member of holy mother church?[7] For although such a man by his cautery empties out the perceptible flux of vices, yet the devil, author of such superfluous flux, spreads all the more, through the hidden channels of hypocrites, through the whole remainder of the body, the flux of slippery sin; and so, made a heresiarch by feigned custom, he has [57] in the head, that is, in reason, the cautery of Antichrist. For none, according to blessed Gregory in the *Register*, second chapter, do harm more dangerously or more widely in the church of holy God.[8] But, returning to the difficulty left aside, it is objected, by appeal to St Thomas, *On Christ*, conclusion eight, article 3, where he says that "Christ is the head of all men, as much of the faithful, who are united to him in act through grace, as of unbelievers, who are only in potency his members"; and afterwards he subdivides according to the predestinate and the foreknown, who, departing from this world, wholly cease to be members of Christ. And he proves this by many an argument.[9] As to this testimony of St Thomas, it seems to me that he equivocates, saying truly that Christ according to the Godhead is the extrinsic head of the whole human race, which can be called aggregatively one natural body, to which Christ also does good, as also to the whole world, according to his humanity, since by virtue of Christ's passion a certain secondary perfection is acquired for the whole world. And so according to his humanity he does good to the whole human race, since he punishes all the damned: either for unbelief, as those who do not look to the Lord Jesus Christ; or for despair, which they ought to have put away and aspired to heavenly things; or, third, for rash judgment, which they ought to have put away and adhered finally, in charity, to the Lord Jesus Christ.[10] And so is understood Christ's threefold "because", John 16:8: "He will convince the world of sin and of justice and [58] of judgment." Of sin, the sin of unbelief, which by antonomasia is called sin: "because they believed not in the Father nor in me"; of justice, which they ought to have had, aspiring with fitting means to the natural homeland: "because I go to the Father"; and of judgment, by which they rashly judge that the dogma of the world and of the devil is to be loved

more ardently, since "the prince of the world is judged" by Christ, who teaches the opposite.[11] And so the opposites of faith, hope and charity, which would correspond in order to the Trinity, damn the foreknown at the final judgment (as I have set out at length elsewhere). For I have not seen in St Thomas, or in another approved doctor, that that whole race, but [only] its predestinate part, is holy mother church, the bride of Christ and the universal or catholic church, the mystical body of Christ of which scripture speaks. And it is of such [a church] that we are speaking.[12]

Notes

1. Gregory, *Moralia in Iob* 31.13 (§24), PL 76:586C, read this session, word for word but *quod sunt* for *quia sunt*. The MSS read *bona* at 54.27; the print agrees with Gregory's *ea* (*ad tuenda ea que terrena sunt*), which is presumably the place. B *primo nedum* for *primo quia nedum*; AB margin: *Conclusio* (54.32).
2. Gregory goes on to say that these men are *not* to be counted among the hypocrites, *quia aliud est infirmitate, aliud malitia peccare*, and sets against them those who know they act wickedly and swell with the name of sanctity (PL 76:586C–D). We take *istos nomine religiosos* as "these, religious in name [only]", Gregory's hypocrites, and the twofold malice as Wyclif's summary of that contrast; read with *istos* as the weak just described, Wyclif would be turning Gregory's distinction round. *Nomine*: plate. *Iste sanctus papa*: Gregory the Great. *Pro facinore querunt laudes*: Gregory's *de nomine sanctitatis intumescunt*.
3. *Viveretur* is Loserth's emendation of the MSS' *videretur* (55.12); B *regnis regnis* (55.10), *ministrentur* (55.11–12). *Vocatis bonis ecclesie*: "so-called", as *vocate ecclesie*, 62.7. *Examinent*: plural after the singular *ecclesiasticus*. *Subtracto ... ministerio*: the stipend stops when the ministry is perceptibly withheld. *Dominus papa*: "the lord pope", the courtesy title, as *dominus episcopus* (the glossary).
4. A hard construal: *quod unus sit rector in ministerio sacerdotali, solicicior habiliorem preponere*. We take *solicicior* with the head (the bishop), and *de quo si non gauderet* of the man passed over, who resents the abler man's preferment. Alternatively: "that one is a more diligent rector in the priestly ministry, [it being the head's part] to prefer the abler", with *gauderet* of a rector who takes no joy in his ministry. A *cognito a capite* (55.19); AB *recto in* (55.20); B *humiliorem* for *habiliorem* (55.21). *Speculator*: the watchman of Ezek. 3:17, the bishop. A margin: *De eleccione ad prelacias*; B: *Nota de eleccione in preposituram qua forma fiet* (55.19).
5. B *pacificari* (55.25). *Viri sancte matris ecclesie*: the churchmen's own claim (*viri* on the plate); against it Wyclif sets *apostatantes partes diaboli*. *Suffragii ... derivandi*: the spiritual aid that should flow from God through priests as instruments.
6. 2 Cor. 12:2 (the third heaven); length, breadth and depth from Eph. 3:18. *Se ipsos amantes*: 2 Tim. 3:2 (Loserth, 56.10); *adulterantes verbum Dei*: 2 Cor. 2:17 (Wyclif *domini*); *cauteriatam ... conscientiam*: 1 Tim. 4:2, the place Wyclif cites. *Exposicionem beati Gregorii*: Loserth refers to Gregory's exposition of the fifth penitential psalm (56.10), not found in the PL text of that exposition (PL 79:601D–630C). *Sensus domini*: cf. Rom. 11:34. *Profunditatem ... profundati*: we take it as stated; it may be ironic. *Confidenter*, *prenostico*: plate. A margin: *Nota bene* (56.1); B: *Qui dicunt se ipsos amare secundum apostolum* (56.8); A: *Verbum domini adulterantes et consciencia cauterizata*; B: *Adulteracio verbum (sic) dei nota. Nota habentes conscienciam cauteriatam (sic)* (56.10).
7. AA_1 *Aut quod* for *Aut quid* (56.19–20); AB *defendet*, corrected in A to *defendat* (56.24). *Iuxta quem defendatur esse hereticum et blasfemum*: by the devil's sense, scripture itself is maintained to be heretical and blasphemous (false in its letter); *ymo ... leve mendacium*: and a light lie is allowed on its authority. *Affeccionem proprietatis*: cf. *affeccio proprietaria* (the glossary). *Cessans ab operibus reprehensibilibus in facie ecclesie*: the cautery stops only open sins, as the next sentence explains.
8. The figure is surgical: a cautery stops the visible discharge while the matter spreads within. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 1.2: *Nemo quippe amplius in ecclesia nocet quam qui perverse agens nomen vel ordinem sanctitatis habet* (Loserth, 57.2; PL 77:16A), also in the *Decretum* D.83 c.2 (PL 187:400C; form ours); Wyclif paraphrases. Wyclif's *in Registro* names the work so. *Sancti Dei* is taken with *ecclesia*: "the church of holy God".
9. Aquinas, *ST* III q.8 a.3 (Wyclif's *conclusione octava, articulo III°*; Loserth: Opp., Venice 1774, V, 51). Loserth italicises *Christus est caput ... eius membra* as quotation. *Difficultatem dimissam*: the question set aside, whether Christ is head of all men; the place is not identified. A margin: *Contra dicta. Nota: In equivoco conceditur quod Christus est capud tam fidelium quam infidelium omnium*; B: *S. Thomas*; AB: *Obieccio* (57.5–6).
10. *Considerant* (57.23), as printed (plate n0094), hardly construes with *in dominum*: we translate "look to"; *crediderunt*, "believed in" (as at 58.2), is the likely sense. *Caput extrinsecum*: a head outside the body, not sharing its life. B *aggregare* for *aggregative* (57.16). *Qua dimissa debuerunt celestibus aspirare*: "which they ought to have put away and [so] aspired". AB margin: *Responsio* (57.13).
11. John 16:8, 16:10, DR; 16:11 in Wyclif's clause (Vulgate *princeps huius mundi iam iudicatus est*, DR "the prince of this world is already judged"); 16:9 Wyclif *quia non crediderunt in patrem neque in me*, Vulgate *quia non crediderunt in me* (cf. John 16:3). *Triplex causalis*: the three *quia* clauses. The MSS read *autonomastice*; Loserth prints *autonomatice* (58.1). AB margin: *Joh. XVI* (57.29).

12. ***Opposita fidei, spei et caritatis*: unbelief, despair and rash judgment, the three sins above. *Ut alias diffuse exposui*: unidentified. Construal: *quod totum illud genus sed pars eius predestinata sit*: "that that whole race, [and not rather] its predestinate part, is", rendered "rather than"; Loserth's side-note reads it so.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **54: *nomine***
  - **54: ∅ (pec-/cant is one word, already at pos 242 (peccant))**
  - **55: *bona* (135d is the folio mark)**
  - **55: *intencione* (final e slightly broken)**
  - **55: *viri***
  - **56: *deficiet***
  - **56: *Cum***
  - **56: *quid***
  - **57: *in* (136a is the folio mark)**
  - **57: *per***
  - **57: *III°***
  - **58: *Christi***
  - **56: *confidenter***
  - **56: *prenostico***
- **57.23 *considerant*: confirmed on the plate (n0094) as printed; a Latin doubt (n. 10).**

Part 4: Equivocation on church and head; three proofs that Christ is head of all; four senses of saving

Loserth pp. 58.17–60.10

¶1 58.17–60.4

59.3 Objectors give three proofs of their opinions: 1. St. Paul's words;

59.8 2, St. John's words;

59.10 3. All men are believers since all believe about God. All these arguments rest on a double use of language.

59.26 Four uses of the word to save:

59.27 I. To some salvation is offered but refused.

60.5 Others receive it but fall away. A third sort after falling away return. The fourth class receive and hold to it.

[58] **Non repugnat ergo equivocando vocare corpus diaboli ecclesiam Christi, ut posito quod una communitas nominetenus clericorum prescita credatur esse particularis ecclesia, licet committat peccata quantumcunque enormia. Tunc vulgus reputat eam esse ecclesiam, ymo quilibet eorum asserit quod propter ordinem est vir sancte matris ecclesie, racione cuius tituli excecat populum, in fide, officio et ypocrisi indubie menciendo, quia sic idem foret simul membrum Christi et membrum diaboli, ecclesia sanctorum et ecclesia malignancium. Tales enim dicit Thomas eciam membra ecclesie in potencia, licet nunquam reducantur ad actum. Ac si diceretur illud habet potenciam ex sufficiencia passionis Christi et potestate sui arbitrii esse membrum Christi, cum tamen nude sit membrum congregacionis habencium fidem informem, licet nunquam sit membrum corporis Christi mistici. Sed ne ego laborem in istis** [59] **equivocis, limitavi nomen ecclesie, ut signat sponsam Christi. Tres tamen evidencie fiunt ad probandum hanc sentenciam. Primo dictum apostoli I. Timothei IV°, 10 Salvator est omnium et maxime fidelium; secundo per illud I. Johannis, II° cap., Ipse propiciacio pro peccatis nostris, non autem pro nostris tantum est, sed eciam pro tocius mundi. Sed in quantum salvat et propiciatur hominibus, est caput eorum: ergo Christus est caput omnium hominum. Tercio per hoc quod omnes homines sunt fideles, quia habent fidem de Deo. Patet**

It is not repugnant, therefore, by equivocation, to call the body of the devil the church of Christ: as, supposing that one community of clerics in name only, foreknown, is believed to be a particular church, although it commits sins however enormous. Then the common people reckon it to be the church; indeed, each of them asserts that by reason of his order he is a man of holy mother church, by reason of which title he blinds the people, lying beyond doubt in faith, office and hypocrisy; for so the same [thing] would be at once a member of Christ and a member of the devil, the church of the saints and the church of the malignant.[1] For Thomas calls such men also members of the church in potency, although they are never brought to act. As if it were said: that [one] has the potency, from the sufficiency of Christ's passion and the power of his own choice, to be a member of Christ, while yet he is barely a member of the congregation of those who have unformed faith, although he is never a member of the mystical body of Christ.[2] But, lest I labour over these [59] **equivocal [senses], I have assigned the name church [to it] as it signifies the bride of Christ. Yet three pieces of evidence are brought to prove this teaching. First, the saying of the apostle, 1 Timothy 4:10: "He is the Saviour of all, especially of the faithful"; second, by that of 1 John, chapter 2: "He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those**

quod ista argumenta procedunt ex equivoco: nam concedi potest cum sancto Thoma quod Christus quoad esse naturale est caput eciam diaboli, et per consequens, caput membrorum suorum, non solum quoad esse naturale, sed eciam quia sunt fratres Christi quoad naturam specificam, quorum omnia peccata ad eorum dampnacionem et penam cedunt, sanctis vero ad gloriam. Et sic misericorditer punit fratres suos ad bonum eorum (ut alias declaravi). Loqui autem sic generaliter atque equivoce est preter propositum nostrum, quia loquimur de capite et membris unius hominis ex sponso et sponsa, de quo Joh. III°, 13 dicitur quod nemo ascendit in celum, nisi qui descendit de celo (ut Augustinus exponit, Joh. Omelia XII[a]). Et quantum ad dictum apostoli, dicitur communiter quod esse salvatorem vel salvare est equivocum ad quatuor: primo generaliter accipitur pro apponere medicinam ad infirmum cuius virtute egrotus sanari poterit, et isto modo salvavit Christus totum mundum humani generis, cum apposuit medicinam passionis, que suffecit redimere multos mundos. Istam autem [60] medicinam apposuit Christus vel obtulit humano generi, cuius septima pars nunquam suscepit eam, sicut semper infideles quos Christus dicit Joh. III°, 18, iam iudicatos, et illos dicit sanctus Thomas esse membra

of the whole world." Now, in so far as he saves men and is propitiation for them, he is their head: therefore Christ is the head of all men. Third, by this: that all men are faithful, because they have faith about God.[3] It is clear that these arguments proceed from equivocation: for it can be granted with St Thomas that Christ, as to natural being, is head even of the devil, and consequently head of his members, not only as to natural being, but also because they are brothers of Christ as to specific nature; all of whose sins turn to their damnation and punishment, but for the saints to glory. And so he punishes his brothers mercifully, for their good (as I have declared elsewhere).[4] But to speak so generally and equivocally is beside our purpose, because we are speaking of the head and members of one man [made] of bridegroom and bride, of which it is said in John 3:13 that "no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven" (as Augustine expounds, on John, homily 12).[5] And as to the saying of the apostle, the answer commonly given is that to be a saviour, or to save, is equivocal in four [ways]: first, it is taken generally for applying to the sick a medicine by whose virtue the sick man could be healed; and in this way Christ saved the whole world of the human race, since he applied the medicine of the passion, which sufficed to redeem many worlds. And this [60] medicine Christ applied or offered to the human race, a seventh part of which never received it, as always the unbelievers, whom Christ, John 3:18, calls "already judged"; and these St Thomas calls members of

¶2 60.5–60.10

[60] Christi in potencia, non in actu. Alii autem recipiunt medicinam sed finaliter recidivant, ut presciti. Tercii vero receperunt medicinam et post lapsum ad sanctam matrem ecclesiam revertuntur, ut peccatores predestinati. Quarti quippe sanantur virtute meriti Christi nec unquam post incidunt in mortale.

Christ in potency, not in act. And others receive the medicine but finally relapse, as the foreknown. But the third have received the medicine and after a fall return to holy mother church, as predestinate sinners. The fourth, indeed, are healed by virtue of Christ's merit and never afterwards fall into mortal [sin].[6]

Notes

1. ***Equivocando***: using the word in another sense. ***Nominetenus clericorum***: clerics in name only; ***prescita*** agrees with ***communitas***. ***Excecat***: the subject is each cleric. ***Ecclesia malignancium***: cf. Ps. 25:5 (Vulgate ***odivi ecclesiam malignantium***). B ***ecclesie Romane cuius*** at 58.23 (the words it replaces are not clear from the apparatus). A margin: ***Equivocando conceditur corpus diaboli esse ecclesiam Christi***; B: ***Ecclesia Christi nuncupative*** (58.16).
2. Aquinas, ***ST*** III q.8 a.3 co. and ad 1: those who are members in a potency never brought to act. ***Illud***: neuter, "that [one]", the foreknown cleric or community. ***Fides informis***: faith not formed by charity (the glossary); B ***formem*** (58.32). A margin: ***Presciti quomodo sunt in potencia membrum (sic) Christi secundum beatum Thomam***; B: ***Sanctus Thomas*** (58.27).
3. ***L*** (59.2) and ***M*** (59.26) were Loserth's alinea letters, since removed from the Latin. B ***literavi*** for ***limitavi*** (59.1). 1 Tim. 4:10, DR without "men" (Wyclif lacks ***hominum***); 1 John 2:2, DR; A ***nostris non tantum est*** (59.7); B ***per idem*** (59.6). The two texts are the ***sed contra*** of ***ST*** III q.8 a.3; the third proof is not. AB margin: ***Triplex obieccio*** (59.3); B: ***I. Tim. 4, I. Joh. 2*** (59.4).
4. That Thomas grants Christ to be head "even of the devil" as to natural being has not been traced: it is not in ***ST*** III q.8 (a.7 makes the devil head of the wicked) nor in ***In III Sent.*** d.13 q.2 (nearest, a.2 qc.2 ad 6: the wicked share with the members only natural life). ***Natura specifica***: the human species, which the devil's members share with Christ. ***Ut alias declaravi***: unidentified. A margin: ***Responsio*** (59.13); ***Nota*** (59.21).

5. John 3:13, DR. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 12.8–9, PL 35:1488–89, read this session: none ascends but he who descended, because Christ descended *ut in illo et cum illo unus essent*. *Unius hominis ex sponso et sponsa*: Christ and the church as one person. B margin: *Augustinus* (59.25).
6. The four senses of *salvare* (59.26) are four sorts of men offered the medicine; Wyclif numbers only the first and then *alii ... tercii ... quarti*. *Septima pars* (60.1), as printed: the fraction is not explained. John 3:18, DR "is already judged". *Mortale*: mortal [sin]. AB margin: *Salvacio triplex* (59.25), against Wyclif's four; A: *Christus salvavit totum mundum quoad sufficienciam* (59.29); B: *Joh. III* (60.3).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 59: *apostoli* [NW]
  - 59: *I* (print 'I. Timothei')
  - 59: *Timothei IV°* (token spans two printed words 'Timothei IV°,')
  - 59: *10* ('their' is side-note text; print '10:')
  - 59: *Thoma quod* (token spans two printed words)
  - 59: *Christus*
  - 59: *III°*
  - 59: *13* (print has verse number '13,' here (Joh. III°, 13))
  - 59: *XII^{a}*
  - 60: *Christus*
  - 60: *Christus*
  - 60: *18*
  - 60: *iudicatos*
  - 60: *membra* (print has membra at start of line 5 before Christi)
  - 60: *finaliter*
  - 60: *humano* (136 folio mark glued)
  - 060: ∅ ('ercii' is inside neighbour 45 (print Tercii; neighbour reads Tercn)) [DELX]
  - 60: ∅ (Tercii printed whole; scan split i|ercn)
  - 60: *Tercii* (print: Tercii vero (agent 13))
- Corrected in the Latin: *L* (59.2) and *M* (59.26), Loserth's alinea letters; 59.11 *quod.* (stray point).

Part 5: The second and third objections answered: the church's digestion, and unformed faith

Loserth pp. 60.11–64.10

¶1 60.11–63.21

60.11 *Christ is specially the saviour of the third and fourth class.*
60.16 *Answer to the second objection: Christ is a Sufficient propitiation for all men, who have naturally free will and may avail themselves of it;*
60.26 *but they need a second birth in Christ,*
61.2 *which those have not who are in the Church but not of it.*
61.14 *These the Church cannot digest,*
62.4 *since they want the warmth of charity.*
63.4 *Three classes who are not members of the*

[60] Et sic vere dicit apostolus quod Christus est salvator maxime fidelium in tercio et quarto gradu, et intelligunt quidam dictum apostoli I ad Thimoteum II°, 4, directe ad litteram, quod Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri. Ad secundum obiectum ex dicto beati Johannis est eadem sentencia. Christus enim est quoad sufficienciam propiciacio, hoc est, medicus vel medicina propiciativa tocius humani generis, quod habet ultra diabolum post ruinam angelorum libertatem arbitrii, ut salvetur, cum totum genus humanum sit homo quidam qui descendendo ab Jerusalem in Jericho incidit in latrones; qui relictus secundum totum semivivus ex gracia Samaritani habuit medicinam dispositam et ministros mercede et instruccione duplicis testamenti provide dispensantes, secundum quam totus ille homo sanari poterit. Sed preter illum hominem naturalem oportet secundum Adam generare spiritualiter unam generacionem priori permixtam que est sancta mater ecclesia. Et in illo corpore sunt aliqui

And so the apostle says truly that Christ is the saviour especially of the faithful in the third and fourth degree; and some understand the saying of the apostle, 1 Timothy 2:4, directly according to the letter, that God "will have all men to be saved".[1] To the second objection, from the saying of blessed John, the teaching is the same. For Christ is, as to sufficiency, the propitiation, that is, the physician or propitiatory medicine, of the whole human race, which has, beyond the devil, after the fall of the angels, freedom of choice, so that it may be saved; since the whole human race is "a certain man" who, going down "from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among robbers"; who, left half dead in his whole [being], had by the grace of the Samaritan medicine prepared, and ministers providently dispensing it with the wages and instruction of the twofold testament, according to which that whole man could be healed.[2] But besides that natural man, the second Adam must spiritually beget one generation mingled with

Church 1. Infidels 2. Priests who make profession for the sake of wealth. 3. Those who have tasted of divine grace but lack final perseverance. 63.22 All men are not believers in the Scripture sense.

vere membra ut predestinati, quarte digestioni assimilati, sive sint ad tempus discrasiati ut lapsi, sive [61]solide post primam sanacionem in sanitate perpetua stabiliti. Illi autem qui sunt intra dictam ecclesiam non ut partes, sunt in gradu duplici, ut quidam in sua infidelitati perpetuo permanentes qui nunquam receperunt caritatem vel graciam. Et hii sunt tamquam aer aut ventus in homine, in quem nunquam egit suus calor naturalis. Hii autem sive commixti sint localiter sive solum in genere humano, prosunt ad refrigerium sancte matris ecclesie. Hii autem sunt tamquam superfluitates cibi sponsi ecclesie qui spiritualiter digerit predestinatos et demum assimilat. Et iste est cibus de quo loquitur Christus Johannis IV°, 32: Ego cibum habeo manducare quem vos nescitis. Unde superflua illius cibi sunt infecta duplici, ut aliqui sunt in stomacho sancte matris ecclesie recepti per graciam secundum presentem iusticiam, sed ex eorum ypocrisi vel heresi non sunt propter abhominacionem caritatis operantis digesti, sed in hac vita sensibiliter evomendi; de quibus loquitur spiritus sanctus Apocalypsis III°, 16: Neque calidus es neque frigidus, ideo incipiam te evomere de ore meo. Tales autem sunt sive clerici sive laici pretendentes se operari ad edificacionem sancte matris ecclesie quidquid agunt, sed tamen quia habent intenciones frigidas temporalium propter quas principaliter agunt, ideo sunt ypocrite Deo abhominabiles ut aqua tepida que provocat ad vomitum. Et hii sunt Deo maxime abhominabiles racione falsitatis in duplicitate latentis que opponitur veritati. Unde sicut iuxta Aristotelem primo Metyororum VI° cap. [62]aqua sic calida cicius congelatur propter exalaciones frigidas quas pori caloris recipiunt: sic pretendentes sanctitatem huiusmodi sunt periculosissimi hostes ecclesie, per quos ut proditorie aperientes portas ecclesie subintrant frigidi fide et virtutibus; qui plus quam inter fideles extinguunt caritatem vocate ecclesie et congelant. Debet, inquam, ecclesia fervere pura caritate ex simplici participacione Christi qui est ignis per se calidus caritate, et matrem omnium malorum cupiditatem postponere, et per consequens, non adinvenciones lucrativas plus quam legem Dei diligere. Sunt autem intra ecclesiam alii presciti magis absconditi, evadentes evomicionem huiusmodi, ut hii tamquam superfluitas sicca digestionis prime, hii tamquam superfluitas humida digestionis secunde, et hii ut apostemata vel vermes digestionis tercie. Et patet quod non sequitur: Si quicunque viantes sunt in ecclesia, tunc sunt de ecclesia, sed econtra. Nam scimus zizania crescere inter frumenta, corvum pasci in eadem area cum columba et paleam inorreari pro tempore inter grana, et tamen est incommunicans distinccio inter ista, sicut exemplatum est in corpore humano. Ita

the former, which is holy mother church. And in that body some are truly members, as the predestinate, assimilated in the fourth digestion, whether they are for a time distempered, as the lapsed, or [61]firmly established in perpetual health after the first healing.[3] And those who are within the said church not as parts are in a twofold degree: as some remaining perpetually in their unbelief, who never received charity or grace. And these are like air or wind in a man, on which his natural heat never acted. And these, whether they are mingled [with the church] in place or only in the human race, serve for the cooling of holy mother church. And these [others] are like the superfluities of the food of the church's bridegroom, who spiritually digests the predestinate and at last assimilates [them]. And this is the food of which Christ speaks, John 4:32: "I have meat to eat which you know not."[4] Hence the superfluities of that food are tainted in two ways: as some are received into the stomach of holy mother church through grace, according to present justice, but because of their hypocrisy or heresy are not digested, on account of the abhorrence of working charity, but are to be perceptibly vomited up in this life; of whom the Holy Spirit speaks, Apocalypse 3:16: "Thou art neither hot nor cold; therefore I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth."[5] And such are, whether clerics or laymen, those who make a show of working for the edification of holy mother church in whatever they do, but yet, because they have cold intentions of temporal goods, for which they principally act, are therefore hypocrites abominable to God, like lukewarm water that provokes to vomiting. And these are most abominable to God by reason of the falsehood lurking in duplicity, which is opposed to truth. Hence, just as, according to Aristotle, *Meteorologica* 1, chapter 6, [62]water thus heated freezes more quickly because of the cold exhalations which the pores of heat receive, so those who make a show of sanctity of this kind are the most dangerous enemies of the church; through whom, as through men treacherously opening the gates of the church, those cold in faith and virtues creep in; who, more than [happens] among the faithful, extinguish and freeze the charity of the so-called church.[6] The church, I say, ought to glow with pure charity from simple participation in Christ, who is a fire hot of itself with charity, and to put after [it] cupidity, the mother of all evils, and consequently not to love lucrative inventions more than God's law. And there are within the church other foreknown, more hidden, escaping such vomiting: some like the dry superfluity of the first digestion, some like the moist superfluity of the second digestion, and some like abscesses or worms of the third

ymaginari debemus de sancta matre ecclesia, et sic intelligendus est textus I. Joh. II°, 18, cum dicitur: Nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt; ex nobis prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis, nam si fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum. Sicut enim superfluitas procedit ex cibo et membris solidis, dum tamen non sit ex eis, sic purgamenta ecclesie procedunt ex ea, non tamen erant ex ea ut partes, cum nulla pars eius potest ab ea excidere. Unde ad discernendum distinccionem puri et superfluorum huiusmodi dicit beatus Johannes epistola secunda canonica: Omnis, inquit, qui recedit et non permanet in doctrina Christi, Deum [63] non habet. Doctrina autem Christi sunt humilitas, caritas et paupertas. Quicunque ergo oderit ista, non imitando Christum ut aquila, scito quod non sit de sua ecclesia. Et sic tres gentes excluduntur a membris ecclesie qui omnino peccant in fide scilicet omnino infideles ut pagani; heretici ut sacerdotes et pharisei cum eis similibus qui nunquam gustaverunt dulcedinem spei beatitudinis ex imitacione sapiencie incarnate, sed resident facietenus in ecclesia gracia affeccionis primatuum temporalium et carnalium voluptatum; tercii vero qui gustaverunt paululum digestionis divine, sed propter defectum caritatis perfecte aut finalis perseverancie excidunt tamquam inhabilia, ut formaliter induant caput Christum; et hii peccant in trinitatem et tres virtutes catholicas (ut dixi superius). Omnes autem tales, dicit Augustinus, non esse de membris ecclesie, sicut in corpore hominis naturali nemo dicit proporcionalia esse membra. Sanctus autem Thomas videtur loqui generaliter, equivocando de membro, scilicet de membro temporaliter vivo et de membro omnino mortuo putativo.

digestion.[7] And it is clear that this does not follow: "If any [persons] on the road are in the church, then they are of the church"; but the converse [does]. For we know that cockle grows among the wheat, that the raven feeds on the same threshing-floor as the dove, and that chaff is laid up in the barn for a time among the grain; and yet there is an incommunicable distinction between these, as has been exemplified in the human body. So we must imagine of holy mother church; and so is to be understood the text of 1 John 2:18, where it is said: "Even now there are become many Antichrists. They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us."[8] For just as superfluity proceeds from the food and from the solid members, while yet it is not of them, so the purgings of the church proceed from her, yet they were not of her as parts, since no part of her can fall away from her. Hence, to discern the distinction between the pure and such superfluities, blessed John says in the second canonical epistle: "Whosoever," he says, "revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ hath [63] not God." Now the doctrine of Christ is humility, charity and poverty. Whoever, therefore, hates these, not imitating Christ as an eagle [does], know that he is not of his church.[9] And so three peoples are excluded from the members of the church, who sin wholly in faith: namely, the wholly unbelieving, as pagans; heretics, as priests and Pharisees with those like them, who never tasted the sweetness of the hope of blessedness from the imitation of incarnate wisdom, but sit in the church in outward face for the sake of an affection for temporal primacies and carnal pleasures; and, third, those who have tasted a little of the divine digestion, but, for want of perfect charity or of final perseverance, fall away as unqualified to put on formally Christ the head; and these sin against the Trinity and the three catholic virtues (as I said above).[10] And all such, Augustine says, are not of the members of the church, just as in the natural body of a man no one says that the proportionals are members. But St Thomas seems to speak generally, equivocating on "member": namely, of a member alive for a time and of a member wholly dead, a putative one.[11]

¶2 63.22–64.10

[63] Ad tercium negatur ad sensum scripture quod omnes homines sunt fideles. Conceditur tamen cum Damasceno quod omnis homo habet fidem saltem informem cum naturaliter prima impressione entis cognoscit saltem confuse primo omnium Deum esse et omnem articulum fidei. Sed ista fides informis non sufficit denominare hominem fidelem vel partem ecclesie, sed oportet excludere omnem

To the third, it is denied, in the sense of scripture, that all men are faithful. Yet it is granted with Damascene that every man has faith, at least unformed, since naturally, by the first impression of being, he knows, at least indistinctly, first of all, that God is, and every article of faith.[12] But this unformed faith does not suffice to name a man faithful, or a part of the church; but all final unbelief must be excluded. And of such

infidelitatem finalem. Et de tali fideli loquitur Christus Johannis X° 28, promittens, ut omnis qui credit in filium non pereat, supple morte perpetua; ille autem credit in [64] filium qui credendo ipsum inheret sibi finaliter per amorem. Unde quia de tali finali inherencia est nobis dubium, ideo docet Augustinus super Johannem, Omelia XII[a], quomodo membrum ecclesie est Deo et cui ipse voluerit revelare satis cognitum. Novit, inquit, dominus qui sunt eius, novit qui permaneant ad coronam, qui permaneant ad flammam, novit in area sua triticum, novit paleam, novit segetem, novit zizania. Ceteris autem est illud incognitum qui sunt columbe et qui corvi.

a faithful man Christ speaks, John 10:28, promising that everyone who believes in the Son may not perish (supply: by everlasting death); now he believes in [64] the Son who, by believing him, adheres to him finally through love.[13] Hence, since about such final adherence we are in doubt, Augustine on John, homily 12, teaches how a member of the church is well enough known to God, and to whom he wishes to reveal [it]. "The Lord knoweth," he says, "who are his; he knows who will remain for the crown, who will remain for the flame; he knows in his threshing-floor the wheat, he knows the chaff; he knows the crop, he knows the cockle." But to the rest it is unknown who are doves and who ravens.[14]

Notes

1. ***the*** (60.16, before ***Ad secundum***), a word of Loserth's English side-note ("Answer to the second objection"), has been removed from the Latin. ***Sal- vator*** is one word broken at the line. ***In tercio et quarto gradu***: the third and fourth sorts of 60.5–10 (03-d). 1 Tim. 2:4, DR "will have all men to be saved"; Wyclif ***quod Deus vult …***, Vulgate ***qui omnes homines vult salvos fieri***. ***Directe ad litteram***: of God's effective will for all, against "as to sufficiency". B margin: ***Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri*** (60.14).
2. Luke 10:30, DR in part. The two pence of Luke 10:35 are read as the twofold testament. ***Ultra diabolum***: unlike the devil, who after the angels' fall has no freedom to be saved; B margin: ***Humanum genus ultra diabolum habet libertatem arbitrii*** (60.18). ***Libertatem arbitrii***: freedom of choice, cf. ***liberum arbitrium*** (the glossary). ***Secundum totum***: as a whole.
3. ***Secundum Adam***: Christ, the second Adam (1 Cor. 15:45–47), subject of ***generare***. The four digestions of medieval physiology: the fourth is assimilation into the members; B's margin sends the reader back to chapter 1 (***Quadruplex digestio prius habetur cap. primo huius tractatus***, 60.32). ***Discrasiati***: ill-tempered in their humours; B ***distrahati*** (60.32).
4. A margin: ***Dupliciter est homo in ecclesia. Ib.: Dupliciter dicitur non pars in ecclesia. Nota quomodo presciti sunt in ecclesia*** (61.3); ***Alia subdivisio*** (61.12). ***In sua infidelitati***, as printed, for ***infidelitate***. The third ***Hii autem*** (61.11) is taken to open the second degree, the superfluities of food, as A's ***Alia subdivisio*** suggests; it could continue the first. B ***dirigit*** for ***digerit*** (61.11). John 4:32, DR.
5. Rev. 3:16 in Wyclif's wording: Vulgate 3:15–16 ***neque frigidus es neque calidus … sed quia tepidus es … incipiam te evomere ex ore meo*** (DR "I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth"). ***Infecta duplici***, as printed, is construed "tainted in two ways": those vomited up here, and the hidden foreknown of 62.9. ***Propter abhominacionem caritatis operantis***: because charity at work abhors them.
6. Aristotle, ***Meteorologica*** 1.12, 348b (Bekker p. 348, Loserth's reference; Wyclif's "chapter 6"): water previously heated freezes faster. A margin: ***Aristoteles***; B: ***Quare aqua tepida cicius congelatur quam frigida secundum Aristotelem*** (61.29); A: ***Contra avariciam cleri et aliorum*** (61.22). ***Vocate ecclesie***: the so-called church. ***Plus quam inter fideles***: obscure; perhaps "more than [the cold do] among [open] believers".
7. ***Matrem omnium malorum cupiditatem***: 1 Tim. 6:10, where the Vulgate has ***radix*** (DR "the desire of money is the root of all evils"); Wyclif "mother". ***Postponere***: put after. AB margin at 62.15: ***Avari, lubrici, cupidi. Correlarium***, naming the three hidden sorts.
8. ***Ita*** (62.23) is Loserth's: the MSS lack it; he compares Hus, ***Opp.*** I, 199b, where the passage is reused (cf. Hus, ***De eccl.***). ***Viantes***: those on the road (the glossary); being ***in*** the church does not entail being ***of*** it, though the converse holds. ***Incommunicans distinccio***: a distinction in which they share nothing. 1 John 2:18–19, DR, Wyclif citing 2:18; ***zizania*** from Matt. 13:25–30. A margin: ***Nota*** (62.18, 62.24).
9. 2 John 9, DR. ***Ut aquila***: as printed; the eagle that follows (cf. Matt. 24:28, Deut. 32:11) is not explained. ***Scito***: imperative, "know". ***Nulla pars eius potest ab ea excidere***: the predestinate do not finally fall away.
10. B lacks ***spei*** (63.7); B ***sapiencie in caritate*** (63.8). B margin: ***Ecce qui non sunt membra ecclesie*** (63.5). ***Sacerdotes et pharisei***: the priests and Pharisees of the gospel, with those like them now. ***Primatuum temporalium***: precedence in temporal things. ***Inhabilia***, neuter plural, "as unqualified things". ***Ut dixi superius***: 58.6–9 (03-c).
11. The Augustine is not identified; AB margin: ***Augustinus*** (63.16). ***Proporcionalia***, as printed: perhaps the humours, proportioned to the body but not members; a doubt. ***Membro … putativo***: a reputed member.
12. John Damascene, ***De fide orthodoxa*** (Loserth: book 4, chapter 11; 63.24). The MSS read ***vel informem*** (63.25); Loserth prints ***saltem informem***. ***Prima impressione entis***: being as the first concept impressed on the mind (the Avicennian formula); ***ens*** here is the concept, not "a being". AB margin: ***Damascenus*** (63.24); A: ***Nota fidem predestinatorum et prescitorum*** (63.22).
13. Wyclif cites John 10:28 (***non peribunt in eternum***); his words follow John 3:16, DR "that whosoever believeth in him may not perish", with ***filium*** for ***eum***. ***Credit in filium … per amorem***: Augustine's distinction of ***credere in***, believing by loving: ***Credendo amare, credendo diligere*** (***In Ioh. tr.*** 29.6, PL 35:1631). B margin: ***Quis credit in filium*** (64.1).
14. Augustine, ***In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*** 12.12 (PL 35), read this session, word for word; ***Novit dominus qui sunt eius***: 2 Tim. 2:19, DR "the Lord knoweth who are his". The last sentence is Wyclif's. AB margin: ***Augustinus***; A: ***De salvandis et dampnandis prescitis et predestinatis*** (64.11).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 60: *sal-* (first half of sal-/vator hyphenated across line (vator is pos 82); N is the alinea letter)
  - 60: *vator* (second half of sal-/vator (italic))
  - 60: *maxime*
  - 60: *fidelium*
  - 60: *in*
  - 60: *et* (trailing 1 is the margin number) [NW]
  - 60: *intelligunt*
  - 60: *II°*
  - 60: *Christus*
  - 61: *graciam* (136d is the folio mark)
  - 61: *III°*
  - 61: *16*
  - 61: *Metyororum VI°* (token spans two printed words 'Metyororum VI°')
  - 62: *exalaciones* (print has exalaciones; 136d is the folio mark) [NW]
  - 62: *II°*
  - 64: *XII^{a}*
  - 61: *solide* (alinea N and 136c folio mark glued)
  - 63: *non* (136d folio mark glued; italic non)
- Corrected in the Latin: 60.16 *the* (side-note text); 60.11 *sal- vator* (one word); 62.21 *eis,.* (stray point).

Part 6: The dove, figure of the Holy Spirit and of the one church

Loserth pp. 64.11–66.2

¶1 64.11–66.2
64.11 *Why the dove is a symbol of the Holy Spirit.*
65.4 *The dove is also a type of the Church.*
65.19 *How the Holy Spirit acts through the creature.*

[64]Unde Augustinus super Joh. Omelia VIa, exponens illud Johannis primo: Vidi spiritum descendentem quasi columbam de celo et manentem super eum, notat primo quomodo descensus columbe signat mistice spiritum sanctum, quia columba habet gemitum amorosum pro cantu. Spiritus autem sanctus secundum apostolum Romanorum VIII°, 26, postulat pro nobis gemitibus inenarrabilibus. Secundo quia columba sine felle vel laceracione unguium communicat pacis seculum, et tercio quia pascitur puris granis, econtra de corvis et minutis avibus que pascuntur carnibus vel muscas capiunt ut pascantur. Et propter istam similitudinem ad proprietates spiritus sancti precepit Christus suis apostolis Matthei X°, 16, quod sint simplices ut columbe. Secundo notat Augustinus quod descensus singularis columbe super Christum cum voce patris docuit Baptistam quod Christus capitaliter baptizat in spiritu sancto primo cuius principii est unitas in baptismo, qui non suscipit magis et minus secundum merita baptizantum, [65]eo quod Christus non potuit communicare hanc primiciam potestatis suis discipulis. Tercio notat quomodo columba ad sensum allegoricum signat matrem ecclesiam que est una (ut dicitur Canticorum, V° capitulo, de columba). Unde sicut in diluvio columba egressa de archa reversa est, deferens ramum virentis olive, corvo pretextu affectus cadaveris extincto diluvio,

Hence Augustine on John, homily 6, expounding that [text] of John 1[:32], "I saw the Spirit coming down, as a dove from heaven, and remaining upon him," notes, first, how the descent of the dove mystically signifies the Holy Spirit: because the dove has a loving moan for its song. And the Holy Spirit, according to the apostle, Romans 8:26, "asketh for us with unspeakable groanings."[1] Second, because the dove, without gall and without tearing with its claws, communicates the age [?] of peace; and third, because it feeds on clean grains, the contrary [being true] of ravens and small birds, which feed on flesh or catch flies to feed themselves.[2] And because of this likeness to the properties of the Holy Spirit, Christ commanded his apostles, Matthew 10:16, that they be "simple as doves." Second, Augustine notes that the descent of a single dove upon Christ, with the voice of the Father, taught the Baptist that Christ baptizes as head in the Holy Spirit, as first [principle], of which principle is the unity in baptism, which does not admit more and less according to the merits of those who baptize, [65]because Christ could not communicate this first-fruit of power to his disciples.[3] Third, he notes how the dove, in the allegorical sense, signifies mother church, which is one (as is said in the Canticle, chapter 5, of the dove). Hence, just as in the

sic in sancta matre ecclesia hii exeunt ad tempus et penitencia ducti redeunt, non solum cum verborum foliis, sed fructu bonorum operum, et omnino cum oleo caritatis que supereminenter super alia carismata instar olei supernatat. Ideo signanter dicit apostolus Iª Cor. XII°, 31: Adhuc eminenciorem viam demonstrabo vobis. Presciti autem exeunt de archa ut corvi, sed propter amorem temporalium pro quibus instanter placitant demerguntur. Quarto notari potest secundum logicam scripture quomodo spiritus sanctus movetur, cum descendit et postulat gemitibus inexplicabilibus et mane consurgit ad instruendum ecclesiam (ut dicitur Isaie VII°). Sed hoc non facit in natura propria, sed in creatura quam assumit, non ypostatice, sed singulariter ad sui noticiam et caritatis officium peragendum, nec solum in simplicitate columbina apparuit, sed in linguis igneis dispertitis ad docendum quod nedum debemus esse simplices, sed in operibus eciam caritatis ferventes, ut, sicut superbia divisit linguas in sensu, non in loco, tempore edificacionis turris Babel, Genesis XI°, sic econtra humilitas spiritus sancti congreget linguas uniformes quoad sensum, quantumlibet dispares quoad locum. Quinto colligitur ex dictis beati Augustini quod solum illi salvantur ut partes matris ecclesie qui proprietatem deserentes [66] querunt finaliter res communes ecclesie que sunt capitaliter domini Jesu Christi.

flood the dove that went out of the ark returned, carrying a branch of green olive, while the raven, on the pretext of its craving for a carcass, was destroyed by the flood, so in holy mother church these go out for a time and, led by penance, return, not only with the leaves of words but with the fruit of good works, and above all with the oil of charity, which floats above the other gifts preeminently, as oil does.[4] Therefore the apostle says pointedly, 1 Corinthians 12:31: "Yet I will shew you a more eminent way." But the foreknown go out of the ark like ravens, but because of the love of temporal goods, for which they plead insistently, they are drowned.[5] Fourth, it can be noted according to the logic of scripture how the Holy Spirit is moved, since he comes down, and asks with inexpressible groanings, and rises early to instruct the church (as is said in Isaiah 7). But he does not do this in his own nature, but in the creature which he assumes, not hypostatically, but singularly, to make himself known and to carry out the office of charity; nor did he appear only in dovelike simplicity, but in parted tongues of fire, to teach that we ought not only to be simple but also fervent in works of charity: so that, just as pride divided tongues in sense, not in place, at the time of the building of the tower of Babel, Genesis 11, so, on the contrary, the humility of the Holy Spirit may gather tongues uniform as to sense, however disparate as to place.[6] Fifth, it is gathered from the sayings of blessed Augustine that only those are saved as parts of mother church who, forsaking property, [66] seek finally the common things of the church, which are the Lord Jesus Christ's as chief [lord].[7]

Notes

1. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 6 (Wyclif "homily 6"; Loserth: John 1:32, cf. Aug. *Opp.* III/2, 330); the dove's kisses at 6.4, PL 35:1427; the power of baptism at 5.7, PL 35:1417. John 1:32, DR, with Wyclif's *manentem* for the Vulgate's *et mansit* ("and he remained"). Rom. 8:26, DR. *Gemitum amorosum pro cantu*: the dove's moan in place of song. B margin: *Nota quare columbe descensus signat spiritum sanctum ... Nota proprietates columbe* (64.16).
2. *Communicat pacis seculum*, as printed (64.c19), (plate: clearly *s*) construes only loosely: "communicates the age (or world) of peace". Augustine has *oscula columbarum ... vera pax* (*tr.* 6.4, PL 35:1427), so *osculum* ("the kiss of peace") may be the sense; no MS reads it, and we translate the print. *Econtra de corvis*: supply "it is".
3. *Primo cuius principii est unitas in baptismo*: construed "as first [principle], of which principle is the unity in baptism"; *primo* might instead be adverbial ("first"). The point is Augustine's against the Donatists: baptism is Christ's, and its worth does not vary with the minister's merit. Augustine says the Lord *could* have given this power to his servants but would not (*potuit ... et noluit*, *tr.* 5.7, PL 35:1417); Wyclif writes *non potuit*, "could not", which we translate as printed. *Baptizantum* for *baptizantium*.
4. Song 6:8, "One is my dove" (*una est columba mea*); Wyclif "chapter 5" (cf. 5:2, *columba mea*). Gen. 8:7–11 told freely: the dove returns with *ramum olivae virentibus foliis* (8:11); the raven "did not return" (8:7). *Corvo ... extincto diluvio*: construed as ablative absolute with *diluvio* instrumental, "the raven ... destroyed by the flood" (cf. *demerguntur* below); possibly "when the flood had abated". *Matrem ecclesiam*: the church as mother, not *matrix ecclesia* (the glossary).
5. 1 Cor. 12:31 in Wyclif's wording (*eminenciorem ... demonstrabo*); Vulgate *excellentiorem viam vobis demonstro*, DR "And I shew unto you yet a more excellent way". B margin: *1 Cor. 12* (65.13). *Placitant*: plead at law, litigate. *Presciti*: those God foreknows will be damned (explained at the first occurrence in the work).
6. *Isaie VII°* (65.20): so the MSS; Loserth: "rightly Jer. 7:13", DR "rising up early, and speaking". *Inexplicabilibus*: Wyclif's variation on Rom. 8:26 *inenarrabilibus*. Acts 2:3, "parted tongues, as it were of fire"; Gen. 11:7–9. *Congreget* (65.29) is Loserth's; the MSS *congregat*, "gathers" (same sense). A margin: *Quomodo spiritus sanctus movetur* (65.17); *Spiritus sanctus per diversa significatur et quare, ut per columbam, per ignem etc.* (65.2).

7. ***Capitaliter*: "as chief [lord]", the feudal sense of *capitalis dominus* (the glossary); the goods are common because they are held of Christ. The "sayings of Augustine" are the same tractate, 6.2: the ravens *sua quaerunt*, the doves *ea quae Christi sunt quaerunt* (Phil. 2:21; PL 35:1426); Wyclif paraphrases. AB margin: *Conclusio*; A: *De capite ecclesie* (66.1).**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **64: *illud***
  - **64: *amorosum* [NW]**
  - **64: *Christus***
  - **65: ∅ (nothing between Christus and non; these words are the last line of p.64 (already in p.64))**
  - **65: *Iª***
  - **65: *3* (first digit of '31:'; the pivot splits it (pos 94 = '1:'))**
  - **65: *placitant* (leading 4 is the margin number)**
  - **66: *sunt* (137c is the folio mark)**
  - **65: *XI°,* (no verse; boxed edge mark is the s of sic) [-VERSE]**
- **Corrected in the Latin: 64.11 stray *j*; 65.13 *3 1* (31). 64.20 *seculum*: the print (plate), translated (n. 2).**

Part 7: No one may claim the obedience of all as head; the bride and the hireling

Loserth pp. 66.3–69.3

¶1 66.3–69.3

66.3 *It is dangerous for any one to claim the obedience of all Christians.*
67.11 *Thus the Saints hesitated to call themselves members of the Church.*
68.1 *Christ's vicar must not ask a submission which Christ cannot ask.*
68.25 *A bishopric should be desired for the work, not for the dignity.*

[66]**Ex quibus concluditur quod periculosum foret cuiquam christiano propter fastum vel questum singularem pretendere quod sibi tamquam capiti universalis ecclesie sit necessarium omnes christianos singulariter obedire, dicente Augustino (ubi supra) quod ecclesie non preerat Faustinus episcopus, sed parti preerat (ut dicit epistola ad Dardanum). Christus congregavit ecclesiam suam in unum spiritum et unum corpus cuius unum caput est Christus. Et Bernardus super Cantica sermone XII°: Quisquis et inebriat verbis et fragrat beneficiis, sibi dictum putet: quia meliora sunt ubera tua vino et fragrancia unguentis optimis. Et ad hec quis idoneus? Quis nostrum unum illorum saltem integre perfecteque possideat, ut interdum non in dicendo sterilior et in operando tepidior sit? Sed est que merito et non ficte hoc preconio glorietur, ecclesia utique cui nunquam de universitate sua deest et unde inebriet et unde fragret; quod enim sibi deest in uno, habet in altero secundum mensuram donacionis Christi ac moderacionem spiritus dividentis singulis prout vult. Fragrat ecclesia in hiis qui sibi faciunt amicos de mamona iniquitatis, inebriat in ministris verbi qui vino leticie spiritualis infundunt terram et inebriant eam et fructum referunt in paciencia. Ipsa audaciter secureque sese nominat sponsam, tamquam que vere habet ubera meliora vino ac fragrancia unguentis** [67]**optimis. Quod etsi nemo nostrum sibi arrogare presumat, ut animam suam audeat sponsam domini appellare, quoniam tamen de ecclesia sumus que merito hoc nomine et re nominis gloriatur, glorie huius participium usurpamus. Quod enim simul omnes plene integreque possidemus, hoc singuli sine contradiccione participamus. Gracias tibi domine**

From this it is inferred that it would be dangerous for any Christian, out of pride or for singular gain, to claim that it is necessary for all Christians singly to obey him as head of the universal church; since Augustine says (in the place cited above) that bishop Faustinus did not preside over the church, but presided over a part (as the letter to Dardanus says). Christ gathered his church into one spirit and one body, whose one head is Christ.[1] And Bernard, on the Canticles, sermon 12: "Whoever both inebriates with words and is fragrant with benefits, let him think it said to himself: 'For thy breasts are better than wine, smelling sweet of the best ointments.' And for these things who is sufficient? Which of us possesses even one of them wholly and perfectly, so as not at times to be more barren in speaking and more lukewarm in working? But there is one who may deservedly and not feignedly glory in this praise: the church, to whom, from her whole body, there is never lacking both whence to inebriate and whence to be fragrant; for what she lacks in one, she has in another, 'according to the measure of the giving of Christ' and the apportioning of the Spirit, 'dividing to every one according as he will.'[2] The church is fragrant in those who 'make unto themselves friends of the mammon of iniquity'; she inebriates in the ministers of the word, who pour the wine of spiritual gladness upon the earth and inebriate it, and 'bring forth fruit in patience.' She boldly and securely names herself bride, as one who truly has breasts better than wine and smelling sweet of the best [67]**ointments. And although none of us would presume to arrogate this to himself, so as to dare to call his own soul the bride of**

Jesu qui nos karissime ecclesie tue aggregare dignatus es, non solum ut fideles essemus, sed eciam ut tibi vice sponse in amplexus iocundos castos eternosque copularemur. Ecce quomodo sancti sub dubio presumpserunt se esse membra ecclesie, sed nonnisi ex presupposita imitacione sponsi ecclesie. Unde sermone XIII° dicit Bernhardus: Si sponsa utique de omni virtute sua vel gracia misericordie audeat sibi quippiam arrogare, quanto minus adolescentule que forte nos sumus? Ecce quomodo dicit forte. Dicamus proinde et nos sponse vestigia insectantes: Non nobis domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam. Dicamus non verbo et lingua tantum, sed opere et veritate: quia aliter non sumus iuvencule, iuxta illud Psalmi LXXVII[i], 36, 37 Quoniam dilexerunt eum in ore suo et lingua mentiti sunt ei; cor autem eorum non erat rectum cum eo, nec fideles habiti sunt in testamento eius. Ecce iste sanctus plane sentenciat quod, nisi habuerimus vitam contemplativam vel activam quam Deus acceptat ad beatitudinem aliter non sumus partes ecclesie. Ideo instar sanctorum decertaremus, quis posset esse in fructuoso ministerio matris sue operosior atque humilior. Et ex hinc iuxta fidem scripture, Matthei XVIII°, 1, sequitur quod sit maior. Christus enim non potuit esse caput ecclesie sine humillimo [68]et pauperrimo ministerio sponse sue. Quomodo ergo eius vicarius preerit uni adolescentule, nisi gerat in moribus vicem Christi, non exigens subieccionem civilem quam Christus non potest exigere? Periculum autem predictum de presumpcione stupida exterreret sensatos, ne contendant circa primatus sancte matris ecclesie vel tamquam in ea aut ex ea capitanei exigant seculariter bona eius. Talis enim presumpcio excluderet contenciosos, ne sint vel membra abiecta huius corporis, cum secundum omnes eius naturas sit compaginata proporcione tali armonica; quod non est possibile quod secundum aliquas eius partes sit contrariacio perpetua, cum oportet ad ultimum quodlibet membrum eius consentanee iuvare quodlibet (ut docet apostolus Ia Cor. XII°). Nam finis pro quo nunc militamus est ut unanimes uno ore sine usurpacione alieni officii in quiete perpetua conletemur; que leticia a nullo queritur, nisi in via tendunt ad finalem concordiam. Temporalia enim abusa tenetur prelatus restituere (ut patet per Archidiaconum XLIV[a] distinccione et declaravi sexto capitulo....). Et primatum non debet clericus principaliter querere sed laborem; aliter enim est mercenarius, non pastor, ut allegatum est in principio huius capituli ex decreto VIII[a], q. I: Sunt in ecclesia. Super quo dicit Archidiaconus quod in quolibet episcopatu sunt duo, scilicet dignitas et opus ad quod dignitas vere consequitur. Et sic quicunque prepostere ambiunt dignitates, ut sint tamquam mercenarii et non ut membra ecclesie,

the Lord, yet, since we are of the church, which deservedly glories in this name and in the reality of the name, we claim a share in this glory. For what all of us together possess fully and wholly, this each of us shares without contradiction. Thanks be to thee, Lord Jesus, who hast deigned to join us to thy most dear church, not only that we might be faithful, but also that, in the place of a bride, we might be united to thee in joyful, chaste and eternal embraces."[3] See how the saints, under doubt, presumed themselves to be members of the church, but only on the presupposition of their imitating the church's bridegroom. Hence in sermon 13 Bernard says: "If the bride, indeed, should dare to arrogate anything to herself of all her virtue or the grace of mercy, how much less the young maidens, which perhaps we are?" See how he says "perhaps."[4] "Let us therefore also, following the bride's footsteps, say: 'Not to us, O Lord, not to us; but to thy name give glory.'" Let us say it "not in word and tongue" only, "but in deed and in truth"; for otherwise we are not young maidens, according to that [text] of Psalm 77:36–37: "For they loved him with their mouth: and with their tongue they lied unto him: but their heart was not right with him: nor were they counted faithful in his covenant."[5] See: this saint plainly pronounces that unless we have a contemplative or active life which God accepts for blessedness, otherwise we are not parts of the church. Therefore, after the manner of the saints, we should contend who could be more laborious and humbler in the fruitful ministry of his mother. And from this, according to the faith of scripture, Matthew 18:1, it follows that he is the greater. For Christ could not be head of the church without the humblest [68]and poorest ministry to his bride. How, then, will his vicar preside over one young maiden unless he bears in his conduct the place of Christ, not exacting civil subjection, which Christ cannot exact?[6] And the aforesaid danger of stupid presumption would terrify the sensible, lest they contend over the primacies of holy mother church, or, as captains in her or from her, exact her goods in a secular manner. For such presumption would exclude the contentious, so that they are not even outcast members of this body; since according to all its natures it is joined together in such harmonic proportion that it is not possible that, according to some of its parts, there should be perpetual contrariety, since in the end every member of it must help every other in agreement (as the apostle teaches, 1 Corinthians 12). For the end for which we now fight is that, "with one mind and with one mouth," without usurping another's office, we may rejoice together in perpetual rest; which joy is sought by no one unless on the way they tend toward final concord.[7] For a prelate is

se reddunt dampnabiles. Et forte in isto capitulo sunt quidam hodie qui non tantum appreciantur lucrum fructus operis evangeliste [69] sicut voluptates temporales, decimas vel honores; et omnes tales sunt venenosi heretici (ut patet libro sexto, tractatu de heresi).

bound to restore temporal goods abused (as is clear from the Archdeacon on distinction 44, and I have declared in the sixth chapter ...). And a cleric ought not principally to seek primacy but labour; for otherwise he is a hireling, not a shepherd, as was alleged at the beginning of this chapter from the Decretum, [causa] 8, question 1, *Sunt in ecclesia*.[8] On which the Archdeacon says that in every bishopric there are two things, namely the dignity and the work, upon which the dignity truly follows. And so whoever canvass for dignities preposterously, so as to be as hirelings and not as members of the church, render themselves damnable. And perhaps in this chapter there are some today who do not value the gain of the fruit of the work of an evangelist [69]as much as temporal pleasures, tithes or honours; and all such are venomous heretics (as is clear in the sixth book, in the treatise on heresy).[9]

Notes

1. *Ubi supra*: Augustine, *In Ioh. tr.* 6 (03-f; Loserth: *Opp.* III/2, 340), and the letter to Dardanus (ep. 187; Loserth: *Opp.* II, 678). *Faustinus* (66.8) is Augustine's (*tr.* 6.25, PL 35:1436: *non Ecclesiae praeerat Faustinus, sed parti praeerat*). The letter to Dardanus supplies the sentence on Christ's one body (*Ep.* 187.37, PL 33:846: *in unum corpus, cujus unum caput est Christus*). B lacks *suam* (66.10).
2. Bernard, *Sermones super Cantica* 12 (Loserth: *Opp.* 523; B *cap. XII*). *Cantica* is Loserth's; the MSS *canonica* (66.12). *Unde fragret* (66.21) is Loserth's, with Bernard; the MSS *bene fragret*. Song 1:1–2, DR (Wyclif *et fragrancia*); 2 Cor. 2:16, DR without "so"; Eph. 4:7, DR; 1 Cor. 12:11, DR. A margin: *Ecclesia que et quomodo fragrat unguentis optimis* (66.13).
3. Luke 16:9, DR (third person for Bernard's *sibi*); Luke 8:15, DR (*referunt* for *afferunt*). *Participium*: here "a share" (for *participacionem*). B reads *Oportet eciam ut tibi vicem* (67.9). *Vice sponse*: in the place of a bride, as the church is the bride and we only of it.
4. Bernard, *Super Cant.* 13. *Audeat* (67.15), as printed (plate): Bernard has *minime audet*, "dares not at all" (*Super Cant.* 13.9, PL 183:838D–839A), which the *quanto minus* argument needs; we translate Wyclif's Latin as it stands, as with scripture. *Adolescentule*: the "young maidens" of Song 1:2. A margin: *Sancti cum formidine et sub spe dixerunt se esse membra sancte ecclesie*; B: *Nemo audeat se asserere membrum ecclesie* (67.11).
5. Ps. 113:9 (Vulgate numbering; Heb. 115:1), DR. *Non verbo et lingua ... sed opere et veritate*: 1 John 3:18 (DR "not ... in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth"). Ps. 77:36–37, DR; Wyclif *Quoniam* for *Et*. Loserth: in Bernard the psalm is introduced *Ne forte (quod nimis vereor) dicatur et de nobis: Quoniam ...* (*Opp.* 527); *quia aliter non sumus iuvencule* is Wyclif's.
6. Matt. 18:1–4: who is "the greater" in the kingdom; he who humbles himself (18:4). *Ministerio sponse sue*: "ministry to his bride" (objective genitive); "of his bride" is possible. B margin: *Matth. XVIII* (67.31).
7. B *exerceret* for *exterreret* (68.6). *Capitanei*: captains, not heads (the glossary). *Quod non est possibile quod*: result clause after *tali*. 1 Cor. 12:12–27 (B margin: *1 Cor. XII*, 68.15); Rom. 15:6, DR "with one mind and with one mouth". A margin: *Membra sancte ecclesie sunt unita* (68.6).
8. The Archdeacon: Guido de Baysio, archdeacon of Bologna, *Rosarium* on D.44 (Loserth). After *capitulo* (68.21) the MSS have a lacuna (Loserth); *sexto capitulo* is chapter 6 of this book. Decretum C.8 q.1 c.19 *Sunt in ecclesia* (Loserth: *Decreti secunda pars causa VIII, q. I, cap. XIX*; the modern form is ours); *mercenarius, non pastor*: John 10:12. *In principio huius capituli*: the earlier citation in chapter 3 (03-a, n. 3 cites the same canon, C.8 q.1 c.19) is not independently checked. A margin: *Prelatus*; AB: *Archidiaconus* (68.24).
9. *Ad quod dignitas vere consequitur*: the dignity follows on the work (Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 19.19, *nomen est operis, non honoris*, PL 41:647). *In isto capitulo*: "in this chapter", either of the book or a cathedral chapter; the former is taken. *Operis evangeliste*: 2 Tim. 4:5, "do the work of an evangelist". *Libro sexto, tractatu de heresi*: not identified. Loserth: on chapter 3 cf. Hus, *Opp.* I, fol. 199a, 205b (cf. Hus, *De eccl.*).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 67: *optimis* (137c is the folio mark)
  - 67: *Quod*
  - 67: *37*
  - 67: *1* (arabic verse number '1,')
  - 67: *Christus*
  - 68: *pauperrimo*

- **68: *moribus***
- **68: *vicem***
- **68: *XLIV[a] distinccione* (print ends line 20 with 'XLIV[a] distinccione,' before et)**
- **68: *VIII[a]***
- **68: *Et***
- **67: *nemo***
- **67: *huius* (italic; no punctuation) [-MARK]**

• **Corrected in the Latin: 68.2 *vicanus* (*vicarius*); 68.21 *restituere(ut* (no space); 66.8 *Faustinus*; 67.15 *audeat*.**

Chapter 4

Part 1: Three objections: quantity, the presence of all times, and human appointment

Loserth pp. 69.5–72.10

¶1 69.5–69.29
69.5 Objection: 1. The Church would have a quantitative relation to the number of the blessed.
69.16 Answer: The Church has such a relation of number, though not of mass;
69.24 one half is composed of angels and one of men.

[69]Ut dicta de sancta matre ecclesia magis appareant, obicitur aliter contra dicta. Primo, inquam, videtur quod continuum quantitative componitur ex non quantis, quia sancta mater ecclesia que est corpus Christi misticum componitur quantitative ex multis milibus beatorum spirituum, et per consequens, corpus se habet in proporcione racionali secundum quantitatem ad multitudinem spirituum beatorum. Sed hic conceditur conclusio, ut patet de attomis principiis corporum, de punctis linearum et sic de instantibus cum aliis partibus indivisibilibus continuorum. Et sic conceditur quod sancta mater ecclesia est comparabilis in proporcione racionali, eciam secundum quantitatem multitudinis celestium spirituum. Quantitatem dico virtutis, non molis; sed illam proporcionem novit sponsus ecclesie, nec oportet ex hinc esse proporcionem racionalem inter corpus et animam, vel animam esse partem quantitativam ac quiditativam formaliter sui compositi. Ymmo, equivocando in nomine corporis, concedi potest quod multitudo beatorum angelorum, sicut fuit ecclesia ut est modo, sic fuit corpus Christi misticum, et ita eadem ecclesia habuit aliquando unam quantitativam medietatem, non mole sed numero; que fuit numerus angelorum, et alia medietas fuit numerus hominum eciam secundum naturam corpoream.

That what has been said of holy mother church may appear more clearly, it is objected in another way against what has been said. First, I say, it seems that a continuum is quantitatively composed of things without quantity; since holy mother church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is quantitatively composed of many thousands of blessed spirits; and consequently a body stands in rational proportion, according to quantity, to a multitude of blessed spirits.[1] But here the conclusion is granted, as is clear of atoms, the principles of bodies, of the points of lines, and so of instants, with the other indivisible parts of continua. And so it is granted that holy mother church is comparable in rational proportion even according to the quantity of the multitude of heavenly spirits. Quantity, I say, of power, not of mass; but that proportion the bridegroom of the church knows. Nor need there be, from this, a rational proportion between body and soul, or the soul be a quantitative and formally quidditative part of its composite.[2] Indeed, equivocating on the name "body", it can be granted that the multitude of the blessed angels, just as it was the church, as it is now, so was the mystical body of Christ; and so the same church at one time had one quantitative half, not in mass but in number, which was the number of the angels, and the other half was the number of men, also according to bodily nature.[3]

¶2 69.30–71.28
70.1
2. Objection: If we are right, all things past and future would be present to God.
70.8 *Answer: All the Saints agree that they are sO present.*
70.17 *All the wicked make one generation;*
71.9 *and so do all the righteous.*
71.20
3. Objection: As lay rulers are humanly

[69]Secundo obicitur per hoc quod iuxta dicta de quiditate ecclesie omnia que fuerunt vel erunt sunt [70]tempore suo Deo presencia, cum aliter non componeretur ecclesia ex omnibus electis presentibus, preteritis et futuris. Sed conceditur conclusio, ut concedunt sancti concorditer; unde sanctus Thomas, De Christo, conclusione octava, articulo III°, vere dicit quod corpus hominis ecclesie constituitur ex hominibus qui fuerunt a principio mundi usque ad finem eius. Et Chrisostomus In Imperfecto, Omelia XLVI[a], exponens illud Matthei XXIII°, 34: Ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas et sapientes, ostendit ex fide scripture quod oportet duas generaciones ab Adam usque ad finem mundi concurrere, scilicet generacionem iustorum que est sancta mater ecclesia et corpus Christi, et generacionem perversorum

Second, it is objected, by appeal to this: that, according to what has been said of the quiddity of the church, all things that were or will be are, [70] in their time, present to God; since otherwise the church would not be composed of all the elect, present, past and future.[4] But the conclusion is granted, as the saints grant with one accord. Hence St Thomas, *On Christ*, conclusion eight, article 3, truly says that the body of man, [that is,] of the church, is constituted of men who were from the beginning of the world to its end.[5] And Chrysostom in the *Incomplete* [*Work*], homily 46, expounding that [text] of Matthew 23:34, "Behold I send to you prophets and wise men," shows from the faith of scripture that two generations must run together from Adam to the end of the world:

appointed, so are the officers of the Church.

71.29 *Answer: We must distinguish between the true and the*

71.30 *We must distinguish between the true and the apparent Church.*

que est ecclesia malignancium et corpus diaboli. Omnium, inquit, iniquorum persecutorum et homicidarum a Caym usque ad finem mundi una generacio est: et si non omnes tempore uno, omnes tamen filii sunt persecutoris et homicide illius Caym. Ideo alibi dicit: Amen dico vobis, non transibit generacio hec, donec omnia fiant. Et illam generacionem demonstrat Christus, quando dicit de presenti: Ecce ego mitto ad vos sapientes et scribas, licet enim Caym persecutor Abel mortuus est, tamen facti sunt gigantes, persequentes filios Seth. Ecce Caym transiit, sed generacio ipsa stetit. Perierunt tercio gigantes in diluvio, sed nati sunt ex Caym Cananei et cetere gentes, persequentes filios Sem. Cananeis mortuis quarto successerunt alienigene, [71] persequentes Iudeos, quinto conversis quibusdam gentibus ad Christum surrexerunt perfidi Iudei genere, martires persequentes christianos, et post ipsos sexto surrexerunt heretici quidam gentiles in eodem genere, martires persequentes; septimo insurrexerunt heretici, ecclesiam persequentes octavo gentiles quoad modicum uniendi, qui licet sint nominetenus clerici, tamen sunt discipuli Antichristi. Sicut ergo ex omnibus istis fit una generacio quoad mores, sic est una generacio iustorum, succedens cum ista quam oportet prosperando procedere. Et iste due generaciones sunt due civitates secunde ecclesie vel duo corpora, Christi et Antichristi; que Augustinus, Gregorius et alii sancti ex fide scripture ponunt concorditer. Nec aliter vere exprimetur sensus spiritus sancti de generacione huiusmodi nec de duracione ordinum vel alterius successim. Unde videtur nimis suspectum verbum modernorum dicere quod dicti sancti erant ignari logice et sequentes scripturam inciderunt in hereses manifestas. Tercio obicitur per hoc quod, sicut institucione humana preficiuntur reges, domini seculares et alii officiarii quoad seculum, sic et clerici constituuntur ordinacione humana partes ecclesie. Oportet ergo sumere ecclesiam in significacione vulgari, concedendo quod predestinatus excommunicatus fit non membrum ecclesie, prescitus autem in gracia est verum membrum ecclesie, quia aliter nemo assumeret sibi nomen ecclesiastici nec quisquam crederet suo proposito in quantum huiusmodi.

namely, the generation of the just, which is holy mother church and the body of Christ, and the generation of the perverse, which is the church of the malignant and the body of the devil.[6] "Of all the wicked," he says, "persecutors and murderers, from Cain to the end of the world, there is one generation; and if they are not all at one time, yet all are sons of that persecutor and murderer Cain. Therefore he says elsewhere: 'Amen I say to you, this generation shall not pass till all things be done.' And Christ points out that generation when he says in the present [tense]: 'Behold I send to you wise men and scribes.' For although Cain, the persecutor of Abel, is dead, yet giants came to be, persecuting the sons of Seth. See: Cain passed away, but the generation itself stood. Third, the giants perished in the flood, but from Cain were born the Canaanites and the other nations, persecuting the sons of Sem. When the Canaanites were dead, fourth, foreigners succeeded, [71] persecuting the Jews; fifth, when certain nations had been converted to Christ, there arose the faithless, Jews by race, persecuting the Christians as martyrs; and after them, sixth, there arose certain heretics, gentiles of the same kind, persecuting martyrs; seventh, heretics rose up, persecuting the church; eighth, gentiles as to a little [measure] of uniting [?], who, although in name they are clerics, yet are disciples of Antichrist."[7] Just as, therefore, out of all these there is made one generation as to morals, so there is one generation of the just, succeeding alongside this one, which must go forward prospering. And these two generations are two cities of the second church [?], or two bodies, of Christ and of Antichrist; which Augustine, Gregory and the other saints posit with one accord from the faith of scripture.[8] Nor otherwise will the sense of the Holy Spirit be truly expressed concerning such a generation, nor concerning the duration of orders or of anything else in succession. Hence the saying of the moderns seems too suspect, that the said saints were ignorant of logic and, following scripture, fell into manifest heresies.[9] Third, it is objected, by appeal to this: that just as, by human institution, kings, secular lords and other officers are set over [men] as to the world, so too clerics are constituted parts of the church by human ordinance. We must, therefore, take "church" in its common signification, granting that a predestinate [man] who is excommunicated becomes a non-member of the church, and that a foreknown [man] in grace is a true member of the church; for otherwise no one would assume to himself the name of churchman, nor would anyone believe his superior as such.[10]

¶3 71.29–72.10
72.1 *The true Church obeys only the orainance of God.*

[71]**Hic dicitur (ut supra) quod ecclesia dicitur dupliciter, scilicet vere et pretense. Vere, quod est vere corpus Christi et sponsa eius; pretense, quod viantes reputant corpus Christi, licet sit sinagoga sathane.** [72]**Primo modo loquendo de ecclesia solum subest ordinacioni Dei eterne vel Christi instituere eius partes. Sicut enim rex terrenus ordinat temporaliter regnum suum, sic rex celestis ordinat eternaliter regnum suum, cum regni illius non erit finis (ut patet Danielis VII°, 14 et Luce 1° 33). Alii autem iuvant vel persequuntur regnum illud quod est ecclesia secundum quod Deus eternaliter ordinavit. Et sic loquendum est de ecclesia vera et de ecclesia pretensa vel mixta; sed de prima est nobis sermo.**

Here the answer is (as above) that "church" is said in two ways, namely truly and pretendedly: truly, what is truly the body of Christ and his bride; pretendedly, what those on the road reckon the body of Christ, although it is "the synagogue of Satan."[11] [72]**Speaking of the church in the first way, to institute its parts lies only under the eternal ordinance of God, or of Christ. For just as an earthly king orders his kingdom temporally, so the heavenly king orders his kingdom eternally, since "of his kingdom there shall be no end" (as is clear from Daniel 7:14 and Luke 1:33). And others help or persecute that kingdom, which is the church, according as God has eternally ordained. And so we must speak of the true church and of the pretended or mixed church; but our discourse is of the first.[12]**

Notes

1. ***Continuum ... ex non quantis***: the objection turns the church's composition from spirits, which have no extension, into the thesis that a continuum is made of indivisibles; the church is then in "rational proportion" (a ratio of whole numbers) to them. A margin: ***Prima obieccio*** (69.5); ***Composicio sancte matris ecclesie et parcium proporcio*** (69.30).
2. ***Conceditur conclusio***: Wyclif grants it, as an atomist: bodies are composed of atoms, lines of points, times of instants. ***Quantitatem ... virtutis, non molis***: quantity of power, not of mass (bulk). ***Quiditativam***: belonging to what the composite is; untagged (an adjective of ***quiditas***). AB margin: ***Responsio*** (69.13).
3. ***Sicut fuit ecclesia ut est modo, sic fuit corpus Christi misticum***: construed "as the multitude was the church, as [the church] is now, so it was the mystical body". ***Medietas ... numero***: the church's two halves are counted, not measured: angels and men (Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 29, men restoring the number of the fallen angels, PL 40:246).
4. B ***de presencia*** for ***presencia*** (70.1). ***Tempore suo***: each at its own time; the objection draws from the church of "all the elect, present, past and future" that past and future things are present to God. AB margin: ***Responsio*** (70.3).
5. Thomas Aquinas, ***Summa theologiae*** III q.8 a.3 (Wyclif "conclusion eight", for question 8; Loserth: ***Opp.*** V, 51). ***Corpus hominis ecclesie*** (70.6), as printed: Aquinas has ***corpus ecclesiae***; ***hominis*** does not construe well, and the bracket is ours; a doubt, reported. B margin: ***Affirmat sanctus Thomas ampliacionem verbi ut videtur***: the reader saw a case of ampliation (the verb's supposition extended to past and future men).
6. The ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*** (Loserth: of an uncertain author), hom. 46 as printed; the MSS ***Omelia XXIX*** (70.8); Loserth: hom. 45, ed. Montfaucon, ***Chrysost. Opp.*** VI, cxciii E. Matt. 23:34, DR in part (***et scribas*** omitted). ***[illud*** (70.9): a stray bracket in the Latin, reported. ***Ecclesia malignancium***: Ps. 25:5, "the assembly of the malignant". B lacks ***Adam*** (70.11).
7. Matt. 24:34, DR, with Wyclif's ***transibit*** and ***omnia fiant*** (Vulgate ***praeteribit ... omnia haec fiant***). Where the ***Opus imperfectum*** ends is not marked; the seventh and eighth persecutions read as Wyclif's extension. B lacks ***genere martires*** (71.3) and ***heretici*** (71.4); A ***cum sunt*** (71.8). ***Quoad modicum uniendi*** (71.7), as printed, hardly construes (B ***quoad modum***); ***quoad modum vivendi***, "as to their manner of life", would suit the clerics in name: a doubt, reported.
8. ***Prosperando procedere***: cf. Ps. 44:5, ***prospere procede***. ***Secunde ecclesie*** (71.12), as printed, does not construe; perhaps ***seu due ecclesie***, "or two churches": a doubt, reported. The two cities: Augustine, ***De civitate Dei*** XIV.28 (also I.35; PL 41:436, 41:46); Gregory not traced.
9. A and A_1 read ***verborum*** at 71.17 (perhaps for ***ordinum***, 71.16; the apparatus is not clear). ***Verbum modernorum***: the "moderns" who taxed the fathers with ignorance of logic, against Wyclif's ***logica scripture*** (03-f).
10. A ***summere*** (71.23); B ***sit non*** for ***fit non*** (71.25). ***Suo proposito*** (71.28), as printed, is taken as ***preposito***, "his superior" (cf. ***prepositi***, the glossary); as ***proposito*** it would be "his purpose": a doubt, reported. ***Predestinatus***, ***prescitus***: the predestinate and the foreknown (the foreknown are those God foreknows will be damned).
11. Apoc. 2:9, "the synagogue of Satan" (DR). ***Ut supra***: the twofold sense of ***ecclesia*** in chapter 1. B margin: ***Responsio ... Duplex de ecclesia*** (71.29).
12. ***Instituere*** (72.2) is the reading of A_1 as corrected, which Loserth prints; A and B ***iusti cure***. ***Solum subest ... instituere eius partes***: the infinitive is the subject. Luke 1:33, DR; Dan. 7:14 ("his kingdom that shall not be destroyed").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 69: ***CAP. IV.***
  - 69: ***Christi***
  - 70: ***Thomas***
  - 70: ***34***

- **71: *persequentes* (138a is the folio mark)**
- **71: *Iudeos***
- **71: *Iudei* (italic capital I)**
- **71: *iustorum* [NW]**
- **71: *successim* (succes-/sim hyphenated; print has successim) [NW]**
- **71: *preficiuntur* [NW]**
- **71: *Christi***
- **70: *XLVI*[a], [-MARK]**

• **Corrected in the Latin: 70.9 *[illud*; 70.19 *dic t* (print *dic't*, i.e. *dicit*; plate); 71.20 *Tercioobicitur*. Latin doubts left as printed: 70.6 *hominis*; 71.7 *modicum uniendi*; 71.12 *secunde*; 71.28 *proposito*.**

Part 2: Membership by predestination cannot be lost; the prelates who trust in the temple

Loserth pp. 72.11–76.24

¶1 72.11–75.15

72.11 *The foreknown as well as the predestinate may hold ecclesiastical office.*
73.10 *Three ways of being a member of Christ; by predestination, by preparation, by concorporation.*
74.6 *That only is a part of the Lord's body which will remain with Him for ever.*
74.27 *The predestinate cannot cease to be such.*
75.2 *The foreknown cannot continue in grace.*
75.7 *St. Paul says that nothing can separate us from the love of God.*
75.16 *It is objected that this applies to the foreknown who is for the time in charity;*
75.22 *but the foreknown are not parts of Christ's body, but excrescences.*

[72]**Conceditur tamen quod ordinacione humana clerici constituuntur in officiis ecclesiasticis tam predestinati quam presciti, sed ordinantes eis talia officia non habent potestatem ordinandi quod sint membra vel partes vere ecclesie. Ulterius conceditur quod predestinatus quantumcunque fuerit in mortali non desinit esse membrum vere ecclesie, licet excommunicacione pretensa ponatur nominetenus extra temporalem ac corporalem communicacionem pretense ecclesie. Unde Ricardus de Sancto Victore in quodam tractatu De Potestate Clavium qui sic incipit: Quodcunque ligaveris Membrum, inquit, Christi potest dici homo secundum geminam consideracionem, aut secundum predestinacionem aut secundum habitudinem. Secundum predestinacionem potest quis membrum Christi esse et necdum caritatem habere. Juxta namque domini testimonium: Refrigescet caritas multorum. Secundum ergo hanc accepcionem contingit hominem esse membrum Christi et adhuc vinculo debite dampnacionis teneri; secundum habitudinem autem membrum Christi dicitur, quando in se habet hoc, unde hoc ipsum efficitur. Sed numquid membrum Christi** [73]**caritas illa facit que ad tempus inardescit et in momento refrigescit? Absque dubio qui perseverantem caritatem nunquam accipiunt, nunquam de veris illis Christi membris fuerunt qui corporis eius integritatem perficiunt. Secundum quandam accepcionem tamen possumus et solemus caritatem transitoriam habentes membra Christi dicere propter membrorum ipsius conformitatem quam ad tempus videntur habere. Sed ut a pie querentibus omnem scrupulum amoveamus, dicimus quod triplici modo membrum Christi dici solemus: predestinacione, preparacione, concorporacione. Predestinacione, quando ad vitam divinitus preordinatur; preparacione, quando paganus vel falsus christianus veraciter compungitur et ad veritatem ac caritatem inbuitur; concorporacione, quando ille per corporis ablucionem, iste**

Yet it is granted that by human ordinance clerics, the predestinate as well as the foreknown, are constituted in ecclesiastical offices; but those who ordain such offices for them do not have the power to ordain that they be members or parts of the true church.[1] Further, it is granted that a predestinate [man], however far he may be in mortal [sin], does not cease to be a member of the true church, although by a pretended excommunication he is put, in name, outside the temporal and bodily communion of the pretended church. Hence Richard of St Victor, in a certain treatise *On the Power of the Keys*, which begins thus, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind": "A man," he says, "can be called a member of Christ according to a twofold consideration: either according to predestination or according to condition. According to predestination someone can be a member of Christ and not yet have charity; for according to the Lord's testimony, 'the charity of many shall grow cold.' According to this acceptation, therefore, it happens that a man is a member of Christ and is still held by the bond of due damnation; but according to condition he is called a member of Christ when he has in himself that whereby he is made this very thing.[2] But does that charity make a member of Christ [73]**which for a time burns and in a moment grows cold? Without doubt those who never receive persevering charity were never of those true members of Christ who complete the integrity of his body. Yet according to a certain acceptation we can, and are accustomed to, call those who have transitory charity members of Christ, because of the conformity with his members which for a time they seem to have. But, to remove every scruple from those who inquire piously, we say that we are accustomed to be called members of Christ in three ways: by predestination, by preparation, by concorporation.[3] By predestination, when one is divinely preordained to**

per sacerdotis absolucionem ecclesie Christi conformatur. Primum agitur proposito divine voluntatis, secundum proposito proprie deliberacionis, tercium vero officio sacerdotis. Ex corporali advertere possumus quid de spirituali edificacione sentire debeamus. Ecce de silva lignum eligitur; ut in edificio ponatur, postea dolatur, et admodum formam congruam dolando preparatur, ad ultimum edificio connectitur et ipsi debite in loco coaptatur. Ecce quomodo unum denique lignum fit edificii membrum: primo sola eleccione, secundo preparacione et tercio compaginacione. Sic sane multi iam sunt membra Christi predestinacione, necdum tamen preparacione; multi vero preparacione, sed necdum tamen concorporacione. Augustinus cum adhuc infidelis esset, secundum predestinacionem [74] membrum Christi fuit, conformiter preparacione membrum Christi extitit, cum corde credens et devocione fervens ad baptismum festinavit. Baptizatus vero et ecclesie consociatus membris Christi concorporatus fuit. Et istam sentenciam docet Augustinus, tercio De Doctrina Christiana, cap. XXXII°: Non enim re vera corpus domini est quod cum illo non erit in eternum. Ypocrite inquit, non solum in eternum, verum eciam nunc non cum illo esse dicendi sunt, quamvis in eius esse videantur ecclesia. Et idem dicit Chrisostomus In Imperfecto, Omelia IXª: Qui Dei fuerunt perire non potuerunt, quia de Deo nemo rapere potest. Et eadem est sentencia sanctorum doctorum qui se ipsos intelligunt in ista materia; nam aliter fides scripture foret falsa, cum Joh. X°, 27, 28, dicit Christus: Oves mee vocem meam audiunt, et ego cognosco eas, et sequuntur me, et ego vitam eternam do eis, et non peribunt in eternum, et non rapiet eos quisquam de manu mea. Et post probat ex immensitate doni patris (quod est spiritus sanctus) quod nemo potest hoc facere, quia pater suus est omnipotens de cuius manu nemo potest quidquam eripere. Sed Christus et pater suus unum sunt cum spiritu sancto qui est donum suum; quo sibi copulatur ecclesia (ut patet cap. X). Ergo nemo potest oves suas de manu eius eripere. Ipse enim eternaliter elegit quodlibet membrum ecclesie in sponsam; ergo sicut nemo potest desinere esse predestinatus, sic non est possibile quod aliquod membrum sponse sue deserat vel expellat, quia (ut dixi superius) tunc persona eligens foret improvida vel ingrata. [75] Secundo confirmatur idem ex fide scripture 1° Joh. IIª 19, ubi sanctus evangelista loquitur de prescitis qui ad tempus manserunt in gracia. Si, inquit, ex nobis fuissent, permansissent utique nobiscum. Non enim sapit quod ista condicionalis tam alti evangeliste sit impossibilis et heretica. Tercio confirmatur ex dicto apostoli Rom. VIII°, 35, ubi loquens de se et aliis membris ecclesie palam asserit quod nulla creatura poterit eos separare a caritate que est numerus fundatus in

life; by preparation, when a pagan or a false Christian is truly pricked to compunction and imbued with truth and charity; by concorporation, when the former, through the washing of the body, the latter, through the absolution of the priest, is conformed to the church of Christ. The first is done by the purpose of the divine will, the second by the purpose of one's own deliberation, but the third by the office of the priest. From the bodily [building] we can observe what we ought to think of the spiritual building. See: a timber is chosen from the forest; that it may be set in a building, it is afterwards hewn, and by hewing is prepared to a fitting shape; at last it is joined to the building and duly fitted to it in its place. See how one timber at length becomes a member of the building: first by choice alone, second by preparation, and third by joining.[4] So indeed many are already members of Christ by predestination, yet not yet by preparation; and many by preparation, but yet not yet by concorporation. Augustine, while he was still an unbeliever, was by predestination [74] a member of Christ; correspondingly, he became a member of Christ by preparation when, believing in heart and fervent in devotion, he hastened to baptism. But baptized and joined in fellowship with the church, he was concorporated with the members of Christ."[5] And this teaching[6] Augustine teaches, *On Christian Doctrine* 3, chapter 32: "For that is not in truth the body of the Lord which will not be with him for ever. Hypocrites," he says, "are to be said not to be with him, not only for ever, but even now, although they seem to be in his church."[7] And Chrysostom says the same in the *Incomplete* [*Work*], homily 9: "Those who were God's could not perish, because no one can snatch from God." And the same is the teaching of the holy doctors who understand themselves in this matter; for otherwise the faith of scripture would be false, since, John 10:27–28, Christ says: "My sheep hear my voice. And I know them: and they follow me. And I give them life everlasting: and they shall not perish for ever. And no man shall pluck them out of my hand."[8] And afterwards he proves from the immensity of the Father's gift (which is the Holy Spirit) that no one can do this, because his Father is omnipotent, out of whose hand no one can snatch anything. Now Christ and his Father are one with the Holy Spirit, who is their gift, by whom the church is joined to him (as is clear in chapter 10). Therefore no one can snatch his sheep out of his hand.[9] For he eternally chose every member of the church as his bride; therefore, just as no one can cease to be predestinate, so it is not possible that he should desert or expel any member of his bride, since (as I said above) the person choosing would then be improvident

Christo Jesu colligans membra sua. Ideo dicit eodem capitulo, 9°, Vos autem in carne non estis, sed in spiritu, si tamen spiritus Dei habitat in vobis. Si quis autem spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius. Et intelligit quod ille non est pars sui corporis.

or ungracious.[10] [75]Second, the same is confirmed from the faith of scripture, 1 John 2:19, where the holy evangelist speaks of the foreknown who for a time remained in grace: "If," he says, "they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us." For it does not make sense that this conditional of so lofty an evangelist should be impossible and heretical. Third, it is confirmed from the saying of the apostle, Romans 8:35, where, speaking of himself and the other members of the church, he openly asserts that no creature shall be able to separate them from the charity which is a number founded in Christ Jesus, binding together his members.[11] Therefore he says in the same chapter, [verse] 9: "But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." And he means that that man is not a part of his body.

¶2 75.16–75.30

[75]Et si obicitur per hoc quod prescitus existens in caritate habet hoc vinculum, et per consequens, unionem, sicut predestinatus existens in crimine caret hoc vinculo, et per consequens, unione: patet quod, sicut in humano corpore est dare humidum fluens et humidum radicale, sic in corpore Christi mistico est dare graciam secundum presentem iusticiam et graciam consummatam. Unde sicut apostemata per humidum fluens sunt adnata, non continuata propter disparitatem nature: sic est de membris diaboli, licet pro tempore secundum presentem iusticiam sint adnati. Predestinati autem licet ad tempus priventur fluente gracia, habent tamen radicalem graciam a qua non possunt excidere, et sic habentes duplicem graciam duplici vinculo sunt ligati. Ligamentum tamen primum est insolubile.

And if it is objected, by appeal to this: that a foreknown [man] who is in charity has this bond, and consequently union, just as a predestinate [man] who is in crime lacks this bond, and consequently union: it is clear that, just as in the human body one must posit a flowing moisture and a radical moisture, so in the mystical body of Christ one must posit grace according to present justice and consummated grace.[12] Hence, just as abscesses are grown on through the flowing moisture, not continuous [with the body] because of the disparity of nature, so it is with the members of the devil, although for a time, according to present justice, they are grown on. But the predestinate, although for a time they are deprived of flowing grace, yet have the radical grace, from which they cannot fall away; and so, having a twofold grace, they are bound by a twofold bond. Yet the first ligament is indissoluble.[13]

¶3 76.1–76.24
76.8 *There are prelates who say that the safety of the Church is due to them.*

[76]Sic ergo videtur mihi quod sentencia sanctorum de membris vere ecclesie sit pernecessaria hodie, sicut fuit tempore sinagoge. Sicut enim tunc sacerdotes pretensi dixerunt repugnare promissioni divine quod ipsi vel possessio eorum pereat, sicut recitat Jeremias VII°, cap. 4: Nolite confidere in verbis mendacii, dicentes templum domini, templum domini, templum domini est, sic et modo videtur quosdam prepositos particularis ecclesie qui pretendunt se ex fide convincere quod ipsi capitaliter regant Petri naviculam, sic quod ipsa potest fluctibus seculi concuti sed non mergi. Et sic implicant se ex predestinacione divina non posse dampnari nec temporalia posse a sua ecclesia spoliari, sed de necessitate salutis oportet omnes alios christianos eis subici et tamquam capitales in dominacione seculari ac

So, then, it seems to me that the teaching of the saints on the members of the true church is most necessary today, as it was in the time of the synagogue. For just as then the pretended priests said that it was repugnant to the divine promise that they or their possession should perish, as Jeremiah recounts, chapter 7[:4]: "Trust not in lying words, saying: The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, it is the temple of the Lord," so too now it seems [so with] certain superiors of a particular church, who claim to prove from faith that they rule Peter's little ship as its head, so that it can be shaken by the waves of the world but not sunk.[14] And so they imply that, by divine predestination, they cannot be damned, nor can temporal goods be stripped from their church; but that,

spirituali omnium bonorum ecclesie dominari. Unde, sicut sacerdotes Aaronite dixerunt quod non peribit lex a sacerdote neque consilium a sapiente neque sermo a propheta (ut dicitur Jeremie XVIII°, 18), sic videntur dicere hodie quod pretensa et particularis ecclesia sit tripliciter stabilita, scilicet Christi promissione, fulcimento legis ecclesie que equivalet fidei christiane, et multorum sapientum constipacione.

of necessity of salvation, all other Christians must be subject to them, and that they, as chiefs, in secular and spiritual exercise of lordship, lord it over all the goods of the church.[15] Hence, just as the Aaronite priests said that "the law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet" (as is said in Jeremiah 18:18), so they seem to say today that the pretended and particular church is established in three ways: namely, by Christ's promise, by the prop of the church's law, which is equivalent to the Christian faith, and by the close ranks of many wise men.[16]

Notes

1. The answer to the third objection (71.20–28) continues: human ordinance makes officers, not members. AB margin: *Conclusio* (72.15).
2. Richard of St Victor, *De potestate ligandi et solvendi*, capp. 19–20 (PL 196:1172A–1173A; Loserth: col. 1172); Wyclif omits *et e converso ... non esse* and has *in momento* for *in modico*; its incipit is Matt. 16:19, *Quodcumque ligaveris*. AB margin: *Ricardus* (72.20). Matt. 24:12, DR. *Habitudo*: the present condition (state) of a man, against God's predestination; B's later hand: *Membrum scilicet secundum habitudinem eius* (73.11).
3. *Qui corporis* (73.4) is Loserth's; the MSS *que corporis*. *Concorporacio*: being made one body with the members, Loserth's "concorporation". AB margin (later hand): *Membrum Christi predestinacione, preparacione, concorporacione* (B adds *ecclesie tripliciter*); *Triplex membrum* (73.11).
4. *Ille ... iste*: the former (the pagan), by baptism; the latter (the false Christian), by absolution. *Edificacio*: the spiritual "building", the figure of the timber that follows. A *lignum sit* for *fit* (73.26). AB margin: *Exemplum* (73.20, 73.29).
5. *Conformiter* (74.1) is Loserth's correction (*Correxi*); the MSS *conformitatis*, which is Richard's word (*conformitatis praeparatione*, PL 196:1172D); we translate the print. The quotation ends with *concorporatus fuit*, where Richard goes on *Si quis ergo*. *Infidelis*: an unbeliever.
6. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): the position taught, "teaching", not a judicial sentence.
7. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.32.45, on Tyconius' second rule, the Lord's bipartite body (Loserth: *Opp.* III/1, 58). The second sentence (*Ypocrite ...*) is Augustine's own (PL 34:82), without his *quia* and with *inquit* added. AB margin: *Augustinus* (74.5).
8. *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 9 (Loserth: *Chrysost. Opp.* VI, lxi E; "Imperfecto sc. opere"). John 10:27–28, DR; Wyclif *eos* for *eas* (no change in English). A margin: *Predestinatum membrum Christi non potest cessare tale membrum* (74.11).
9. John 10:29–30. The Vulgate *quod dedit mihi, maius omnibus est* (DR "That which my Father hath given me is greater than all") is read of the gift, the Holy Spirit. *Sed* brings the minor premiss ("Now"). *Cap. X* (74.24): John 10 itself (10:29–30), the chapter being expounded. This book's chapter 10 has nothing on the Spirit; the church joined to Christ by the Spirit is chapter 1 (3, 01-b: *amore spiritus sancti Christo in matrimonio perpetuo copulatur*).
10. *Ingrata*: rendered "ungracious", of God choosing, where the glossary, 's "displeasing (to God)" cannot apply and "ungrateful" has no object; proposed. *Ut dixi superius*: chapter 1 (5, 01-b): *Quomodo queso tam potens, tam sciolus et tam benivolus ... eternaliter eligeret sibi sponsam quam finaliter repudiaret?*.
11. 1 John 2:19, DR; AA_1 *per tempus* for *ad tempus* (75.3). Rom. 8:35–39 paraphrased: DR "the love of Christ" (8:35), "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus" (8:39), for *caritas* (the glossary, : "charity"); Wyclif cites 8:35. *Numerus fundatus* (75.10), as printed: B *minus fundatus*, which may point to *munus*, "a gift" (cf. *donum*, 74.22) or *nexus*, "a bond"; a doubt, reported. B lacks *eos* (75.9). Rom. 8:9, DR.
12. AB margin: *Obieccio* (75.16); B: *Solucio ... Predestinati quomodo sunt in ecclesia et quomodo presciti qui sunt ad tempus in gracia* (75.19). *Humidum radicale*: the radical (innate) moisture of medieval physiology, against the flowing (nutritive) moisture. *Est dare*: "one must posit". *Graciam secundum presentem iusticiam*: the grace of present righteousness, which the foreknown can have for a time.
13. *Adnata ... non continuata*: grown onto the body, not continuous with it (Loserth's "excrescences"). *Predestinati autem* (75.26) is B's reading; A_1 *vero*, as also in Hus's reuse (Loserth: Hus, *Opp.* I, 204b; cf. Hus, *De eccl.*). B *Ligamentum cum* (75.30). *Ligamentum ... primum*: taken as the bond of radical grace, the only indissoluble one, though it is named second.
14. Jer. 7:4, DR (Wyclif *VII°, cap. 4*, the verse). The MSS *repungnare* (76.4). *Videtur quosdam prepositos*: the accusative has no infinitive; supply "[so with]" or "[that] certain superiors [say]". *Ex fide convincere*: "to prove from faith" (a verb governs *ex*, so not the formula, the glossary). *Petri naviculam*: the bark of Peter (Matt. 14:24–32). A margin: *Nota de papa* (76.10).
15. *Capitaliter ... capitales*: as head, as chiefs, the claim Wyclif denies them (cf. *capitaneus*, the glossary). *De necessitate salutis*: the formula of *Unam sanctam* (*Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1), cited by Loserth earlier in the work. *Dominari*: "lord it", the pejorative sense.
16. Jer. 18:18, DR; Wyclif *neque ... neque*. *Aaronite*: the priests of Aaron's line. *Constipacio*: a crowding together, the "close ranks" of their learned supporters.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):

- **72: *in***
- **73: *edificio* [NW]**
- **73: *formam***
- **73: *congruam***
- **73: *dolando***
- **73: *edificio* [NW]**
- **73: *edificii* [NW]**
- **74: *corpus***
- **74: *IX^{a}***
- **75: *19* (138c is the folio mark)**
- **76: *particularis* (parti-/cularis hyphenated across line) [NW]**
- **76: *dominacione* (domi-/nacione hyphenated; 15 is the line number)**
- **76: ∅ (nacione is the second half of domi-/nacione (pos 112))**
- **75: *II^{a}***
- **072: ∅ (second half of mem-brum; neighbour 202 already membrum) [DELX]**
- **75: *VIII°, 35,* (print has verse 35 after chapter) [-VERSE]**

• **Corrected in the Latin: 72.13 *ofncia*; 74.8 *Ypocrite.*; 75.11 *9%*. 75.10 *numerus*: the print (plate; B *minus*), translated.**

Part 3: The fourth objection; the foreknown are no part of the bride whom Christ always loves

Loserth pp. 76.25–80.31

¶1 76.25–77.8

76.25 *They should consider that no office can make a member of Christ;*
76.31 *and reflect whether their life is conformed to that of their Head.*
77.1 *They should rely on humble ministry, not on worldly splendour.*
77.9 *4. Objection: It is impossible to know who is a member of the Church,*
77.16 *and this discredits the Sacraments.*
77.20 *Answer: In one sense the foreknown may be members of the Church.*

[76]**Sed utinam considerarent, primo quod nec locus nec eleccio humana facit membrum ecclesie sed predestinacio divina respectu cuiuscunque qui perseveranter Christum sequitur in caritate et relinquendo omnia temporalia moritur penaliter in defensione legis sue. Secundo considerarent cum formidine conversacionem suam, quomodo vite capitis conformantur, quia ex fide debent credere quod nec sunt vel membrum ecclesie, nec illi sunt quibus facta fuit promissio, nisi relinquendo omnia usque ad mortem penaliter secuti** [77]**fuerint dominum Jesum Christum. Tercio vero confidant in suo humili ministerio ecclesie et non in fastu vel questu seculi, cum solum sic: humilibus promittitur celestis hereditas. Deus enim non potest promittere regnum alicui christiano nisi sub tali condicione tacita vel expressa, ut pertinenter innuitur I° Reg. cap. II° de Hely, et alibi sepius in scriptura. Et utinam nostri prelati ad sentenciam istam attenderent.**

But would that they considered, first, that neither place nor human election makes a member of the church, but divine predestination, with respect to anyone whatever who perseveringly follows Christ in charity and, leaving all temporal goods, dies in hardship in defence of his law.[1] Second, they should consider with misgiving their manner of life, how it is conformed to the life of the head; for as faith teaches they must believe that they neither are [the church] nor a member of the church, nor are they those to whom the promise was made, unless, leaving all things, they have followed [77]**the Lord Jesus Christ in hardship unto death.[2] Third, let them trust in their humble ministry to the church, and not in the pride or the gain of the world, since only thus: to the humble is the heavenly inheritance promised. For God cannot promise the kingdom to any Christian except under such a condition, tacit or express, as is aptly intimated in 1 Kings, chapter 2, of Eli, and more often elsewhere in scripture.[3] And would that our prelates attended to this teaching.**

¶2 77.9–78.11

78.12 *But in that sense the affirmation does not affect Our proposition.*

[77]**Quarto obicitur per hoc quod non docetur efficaciter, quando quicunque sit membrum ecclesie qui est in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, specialiter cum sanctus Thomas dicit hoc expresse, et idem videtur sequi ex dictis Ricardi de Sancto Victore. Aliter enim nemo absolveret prescitum nec incorporaret penitentem per misterium sacramentorum ecclesie, et sic titubaret**

Fourthly it is objected, by appeal to this: that [the teaching] is not effectively taught, since anyone whatever who is in grace according to present justice is a member of the church, especially as St Thomas says this expressly, and the same seems to follow from the sayings of Richard of St Victor.[4] For otherwise no one would absolve a foreknown [man] or incorporate a penitent through the mystery of the sacraments of

fides sacramentorum tam ex incertitudine ministri quam ex ignorancia predestinacionis ministrantis. Hic dicitur (ut supra) quod quicunque vocaverit prescitum in gracia membrum ecclesie, equivocat cum Augustino de scriptura sacra, attendens ad modum loquendi vulgarem et reputacionem ecclesie militantis. Ideo detecta equivocacione expressi superius sentenciam sancti Thome. Et idem videtur Ricardus sentire quod, sicut predestinatus in quantumcunque magno mortali manet continue membrum Christi, sic prescitus absque gracia predestinacionis quantumcunque magnam graciam momentaneam habuerit non remanet eius membrum. Sic enim si foret paterfamilias, cedens lignum de silva quod ordinat aliquantulum expoliri, sed composicionem domus sue nunquam ingredi, non vere diceretur, vel quod ipsum lignum preparaverit in partem domus, [78] vel quod unquam fuerit pars domus huiusmodi, quia sic quelibet domus materialis foret nimis magna, habens in composicionem sui omnes materiales substancias que sunt in potencia fieri eius partes. Sic videtur quod domus mundi excidens de massa humani generis quosdam ad ignem perpetuum, quosdam ut sint postes vel alie partes perpetue in domo domini, nec ordinavit nec futurum erat, ut comburendi forent pars ecclesie, quantumcunque politi fuerint ad tempus, sed finaliter reprobandi. Aliter enim diabolus et omnia membra eius forent pars domus domini.

the church; and so faith in the sacraments would totter, as much from uncertainty about the minister as from ignorance of the predestination of the one ministering.[5] To this the answer is (as above) that whoever calls a foreknown [man] in grace a member of the church equivocates, with Augustine, about holy scripture, attending to the common manner of speaking and to the reputation of the church militant.[6] Therefore, the equivocation having been laid bare, I expressed above the teaching of St Thomas. And Richard seems to think the same: that, just as a predestinate [man], in however great a mortal [sin], remains continually a member of Christ, so a foreknown [man], without the grace of predestination, however great a momentary grace he may have had, does not remain his member. For thus, if there were a householder cutting timber from the wood which he ordains to be somewhat smoothed, but never to enter into the structure of his house, it would not truly be said either that he had prepared that timber as a part of the house, [78] or that it was ever a part of such a house; because so every material house would be too great, having in its structure all the material substances that are in potency to become its parts.[7] So it seems that the lord of the world, cutting from the mass of the human race some for everlasting fire, and some to be posts or other everlasting parts in the house of the Lord, neither ordained, nor was it to be, that those who are to be burned should be part of the church, however polished they may have been for a time; but [they are] finally to be reprobated. For otherwise the devil and all his members would be part of the house of the Lord.[8]

¶3 78.12–79.3
79.4 Christ cannot cease to love his spouse nor any of her members;

[78] Et si dicatur quod Christus habet pro statu viacionis secundum presentem iusticiam tugurium estivale cuius omnes tales sunt partes, tamen cum pro tempore ipsos inhabitat, nihil proposito nostro de tugurio, quia limitatur nobis sermo de sancta matre ecclesia, sponsa Christi, quam ordinavit perpetuam reginam, eternaliter secum mansuram, sine macula vel ruga, ut loquitur apostolus Ephesiis V°, 25, 27: Christus, inquit, tradidit semetipsum pro ecclesia, ut ipse sibi exhiberet ecclesiam gloriosam, non habentem maculam neque rugam. Et de illa dicit sanctus Thomas, De Christo, conclusione VIII[a] articulo III°, quod ille est ultimus finis ad quem producitur sancta mater ecclesia per passionem Christi pro statu patrie, non autem pro statu vie; in quo si dixerimus, quia peccata non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus; et veritas in nobis non est (ut dicitur I[a] Johannis 1° cap., 8). Unde miror quo spiritu nos qui sumus pregravati macula mortalis peccati et ruga venialis presumimus sine revelacione speciali frontose

And if it be said that Christ has, for the state of wayfaring according to present justice, a summer hut of which all such are parts, yet since he inhabits them [only] for a time, [this is] nothing to our purpose concerning the hut; because our discourse is limited to holy mother church, the bride of Christ, whom he ordained an everlasting queen, to abide with him eternally, without spot or wrinkle, as the apostle says, Ephesians 5:25, 27: "Christ," he says, "delivered himself up for the church, that he might present to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle."[9] And of it St Thomas says, *On Christ*, conclusion 8, article 3, that this is the last end to which holy mother church is brought through the passion of Christ, for the state of the homeland, but not for the state of the way; in which, "if we say that we have no sins, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (as is said in 1 John 1:8).[10] Hence I wonder by what spirit we, who are weighed down by the spot of mortal

asserere quod sumus membra illius ecclesie. Et si dicatur quod ista non sunt verba sine racione, arguitur ex principiis fidei [79]scripture quod impossibile est quemcunque prescitum quantumcunque magna gracia ad tempus prepolleat esse membrum sancte matris ecclesie.

sin and the wrinkle of venial [sin], presume, without special revelation, brazenly to assert that we are members of that church. And if it be said that these are not words without reason, it is argued from the principles of the faith [79]of scripture that it is impossible that any foreknown [man] whatever, however great the grace in which he excels for a time, should be a member of holy mother church.[11]

¶4 79.4–79.29

[79]Nam impossibile est Christum unquam non diligere sponsam suam vel aliquam eius partem, cum necessario ipsam totam diligit ut se ipsum. Sed impossibile est ut aliquem prescitum sic diligat, ergo impossibile est ut aliquis prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie. Pro probacione antecedentis suppono hoc famosum principium aput theologos quod Deus non potest quidquam de novo cognoscere sive diligere. Patet per beatum Augustinum VI° De Trinitate XXVII° et eciam philosophica racio contestatur idem concorditer. Unde doctor profundus, libro primo, correlario XXIII[i] capituli pulcre declarat quod Deus nullum noviter diligit neque odit, nec magis aut minus una vice quam alia, nec preces aut quecunque merita bona vel mala flectunt aut mutant voluntatem divinam in minimo huc aut illuc, et quod omnem salvandum aut dampnandum, premiandum vel puniendum sub quocunque gradu voluit ab eterno salvari vel dampnari, premiari vel puniri, sub eodem gradu semper vult precise, et hoc nedum voluntate condicionali vel indeterminata, sed ita absoluta et determinata, sicut vult in presenti vel in finali iudicio aut post volet. Patet ex hoc quod Deus non potest incipere vel desinere quidquam intelligere nec actum voluntatis elicere, tum quia est immutabilis, tum eciam quia tunc noticia aut volucio divina dependeret ab extrinseco plus quam nostra.

For it is impossible that Christ should ever not love his bride or any part of her, since of necessity he loves her whole as himself. Now it is impossible that he should so love any foreknown [man]; therefore it is impossible that any foreknown [man] should be a member of that church.[12] For the proof of the antecedent I suppose this well-known principle among theologians: that God cannot know or love anything anew. It is clear through blessed Augustine, *On the Trinity* 6, [chapter] 27, and philosophical reason also bears witness to the same in agreement.[13] Hence the Profound Doctor, in the first book, in the corollary of chapter 23, beautifully declares that God loves or hates no one newly, nor more or less at one time than at another; nor do prayers or any merits whatever, good or bad, bend or change the divine will in the least, this way or that; and that every one to be saved or damned, rewarded or punished, under whatever degree he willed from eternity [that he] be saved or damned, rewarded or punished, under the same degree he always precisely wills; and this not only by a conditional or indeterminate will, but by one as absolute and determinate as [that by which] he wills in the present, or will will at the final judgement or after.[14] This is clear from the fact that God cannot begin or cease to understand anything, nor to elicit an act of will: both because he is immutable, and also because then the divine knowledge or volition would depend on something extrinsic more than ours [does].

¶5 80.1–80.31
80.1 *Otherwise Christ would not be truly married to the Church.*

[80]Ex istis videtur quod Christus semper diligit totam ecclesiam ut se ipsum, quia aliquando sic diliget, scilicet post diem iudicii, quando regnabit cum eo (ut patet ex processu Cantici Canticorum). Aliter enim non foret verum matrimonium ex caritate perpetua Christi consencientis ad divinas nupcias, nisi sponsus qui est una persona cum sponsa ipsam diligat ut se ipsum. Exemplar enim oportet habere summum gradum denominacionis, quam exemplatis communicat, et hinc Ephes. V°, 25, 28, dicitur: Viri diligite uxores vestras, sicut Christus dilexit ecclesiam et semetipsum tradidit pro

From these it seems that Christ always loves the whole church as himself, since at some time he will so love [it], namely after the day of judgement, when it will reign with him (as is clear from the course of the Song of Songs). For otherwise there would not be a true marriage, from the everlasting charity of Christ consenting to the divine nuptials, unless the bridegroom, who is one person with the bride, love her as himself. For the exemplar must have the highest degree of the denomination which it communicates to the things exemplified; and hence it is said, Ephesians 5:25, 28: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and

ea, ut eam sanctificaret, mundans illam lavacro aque in verbo vite, ut ipse exhiberet gloriosam ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid huiusmodi, ut sit sancta et immaculata. Ita et viri debent diligere uxores suas ut corpora sua. Ex ista fide scripture de sancta matre ecclesia patet cum dicto correlario quod debet semper diligere totam sanctam ecclesiam sicut diliget post diem iudicii; et per idem semper odit quemcunque prescitum, sicut unquam post diem iudicii. Cum enim Deus plene scit qualem finem quicunque prescitus cum ipso faciet et quantam penitenciam agent quicunque predestinati casuri, postmodum perpetuo Dei grati, patet quod necessario omnem predestinatum quantumcunque criminosus fuerit plus diligit, quam aliquem prescitum in quantacunque gracia fuerit temporali, quia primum eternaliter vult habere beatitudinem et alium ignem perpetuum. Testatur autem scriptura quod Deus odit peccatores, ut patet Psalmo V°, 7: Odisti omnes qui operantur iniquitatem.

delivered himself up for it: that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life: that he might present a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies."[15] From this faith of scripture concerning holy mother church it is clear, together with the said corollary, that he must always love the whole holy church as he will love [it] after the day of judgement; and by the same token he always hates any foreknown [man] whatever, as [much as] ever [he will] after the day of judgement.[16] For since God fully knows what kind of end any foreknown [man] whatever will make with him, and how great a penance any predestinate who are going to fall will do, [being] afterwards everlastingly pleasing to God, it is clear that of necessity he loves every predestinate [man], however criminous he may have been, more than any foreknown [man], in however great a temporal grace he may have been; because he eternally wills the first to have blessedness and the other everlasting fire. And scripture bears witness that God hates sinners, as is clear from Psalm 5:7: "Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity."[17]

Notes

1. The answer to the third objection (the prelates who trust in place and office, 76.1–24) continues. AA, *nullus locus vel eleccio*, as also Hus (Loserth); the print *nec locus nec eleccio* is B's. AB margin: *Triplex consideracio* (76.25); B's later hand: *Nec locus nec eleccio facit predestinatum*. *Penaliter*: under suffering, the adverb of *penalitas* (the glossary, "hardship").
2. *Nec sunt vel membrum ecclesie*: the first member has no complement; we supply "[the church]" (the church, or a member of it). *Facta fuit promissio* (76.33): the print (plate); the OCR had *ruit*.
3. 1 Sam. 2:30 (DR 1 Kings): the promise to Eli's house, "should minister in my sight, for ever. But now saith the Lord: Far be this from me"; the conditional promise is the point. Not quoted. *Cum solum sic*: the colon is the print's; the clause states what the "thus" is.
4. *Quando* taken as causal ("since"), which gives the objection Loserth's side-note states; read as temporal ("it is not effectively taught when anyone ... is a member") it says the same less directly. *Gracia secundum presentem iusticiam*: as in 04-b ¶2. St Thomas and Richard, "loc. cit." (Loserth, = *Thomae Opp.* V, 51): Thomas *ST* III q. 8 a. 3 co. and ad 2, and most expressly *In III Sent.* d. 13 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 2 ad 3 (cf. 18-a); Richard, *De potestate ligandi et solvendi* (04-b n. 2). A margin: *Quarta obieccio* (77.9). B *ideo videtur*, and B lacks *Ricardi* (77.12–13).
5. AA_1 *predestinacionis ministri*; B *ministrati*, "of the one ministered to", which would set the minister's uncertainty against ignorance of the recipient's predestination. We translate the print. B *tutubaret* (77.16).
6. *Equivocat cum Augustino de scriptura sacra*: taken as "uses the word as Augustine does when he speaks of scripture's usage", i.e. the common sense of *ecclesia* that includes the foreknown (cf. *ut supra*); *cum Augustino* could also mean "against Augustine['s usage]". A margin: *Responsio. Presciti et predestinati quomodo sunt in ecclesia* (77.19); *Conclusio* (77.25). A *iterum videtur*, and B lacks *Ricardus* (77.23).
7. Richard's figure of the timber (04-b ¶1, 73.20–26) turned against the foreknown: timber smoothed for a time but never built in was never part of the house. *Cedens* = *caedens*. A margin: *Exemplum* (77.28).
8. *Domus mundi* (78.4), as printed (plate), does not construe as the subject of *ordinavit*; we translate *dominus mundi*, "the lord of the world" (our emendation); reported as a doubt. *Postes*: the posts or door-posts of the house. *Reprobandi*: "to be reprobated", the verb of *reprobi*.
9. Eph. 5:25, 27, DR, abridged by Wyclif (*Christus ... tradidit ... pro ecclesia*; *neque* for *aut*). *Tugurium estivale*: a summer hut, a temporary dwelling, set against the house that stands for ever; the opponent's figure for the church of present justice. A margin: *Ficcio* (78.12). B *non aut* (78.26).
10. Aquinas, *ST* III q. 8 a. 3 ad 2 (Loserth: *Thomae Opp.* V, 51–52, quoting *Unde hoc erit in statu patriae, non autem in statu viae*). *De Christo* is the *Tertia pars*; *conclusione VIII* the question. Thomas has *perducimur*, Wyclif *producitur ... ecclesia*. 1 John 1:8, DR; Wyclif *peccata* (plural) for *peccatum*, *quia* for *quoniam*. A margin: *S. Thomas* (78.23).

11. ***Venialis*** **is Loserth's; the MSS** ***venali*** **(78.30). B** ***asserunt*** **(78.31).** ***Si dicatur quod ista non sunt verba sine racione*****: as printed, "if it be said that these are not words without reason", where the sense wants "if it be said that these are words without reason" or "that it may be said that they are not"; we translate the print; reported. A margin:** ***Nota bonam racionem*** **(79.2);** ***Arguitur quod impossibile est prescitum esse membrum ecclesie sponse Christi*** **(79.3).**
12. ***Impossibile°*** **(79.5): the degree sign is an OCR scar (Loserth's line has no reference mark); reported.** ***Sed*** **brings the minor premiss ("Now"). The** ***antecedens*** **proved next is the minor: that Christ cannot so love a foreknown man.**
13. Augustine, ***De Trinitate*****, as Wyclif cites it, "VI, 27"; Loserth: "rightly XIV, cap. XVIII",** ***Opp.*** **VIII, 95, and cf. a second place (the OCR of his note is uncertain: "lib. VIII [?], cap. XII"); XIV.18 (PL 42:1055) does not contain the claim, and the place is untraced. B** ***ideo contestatur*** **(79.12). A margin:** ***Supposicio*** **(79.10),** ***Augustinus*** **(79.12).**
14. Thomas Bradwardine, the ***doctor profundus*****,** ***De causa Dei*** **I, corollary of chapter 23 (Loserth's note: Bradwardine, confessor of Edward III, archbishop of Canterbury, d. 1349). Wyclif gives the corollary almost word for word (Savile, 1618, I.23 capitula). B** ***nec partes aut*** **for** ***nec preces aut*** **(79.16). B margin:** ***Bradwardyn*** **(79.13);** ***Probat prescitum non esse partem ecclesie*** **(79.22).**
15. Eph. 5:25–28, DR; Wyclif lacks ***et*** **before** ***Christus*****,** ***sibi*** **(5:27) and** ***sed*** **(5:27), and has** ***illam*** **after** ***mundans*****.** ***Exemplar … denominacionis*****: the exemplar has in the highest degree the quality by which it names its copies; so Christ's love of the church is the measure of a husband's. B** ***exemplaris*** **(80.9). A margin:** ***Christus diligit totam ecclesiam sicud se ipsum*** **(80.2).** ***Processus*****: the course of the Song (the glossary);** ***regnabit cum eo*****: "it" is the church.**
16. ***Debet*****: "he must", of necessity, not of obligation.** ***Ex ista fide scripture*****: "from this faith of scripture", the genitive use of the formula (the glossary). A margin:** ***Conclusio*** **(80.24).**
17. ***Qualem finem … cum ipso faciet*****: "what end … will make with him", i.e. how the foreknown man will end in relation to God; the Latin is compressed.** ***Dei grati*****: "in favour with God". Ps. 5:7 (Vulgate numbering), DR. B** ***Testatur aut[em]*** **(80.27). A margin:** ***Quinta obieccio*** **(80.32), at the next chunk.**
How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **76:** ***facit***
  - **76:** ***conversa-*** **(first half of conversa-/cionem (cionem is pos 209); b is the margin letter) [NW]**
  - **76:** ***illi*** **(print 'nec illi sunt')**
  - **76:** ***facta***
  - **77:** ***vel*** **(139a is the folio mark)**
  - **77:** ***I°***
  - **77:** ***II°*** **(print 'cap. II° de Hely' (de is the INS? row at pos 48))**
  - **77:** ***de*** **(print 'II° de Hely')**
  - **77:** ***est*** **('to' is side-note text)**
  - **78:** ***Christus***
  - **78:** ***tugurium*** **(print has tugurium) [NW]**
  - **78:** ***III°***
  - **78:** ***Iª***
  - **79:** ***XXIIIⁱ*** **(superscript i after XXIII (not a degree sign))**
  - **80:** ***ipsum***
  - **80:** ***iudicii***
  - **80:** ***videtur***
  - **80:** ***Christus***
  - **80:** ***diliget***
  - **78:** ***patrie,*** **(25 is the line number) [-MARK]**
- **Corrected in the Latin; plates): 76.33** ***ruit → fuit*****; 79.5** ***impossibile°*****; 79.12** ***DeTrinitate*****; 76.30** ***conversa- cionem*****. Read on the plate and left as printed: 78.4** ***domus mundi*** **(translated as** ***dominus*****, our emendation, n. 8); about 78.33** ***non sunt verba*** **(Latin doubt, translated as printed).**

Part 4: The fifth objection; the one church from Abel, of which no foreknown man is a member

Loserth pp. 80.32–84.22

¶1 80.32–81.10
80.32
5. Objection: This opinion is not supported by doctors or the canon law.
81.11 *Answer: All doctors and saints do support it;*

[80]**Sed adhuc instatur quinto per hoc quod non expresse fulcitur ista sentencia ex testimonio sanctorum doctorum vel textu iuris canonici, imo fingitur ad** [81]**colorandum quod omnia que fuerunt vel erunt sunt Deo presencia, et sic ad tollendum principatum Romane ecclesie fingitur quod ecclesia est corpus et homo, ubicunque**

But it is still objected, fifthly, by appeal to this: that this teaching is not expressly supported by the testimony of the holy doctors or by the text of canon law; rather, it is feigned in order [81]**to colour [the claim] that all things that were or will be are present to God; and so, in order to take away the principate of the Roman church, it is feigned that the church**

81.16 *as Augustine, who says that the Church began with Abel.*
81.20 *Objection: This would exclude the angels and Adam and Eve.*
81.26 *Answer: The Church sometimes is used only of men, sometimes to include angels.*

sunt fideles; quod Johannes papa XXII negat et philosophia de continuacione requisita ad esse corporis. Unde nisi a signo sensibili possemus discernere qui forent ecclesiastici, non possemus hic cognoscere matrem nostram; quod tamquam maximum inconveniens confunderet religionem christianam, cum nemo tenetur diligere quod non noscit.

is a body and a man wherever the faithful are; which Pope John XXII denies, and [so does] philosophy, concerning the continuity required for the being of a body.[1] Hence, unless we could discern by a perceptible sign who belonged to the church, we could not know our mother here; which, as the greatest absurdity, would confound the Christian religion, since no one is bound to love what he does not know.[2]

¶2 81.11–82.10
82.11 *Abel was the first to lead a perfect life, so in dignity he has the first place.*

[81]Hic dicitur quod ista est concors sanctorum sentencia (ut partim patuit ex dictis), nec usquam invenietur aliquem sanctum contradicere isti sentencie, si non fallor. Unde sancti doctores, fides ecclesie et iura canonica tenent illam concorditer. Nam quoad etatem ecclesie sic scribit Augustinus super Psalmo CXLII°: Ecclesia, inquit, que est mulier antiqua, civitas Dei et corpus Christi, habet inicium ab Abel, sicut mala civitas a Caym. Sed contra istud obicitur, primo per hoc quod angeli confirmati qui sunt principalis pars ecclesie totum genus hominum precesserunt. Item, Adam et Eva qui sunt membra sancte matris ecclesie fuerunt priores filio suo Abel, non ergo sumpsit ecclesia inicium suum ab Abel. Quantum ad istud, dicitur quod ecclesia nunc sumitur pro universitate hominum predestinatorum (ut in auctoritate predicta beati Augustini) et nunc pro universitate creature beate (ut patet Encheridion LVI°), et cum in equivocis non sit contradiccio, patet quod nec [82]verba nec sentencia Augustini contradicit supradictis de totali ecclesia. Et ita civitas Dei tempore vel natura precessit civitatem diaboli, cum angeli stantes pro primo instanti mundi erant civitas Dei quodam modo imperfecte, mali autem angeli non erant de civitate diaboli ante peccatum quod post fuit, et prius erant extravagantes presciti ad dampnandum ac excommunicandum se ipsos instituendo sese civitatem superbie; alios autem ex humili subieccione constituit Deus sibi in civitatem gloriosam quam semper inhabitat.

To this the answer is that this is the concordant teaching of the saints (as was partly clear from what has been said), nor will any saint anywhere be found to contradict this teaching, if I am not mistaken. Hence the holy doctors, the faith of the church and the canon laws hold it in agreement. For as to the age of the church, Augustine writes thus on Psalm 142: "The church," he says, "which is the ancient woman, the city of God and the body of Christ, has its beginning from Abel, as the evil city from Cain."[3] But against this it is objected, first, by appeal to this: that the confirmed angels, who are the principal part of the church, preceded the whole human race. Again, Adam and Eve, who are members of holy mother church, were prior to their son Abel; therefore the church did not take its beginning from Abel.[4] As to this, the answer is that "church" is now taken for the whole body of predestinate men (as in the aforesaid authority of blessed Augustine), and now for the whole body of blessed creatures (as is clear from the *Enchiridion* 56); and since in equivocal [terms] there is no contradiction, it is clear that neither [82]the words nor the teaching of Augustine contradict what was said above of the total church.[5] And so the city of God preceded the city of the devil in time or in nature, since the angels who stood were, at the first instant of the world, the city of God, in a certain way imperfectly; and the evil angels were not of the city of the devil before the sin, which came after, and before [it] they were strays, foreknown to damn and excommunicate themselves by establishing themselves as the city of pride; but the others, from humble subjection, God constituted for himself into a glorious city, which he always inhabits.[6]

¶3 82.11–83.5
83.17 *The Saints testify that there is but one holy mother Church,*
83.21 *of which none that is foreknown is a member,*

[82]Ad secundum obiectum conceditur quod parentes Abel prius erant imperfecte de ecclesia, sed ille fuit primus hominum qui consumavit viacionem perfectam incorporatus quoad perfeccionem beatitudinis, et sic dicitur quoad dignitatem totum genus suum precedere, unde quoad etatem ac unitatem ecclesie ponitur ista sentencia in decretis

To the second objection it is granted that Abel's parents were, before [him], imperfectly of the church; but he was the first of men who completed a perfect wayfaring, incorporated as to the perfection of blessedness, and so he is said to precede his whole race in dignity.[7] Hence, as to the age and unity of the church, this teaching is set down in the

XXXII q. IV, Recurrat, sub auctoritate beati Augustini notabiliter in hiis verbis: Ecclesia que peperit Abel, Enoch, Noe et Abraham, ipsa peperit Moysen et prophetas tempore posteriores ante domini adventum, et que istos, ipsa et apostolos et martires nostros et omnes bonos christianos. Omnes enim peperit qui diversis temporibus nati apparuerunt, sed societate unius populi continentur. Tamquam eiusdem civitatis cives labores peregrinacionis experti sunt, quidam autem nunc experiuntur et usque in finem ceteri experientur. Et correspondenter loquitur de ecclesia malignancium: Que, inquit, peperit Caym, Cham, Ysmahel et Esau, [83] eadem ipsa peperit Datan et alios in eodem populo similes, et que istos, eadem ipsa Judam, pseudoapostolos, Simonem magum et ceteros usque ad hec tempora pseudochristianos pertinaciter obduratos, sive sint permixti sive aperta precisione dissenciant.

Decretum, 32 q. 4, *Recurrat*, under the authority of blessed Augustine, notably in these words: "The church which bore Abel, Enoch, Noah and Abraham, she bore Moses and the prophets, later in time, before the Lord's coming; and she who [bore] these, she [bore] also the apostles and our martyrs and all good Christians. For she bore all who appeared, born at different times, but are held together in the fellowship of one people. As citizens of the same city they have experienced the labours of pilgrimage; and some experience them now, and the rest will experience them until the end."[8] And correspondingly he speaks of the church of the malignant: "She," he says, "who bore Cain, Ham, Ishmael and Esau, [83] she the same bore Dathan and others like them in the same people; and she who [bore] these, she the same [bore] Judas, the false apostles, Simon Magus, and the other false Christians down to these times, obstinately hardened, whether they are mixed in or dissent by open cutting-off."[9]

¶4 83.6–84.10
84.11 *or the Church would not be without spot or wrinkle.*

[83] Et post exponit quomodo allegorice docetur in historia veteris testamenti quomodo boni quandoque pariunt bonos, ut Jacob duodecim patriarchas, mali autem quandoque pariunt bonos, ut ancille Rachel pariunt Jacob filios, mali autem quandoque pariunt malos, et boni malos, ut patet de Ismahel, filio Abrahe et ancille. Et postmodum declarat quod palea nullo modo potest converti in frumentum sicut nec caro in spiritum, sed presciti omnes ab illa ecclesia que triumphans est sine macula vel ruga semper divisi sunt. Et sic patet ex testimonio sanctorum Augustini, Crisostomi et decreti quomodo est unica sancta mater ecclesia a principio mundi que eternaliter et impermixte amplexata est a sponsi dextera post diem iudicii. Unde, supposita ad istum sensum unitate sancte matris ecclesie, manifestum videtur quod nullus prescitus sit membrum illius ecclesie; nam solum illa est mater ecclesia pro tempore vie que coronabitur, nec habebit hic alias partes quam habebit post diem iudicii. Sed illa mater nostra post diem iudicii, quando erit sine macula vel ruga, non habebit prescitos sed solum predestinatos partes suas; ergo et modo. Assumptum patet de una sancta matre ecclesia que inutiliter serviret hic sponso, nisi post laborem eternaliter coronetur. [84] Et hec eadem unica que in via fuit sancta ecclesia catholica. Non enim potest fingi quod decreta et sancti doctores loquuntur de alia sancta ecclesia catholica quam de illa, sic quod solum manebit una sancta ecclesia catholica usque ad diem iudicii, et post quando reciperet perfeccionem ultimam extinguetur vel in plures ecclesias dividetur, quia ut Augustinus dicit III° De Doctrina Christiana cap.

And afterwards he expounds how it is taught allegorically in the history of the Old Testament how the good sometimes bear good, as Jacob the twelve patriarchs; and the evil sometimes bear good, as the handmaids of Rachel bore sons to Jacob; and the evil sometimes bear evil, and the good evil, as is clear of Ishmael, the son of Abraham and the handmaid.[10] And afterwards he declares that chaff can in no way be turned into wheat, as neither [can] flesh into spirit; but all the foreknown have always been divided from that church which, [as] triumphant, is without spot or wrinkle. And so it is clear from the testimony of Saints Augustine and Chrysostom and of the Decretum how there is one only holy mother church from the beginning of the world, which eternally and unmixed is embraced by the bridegroom's right hand after the day of judgement.[11] Hence, the unity of holy mother church being supposed in this sense, it seems manifest that no foreknown [man] is a member of that church; for only that [church] is mother church for the time of the way which will be crowned, nor will it have other parts here than it will have after the day of judgement. Now that mother of ours, after the day of judgement, when she will be without spot or wrinkle, will have not the foreknown but only the predestinate as her parts; therefore now also.[12] The assumption is clear of the one holy mother church, which would serve the bridegroom here to no purpose unless after labour she were eternally crowned. [84] And this same [is] the one only [church] which in the way was the holy catholic church. For it cannot be feigned that the decrees and the holy doctors speak of another holy catholic church than that one, so that only one holy

XXXII°: Illi qui in die iudicii statuentur a sinistris ut edi (sicut patet Matthei XXV°, 41) nunquam erant de corpore domini, sed

catholic church will remain until the day of judgement, and afterwards, when it should receive its final perfection, it will be extinguished or divided into several churches; because, as Augustine says, *On Christian Doctrine* 3, chapter 32: "Those who on the day of judgement will be set on the left as goats (as is clear from Matthew 25:41) were never of the body of the Lord, but[13]

¶5 84.11–84.14

[84]continue membra diaboli. Tale, inquam, aggregatum non foret sancta mater ecclesia sine macula vel ruga, quia per idem foret maledicta ecclesia malignancium, sedes sathane et meretrix adulterantis diaboli.

continually members of the devil." Such an aggregate, I say, would not be holy mother church without spot or wrinkle, because by the same token it would be the accursed church of the malignant, the seat of Satan and the harlot of the adulterous devil.[14]

¶6 84.15–84.22

[84]Ideo notet adversarius que sit illa mater ecclesia de cuius unitate leges, sancti doctores et ecclesia sic loquuntur et videat si membrum illius sit quivis reprobus. Nam in extravagante Bonifacii VIII^vi^ suadetur multipliciter ex scriptura quod tantum est una talis ecclesia (ut patet cap. II), et idem exprimitur in decretis XXIV^a^ q. I, Loquitur, cum concordanciis legum atque doctoribus.

Therefore let the adversary note which is that mother church of whose unity the laws, the holy doctors and the church speak thus, and let him see whether any reprobate whatever is a member of it.[15] For in the Extravagant of Boniface VIII it is urged in many ways from scripture that there is only one such church (as is clear, chapter 2), and the same is expressed in the Decretum, 24 q. 1, *Loquitur*, with the concordances of the laws and the doctors.[16]

Notes

1. *Ad colorandum*: "to give colour to", i.e. a plausible ground (the glossary, *color*), here the verb; A_1 would correct to *tollerandum*. *Imo* = *ymmo*, "rather". *Continuacio*: the physical continuity a body needs, which scattered believers lack. John XXII's denial is not identified. A margin: *Quinta obieccio* (80.32).
2. *Ecclesiastici*: here "those who belong to the church", not "the clergy"; the objector's point is that the members must be visible. *Inconveniens*: an absurdity in argument (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), though the consequence named is a disorder in affairs.
3. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 142.3, paraphrased (PL 37:1846, *Haec civitas initium habet ab ipso Abel*; Loserth: *Opp.* V, 1589). The two cities are those of *De civitate Dei* 15.1. A margin: *Responsio* (81.11); *Triplex testamentum* [*testimonium*?] (81.14); *Augustinus* (81.16). B *concorditer etatem* (81.15).
4. B *qui sunt membra* (81.21). A margin: *Duplex obieccio* (81.21). *Angeli confirmati*: the angels confirmed in grace after the fall of the others.
5. *Encheridion LVI* is Loserth's correction (*Correxi*); the MSS *XLI* (81.29). Augustine, *Enchiridion* 56 (15), the church including the holy angels (Loserth: *Opp.* VI, 217). *Universitas ... predestinatorum*: "the whole body", as for *universitas fidelium* (the glossary). A margin: *Solucio* (81.26); *Ecclesie equivocacio* (81.27).
6. *Extravagantes*: "strays", wandering outside the city; perhaps a play on the *Extravagantes*, the papal decretals "wandering outside" the Decretum (cf. 84.16). *Ad dampnandum ac excommunicandum se ipsos* is read with *presciti*: foreknown to damn and excommunicate themselves. B's later hand: *Ecclesia est unica eternaliter*; A margin: *Ecclesia quid est* (82.18).
7. *Prius* (82.12): the print has lower-case *prius* (plate). *Incorporatus quoad perfeccionem beatitudinis*: incorporated [into the church] in respect of the perfection of blessedness, i.e. the first to die in grace. A margin: *Ad secundum* (82.11); *Nota qualiter ecclesia sumpsit exordium ab Abel, cum tamen angeli, Adam et Eva precesserint* (82.12).
8. Decretum C. 32 q. 4 c. 2, *Recurrat* (Loserth: *Decreti sec. pars, causa XXXII, q. IV, cap. II*; the modern form is ours), inscribed *Augustinus super Joannem, tract. XI* (PL 187:1476C). The Decretum reads *Et eiusdem* (82.24). A_1 margin, a reader's dissent: *Nota Augustinus in hoc capitulo nullam facit mencionem de predestinacione nec de prescitis, ergo racionem non habet ad propositum* (82.19). *Peregrinacio*: the pilgrimage of the city of God on earth (the glossary, *pars peregrinans*).
9. *Ecclesia malignancium*: Ps. 25:5 (Vulgate), DR "the assembly of the malignant". The Decretum reads *in affeccione carnali pertinaciter* (83.4). *Aperta precisione*: by open cutting off, i.e. schism. A margin: *Nota continue infra de ecclesia, de prescitis et de predestinatis*; *Ecclesia malignancium* (82.28).
10. Augustine as Loserth quotes him (83.6): *In omnibus enim christianis ... aut per malos nascuntur boni aut per bonos nascuntur mali aut per bonos boni aut per malos mali*. *Autem* only extends the list ("and"). B *pariunt malos* (83.9). A margin: *Generacio ecclesie* (83.6).
11. *Amplexata est a sponsi dextera*: Song 2:6, DR "his right hand shall embrace me"; the perfect is rendered "is embraced", of the church's settled state. Chrysostom's testimony is that cited in 04-b (*Opus imperfectum*, hom. 9). B's later hand: *Palea nunquam vertetur in frumentum sicut corpus in animum* (83.13). AA_1 *de testimonio*; B *unica et sancta* (83.16–17).

12. ***Sed illa … iudicii*** **(83.24–25) is lacking in AA$_1$; the print follows B.** ***Sed*** **brings the minor premiss ("Now").** ***Mater ecclesia*** **is holy mother church, not the local** ***matrix ecclesia*** **(the glossary).**
13. Augustine, ***De doctrina christiana*** **3.32.45 (cf. 04-b n. 7), cited by Wyclif;** ***Illi … diaboli*** **paraphrases 3.32.45 (PL 34:82) and the seventh rule (PL 34:88,** ***ituri cum illo in supplicium ignis aeterni*****). The goats on the left are Matt. 25:33; Wyclif cites 25:41, the sentence on them.** ***Edi = haedi*****. A margin:** ***Augustinus*** **(84.8).**
14. ***Sedes sathane*****: Apoc. 2:13, DR "the seat of Satan"; the harlot is that of Apoc. 17.** ***Aggregatum*****: the church taken as an aggregate of good and bad (cf.** ***aggregative*****, the glossary). A margin:** ***Nota*** **(84.11).**
15. ***Reprobus*****: "reprobate" (the glossary), Wyclif's word here, not** ***prescitus*****. B** ***Igitur notet*** **(84.15). A margin:** ***Vis racionis*** **(84.15).**
16. Boniface VIII, ***Unam sanctam*** **(*****Extrav. comm.*** **1.8.1; the modern form is ours), cited by Loserth as at 25.26.** ***Cap. II*****: Loserth prints** ***II*** **where the MSS have** ***X*** **(84.20); taken as this work's chapter 2, where the bull was discussed. Decretum C. 24 q. 1 c. 18,** ***Loquitur*****, from Cyprian,** ***De unitate ecclesiae*** **(PL 187:1271B; Loserth; the modern form is ours).**
How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **81:** ***colorandum*** **(139c is the folio mark)**
  - **81:** ***et*** **('gan' is side-note text (the Church began))**
  - **82:** ***Ad***
  - **82:** ***Et*** **(print 'Et correspondenter')**
  - **84:** ***sed*** **(print 'sed continue' (italic sed at line start))**
  - **84:** ***loquuntur***
  - **84:** ***VIII^{vi}*** **(superscript vi after VIII)**
- **Corrected in the Latin: 80.32** ***ex-i presse*****; 82.12** ***Prius*****; 84.1** ***ceclesia*****; 84.7** ***111°*****.**

Part 5: The Roman church is the whole church militant, not the pope and his college

Loserth pp. 84.23–88.30

¶1 84.23–86.2
84.25 *Hence it is presumption to assert oneself to be a member of the Church.*
85.4 *Yet this is done by prelates, whose lives are most unlike Christ's.*
85.22 *The Roman Church may be used as a name of the Catholic Church, including all the faithful.*
86.17 *It cannot be only the Pope and the Curia;*

[84]**Non ergo est nova ficticia sic loqui de unitate ecclesie, nec dubium quin sit illa que post diem iudicii erit regnum celorum, celestis Jerusalem et sponsa Christi (ut supra meminit Augustinus). Ex istis sequitur ut sepe repecii) quod nimis magna foret presumpcio quemquam sine formidine vel revelacione asserere quod sit membrum illius ecclesie. Nam nemo nisi predestinatus et sanctus tempore suo sine macula vel ruga est** [85]**membrum illius ecclesie. Sed nemo sine formidine vel revelacione assereret quod sit predestinatus et sanctus sine macula vel ruga: ergo conclusio. Unde miror qua fronte magis contendentes pro proprietate bonorum ecclesie, magis seculariter viventes, elongati a Christi conversacione et plus steriles ab execucione Christi consilii et precepti plus vendicant titulo participii illius ecclesie bona fortunii per accidens adiacencia illi ecclesie, quam fecerunt apostoli vel sancti patres priores. Numquid credimus quod sic placitantes sunt sancti sine macula mortalis vel ruga venialis? Si dicunt quod sic, desercio Christi consilii cum ocio sancti officii hos condempnat. Jus enim humanum non dat eis titulum taliter vendicandi, et ius divinum docet quod rapinam bonorum cum gaudio susciperent et que sua sunt non sic repeterent (ut patet cap. III° ex testimonio beati Gregorii). Quo iure ergo sic vendicant, cum nitendo sic illi titulo ab eodem se privant? Considerarent ergo condiciones sancte matris ecclesie, antequam redarguti ex proprio opere contra Christi consilia sic instarent. Et quantum ad dictum de Romana**

It is not, therefore, a new fiction to speak thus of the unity of the church, nor is there doubt that it is that [church] which after the day of judgement will be the kingdom of heaven, the heavenly Jerusalem and the bride of Christ (as Augustine mentioned above). From these it follows (as I have often repeated) that it would be too great a presumption for anyone to assert without misgiving or revelation that he is a member of that church. For no one except one predestinate and holy in his time, without spot or wrinkle, is [85]**a member of that church. Now no one would assert without misgiving or revelation that he is predestinate and holy without spot or wrinkle: therefore the conclusion.**[1] **Hence I wonder with what face those who contend the more for the ownership of the goods of the church, living the more worldly, removed far from Christ's manner of life and the more barren of the carrying out of Christ's counsel and precept, claim the more, by title of participation in that church, the goods of fortune that by accident lie next to that church, than the apostles or the earlier holy fathers did.**[2] **Do we believe that those who plead [at law] in this way are saints without the spot of mortal [sin] or the wrinkle of venial? If they say so, the desertion of Christ's counsel, with idleness in the holy office, condemns them. For human law does not give them a title to claim in such a way, and divine law teaches that they should take the plundering of their goods with joy, and not so ask back what is theirs (as is**

ecclesia, suppono quod illa dicatur sancta mater ecclesia catholica, sponsa Christi. Et patet quod illa diffunditur, ubicunque sunt fideles predestinati; unde (ut tetigi superius) Augustinus in epistola ad Dardanum cap. XI°, exponens illud Johannis XVIII°, 14, Expedit ut unus homo moriatur pro populo etc. Cayphas, inquit, prophetavit quod Deus filius suos congregaret in unum. Non, inquit, in aliquem unum locum corporalem, sed congregavit in unum spiritum et unum corpus cuius unum caput est Christus. Ex quo patet quod unitas sancte matris ecclesie stat in [86] unitate fidei et virtutum, licet fideles quantumcunque varie localiter sint diffusi.

clear in chapter 3 from the testimony of blessed Gregory).[3] By what right, then, do they so claim, since by striving thus for that title they deprive themselves of it? Let them consider, then, the conditions of holy mother church, before, refuted by their own work, they press [their case] thus against Christ's counsels. And as to what was said of the Roman church, I suppose that it is called holy mother catholic church, the bride of Christ.[4] And it is clear that it is spread abroad wherever the predestinate faithful are; hence (as I touched on above) Augustine, in the letter to Dardanus, chapter 11, expounding that [text] of John 18:14, "It is expedient that one man should die for the people," etc.: "Caiaphas," he says, "prophesied that God would gather his sons into one. Not," he says, "into some one bodily place, but he gathered [them] into one spirit and one body, whose one head is Christ."[5] From which it is clear that the unity of holy mother church stands in [86] the unity of faith and of the virtues, although the faithful are spread abroad in place, however variously.

¶2 86.3–88.19
87.10 *since Jerome's description of the Roman Church applies to them only by contrast;*
87.28 *but must be the whole Church militant.*
88.12 *The Pope and his college are chief in dignity if they follow Christ;*
88.17 *otherwise they are a nest of heretics.*

[86] Unde beatus Isidorus, libro primo De Summo Bono cap. XIX°, ita scribit: Sancta ecclesia ideo dicitur catholica, eo quod universaliter per omnem sit mundum diffusa. Et Hugo, libro II° De Sacramentis parte cap. II°: Sancta ecclesia, id est, universitas fidelium corpus Christi vocatur. Et istam sententiam innuunt decreta XXI[a] d.: Quamvis universe per orbem catholice ecclesie unus thalamus sit Christi, tamen sancta Romana ecclesia catholica et apostolica multis sinodicis institutis ceteris ecclesiis prelata est. Quod probat ex illo Matthei XVI°: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam. Et illam ecclesiam vocat postmodum ecclesiam Romanam, primam apostoli Petri sedem, non habentem maculam neque rugam. Ista ecclesia non potest intelligi dumtaxat iste papa cum istis cardinalibus ac sua familia, cum ipsi cotidie recedunt et veniunt et crebrius quam alius fidelis populus sunt rugosi. Unde super isto textu sic dicit glosa: Argumentum, inquit, est quod ubicunque sunt boni ibi est Romana ecclesia. Et hoc argumentum daret plenam fidem fidelibus. Et sic intelligo decretum XXIV[a], q. 1 A recta, ubi canon de Romana ecclesia sic loquitur: Hec est sancta et apostolica mater omnium ecclesiarum Christi ecclesia que per Dei omnipotentis graciam a tramite apostolice tradicionis nunquam errasse probatur nec hereticis succubuit. Ubi notum est hoc [87] non posse intelligi de quolibet papa et suis domesticis. Ideo glosa sic loquitur: Quero, inquit, de qua ecclesia hic loquitur, quia non potest intelligi de papa qui dicitur ecclesia, ut supra eodem, Quodcunque, et VII[a] q. prima: Scire debes. Sed certum est quod papa errare potest (ut XIX dist. Anastasius

Hence blessed Isidore, in the first book *On the Highest Good*, chapter 19, writes thus: "The holy church is called catholic for this reason, that it is spread universally through the whole world." And Hugh, in book 2 *On the Sacraments*, part [2], chapter 2: "The holy church, that is, the whole body of the faithful, is called the body of Christ."[6] And the decrees intimate this teaching, distinction 21: "Although all the catholic churches throughout the world are the one bridal chamber of Christ, yet the holy Roman church, catholic and apostolic, has been set over the other churches by many synodal decrees." Which it proves from that [text] of Matthew 16: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church." And afterwards it calls that church the Roman church, the first see of the apostle Peter, "not having spot or wrinkle."[7] This church cannot be understood as only this pope with these cardinals and his household, since they daily depart and come, and are wrinkled more often than the rest of the faithful people. Hence on this text the gloss says thus: "It is an argument," it says, "that wherever the good are, there is the Roman church." And this argument would give full faith to the faithful.[8] And so I understand the decree 24 q. 1, *A recta*, where the canon speaks thus of the Roman church: "This is the holy and apostolic church, mother of all the churches of Christ, which by the grace of almighty God is proved never to have erred from the path of apostolic tradition, nor has it succumbed to heretics." Where it is known that this [87] cannot be understood of any pope whatever and his domestics.[9]

et XL dist. Si papa). Ideo nec ipse nec eius familia est illa ecclesia de qua hic dicitur quod errare non potest. Unde ipsa congregacio fidelium dicitur hec ecclesia (ut De Consecracione d. Iª, Ecclesia). Et sic intelligitur dictum beati Jeronymi positum XXIVª, q. i. Hec est fides. Sancta, inquit, est Romana ecclesia que semper immaculata permansit domino providente et beato Petro apostolo opem ferente in futurum manebit sine ulla hereticorum insultacione atque firma et immobilis omni tempore persistet. Hic non potest intelligi quicunque papa cum suo collegio. Illi enim sunt sepius maculati et insultacione hereticorum tam ab intra quam ab extra tamquam fragilis viator concussi, ut oculata fide patet diebus nostris, cum due partes cardinalium inponunt papa nostro et fratribus eum foventibus hereticam pravitatem, cum (ut inquiunt) nedum nituntur auferre privilegia Romane ecclesie, sed quantum in eis est ipsam destruere. Et omnis talis est hereticus (ut patet XXIIª dist. Omnes, ut patet libro VI°, tractatu de heresi). Cum ergo iuxta decreta Romana ecclesia habet primatum et dignitatem quoad Deum super omnes alias, patet quod illa est totalis ecclesia militans quam Deus plus diligit quam aliam eius partem. Et sic manifeste sequitur ex fide quod non illud collegium sed tota mater in omni gente et lingua dispersa [88] sit illa sancta Romana ecclesia de qua iura loquuntur cum sanctis doctoribus. Unde ad imprimendum in nobis istam sentenciam in cantu ecclesie per beatos Ambrosium et Augustinum composito mater nostra sic Deum alloquitur: Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur ecclesia. Et in canone misse primo et principaliter offerimus pro sancta ecclesia catholica, ut Deus dignetur pacificare, custodire et adiuvare eam toto orbe terrarum. Unde non dubium oratur pro principalissima ecclesia militante quam suppono esse Romanam ecclesiam, verumptamen inter partes eius in comparacione ad quantitatem sunt papa et suum collegium pars precipua dignitate, dum tamen sequantur Christum propinquius et deserendo fastum atque primatum serviant matri sue efficacius atque humilius. Nam faciendo oppositum sunt nidus hereticorum, apostema putridum et ydolum desolacionis cum aliis monstrosis nominibus in sacra pagina prophetatis.

Therefore the gloss speaks thus: "I ask," it says, "of which church it speaks here; because it cannot be understood of the pope, who is called the church (as above in the same [question], *Quodcunque*, and 7 q. 1, *Scire debes*). But it is certain that the pope can err (as dist. 19, *Anastasius*, and dist. 40, *Si papa*). Therefore neither he nor his household is that church of which it is said here that it cannot err. Hence the congregation of the faithful itself is called this church (as *De consecratione*, dist. 1, *Ecclesia*)."[10] And so is understood the saying of blessed Jerome placed at 24 q. 1, *Hec est fides*: "Holy," he says, "is the Roman church, which has always remained unspotted, and, the Lord providing and blessed Peter the apostle bringing help, will remain in the future without any assault of heretics, and will persist firm and immovable for all time."[11] Here cannot be understood any pope whatever with his college. For they are rather often spotted, and shaken by the assault of heretics from within as well as from without, as a frail wayfarer [is], as is clear to eyewitness faith in our days, since two parts of the cardinals impute heretical depravity to our pope and to the brethren who support him, since (as they say) they strive not only to take away the privileges of the Roman church but, as far as in them lies, to destroy it.[12] And every such [man] is a heretic (as is clear from dist. 22, *Omnes*; as is clear in the Sixth Book, in the title on heresy).[13] Since, therefore, according to the decrees the Roman church has the primacy and dignity with respect to God over all others, it is clear that it is the total church militant, which God loves more than any other part of it. And so it follows manifestly from faith that not that college but the whole mother, dispersed in every nation and tongue, [88] is that holy Roman church of which the laws speak, with the holy doctors.[14] Hence, to imprint this teaching in us, in the church's chant composed by blessed Ambrose and Augustine, our mother thus addresses God: "Thee the holy church throughout the world doth acknowledge." And in the canon of the mass we offer first and chiefly for the holy catholic church, that God may vouchsafe to give it peace, to guard and to help it throughout the whole world.[15] Hence without doubt prayer is made for the most principal church militant, which I suppose to be the Roman church; nevertheless, among its parts, in comparison with respect to quantity, the pope and his college are the chief part in dignity, provided however that they follow Christ more closely and, deserting pride and primacy, serve their mother more effectively and more humbly. For, doing the opposite, they are a nest of heretics, a putrid abscess and the idol of desolation, with other monstrous names prophesied in the sacred page.[16]

¶3 88.20–88.30

[88] Et ne fingam istam sentenciam, ecce decretum ecclesie De Penitencia d. Iª: Ecclesia, inquit, Christi non habet maculam neque rugam aut aliquid huiusmodi; qui ergo peccatorum sorde aliqua maculatus est, de ecclesia Christi non potest appellari. Maculam, inquit glosa, id est, heresim vel mortale peccatum, neque rugam, idest, scisma vel veniale. Sed hoc credo ego cum sancto Thoma debere modificari ad statum patrie, et hic quicunque est in macula mortalis peccati, protunc deficit ab humido fluent continuante, hoc est, gracia secundum presentem iusticiam.

And lest I feign this teaching, behold the decree of the church, *De penitencia*, dist. 1: "The church of Christ," it says, "has not spot or wrinkle or any such thing; he therefore who is spotted with any filth of sins cannot be called of the church of Christ." "Spot," says the gloss, "that is, heresy or mortal sin; nor wrinkle, that is, schism or venial [sin]."[17] But this, I believe with St Thomas, ought to be modified to the state of the homeland; and here whoever is in the spot of mortal sin is, for that time, lacking in the continuing flowing moisture, that is, grace according to present justice.[18]

Notes

1. *(Ut sepe repecii)* (84.26–27), as printed; the OCR had lost the bracket. The syllogism: major *Nam nemo …*, minor *Sed nemo …* ("Now"). A margin: *Ecclesia* (84.23); *Conclusio* (84.26). B margin: *Nemo audet se dicere membrum ecclesie* (84.28).
2. *Magis … magis … plus … plus*: the comparatives run in parallel ("the more … the more") against *quam … apostoli*. *Participium*: participation, a share in the church. *Bona fortunii per accidens adiacencia*: goods of fortune lying beside the church by accident, not of its essence.
3. Heb. 10:34 (DR "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods") and Luke 6:30 (DR "of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again") are alluded to, not quoted. *Cap. III*: this work's chapter 3 (51–52, 03-b), where Gregory (*Moralia* 31) quotes *Si quis quod tuum est tulerit, ne repetas*. *Ius*: here "law" (human and divine law); in the next sentence *quo iure*, "by what right" (the glossary). *Placitantes*: pleading in the courts.
4. *Instarent*: "press [their case]", not the objection formula. *Dictum de Romana ecclesia*: the objector's claim at 81.1–3 (04-d ¶1). A and B margin: *De Romana ecclesia*; A: *Romana ecclesia est, ubicunque sunt fideles* (85.22).
5. Augustine, *Ep.* 187 (to Dardanus), as Wyclif cites it, ch. 11 (AB *cap. XVII*; A_1 corrects to *XI*, which the print follows; PL 33:846 = cap. XII §37) (Loserth: *Opp.* II, 690). John 18:14 (the MSS *XIX*, Loserth *XVIII*): Wyclif *Expedit ut unus homo moriatur* for the Vulgate *Quia expedit unum hominem mori*; DR "That it was expedient that one man should die for the people". The prophecy is John 11:51–52. *Deus filius suos* (85.29–30) is printed so (plate); Augustine has *filios Dei … congregaret* (PL 33:846): the slip is Wyclif's or his scribe's, and we translate the sense, "his sons". B *fiat in unitate* (86.1).
6. Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) I.16.6 (PL 83:572): the MSS' *XVI* is right, Loserth's XIX not (Loserth: fol. 17b, ed. Jehan Petit). Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II, part 2, ch. 2, *De Ecclesia, quid sit Ecclesia* (PL 176:416D–417A), as Wyclif gives it; his *parte* lacks its number. A margin: *Isidorus* (86.4), *Hugo* (86.6). B margin: *Ecclesia per universum orbem est diffusa* (86.10).
7. Decretum D. 21 c. 3, *Quamvis* (Loserth; the modern form is ours). The canon (the Gelasian decree) reads *nullis synodicis constitutis*, "by no synodal decrees", but by the Lord's own voice (Matt. 16:18): so Gratian in Migne (PL 187:119B), the decree itself (PL 59:159B) and Ivo (PL 161:1183A). Wyclif has *multis*; the nearest attested reading is *nonnullis* (PL 13:374B). Friedberg I, D.21 c.3 also reads *nullis sinodicis constitutis*, and his apparatus records no *multis*. A_1, better, *innuit decretum* (86.8). Matt. 16:18, DR.
8. The ordinary gloss to D. 21 c. 3, v. *nec aliquid*: *Argu. quod ubicunque sunt boni, ibi est ecclesia* (glossed Decretum, 1605); *Romana* is Wyclif's addition. AA_1 *inquit et quod* (86.21). *Daret plenam fidem*: "would give full faith", i.e. would settle the matter for believers. *Familia*: the pope's household (the glossary).
9. Decretum C. 24 q. 1 c. 9, *A recta* (Loserth; the modern form is ours). A margin: *A recta*; B in the text *Erecta* (86.24). The MSS *a tempore* (86.27), Loserth *a tramite*. B's later hand: *Romana ecclesia nunquam errat* (86.27).
10. The ordinary gloss to C. 24 q. 1 c. 9. Its references, per Loserth: C. 24 q. 1 c. 6 (*Quodcunque*), C. 7 q. 1 c. 7 (*Scire debes*), D. 19 c. 9 (*Anastasius*), D. 40 c. 6 (*Si papa*); *De cons.* D. 1 c. 8 *Ecclesia* (Nicholas I; PL 187:1708B), not given by him. Where the gloss ends is our judgement. A margin: *Nota glosam* (87.2).
11. Decretum C. 24 q. 1 c. 14, *Hec est fides* (Loserth); he notes that it is not Jerome's (cf. *Polycarpus* 1.3.6; Friedberg I, 970). B *ferentem* (87.14). *Q. i.* is the print's figure 1.
12. The Schism: in 1378 the dissident cardinals declared Urban VI ("our pope") deposed. *Due partes*: "two parts", probably two thirds. *Fratribus eum foventibus*: "the brethren who support him", either friars or his remaining cardinals; the Latin does not say. *Papa nostro* (about 87.20) is printed so (plate) where a dative *pape* is wanted; translated as dative. *Oculata fide*: by the faith of eyewitnesses.
13. Decretum D. 22 c. 1, *Omnes*, Nicholas II to the Milanese (PL 187:122C; Loserth; the modern form is ours); *Liber Sextus* 5.2, *De hereticis* (Friedberg II, 1067–68; the title as a whole, no chapter named).
14. A *patet illa* (87.28). The MSS *ligua* (87.31). *Loquuntur* (88.2): the print (plate); the OCR had *quuntur*. *Sequitur ex fide*: the verb governs *ex*, so "from faith", not the formula (the glossary, *ex fide*). *Primatum et dignitatem quoad Deum*: in God's sight, not in law.
15. The *Te Deum*, held then to have been composed by Ambrose and Augustine. The Roman canon, *Te igitur*: *pacificare, custodire, adunare et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum* (Sarum, Legg p. 221; Gregorian Sacr., PL 78:26A); Wyclif also drops *et regere*; Wyclif has *adiuvare*, "help", for *adunare*, "unite". B *ut dignetur* (88.8). A margin: *Conclusio* (88.9).

16. ***Ydolum desolacionis***: 1 Macc. 1:57, DR "the abominable idol of desolation" (cf. Dan. 9:27, Matt. 24:15, "the abomination of desolation"). ***In comparacione ad quantitatem***: as parts are compared in size, the college is chief only in dignity.
17. Decretum C. 33 q. 3 (***De penitencia***) D. 1 c. 70 (Loserth; the modern form is ours), with its ordinary gloss. The canon echoes Eph. 5:27. B lacks ***inquit — rugam*** (88.24).
18. B ***oportet hoc credo*** (88.26). ***Cum sancto Thoma***: ***ST*** III q. 8 a. 3 ad 2, as in 04-c n. 10. ***Humido fluent*** (88.29) is printed so (plate), for ***fluente***. The flowing and radical moisture are the figure of 04-b ¶2 (75.16–30).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 84: ***ut*** (print '(ut'; bracket is punctuation)
  - 85: ***magis***
  - 85: ***magis***
  - 85: ***Christi***
  - 86: ***dicitur***
  - 86: ***II°***
  - 86: ***XXI^{a}***
  - 86: ***XXIV^{a}***
  - 86: ***I*** (x-height old-style figure 1 ('q. 1:'), not capital I)
  - 87: ***Quero***
  - 87: ***VII^{a}***
  - 87: ***I^{a}***
  - 87: ***XXIV^{a}*** (one token 'XXIV^{a},')
  - 87: ∅ (the V belongs to XXIV^{a} at pos 92; nothing between it and q.)
  - 87: ***XXII^{a}***
  - 87: ***Cum***
  - 88: ***I^{a}***
  - 85: ***membrum*** (alinea M and 140a folio mark glued)
- Corrected in the Latin; plates): 84.26 ***Sepe***; 88.2 ***quuntur***. Printed so (plate), translated with notes: 85.29 ***filius***; 87.21 ***papa nostro***; 88.29 ***fluent***.

Part 6: The gloss's three replies; knowing our mother by faith

Loserth pp. 88.31–92.5

¶1 88.31–90.8
88.31 *Objection drawn from the gloss.*
89.3 *Answer: a. The Church means sometimes the visible Church mixed of good and evil.*
89.15 *b. To be in the Church is not be of the Church.*
89.19 *c. Men's different relations to the Church,*
90.9 *The faithful have a sufficient knowledge of the Church, although an imperfect one.*
90.16 *Knowledge not going beyond belief fits our state here.*

[88] Unde glosa obicit in contrarium per duo capitula, videlicet XXIII^{a}, q. IV, cap. Forte et cap. Hec [89] autem vita, ubi vere dicitur quod quamdiu sumus in hoc mundo, non deficiet nobis ruga venialis. Et solvit tripliciter: primo quod ecclesia quandoque large sumitur, ut granum et paleam complectatur, ut in allegatis capitulis, quandoque stricte pro puro grano, ut XXXII^{a} q. IV: Recurrat, ubi sic scribitur (ut supra tetigi): Itaque, inquit Augustinus, sive intus versari videantur sive aperte foris sint, quod caro est caro est, quod palea est palea est. Et semper ab illius ecclesie que sine macula est vel ruga unitate decisus. Vult iste sanctus dicere (ut patet ex dictis) quod impossibile est prescitum esse membrum sancte matris ecclesie vel predestinatum a maternitate illa deficere, quomodocunque secundum presentem iusticium varientur. Secunda responsio glose est quod aliud est esse de ecclesia et aliud esse in ecclesia, ut patet XXIII^{a} q. IV: Vasis ire et supra exposui. Tercia responsio distinguit de quadruplici habitudine viantis ad sanctam matrem ecclesiam. Quidam autem sunt in ecclesia

Hence the gloss objects, by appeal to two chapters, to the contrary: namely 23 q. 4, the chapter ***Forte*** and the chapter ***Hec*** *[89]* ***autem vita***, where it is truly said that as long as we are in this world the wrinkle of venial [sin] will not be lacking to us.[1] And it resolves [the objection] in three ways. First, that the church is sometimes taken broadly, so as to embrace the grain and the chaff, as in the chapters cited; sometimes strictly, for the pure grain, as at 32 q. 4, ***Recurrat***, where it is written thus (as I touched on above): "Therefore," says Augustine, "whether they seem to dwell within or are openly outside, what is flesh is flesh, what is chaff is chaff. And [he is] always cut off from the unity of that church which is without spot or wrinkle." This saint means (as is clear from what has been said) that it is impossible for one foreknown to be a member of holy mother church, or for one predestinate to fall away from that motherhood, however they may vary according to present justice.[2] The second reply of the gloss is that it is one thing to be of the church and

nomine et re ut obedientes catholici, quidam nec re nec nomine ut pagani, quidam nomine tantum ut presciti ypocrite, et quidam re licet videantur nomine esse foris ut predestinati, quos satrape videntur in facie ecclesie condempnare. Ecce decretorum concordia sentencie supradicte. Unde videtur nimis blasphema heresis papam vel collegium suum credere quod in quantum eliguntur in illo officio tenent primatum tocius ecclesie. Oportet enim quod sint filii imitacionis in moribus parentum quorum [90]pretendunt se gerere vicariam potestatem. Aliter enim sunt de generacione pessima meretricis diaboli. Generacio enim sunt Christi, neque constat ex sanguinibus ut in propagacione naturali neque ex voluntate carnis ut in electis nude ex affeccione carnali neque in electis pro pompa seculi que nascitur ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo nati sunt tamquam filii imitacionis per graciam adoptantem et tunc ex condicione generis patrizabunt.

another to be in the church, as is clear at 23 q. 4, *Vasis ire*, and as I expounded above.[3] The third reply distinguishes a fourfold condition of one on the road in relation to holy mother church. And some are in the church in name and in fact, as obedient catholics; some neither in fact nor in name, as pagans; some in name only, as foreknown hypocrites; and some in fact, although in name they seem to be outside, as the predestinate whom satraps seem to condemn in the face of the church.[4] Behold the agreement of the decrees with the teaching stated above. Hence it seems a too blasphemous heresy for the pope or his college to believe that, inasmuch as they are elected to that office, they hold the primacy of the whole church. For they must be sons of imitation in the manners of the parents whose vicarious power they [90]claim to bear. For otherwise they are of the most wicked generation of the devil's harlot.[5] For they are the generation of Christ: it is neither of blood, as in natural propagation, nor of the will of the flesh, as in those elected merely out of carnal affection, nor, in those elected for the pomp of the world, of that which is born of the will of man; but they are born of God, as sons of imitation, through adopting grace, and then by the condition of their kind they will take after their father.[6]

¶2 90.9–92.5
91.1 *and such a knowledge we have of the Church.*
91.10 *Nor is it difficult for us to know the divine will,*
91.26 *which is that we should serve the Church,*

[90]Tercio dicitur ad obiectum de noticia matris nostre quod satis cognoscitur a fideli: est enim dare noticiam distinctam et confusam et utraque potest subdividi, quoad personam vel circumstanciam, quoad sensum vel intellectum, quoad fidem vel racionem. Sic enim cognosco caput ecclesie et tamen ipso ostenso michi nude in specie humana nescirem ipsum ab alio discernere. Unde, cum fide ambulamus et vivimus, consonum est quod nos quasi modo geniti infantes confuse in velamento fidei habeamus noticiam matris nostre: sic enim nec prescitos reprehendimus nec predestinatos extollimus viciose, sed correspondenter ad noticiam tam membra matris nostre quam infideles sibi et nobis inimicos diligimus; illos autem quos videmus vivere secundum legem Dei reputamus esse filios regni, et sic de aliis habemus maiorem evidenciam, de aliis minorem. De illis tamen nunc credimus quod sunt membra matris nostre vel meretricis opposite plus quam fide. Unde, quesito a me de quacunque persona vel populo conversante nobiscum utrum sit membrum matris nostre, sic quod videndo ipsum videamus parcialiter matrem nostram, dico quod ego ignoro sed reputo vel suppono ex modo conversandi sic vel sic, nec est inconveniens sed consonum statui vie quod ignoremus [91]et nesciamus in particulari illud quod

Thirdly, the answer to the objection about the knowledge of our mother is that she is sufficiently known by the faithful: for there is distinct and indistinct knowledge, and each can be subdivided: as to the person or the circumstance, as to sense or understanding, as to faith or reason. For thus I know the head of the church, and yet, were he shown to me barely in human form, I should not know how to tell him from another.[7] Hence, since we walk and live by faith, it is fitting that we, "as newborn babes", should have the knowledge of our mother indistinctly, under the veil of faith: for so we neither rebuke the foreknown nor extol the predestinate viciously, but, in correspondence with our knowledge, we love both the members of our mother and the unbelievers who are enemies to her and to us; and those whom we see live according to the law of God we reckon to be "the children of the kingdom", and so of some we have greater evidence, of others less. Yet of them we now believe that they are members of our mother, or of the opposed harlot, more than by faith.[8] Hence, when I am asked of any person or people whatever living among us whether it is a member of our mother, such that in seeing it we partly see our mother, I say that I am ignorant, but I reckon or suppose, from the manner of living, this way or that; nor is it an absurdity, but in keeping

cognoscimus in communi; et illa scimus demonstracione intellectus limitati per fidem quod hec est mater nostra, licet demonstracio sensualis hoc non certificet. Unde neminem conversantem nobiscum debemus absolute contempnere sed vicia, quia ignoramus si in hoc despicimus matrem nostram et omnino sponsum ecclesie. Et ita certi sumus quod quidquid bene agimus secundum legem sponsi, in hoc honoramus et proficimus matri nostre. Nec est difficile scire voluntatem sponsi, quia ex fide cognoscimus omne factum naturaliter vel meritorie fieri secundum beneplacitum voluntatis divine. Et sic possumus facillime voluntatem divinam cognoscere in effectu, et ita cum omnes debemus esse domestici fidei et sic de familia huius coniugii, debemus regulariter honorem sponsi et profectum sponse utrobique primo intendere, sicut exemplificat, Hugo De Sacramentis, libro II°, parte IIª, secundo capitulo, ex textu apostoli Iª. Cor. XII°. Quamvis enim visio subiectatur in oculo, ipse tamen videt prius toti corpori quam sibi ipsi, et ita de quolibet membro humani corporis in tantum quod naturaliter membrum ignobilius ut brachium exponitur ad mutilacionem pro membro nobiliori ut capite, et quelibet pars naturalis integri intendit principaliter et finaliter conservacionem et bene esse suo toti. Et ita debet quilibet christianus quoad sanctam matrem ecclesiam, nullum membrum contrariando alteri sed iuvando; unde intendens prepostere proprietati commodi aspirat implicite secundum luciferinam superbiam ad honorem Deo proprium qui constituit universitates creaturarum que gracia sui finaliter ordinantur, quelibet autem pars unius tocius [92]creati debet plus esse gracia sui tocius quam gracia sui ipsius. Et sic omnes creature et singule sunt finaliter propter Deum: et hec est racio, quare religio christiana ordinatur amare communi vivendo mentaliter in communi. Unde Christus non potuit civiliter dominare.

with the state of the way, that we should be ignorant of [91]and not know in particular that which we know in general; and we know these things, by a demonstration of the understanding limited by faith, that this is our mother, although a demonstration of sense does not make it certain.[9] Hence we ought not absolutely to despise anyone living among us, but [their] vices, since we are ignorant whether in this we despise our mother, and altogether the bridegroom of the church. And so we are certain that whatever we do well according to the law of the bridegroom, in this we honour our mother and profit her. Nor is it difficult to know the will of the bridegroom, since we know from faith that everything done comes about, naturally or meritoriously, according to the good pleasure of the divine will. And so we can very easily know the divine will in its effect; and so, since we all ought to be "of the household of the faith", and so of the household of this marriage, we ought as a rule to aim first, in both respects, at the honour of the bridegroom and the profit of the bride, as Hugh exemplifies, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 2, the second chapter, from the text of the apostle, 1 Corinthians 12.[10] For although vision has its subject in the eye, the eye nevertheless sees for the whole body before [it sees] for itself; and so of every member of the human body, so far that by nature a less noble member, such as the arm, is exposed to mutilation for a nobler member, such as the head; and every part of a natural whole aims principally and finally at the preservation and well-being of its whole. And so ought every Christian [to stand] toward holy mother church, no member opposing another but helping; hence one who aims preposterously at the ownness of advantage aspires implicitly, after Luciferian pride, to the honour proper to God, who established the universes of creatures, which are ordered finally for his sake; and every part of one [92]created whole ought to be more for the sake of its whole than for its own sake.[11] And so all creatures, and each one, are finally for the sake of God; and this is the reason why the Christian religion is ordained to love in common, living in mind in common. Hence Christ could not exercise civil lordship.[12]

Notes

1. The gloss objects to the canon of 88.21 (*De pen.* D. 1 c. 70; 04-e n. 17) from two canons: Decretum C. 23 q. 4 c. 11 (*Forte*) and c. 15 (*Hec autem vita*) (Loserth: *causa XXIII, q. IV, capp. XI and XV*; the modern form is ours). *Ruga venialis*: the wrinkle of venial sin, as in the gloss at 88.25.
2. Decretum C. 32 q. 4 c. 2, *Recurrat* (Loserth: *ibid., XXXII, q. IV, cap. II*; the modern form is ours); it opens with Augustine, *In Ioh. tr.* 11.8, but the sentence *Itaque sive intus ... caro est caro est ... palea est* is his *De baptismo* I.17.26 (PL 43), which Gratian reuses (*divisus*; Wyclif *decisus*). A margin *Triplex solucio* (89.3). B in the margin *sint quod caro est, quod palea est* (89.5).

***Decisus*: the excerpt breaks off, and the singular participle has no subject; "[he is]" is supplied. *Ut supra tetigi*: earlier in this work. *Prescitus*: one God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). *Iusticium* (89.14–15, *iusti-*|*cium*) is printed so (plate), for *iusticiam* (so 88.30); translated "justice".**

3. Decretum C. 23 q. 4 c. 23, *Vasis ire* (Loserth; the modern form is ours). A *Vasis enim* (89.17). A margin: *Ecclesia Christi sponsa. Nota* (89.14); *De ecclesia esse, in ecclesia esse, quid est* (89.16). *Supra exposui*: earlier in this work.

4. *Habitudo*: here the condition of a person as it relates him to the church (the glossary). *Viantis*: the participle, "one on the road" (the glossary, *viantes*). *Autem* opens the division ("And"). B lacks *et — nomine* (89.20). *Satrape*: church-court officials wielding delegated power (the glossary); *in facie ecclesie*, publicly, before the church.

5. A margin (89.26): *Conclusio. Eleccio pape vel cardinalium non facit eos primatum tenere in ecclesia sed imitacio sancta*, "The election of the pope or of the cardinals does not make them hold the primacy in the church, but holy imitation." *Filii imitacionis*: sons by imitation, not by election; kept literal because 90.7 returns to it. *Aliterenimp* (90.1) stands so, an OCR scar for *Aliter enim*; the stray *p* is not translated. *Meretrix diaboli*: the harlot set against the bride (cf. 90.26, *meretricis opposite*).

6. John 1:13, DR "Who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God", whose clauses Wyclif glosses one by one. The *electi nude ex affeccione carnali* are those raised [to office] merely for kinship, the *electi pro pompa seculi* those raised for worldly show. *Generacio enim sunt Christi*: the subject is not expressed; we take it as those who truly are Christ's, the "sons of imitation", not the pope and college as such. B lacks *sunt* (90.2); A margin *Generacio Dei* (90.2); A *patrissabunt* (90.8). *Patrizare*: to take after one's father.

7. A margin *De noticia* (90.9). *Si cenim* (about 90.12) stands so, an OCR scar; we read *Sic enim*, "For thus". The other repair, *Si enim*, "For if", leaves the sentence without a main clause. The *not* after *discernere* (about 90.15) is a fragment of the English side-note at 90.16 ("Knowledge not going ..."), not Wyclif's, and is not translated. *Noticia distincta / confusa*: knowledge of a thing in its parts / in the whole (the glossary). The example: Christ the head is known by faith, not by sight.

8. 2 Cor. 5:7, DR "For we walk by faith", alluded to. 1 Pet. 2:2: Wyclif *quasi modo geniti infantes*, the Vulgate *sicut modo geniti*; DR "As newborn babes". Matt. 13:38, DR "the children of the kingdom". A margin (90.19): *Noticiam qualem habemus de ecclesia et de partibus eius hic in via. De illis tamen nunc credimus ... plus quam fide* (90.25–26): Loserth's foot, *Hic locus corruptus esse videtur; fortasse legendum: tamen non credimus.* The print construes and is translated: what we believe of particular persons goes beyond what faith gives, as reckoning (cf. *reputo vel suppono*, 90.29). On Loserth's conjecture: "yet we do not believe of them ... more than by faith". B *iidem* (90.26).

9. A margin *Questio* (90.27), *Responsio* (90.31); B *Unde queso* (90.27). *Inconveniens*: here "absurdity", the logical sense (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL): nothing absurd follows from our ignorance. *Conversante, conversandi*: "living among us", "manner of living" (cf. *conversacio*, the glossary). *Demonstracio*: here the pointing out of a thing as "this" (*hec est mater nostra*), not a proof; *illa scimus ... quod* anticipates the *quod*-clause.

10. A margin *Conclusio* (91.11), *Hugo* (91.17). *Ex fide cognoscimus*: the verb governs *ex*, so "from faith", not the formula (the glossary). Gal. 6:10, DR "those who are of the household of the faith". Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis*, as Wyclif cites it; *libro II°* (91.17; book 2, as at 86.6). Loserth: "I have not been able to find this passage in Hugo de S. Victore l. c. but comp. lib. I, pars X, cap. VI"; the figure of the eye that sees for the whole body is in II.2.2 (*Soli enim oculi vident ... toti corpori*; PL 176:416C–D); the bridegroom-and-bride frame is Wyclif's. The apostle's text is presumably 1 Cor. 12, the body and its members. *Utrobique*: in both, the bridegroom's honour and the bride's profit.

11. B lacks *prius* (91.20); AA_1 lack *ut brachium* (91.22–23); A margin *Conclusio* (91.29). *Subiectatur*: has its subject, the eye being the subject in which sight inheres (the glossary, *subiectum*); *ipse* is the eye. *Intendens ... proprietati commodi*: "aiming at the ownness of advantage", advantage as one's own rather than common. *Gracia sui* in the relative clause: for God's sake (cf. 92.2, *propter Deum*).

12. *Amare communi* (92.4) is printed so (plate); *amore communi*, "by common love", would run more easily, but the print construes ("to love in common"). *Dominare* (92.5): so AA_1, which add *In vigilia Pentecostes*, "on the vigil of Pentecost" (Loserth's foot). Loserth lists Hus's reuse of chapter 4 (cf. Hus, *De eccl.*, several folios).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **88: *XXIII^{a}***
  - **89: *Et* (leading a is the margin letter) [NW]**
  - **89: *granum***
  - **89: *palea***
  - **89: *XXIII^{a}* (one token 'XXIII^{a},' (pivot splits XXI | II^{a}))**
  - **89: ∅ (II^{a} is the tail of XXIII^{a} (pos 128); no separate word)**
  - **90: *Christi***
  - **90: *nostre* (Q is the alinea letter)**
  - **90: *noticiam* (noti-/ciam hyphenated across line)**
  - **91: ∅ (nothing between et and nesciamus; these words are on p.90 (already in p.90 text))**
  - **91: *ex* ('Nor' is side-note text)**
  - **91: *II^{a}***
  - **91: *I^{a}***
  - **92: *gracia* (141a is the folio mark; R is the alinea letter)**
  - **92: *sui ipsius* (token spans two printed words)**
- **Corrected in the Latin: 89.5–6 *caro estcaro est*; 90.1 *Aliterenimp*; 90.12 *Si cenim*; 90.15 *not* (side-note fragment); 91.17 *11°*. Printed so (plate), translated with notes: 89.14 *iusticium*; 92.4 *amare*.**

Chapter 5

Part 1: The universal church: equivocations, and why Christ alone is its head

Loserth pp. 92.7–96.19

¶1 92.7–92.18
92.7 *Objection: The Roman Church is commonly understood of the Pope and Cardinals.*
92.15 *Why may not "the whole Church" mean the whole of any body of the faithful.*
92.19 *Answer: Whole is used in various senses*

[92]**Sed adhuc obicitur contra dicta per hoc quod communitas intelligit per Romanam ecclesiam papam et cardinales quibus est necessarium omnibus aliis obedire. Et sic intelligit maior pars ecclesie in tantum quod dominus Ardmacanus scribit Innocencio pape librum De Pauperie Christi tamquam capiti universalis ecclesie. Et talem stilum a maioribus et minoribus recipiunt pape communiter, ubi utrinque est verisimile quod nec papa nec suus fidelis subditus audiret talem blasfemiam, si stilus ille foret scripture sacre contrarius. Quare ergo non potest universalis ecclesia vocari quecunque universitas fidelium viatorum?**

But it is still objected, by appeal to this, against what has been said: that the community understands by the Roman church the pope and cardinals, whom all others must of necessity obey. And so the greater part of the church understands [it], so far that the lord Armachanus writes to Pope Innocent the book *On the Poverty of Christ* as to the head of the universal church. And popes commonly receive such a style from greater and lesser [men], where on both sides it is likely that neither the pope nor his faithful subject would hear such blasphemy, if that style were contrary to sacred scripture.[1] Why, then, cannot any whole body whatever of faithful wayfarers be called the universal church?

¶2 92.19–94.9
93.1 *and commonly in too low a sense*
93.10 *as of Universities.*
93.14 *Many do not know how great the Church is.*
93.20 *And some madmen think that only their subjects are in the faith.*
93.29 *We mean the Church truly universal*
94.4 *which Pope and Cardinals may represent if they rule rightly.*
94.10 *But only Christ can be its head;*
94.16 *to offer a model, of spiritual and secular rule.*
94.22 *The Pope has to rule only spiritually.*

[92]**Hic dicitur (ut supra) quod multi laborant in equivocis, loquendo de ecclesia, unde communiter universitas predestinatorum viancium vocatur universalis ecclesia tam in legibus quam in doctoribus. Et racio potest esse in hoc quod ipsi habent equivoce racionem inperfeccionis in obscuritate fidei qua filii superioris ecclesie sunt purgati. Et quod plus est: Aliqui descendunt** [93]**particularius ad gradus universalitatum, et hii vocant ecclesiam Latinorum universalem ecclesiam, hii ecclesiam Grecorum vel Hebreorum, et sic de aliis linguis aut gentibus de quarum universitate solum considerant. Et hoc contingit vel ex radice superbie vel ignorancie. Nam quidam ex fastu aspirant quod sint magnarum universitatum capita. Quod non laudo, et hinc credo quod scole que olim vocate sunt studia generalia propter doctrinam septem arcium, nunc dicuntur universitates, cum sint quasi punctus in comparacione ad primam universitatem creatam. Quandoque autem ex ignorancia quidam vocant datam particularem congregacionem universalem ecclesiam, non putantes esse ecclesiam ampliorem, ut III Reg. XIX, 18, alloquitur Helyas Deum, quoniam ipse solus relictus est fidelis in populo, et tamen audivit divinum responsum quod Deus reliquit sibi septem millia qui non curvaverunt genua ante Baal (ut meminit apostolus). Sic quidam maniaci putant quod non sit fidelis in terris nisi sit eis seculariter subiectus, cum tamen stat quod sint multe gentes ignote linguis priores illis in ecclesia sancta Dei. Quando**

To this the answer is (as above) that many labour in equivocations in speaking of the church; hence the whole body of the predestinate on the road is commonly called the universal church, both in the laws and in the doctors. And the reason can lie in this, that they have, equivocally, the character of imperfection in the obscurity of faith, from which the sons of the higher church have been purged.[2] And what is more, some descend [93]**more particularly to grades of universality, and these call the church of the Latins the universal church, those the church of the Greeks or of the Hebrews, and so of other tongues or nations, of whose whole body alone they take account. And this happens from the root either of pride or of ignorance. For some out of haughtiness aspire to be heads of great universities. This I do not praise; and hence I believe that the schools which were once called general studies, on account of the doctrine of the seven arts, are now called universities, although they are as a point in comparison with the first created universe.[3] And sometimes out of ignorance some call a given particular congregation the universal church, not thinking that there is a wider church; as in 1 Kings 19:18 Elias addresses God [saying] that he alone was left faithful among the people, and yet he heard the divine answer that God had left himself seven thousand who had not bowed their knees before Baal (as the apostle recalls). So some madmen think that there is no faithful [man] on earth**

ergo doctores sic loquuntur ex circumstanciis, potest perpendi equivocacionis sue deteccio, ut vocando episcopum Romanum caput universalis ecclesie intelligitur quod sit caput tante Latine ecclesie quantam regit. Quod reputative vel suppositive potest dici de quocunque Romano pontifice cuius opera papalia ad hoc movent. Sed ne laboraverim in istis equivocis, limitavi ad universalem ecclesiam, distinctam contra particularem, que quidem universalis est unica, habens omnes alias eius partes. Nam (ut ostendi superius, cap. II) sunt multe [94] tales particulares ecclesie: ideo decreta ecclesie et sancti doctores non debent vocare illam particularem et pauperem ecclesiam sic artatam in angulo ecclesiam sanctam catholicam. Verumptamen si papa ut olim regat illam secundum legem Christi principaliter et capitaliter tam in moribus quam in dubiis decidendis, tunc cum suo collegio potest dici virtualiter universalis ecclesia in effectu. Sed hec est solum per accidens dependens ab opere et non a nudo nomine.

unless he is subject to them in secular fashion, although it may well be that there are many nations, unknown in tongue, before them in the holy church of God.[4] When, therefore, the doctors speak thus, the detection of their equivocation can be weighed from the circumstances; as, in calling the Roman bishop head of the universal church, it is understood that he is head of as much of the Latin church as he rules. Which can be said by reckoning or by supposition of any Roman pontiff whatever whose papal works move [us] to this. But, lest I labour in these equivocations, I have assigned [the name] to the universal church, distinguished against the particular, which universal [church] indeed is single, having all the others as its parts.[5] For (as I showed above, chapter 2) there are many [94] such particular churches; therefore the decrees of the church and the holy doctors ought not to call that particular and poor church, so confined in a corner, the holy catholic church. Nevertheless, if the pope, as once, rules it according to the law of Christ, principally and as head, both in morals and in deciding doubts, then with his college he can be called virtually the universal church in effect. But this is only by accident, depending on the work and not on the bare name.[6]

¶3 94.10–94.15

[94] Unde (ut dixi superius) solus Christus potest esse caput ecclesie sancte catholice. Ipsa enim (ut dicit Augustinus in epistola ad Dardanum) habet solummodo unum caput; nec movet quod respublica habet imperatorem et papam capita unum subordinatum alteri (ut exemplificat dominus Ardmacanus).

Hence (as I said above) Christ alone can be head of the holy catholic church. For it (as Augustine says in the letter to Dardanus) has only one head; nor does it move [me] that the commonwealth has an emperor and a pope as heads, one subordinated to the other (as the lord Armachanus exemplifies).[7]

¶4 94.16–95.1
95.2 *The emperor's rule is independent of the pope.*
95.15 *Prelates demand undue honours.*

[94] Nam caput tocius ecclesie oportet simul in unum exemplare tam spirituale quam seculare regnum, et cum hoc regnum ierarchie celestis ad quod officium nulla alia creatura potest attingere. Unde bene est pape, si habet a Christo virtutem ad regendum se ipsum et pauculas oves in spiritualibus, licet non blasphemet quod sit caput universalis ecclesie paris potestatis cum Christo. Nec debet eius vicarius sentire heretice quod regat parcialem ecclesiam viantem tam seculariter quam spiritualiter, dum Christus solum spiritualiter rexit utramque ecclesiam. Ideo sufficit eius vicario quod tam in temporalibus quam in spiritualibus regat spiritualiter eius iuvenculam. Nam vivendo seculariter Christus non potuit exemplare utrumque officium. Quomodo ergo eius vicarius? [95] Regnum ergo imperatoris est independens a

For the head of the whole church must at once, in one, be the pattern of the spiritual as well as of the secular kingdom, and with this of the kingdom of the heavenly hierarchy; to which office no other creature can attain. Hence it is well with the pope if he has from Christ the power to rule himself and a very few sheep in spiritual things, even though he does not blaspheme [by saying] that he is head of the universal church, of equal power with Christ. Nor ought his vicar to think heretically that he rules the partial church on the road both secularly and spiritually, while Christ ruled both churches only spiritually. Therefore it suffices for his vicar that he rule his young girl spiritually, in temporal as well as in spiritual things. For Christ could not, by living in secular fashion, have been the pattern of both offices. How then [could] his vicar?[8] [95] The kingdom of the emperor, therefore, is independent

¶5 95.2–95.29

[95] **regimine pape et econtra. Utrumque tamen per accidens iuvat reliquum, licet prepositura spiritualis sit dignior. Regimen autem Christi respicit essenciali causacione regimen utriusque sui vicarii. Unde ne vicarii Christi inducantur in blasphemiam, usurpando ex verbis floridis honorem Deo proprium, necesse est doctores cavere ab adulacionibus et instar beati Gregorii vinum et oleum alternare. Nam secundum Commentatorem in prologo tercii Phisicorum sicut quidam assuescunt sic venenum comedere quod totum cibarium vertatur in substanciam venenosam: sic quidam sic assuescunt opinionibus falsis quod instruccioni veritatis redduntur inhabiles. Correspondenter evenit de honoribus (ut patet inferius cap...) Unde hodie non valet vocare prepositum nisi reverendissimum, sanctissimum et beatissimum, quia in quolibet inferiori gradu est dulia, sed in superlativo gradu est latria qua non est honor amplior expectandus. Correspondenter ad ista non quietatur prepositus vocari caput ecclesie militantis, sed exigit vocari caput universalis ecclesie et ecclesie tocius catholice. Utrobique tamen possunt predicta sane concipi, ut quod Deus sit in tali preposito tamquam in imagine adorandus vel secundo quod inter signandos prepositos ille sit reverendissimus, sanctissimus et tempore suo beatissimus, dum tamen nomen et meritorium ministerium correspondent; quod debet supponi in preposito reputative, non diffinitive asseri, dum tamen nec ocium nec commissum notorie contradicant.**

of the rule of the pope, and conversely. Yet each by accident helps the other, although the spiritual office of superior is the worthier. But the rule of Christ regards, by essential causation, the rule of each of his two vicars.[9] Hence, lest the vicars of Christ be led into blasphemy, usurping on the strength of flowery words the honour proper to God, the doctors must beware of flatteries and, after the pattern of blessed Gregory, alternate wine and oil. For according to the Commentator, in the prologue of the third [book] of the *Physics*, just as some grow so used to eating poison that all their food is turned into a poisonous substance, so some grow so used to false opinions that they are rendered unqualified for instruction in the truth.[10] Correspondingly it happens with honours (as is clear below, chapter ...). Hence today it does not do to call a superior anything but most reverend, most holy and most blessed, since in any lower degree there is dulia, but in the superlative degree there is latria, than which no ampler honour is to be looked for. Correspondingly to these things, the superior is not content to be called head of the church militant, but demands to be called head of the universal church and of the whole catholic church. In both cases, nevertheless, the aforesaid can be soundly conceived: as, that God is to be adored in such a superior as in an image; or, secondly, that among the superiors to be designated he is the most reverend, most holy and, in his time, most blessed, provided however that the name and the meritorious ministry correspond; which ought to be supposed in the superior by reckoning, not asserted definitively, provided however that neither idleness nor [a deed] committed notoriously contradict [it].[11]

¶6 96.1–96.19

96.1 *The Pope may be head of the Church, as meaning the militant Church that is under his rule.*

[96] **Et sic Potest intelligi papam esse caput universalis ecclesie vel in quantum ministratorie propinquius gerit ministerium Christi quem induit, vel secundo equivocando in universali, universaliori et universalissimo intelligatur per universalem ecclesiam tota ecclesia militans quam hic regit; que debet supponi extencior quam alia militans cui vicarius eius preest. Melius tamen foret inniti modo loquendi scripture et instar apostolorum vehemenciori ac humiliori ministerio totalis ecclesie propter blasphemam ydolatriam precavendam. Nam dum papa non supereminet quoad Deum, sed appreciatur honorem secularem plus opere servili ecclesie, tunc facit populum non adorare eum, sed statum communem in alio ad sui dedecus et ypocrite detrimentum. Et ita ecclesia Romana potest sumi tripliciter: vel pro ecclesia catholica (ut in fine proximi capituli), vel**

And so it can be understood that the pope is head of the universal church: either inasmuch as, by way of ministry, he bears more nearly the ministry of Christ, whom he has put on; or, secondly, by equivocating among universal, more universal and most universal, [so that] by the universal church is understood the whole church militant which he rules here, which ought to be supposed more extensive than another [church] militant over which his vicar presides. Yet it would be better to rely on scripture's manner of speaking and, after the pattern of the apostles, on a more vehement and humbler ministry of the total church, so as to guard against blasphemous idolatry.[12] For when the pope does not stand pre-eminent with respect to God, but prizes secular honour more than the servile work of the church, then he makes the people adore not him but

pro papa, vel coniunctim et divisim pro suo collegio. Sed hec duo membra postrema sunt extorta.

the common state in another, to his own dishonour and the hypocrite's detriment. And so the Roman church can be taken in three ways: either for the catholic church (as at the end of the preceding chapter), or for the pope, or, jointly and severally, for his college. But these two last members are forced.[13]

Notes

1. ***Dominus Ardmacanus***: Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh; the book is his *De pauperie Salvatoris*, which Wyclif calls *De pauperie Christi* and says was written to Pope Innocent [VI] (Loserth's foot identifies the work; the dedication to Innocent is not independently checked). Loserth's foot cites Vienna, ÖNB Cod. Pal. 1430, *Libri septem de paupertate Salvatoris*, whose fol. 1 note says Ricardus composed it in the Roman curia against the mendicant friars "at the instance of Pope Clement VI". A ***verissimile*** (92.15). A_1 ***auderet*** (92.16), "would dare [to use]", is easier; but A_1 alone does not outweigh the print, which construes: neither would listen to such blasphemy. ***Stilus***: the style of address.
2. A margin ***Ecclesie equivocacio*** (92.19). ***Universitas*** runs through ¶1–2 as "whole body", "university" and "universe": the play is Wyclif's. ***Ipsi habent equivoce racionem inperfeccionis***: our construal, doubtful: the predestinate on the road are "universal church" only equivocally, since they share the imperfection of faith's obscurity, from which the church above has been purged. ***Qua***: ablative with ***purgati***.
3. B ***ut bene vocant*** (93.2). ***De quarum***: Loserth's emendation; the MSS ***de quorum*** (93.4). B ***quod sicut*** (93.6–7). ***Studia generalia***: the medieval name of a university. ***Doctrina*** (the glossary): here the teaching of the arts course. ***Cum***: concessive. ***Prima universitas creata***: the created universe.
4. 1 Kings 19:10–18 (Wyclif *III Reg.*, the Vulgate numbering), recalled through Rom. 11:3–4 (Loserth's foot); the indirect speech follows Rom. 11:4, DR "But what saith the divine answer to him? I have left me seven thousand men that have not bowed their knees to Baal"; Wyclif ***ante Baal***, as the Vulgate. B ***quod sicut***; B ***ignote lingue*** (93.21–22). ***Ignote linguis***: we take the ablative of respect (nations whose tongues they do not know); a dative, "unknown to [their] tongues", is possible. ***Cum tamen stat quod***: "although it stands that", the logicians' "it is consistent that".
5. ***Ex circumstanciis***: taken with ***potest perpendi***; it may go with ***loquuntur*** ("speak thus from the circumstances"). A margin ***Papa quomodo est caput ecclesie*** (93.28). ***Reputative vel suppositive***: by reckoning or supposition, not as known (cf. 90.29). ***Limitavi*** (93.29): the print has an inkless gap (***limi avi***), corrected in the Latin. ***Limitare***: to assign (the glossary): the name "universal church" is kept for the whole church as against the particular.
6. ***Cap. II***: chapter 2 of this work. ***Illam particularem et pauperem ecclesiam***: the Roman church in the narrow sense, as against the catholic church. ***Ut olim***: as [popes did] once. ***Hec***: this naming of pope and college "universal church".
7. Augustine, *Ep.* 187 to Dardanus §§20, 37, PL 33 (***Hujus corporis caput est Christus***; ***unum caput est Christus***), in sense (Loserth: *Opp. Aug.* II, p. 678); cf. 04-e ¶1 (85.25–29). A margin (94.10): ***Solucio obiectus. Solus Christus est caput ecclesie sancte catholice***. B ***unum scribo animatum alteri*** (94.14), a garble of ***unum subordinatum alteri***; B ***dominus Dardinandus*** (94.15). FitzRalph's example of the two heads: untraced (not in *De pauperie Salvatoris* I–IV; Loserth gives no reference). ***Respublica***: the commonwealth of Christendom.
8. ***Simul in unum exemplare***: to be in one person the pattern of both kingdoms and of the heavenly hierarchy; only Christ is. ***Licet non blasphemet***: concessive; the alternative, "provided he does not blaspheme", gives the same point. A margin (94.24): ***Solucio obiectus. Papa debet spiritualiter regere utramque partem ecclesie et non seculariter***, which takes ***utramque ecclesiam*** as both parts of the church. ***Eius vicarius***: Christ's vicar, the pope. ***Iuvencula***: a girl, a young woman (also a heifer); here Christ's young bride, the church on the road. A margin ***Conclusio*** (94.28).
9. B lacks ***tamen*** (95.2); B ***Regnum autem*** for ***Regimen autem*** (95.4). ***Regimine pape***: ablative after ***independens***. ***Prepositura***: the office of a superior (the glossary, ***prepositi***). ***Utriusque sui vicarii***: the king and the priest, vicar of the Godhead and vicar of Christ's humanity (the glossary).
10. A margin ***Contra adulatores ad papam*** (95.7), ***Commentator*** (95.10). Gregory's wine and oil (Luke 10:34), severity and gentleness in the ruler of souls: ***Regula pastoralis*** II.6 (PL 77: ***vinum atque oleum ... Miscenda ergo est lenitas cum severitate***). "The Commentator" is Averroes (Loserth's foot); the passage in his commentary on *Physics* III (the prologue, with the poison simile) is not independently checked. B lacks ***Nam — assuescunt*** (95.10). ***Inhabiles***: "unqualified" (the glossary), here for receiving instruction.
11. ***Cap. ...***: Loserth, ***Num. capituli deest*** (95.15). B, a later hand, in the margin (95.18): ***Reverendissime sanctissime cum vocatur, ydolatratur***, "when he is called most reverend, most holy, he is idolised". ***Dulia / latria***: the honour due to creatures / the worship due to God alone; the superlative claims latria. A margin ***Sensus duplex*** (95.23), ***Nota de titulis pape quomodo debent intelligi*** (95.25). ***Inter signandos prepositos***: our construal of the gerundive, "among the superiors to be designated [by such titles]". ***Ocium ... commissum***: what is left undone and what is done.
12. ***Potest*** (96.1) is printed with a capital. ***Quam hic regit***: ***hic*** may be "here" or "this [man]", the pope. If the pope rules, ***eius vicarius*** is the pope's deputy; if Christ rules (***hic***, "here"), ***eius vicarius*** is the pope. Loserth's side-note (96.1) takes the pope as ruler. AB ***blasphemiam*** (96.10), "to guard against blasphemy [and] idolatry"; we translate the print ***blasphemam***.
13. ***Eum***: the pope, or God (***quoad Deum***); ***statum communem in alio***: the common state of man in another man: the people adore a man for his rank. The construal is doubtful. A margin ***Equivocacio ecclesie Romane ad tria*** (96.16). ***Proximi capituli***: chapter 4 (04-e ¶2). ***Membra***: the members of the division; ***extorta***, wrested, forced.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 92: ***CAP. V.***
  - 93: ***18*** (15 is the line number)

- **93: *avi* (zoomed on leaf: 'limi avi' with an inkless gap before avi (a sort did not print; limi[t]avi by sense) - ink has avi)**
- **94: *Christus***
- **94: *unum***
- **94: *caput***
- **95: *Christi***
- **95: *Commentatorem***
- **96: *Et***
- **96: *sic***

• **OCR scars corrected in the Latin; plates for 96.27, 100.10), and doubts: 92.29–93.1 *desceni4iadunt*; 93.29 *limi avi*; 94.12 *hdbet*; 95.24 *velsecundo*; 95.15 *cap...* (Loserth: number wanting).**

Part 2: One body of three churches; a digression on lines; the church seen from afar

Loserth pp. 96.20–100.12

¶1 96.20–97.3
96.20 Objection: The Church dormant, militant and triumphant is not one body, since these parts are separate.
96.26 Answer: Separation is no bar to unity.
97.1 The souls of the blessed are incorporate in Christ's body.
97.19 A mathematical digression,

[96]**Secundo principaliter arguitur contra dicta per hoc quod nichil unum et specialiter non unum corpus componitur ex spiritibus in purgatorio, ex viantibus in mundo et ex triumphantibus in celo, cum continuacio et unio sint de essencia corporis, eo quod aliter periret sciencia linearum. Hic negatur assumptum, nec est continuacio vel unio, cum sit accidens de essencia cuiuscunque substancie; nam in quotquot partes quantitativas corpus martiris divisum fuerit, manet durante forma idem corpus in numero, et Christus fuit humanitus in limbo et mortuus in sepulchro. Absit ergo quod credamus animas fidelium defunctorum tunc non esse partes** [97]**ecclesie, quando instar Abel a quo cepit ecclesia sunt secure de sua beatitudine corpori Christi insolubiliter incorporate.**

Secondly and principally, it is argued, by appeal to this, against what has been said: that nothing one, and specially not one body, is composed of spirits in purgatory, of those on the road in the world and of the triumphant in heaven, since continuity and union are of the essence of a body; for otherwise the science of lines would perish.[1] Here the assumption is denied; nor is continuity or union, since it is an accident, of the essence of any substance whatever; for into however many quantitative parts the body of a martyr may have been divided, it remains, while the form endures, the same body in number; and Christ was in his humanity in limbo, and dead in the sepulchre. Far be it, therefore, that we should believe the souls of the faithful departed not to be parts [97]**of the church then, when, after the pattern of Abel, from whom the church began, they are secure of their blessedness, indissolubly incorporated in the body of Christ.[2]**

¶2 97.4–97.5

[97]**Unde in cantu ecclesie die Dedicacionis sic canitur: Rex Salomon fecit templum**

Hence in the chant of the church on the day of the Dedication it is sung thus: "King Solomon made a temple,

¶3 97.6–97.6

[97]**Cuius instar et exemplum**

whose likeness and example

¶4 97.7–97.7

[97]**Christus et ecclesia.**

[are] Christ and the church.

¶5 97.8–97.8

[97]**Sed tres partes sunt in templo**

But there are three parts in the temple,

¶6 97.9–97.10

[97]**Trinitatis sub exemplo Ymma, summâ, media.**

under the example of the Trinity: the lowest, the highest, the middle.

¶7 97.11–97.11

[97]**Prima signat vivos cunctos,**

The first signifies all the living,

¶8 97.12–97.12

¶9 97.13–97.13

¶10 97.14–98.22
98.23 *Men judge each other wrongly because their minds are fixed on human law.*
98.31 *The study of Scripture would make them wiser.*

[97] **Et secunda iam defunctos,**

[97] **Redivivos tercia.**

[97] **Et quantum ad combinaciones parcium corporum tam eiusdem speciei quam disparium, dictum est diffuse alibi; quem ille solus inter homines per se perfecte novit numerum talium cuius sapiencia non habet numerum mensurantem. Et quantum ad lineas, dicitur quod licet resolvantur in attomos manent eedem, unde priorem et cerciorem noticiam habet de eis arismetricus geometro. Alia autem est racio continuacionis, unde prius considerat arismetricus de quantitate continui quam geometer, uterque tamen sicut ignorat quantitatem numeri attomorum compositi, sic ignorat eius precisam quantitatem; quadam tamen estimacione capta a sensu excedit geometer arismetricum, cum suffragio sensus cognoscit quomodo dyameter quadrati superat costam suam. Intellectus tamen ultra imaginativam percipit utrumque errorem: nam sicut in quadratis de costis nobis finitis quoad numerum punctorum contingit accipere dyametros** [98] **eorum que paria puncta precise continuant, sic indubie quantumcunque magna fuerit figura quadrata contingit accipere dyametrum, que paria puncta contineat cum suo latere, ut capiendo dyametrum que de qualibet costa transversatili precise contineat unum punctum. Tunc precise quot sunt puncta in costa, precise tot sunt latera transversatilia, et precise tot puncta continet data dyameter. Et tamen contingit accipere aliam diametrum in cuius composicionem racione obliquacionis plura vel pauciora puncta ingrediantur. Nec scietur diffinite proporcio aut quantitas diametri respectu lateris, nisi scita quantitate numeri punctorum ex quibus componitur. Ideo querendum est de qua diametro arguens velit loqui, cum inter eadem puncta contingit accipere infinitas lineas, quarum nulla divisibiliter excedit a rectitudine racione variacionis punctorum dyametrum quantitative componencium. Et sic communiter est dyameter super qua cadit imaginacio maior costa, ut communiter dicitur in medietate proporcionis duple, sed certitudo deficit in tali imaginacione, cum error sensus in capiendo lineas corrigitur ex subtilitate intellectus (ut alias exposui).**

and the second those now departed,

the third those living again."[3]

And as to the combinations of the parts of bodies, both of the same species and of disparate [species], it has been said at length elsewhere; the number of such things he alone among men knows perfectly of himself whose "wisdom" has "no number" measuring [it].[4] **And as to lines, the answer is that although they are resolved into atoms they remain the same; hence the arithmetician has a prior and more certain knowledge of them than the geometer. But the account of continuity is another; hence the arithmetician considers the quantity of the continuum before the geometer; yet each, just as he is ignorant of the quantity of the number of atoms in the composite, so is ignorant of its precise quantity; yet by a certain estimation taken from sense the geometer exceeds the arithmetician, since with the aid of sense he knows how the diameter of a square exceeds its side.**[5] **Yet the understanding, beyond the imagination, perceives the error of both: for just as in squares whose sides are finite to us as to the number of points it is possible to take diameters** [98] **of them that continue precisely equal [numbers of] points, so without doubt, however great the square figure may be, it is possible to take a diameter that contains as many points as its side, as by taking a diameter that contains precisely one point of each transverse side. Then precisely as many points as there are in the side, precisely so many are the transverse sides, and precisely so many points does the given diameter contain. And yet it is possible to take another diameter into whose composition, by reason of its obliquity, more or fewer points enter. Nor will the proportion or quantity of the diameter with respect to the side be known definitely, unless the quantity of the number of points of which it is composed be known. Therefore it must be asked of which diameter the arguer wishes to speak, since between the same points it is possible to take infinitely many lines, none of which departs divisibly from straightness by reason of the variation of the points that make up the diameter in quantity.**[6] **And so commonly the diameter on which the imagination falls is greater than the side, as is commonly said, by half of the double proportion; but certainty fails in such imagination, since the error of sense in taking lines is corrected by the subtlety of the understanding (as I have expounded elsewhere).**[7]

¶11 98.23–99.31

99.1 *Some think that Christ's Church is united as to time and space, whereas the true members of Christ are scattered.*

[98]**Sed redeundo ad materiam de ecclesia dicitur primo quod sicut sensus errat circa magnitudinem et rectitudinem linee, quia ignorat numerum punctorum ex quibus componitur, sic viantes errant circa magnitudinem dignitatis vel meriti viantis, quia ignorant numerum et mensuram in quibus verbum eternaliter disposuit ponere sponsam suam. Multi enim obliquant a rectitudine iusticie, et sensus infixi in legibus humanis hoc non Percipiunt, sed intellectus considerans veritatem ac sapienciam scripture probabiliter percipit quod declinant a mandatis domini, quia solum in speculo scripture sacre discitur, tenetur et docetur sapiencia mandatorum.** [99]**Dicitur secundo quod propter elongacionem a vera ecclesia et ab irradiacione luminis capitalis frequenter putatur ecclesiam Christi esse continuam quoad locum et tempus, dum tamen membra Christi et sponse per vacuitates predestinacionis et operis rarenter sunt positi. Multi enim putant totum populum et totum genus sibi succedencium esse christianos verissimos et capitales precipuos in area sancte matris ecclesie, cum tamen sunt vacuitates et membra diaboli. Sicut enim iuxta naturales et perspectivos videns silvam vel campum segetum a longinquo iudicat totum esse continuum consitum arboribus vel frumento, sic nos inperfecta fide videntes ecclesiam a longinquo, non obstante quod habeat in se arbusta sterilia atque zizannia, iudicamus eam plenam fructuosis arboribus et frumento. Et ad istum sensum exponit Lincolniensis propheciam Michee VII°: Ve, inquit, tanta christianismi dilatacio, tanto opere Christi et suorum mediante lege scripture elaborata, est hodie velut in brevis anguli angustia coartata. Plurimam namque mundi partem occupavit infidelitas et a Christi ecclesia separavit; de parte vere dicta christiana separavit a Christo scisma, de parte vero residua que respectu duarum prenominatarum admodum est parva et pauca (ut puto) non modicam porcionem separavit a Christo pravitas heretica, quasi autem totalitatem residui concorporarunt diabolo et separarunt a Christo septem criminalia peccata, ut iam voce lugubri plangat Christus dicens: Ve mihi quia factus sum sicut qui colligit in autumpno racemos vindemie, non est botrus ad comedendum. Uvas preciosas desideravit anima mea;**

But, returning to the matter of the church, the answer is, first, that just as sense errs about the magnitude and straightness of a line, because it is ignorant of the number of points of which it is composed, so those on the road err about the magnitude of the dignity or merit of one on the road, because they are ignorant of the number and measure in which the Word eternally disposed to set his bride. For many slant away from the straightness of justice, and senses fixed in human laws do not perceive this; but the understanding that considers the truth and wisdom of scripture perceives with probability that they decline from the commandments of the Lord, since only in the mirror of sacred scripture is the wisdom of the commandments learned, held and taught. [99]**The answer is, secondly, that on account of distance from the true church and from the irradiation of the light of the head, the church of Christ is often thought to be continuous as to place and time, whereas the members of Christ and of the bride are set sparsely, through vacancies of predestination and of work.**[8] **For many think that the whole people, and the whole line of those succeeding them, are most true Christians and foremost chiefs on the threshing-floor of holy mother church, when in fact they are vacancies and members of the devil. For just as, according to the natural philosophers and the writers on perspective, one seeing a wood or a field of crops from afar judges the whole to be continuously planted with trees or corn, so we, seeing the church from afar with imperfect faith, notwithstanding that it has in it barren shrubs and cockle, judge it full of fruitful trees and corn.**[9] **And to this sense Lincoln expounds the prophecy of Micah 7: "Woe," he says, "so great an expansion of Christianity, wrought with so great labour of Christ and his own by means of the law of scripture, is today as it were confined in the narrowness of a small corner. For unbelief has occupied the greatest part of the world and separated it from Christ's church; of the part truly called Christian, schism has separated [a part] from Christ; of the remaining part, which in respect of the two aforenamed is very small and few, heretical depravity (as I think) has separated no small portion from Christ; and almost the whole of the remainder the seven criminal sins have concorporated with the devil and separated from Christ; so that now Christ laments with mournful voice, saying: 'Woe is me, for I am become as one that gleaneth in autumn the grapes of the vintage: there is no cluster to eat. My soul desired precious grapes;**

¶12 100.1–100.12

100.1 *The visible Church contains more tares than wheat.*

[100] sanctus de terra et sanctus in hominibus non est Nam sponsus ecclesie plus invenit de ficu fatua et vite sterili, plus de zizannia quam de lignis fructiferis et frumento. Nam vitis que solebat facere uvas, ex quibus tamquam uberibus solebat mater ecclesia inebriare suos palmites (ut superius exponitur a Bernardo) iuxta vaticinium prophete Isaie V° 2 facit labruscas, id est, fatuitates honoris mundani atque discordias. Ideo non restat ut quid tales terram occupant in agro dominico, nisi ut reserventur colligendi in finali iudicio et (ut dicitur Matthei XIII° 30) ad laudem ecclesie comburendi.

[100] there is no holy man of the earth, and no holy man among men.'"[10] For the bridegroom of the church finds more of the foolish fig tree and the barren vine, more of cockle, than of fruit-bearing trees and corn. For the vine which used to make grapes, from which, as from breasts, mother church used to inebriate her branches (as is expounded above by Bernard), according to the oracle of the prophet Isaiah 5:2, makes "wild grapes", that is, the follies of worldly honour, and discords.[11] Therefore no reason remains why such should occupy the ground in the Lord's field, except that they be reserved to be gathered at the final judgement and (as is said in Matthew 13:30) to be burned to the praise of the church.[12]

Notes

1. A margin *Secunda obieccio* (96.20), *Purgatorium* (96.22); B *unio sunt* (96.24). The *no* after *linearum* (about 96.25) is a fragment of the English side-note at 96.26 ("Separation is no bar to unity"), not Wyclif's, and is not translated. *Sciencia linearum*: geometry. The spirits in purgatory are the church sleeping.
2. A margin *Responsio* (96.26). *Cum sit accidens*: continuity and union are accidents, so not of the essence of a substance. *Humanitus*: in his human nature; soul in limbo and body in the tomb, Christ remained one. Abel as the beginning of the church (*ecclesia ab Abel*) is a commonplace: Gregory, *Hom. in Ev.* 19.1, *ab Abel justo usque ad ultimum electum* (PL 76:1154B; cited by Wyclif at 02-b); Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 142.3, *initium habet ab ipso Abel* (PL 37:1846). Wyclif names no source here.
3. The Dedication sequence *Rex Salomon fecit templum* (Loserth: Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus* V, p. 106); its ascription (Adam of St Victor?) is not independently checked (same row). *Cuius* (97.6) is Loserth's: the MSS *Quorum*, as the Angers missal in Daniel; *Cuius* as Wyclif quotes the stanza in his *Sermones mixti* (sermon *Propter fratres meos et proximos*, Ps. 121) and in the second part of the gospel sermons (*Egrediente Jesu de templo*, Mark 13) (Loserth). *Ymma*: *ima*; *summâ* (97.10) carries a circumflex on the plate. The working transcription divides the stanza into ¶2–9 by its printed lines.
4. *Quem* (97.15): so the MSS (Loserth *sic*); it construes only as drawn to *numerum* ("the number of such things, which ..."). Ps. 146:5, DR "of his wisdom there is no number", alluded to; "he alone among men" is Christ. *Dictum est ... alibi*: in another work, not identified here.
5. The digression answers the objection's "science of lines" (96.25): lines are resolved into indivisible points (*attomi*), so the arithmetician, who counts, knows them before the geometer, who measures. A margin (96.29): *Arismetricus et geometer hec videant*. *Dyameter*: the diagonal; *costa*, the side. *Suffragio sensus*: with the aid of sense (not the *suffragia* of the glossary).
6. B *signa quadrata* (98.2); A *quantitatem* (98.17). *Paria puncta*: an equal number of points in diagonal and side. *Costa transversatilis*: a transverse row of points parallel to a side; a diagonal taking one point from each row has as many points as the side. *De costis nobis finitis*: with sides finite "to us", i.e. countable. *Divisibiliter*: by any divisible amount: the many point-lines between the same ends differ from straightness by less than any part.
7. *In medietate proporcionis duple*: in the medieval doctrine of ratios, the diagonal stands to the side in half the double ratio (in modern terms $\sqrt{2} : 1$). *Ut alias exposui*: in another work, not identified here.
8. A margin *Nota* (98.23). Wis. 11:21, DR "thou hast ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight", alluded to (*numerum et mensuram ... disposuit*). *Verbum*: the Word. A margin (99.1): *Nota quare iudicium nostrum errat circa ecclesiam*. B lacks *a vera — ecclesiam* (99.1–3). *Luminis capitalis*: the light of the head, Christ. *Positi* (99.5): masculine by sense, though *membra* is neuter. *Vacuitates*: empty places, gaps.
9. *Capitales precipuos*: the foremost chief men; *capitalis* echoes *caput*. *Area*: the threshing-floor, where grain and chaff lie together (cf. 89.3). *Naturales et perspectivi*: the natural philosophers and the writers on optics (*perspectiva*).
10. "Lincoln": Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln; his *Sermo* before Innocent IV at Lyon, 1250 (Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum* II, 1690, p. 251), quoted closely, *uvas preciosas* included. His words end at *in hominibus non est*. A margin *Lincolniensis* (99.16), *Ecclesia sancta catholica quantum sit artata* (99.17). *Mediante*: Loserth's expansion of the MSS *medi°* (99.18). *Vere*: Loserth; the MSS *vero* (99.22), "but of the part called Christian"; we translate the print. *Quia factus*: the MSS *qui factus* (Loserth's foot). Micah 7:1–2 (Loserth): Wyclif agrees with the Vulgate as far as *ad comedendum* (DR used); then *uvas preciosas* for the Vulgate's *praecoquas ficus* (DR "the first ripe figs"), and *sanctus de terra et sanctus in hominibus non est* for *Periit sanctus de terra, et rectus in hominibus non est* (DR "The holy man is perished out of the earth, and there is none upright among men"). B *Uvas preter quas desideravit* (99.31); B *in hominibus non erit* (100.1). *Septem criminalia peccata*: the seven deadly sins.
11. Isa. 5:2: Wyclif *facit labruscas*, the Vulgate *fecit*; DR "it brought forth wild grapes". B *tanquam universalibus* for *uberibus* (100.5). *A Bernardo*: the place "above" is most likely Bernard, *Super Cant.* 12.11 (PL 183:833B, *Quisquis et inebriat verbis* and *meliora sunt ubera tua vino*), quoted in 03-g; the vine is not in it. *Ficus fatua*: the barren fig tree (cf. Luke 13:6–9).

12. ***Iudicio*** **(100.10): the print (plate); the OCR had *iudic. Ut quid ... terram occupant* echoes Luke 13:7, DR "Why cumbereth it the ground?"; we construe *non restat ut quid ... nisi ut*: "no 'why' remains ... except that". Matt. 13:30, DR "Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn", paraphrased; *ad laudem ecclesie* is Wyclif's.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **96: *quod***
  - **96: *componitur*** **(com-/ponitur hyphenated; main token holds whole word)**
  - **96: *Hic***
  - **97: *summâ*** **(leaf zoom: circumflex over final a)**
  - **97: *attomorum*** **(atto-/morum hyphenated; main token holds whole word)**
  - **98: *eorum***
  - **98: *que***
  - **98: ∅ (inserted "each" is the English side-note; print has Sed at box, no extra word)**
  - **98: *humanis*** **(huma-/nis hyphenated; main token holds whole word)**
  - **98: *hoc***
  - **99: *frequenter*** **(is is the English side-note)**
  - **99: *Christi***
  - **99: *vacuitates*** **(5 is the line number)**
  - **99: *VII°***
  - **100: *sanctus***
  - **100: *de***
  - **100: *est***
  - **99: *secundo***
- **OCR scars corrected in the Latin; plates for 96.27, 100.10), and doubts: 96.25 *no*** **(side-note fragment, not translated); 96.27 *uni*; 100.4 *aBernardo*; 100.9 *restatut*; 100.10 *iudic et*; 98.29 *Percipiunt*** **(capital only).**

Part 3: Squaring the circle; the body of the devil

Loserth pp. 100.13–104.17

¶1 100.13–102.6

100.13 *A Christian must know how to square the circle.*
100.27 *God is said to be a circle with its centre everywhere and its circumference nowhere.*
101.3 *He has combined the four elements on man and has assumed the square thus made.*
101.20 *The Christian should lose himself in God by love.*
102.7 *3rd objection: If the predestinate form one body, so must the foreknown.*
102.13 *Answer: The foreknown do form one body*
102.24 *of which the devil is the head.*

[100]**Dicitur tercio quod nisi christianus sciverit quadrare circulum, non est de membris ecclesie. Quadratura quidem circuli est scibilis, ut patet in Predicamentis, sed fuit in tempore Aristotelis nondum scita. Constat quidem quod figura tripunctalis ad instar trinitatis habet tria puncta supposita quorum nullum excedit reliquum sicut nec latera vel anguli, sed habent figuram et angulos utrobique. Correspondenter mistice tota trinitas personarum est parilis et nocio personarum ut latera nec non et proprietates earum ut anguli, et communem habent essenciam ubique plenariam ut figuram. Et sicut omnes illi tres anguli valent duos rectos, sic omnes tres persone divine valent ydemptice commune principium et commune principiatum. Si ergo in medio trium punctorum sit punctus positus, gerens similitudinem essencie que secundum racionem communicabilitatis distinguitur a personis, tunc figurat illud simul existens quadratum et circulus Deum nostrum qui secundum unum de viginti quatuor prophetis est circulus intelligibilis cuius centrum est ubique et circumferencia** [101]**nusquam; iste autem simul circulus intelligibilis et quadratum secundum multiplicem racionem miserendi ecclesie**

The answer is, thirdly, that unless a Christian knows how to square the circle, he is not of the members of the church. The squaring of the circle is indeed knowable, as is clear in the *Categories*, but in the time of Aristotle it was not yet known.[1] It is evident indeed that a figure of three points, after the likeness of the Trinity, has three points set under it, of which none exceeds the rest, as neither do the sides or the angles; but they have the figure and the angles alike on each side. Correspondingly, in a mystical sense, the whole trinity of persons is equal, and the notion of the persons [is] as the sides, and their properties too as the angles; and they have a common essence, everywhere full, as the figure. And just as all those three angles are equal to two right angles, so all three divine persons are, identically, equal to a common principle and a common [term that is] from a principle.[2] If, then, a point is set in the middle of the three points, bearing the likeness of the essence, which by the account of communicability is distinguished from the persons, then that [figure], existing at once as square and circle, figures our God, who according

constituit quadratum sensibile, quando in plenitudine temporis compaginavit quatuor elementa in quattuor humores ac quattuor complexiones et assumpsit plenum hominem quem sic fecit. Tunc enim sensibile quadratum humanitatis et circulus intelligibilis divinitatis factum est utrumque natura idem suppositum verbi Dei. Et istam sentenciam inculcat sanctus et devotus doctor magister Johannes de Howdan, alloquens amorem qui incarnavit filium in hec verba: Artem nosti, quadrantem circulum quem quadrasti, carnis quadrangulum spere Dei dans per miraculum sauciatum sanando seculum. Isti circulo oportet hominem inniti et secundum quadraturam quatuor virtutum cardinalium incorporari, si debeat esse membrum ecclesie dicente veritate Johannis XV° 4: Sicut palmes non potest ferre fructum nisi manserit in vite, sic nec vos nisi in me manseritis. Oportet enim christianum esse Deo insorptum per amorem, sic quod tota terrestritas instar ferri vel carbonis candentis pro zelo honoris Dei, honore seculi postposito, sit ignita; in cuius signum apostoli ex doctrina Christi Luce XXII° vocarunt se in suarum epistolarum iniciis servos Dei et domini Jesu Christi, ut per hoc reprimatur in eis fastus vel dignitatis apparencia, sed in dominum suum convertatur tota dignitatis tendencia. Sed hodie prepostere de dignitate, primatu et reverencia servi fit tota intencio, de honore vero Christi vel suo contemptu [102] qui stat in legis suo observancia vel despectu non fit scrutinium; quod est signum evidentissimum quod tales superbi prepositi sunt extra Christum et suam ecclesiam, membra regis superbie que suam quadraturam ostentant in figura mundi, figuram autem substancie divine postponendo occultant.

to one of the twenty-four prophets is an intelligible circle whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference [101] nowhere.[3] And he, at once intelligible circle and square, according to the manifold reason of having mercy on the church, constituted a perceptible square when, in the fulness of time, he joined the four elements into the four humours and the four complexions, and assumed a full man, whom he thus made. For then the perceptible square of the humanity and the intelligible circle of the divinity became, each [being] a nature, the same suppositum of the Word of God.[4] And this teaching the holy and devout doctor, master John of Howden, drives home, addressing the love that incarnated the Son, in these words: "You know the art, the squaring circle which you have squared, giving by a miracle the quadrangle of flesh to the sphere of God, healing the wounded world."[5] On this circle a man must lean, and be incorporated according to the squaring of the four cardinal virtues, if he is to be a member of the church, as the Truth says in John 15:4: "As the branch cannot bear fruit, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in me."[6] For a Christian must be absorbed into God by love, so that his whole earthiness, like iron or a glowing coal, be set on fire for zeal for the honour of God, the honour of the world being put after; in sign of which the apostles, from the doctrine of Christ in Luke 22, called themselves at the beginnings of their epistles servants of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that by this pride or the show of dignity might be repressed in them, but the whole tendency of dignity be turned towards their lord.[7] But today, preposterously, the whole concern is with the dignity, primacy and reverence of the servant, while into the honour of Christ, or the contempt of him, [102] which consists in the observance or the despising of his law, no inquiry is made; which is a most evident sign that such proud superiors are outside Christ and his church, members of the king of pride, who display their squareness in the figure of the world, but hide the figure of the divine substance by putting it after.[8]

¶2 102.7–102.12

[102] Tercio arguitur contra dicta de corpore ecclesie per hoc quod pari evidencia qua illa foret unum corpus, et congregacio prescitorum constitueret unum corpus, consequens falsum, quia nec corpus naturale nec misticum, eo quod non foret forma uniens, nisi foret peccatum, illud autem non continuat sed seiungit.

Thirdly, it is argued, by appeal to this, against what has been said about the body of the church: that by the same evidence by which it would be one body, the congregation of the foreknown too would constitute one body; the consequent is false, since [it would be] neither a natural nor a mystical body, because there would be no uniting form unless it were sin; now that does not join but separates.[9]

¶3 102.13–104.17
103.6 *A body may be composed either of material or formal parts.*
103.19 *The body of the devil is united by an outward form (God's foreknowledge) and an inward deformity (the sin of final impenitence).*
104.4 *At the day of judgment the parts of these two bodies (of Christ and the devil) will be finally separated.*

[102]**Hic dicitur ex fide scripture quod omnes presciti constituunt unum corpus. Christus enim dicit Joh. VIII° 44, Judeis et principaliter sacerdotibus et phariseis qui dicebantur esse capitales ecclesie: Vos ex patre diabolo estis et desideria patris vestri vultis facere. Ex quo patet quod oportet esse unam generacionem que fuit mala in vulgaribus, peior in secularibus prepositis, sed pessima in prelatis, sicut generacio iustorum secundum tres gradus oppositos eis proporcionaliter correspondet. Si ergo sit una generacio perversorum, oportet quod sit unus iniquus homo habens partes que sunt membra diaboli, et cum non potest esse membrum vel caput nisi in comparacione ad totum corpus integrum, manifestum est quod est unum corpus diaboli, sicut est unum corpus Christi. Ubi autem corpus Christi vocatur corpus misticum propter misterium celestis coniugii inter Christum et ecclesiam Christi, corpus diaboli non est sic misticum sed obscurum, cum sic coniungi diabolo** [103]**non sonat directe in misterium sed flagellum, et sic corpus diaboli habet esse naturale, cum secundum Augustinum in libro De Natura Boni... omne malum oportet fundari in bono: ergo omne malum moris fundatur in bono nature. Nec est inconveniens sed consonum modo loquendi sanctorum et vulgi vocare quamcunque creatam substanciam ex partibus quantitativis sive materialibus sive formalibus compositam verum corpus, sic enim vocatur aggregatum ex spiritualibus et indivisibilibus legibus corpus iuris. Tale ergo esse naturale habet quecunque aggregata substancia, unita in suo communi ut specie vel genere, et preter esse naturale habet racionalis creatura esse beatitudinis, virtutis vel vicii, ut est de membris Christi atque diaboli. Et loquendo de tali unione vel esse corporis negat Augustinus III°, De Doctrina Christiana, XXXII° cap., quod ex membris Christi atque diaboli sit unum corpus compositum. Et ulterius quando tangitur de forma uniente corpus diaboli, dicitur quod est dare formam extrinsecam et deformitatem intrinsecam. Forma autem extrinseca est presciencia Dei eterna qua scit et ordinat omnes tales constringi ad penam perpetuam, deformitas autem intrinseca est finalis inobediencia vel superbia, contumacia quam sancti vocant culpam finalis impenitencie vel peccatum in spiritum sanctum. Et sic idem peccatum continuat et seiungit. Continuat enim membra diaboli, constringens eos in tartaris in sua malicia, et segregat eos a consorcio beatorum, sicut calor dissolvens mixtum congregat omogena, cum facit quodlibet elementum** [104]**mixti dissoluti petere locum suum, sed segregat ethrogena, cum dissolvit compleccionem armonicam, resolvendo partes mixti in suas naturas simplices separatas. Oportet enim in die**

To this the answer is, from the faith of scripture, that all the foreknown constitute one body. For Christ says in John 8:44, to the Jews, and principally to the priests and Pharisees, who were said to be the chiefs of the church: "You are of your father the devil: and the desires of your father you will do." From which it is clear that there must be one generation, which was bad in the common people, worse in the secular superiors, but worst in the prelates, just as the generation of the just corresponds to them proportionally according to three opposite degrees.[10] If, then, there is one generation of the perverse, there must be one wicked man having parts that are members of the devil; and since there cannot be a member or a head except in relation to a whole, integral body, it is manifest that there is one body of the devil, just as there is one body of Christ. But whereas the body of Christ is called the mystical body on account of the mystery of the heavenly marriage between Christ and the church of Christ, the body of the devil is not mystical in this way but obscure, since to be so joined to the devil [103]**does not sound directly of mystery but of the scourge;[11] and so the body of the devil has natural being, since according to Augustine in the book *On the Nature of the Good* ... every evil must be founded in a good: therefore every evil of conduct is founded in a good of nature.[12] Nor is it an absurdity, but in harmony with the manner of speaking of the saints and of the common folk, to call any created substance composed of quantitative parts, whether material or formal, a true body; for thus the aggregate of spiritual and indivisible laws is called the body of law. Such natural being, therefore, any aggregate substance has that is united in what it has in common, as in a species or genus; and besides natural being the rational creature has the being of blessedness, of virtue or of vice, as is the case with the members of Christ and of the devil.[13] And speaking of such union, or being of a body, Augustine denies in *On Christian Doctrine* III, chapter 32, that one body is composed of the members of Christ and of the devil.[14] And further, when the form uniting the body of the devil is touched on, the answer is that there is to be given an extrinsic form and an intrinsic deformity. And the extrinsic form is God's eternal foreknowledge, by which he knows and ordains that all such are bound to perpetual punishment; and the intrinsic deformity is final disobedience, or pride, a contumacy which the saints call the guilt of final impenitence, or the sin against the Holy Spirit.[15] And so the same sin joins and separates. For it joins the members of the devil, binding them in hell in their malice, and**

iudicii ex contrarietate frigoris corporis diaboli et caloris caritatis corporis Christi secundum legem forme ultime corpus bipartitum dissolvi, quando partes leves advolabunt cum capite suo quod est ignis consumens ad mansiones naturales in superis. Partes autem plumbee affeccione terrestri descendunt ad inferos, et sic duo hec nedum sunt duo corpora, sed due persone (ut tetigi cap. XLIII° tercii libri); de quo satis est adducere unum testimonium beati Gregorii, IV° Moralium, cap. XI°. Sicut, inquit, redemptor noster una persona est cum congregacione bonorum (ipse namque caput est corporis et nos huius capitis corpus), ita antiquus hostis una persona est cum cuncta colleccione reproborum.

segregates them from the fellowship of the blessed; just as heat, dissolving a mixed body, gathers together things of one kind, since it makes each element [104] of the dissolved mixture seek its own place, but segregates things of different kinds, since it dissolves the harmonious complexion, resolving the parts of the mixture into their simple, separated natures.[16] For on the day of judgement, from the contrariety of the cold of the body of the devil and the heat of charity of the body of Christ, the bipartite body must, according to the law of the final form, be dissolved, when the light parts will fly up with their head, which is a consuming fire, to their natural mansions above. But the leaden parts, by earthly affection, go down to the lower regions; and so these two are not only two bodies, but two persons (as I touched on in chapter 43 of the third book);[17] on which it is enough to adduce one testimony of blessed Gregory, *Moralia* IV, chapter 11: "Just as," he says, "our Redeemer is one person with the congregation of the good (for he is the head of the body, and we the body of this head), so the old enemy is one person with the whole collection of the reprobate."[18]

Notes

1. The third answer to the second objection (96.20), after "first" (98.23) and "secondly" (99.1). A margin *Nota de quadratura circuli*, B margin *Quadratura circuli* (100.13). Aristotle, *Categories* 7, says that the squaring of the circle, if it is knowable, is not yet known: 7b30–33; Loserth gives no reference here (his note on *Predicamentis* belongs to 104.27).
2. *Figura tripunctalis*: the triangle of three points; *utrobique*, "on each side", i.e. the figure and the angles belong alike to all three. *Nocio personarum*: the notions (paternity, filiation and the rest) by which the persons are known apart. *Principiatum*: what is from a principle; the persons together are one principle and one term from a principle. Loserth's foot has "17. In codd.: quod figuratur", which we cannot place with certainty; the print is translated (see Latin doubts).
3. "One of the twenty-four prophets": the *Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers*, whose second proposition defines God as an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere; prop. II reads *Deus est sphaera infinita cuius centrum est ubique, circumferentia nusquam*; Wyclif's *circulus intelligibilis* is not its wording. Loserth: "This passage is not to be found in the prophets." A A_1 lack *cuius — intelligibilis* (100.32–101.1), an eye-skip between the two *circulus intelligibilis*.
4. A A_1 *racionum miserendi ecclesie*, "the manifold reasons"; B *miterendi*; B *que sic fecit* (101.2–6). *In plenitudine temporis*: Gal. 4:4, DR "when the fulness of the time was come". The four humours and complexions answer to the four elements: the man assumed is the "perceptible square". *Utrumque natura*: each, being a nature, became one suppositum (person) of the Word; A *utramque* (101.8). B margin *Circulus quadratus*.
5. Codd. *magister J. de Howdan*, expanded by Loserth; A margin *J. Howdan* (101.10). Loserth: John of Howden (d. 1275), chaplain of Eleanor, mother of Edward I. The poem the lines come from is not identified (same row). *Quadrantem*: we take it with *circulum*, "the squaring circle"; it can also be read "you know the art, squaring the circle you have squared". *Spere Dei*: the sphere of God, the divinity as circle.
6. "The Truth": Christ (John 14:6). Codd. *facere fructum*; Loserth corrected to *ferre* from the Vulgate (101.19), and the print is translated. Wyclif lacks the Vulgate's *a semetipso* (DR "of itself"). B margin *In ecclesia esse etc.* (101.17).
7. *Insorptum*: absorbed (*insorbere*); so the print on the plate. B *quod nos* (101.21), place uncertain. Luke 22:26, DR "he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger". The epistle openings: e.g. Jas. 1:1, DR "James, the servant of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ".
8. "The king of pride": Job 41:25, DR "he is king over all the children of pride", alluded to. *Figura mundi*: cf. 1 Cor. 7:31, DR "the fashion of this world passeth away"; the play is on *figura* and *quadratura* above. A *figuram figuram* (102.5).
9. A margin (102.7): *Malorum congregacio est unum corpus naturale sicut bonorum est unum corpus misticum*. A *continat* (102.12). *Continuare*: to make continuous, "join", the opposite of *seiungere*. The foreknown are those God foreknows will be damned (the glossary).
10. A margin *Responsio* (102.13); B margin, later hand, *Ecclesia malignancium per consequens est unum corpus* (102.14; cf. Ps. 25:5); A margin *Triplex generacio mala*. *Capitales*: the chief men, echoing *caput*. A A_1 *correspondent* (102.22).

11. B lacks *corpus* (102.26) and *Christi* (102.30); B *cum coniungi* (102.31). The "mystery" of the marriage: Eph. 5:32, DR "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church" (Vulgate *sacramentum*, Wyclif *misterium*).
12. Loserth: a lacuna in the codd. after *boni* (103.3), and the sentence is not extant in *De natura boni*, though there are many like it there. A margin *Augustinus*.
13. *Inconveniens* here in its argumentative sense (glossary: CONTEXTUAL). *Corpus iuris*: the body of law, the canonists' *corpus iuris*; *ius* as law. B *ut supra corpus* (103.9), place uncertain. A margin *Quid est corpus*; B margin, later hand: *Ex esse virtutis (vel) vicii unum corpus esse non potest*, an early reader's summary.
14. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.32, on the second rule of Tyconius, "on the bipartite body of the Lord", where he objects to calling one body the members of Christ and those who are not his: PL 34:82; the summary is ours. A margin *Augustinus* (103.16).
15. A margin *Nota de forma uniente malos in corpus unum* (103.19). The foreknowledge is the extrinsic form, as predestination is for the body of Christ (cf. 110.9). The sin against the Holy Spirit: Matt. 12:31–32, alluded to. B *et sicut* (103.26); A margin *Conclusio*.
16. B *in carceris* for *in tartaris* (103.28); A margin *Exemplum*. Heat gathers like and separates unlike: Aristotle's definition of heat (*De generatione et corruptione* II.2, 329b26–30: heat associates things of the same kind, while cold brings together kinds alike and unlike). *Omogena / ethrogena*: things of one kind / of different kinds; A *ethromogena*, A_1 *etherogena* (104.2).
17. *Caritatis* (104.5): the print (plate); the OCR had *cantatis*. For *caloris*: A *calore*, A_1 *calce*, B *calores*. "A consuming fire": Heb. 12:29, Deut. 4:24. *Lex forme ultime*: the law by which each part follows its final form, the light upward and the heavy down. Codd. *terrestres* (104.10), "the earthly leaden parts"; Loserth *terrestri*, translated. "Chapter 43 of the third book": the work is to be identified.
18. Gregory, *Moralia* IV, chapter 11 (codd. *cap. IX*; PL 75:647B–C, cap. XI [Vet. XIV]; Loserth: *Opp. Greg.* I, p. 112): Wyclif lacks *isdem* and adds *inquit*; A margin *Gregorius* (104.13); B *est cunta* (*sic*, 104.17). *Reproborum*: the reprobate, kept apart from the foreknown (the glossary).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 100: *quadrare* (3 is a margin enumeration, H alinea letter)
  - 101: *nusquam*
  - 101: *insorptum* (print has insorptum) [NW]
  - 103: ∅ (inserted run not in print here: line begins K 142c non sonat)
  - 103: *Christi*
  - 104: *Christi*
  - 103: *elementum* (ele- here, mentum at top of p.104; main token holds whole word)
  - 104: *mixti*
- Doubts: 104.5 *cantatis* (read as *caritatis*, n. 17); 100.17 Loserth's *quod figuratur* unplaced (n. 2).

Part 4: The church a true continuum; Christ the common term and the mean

Loserth pp. 104.18–108.17

¶1 104.18–107.11

104.18 *Objection: The Church cannot be one body because its parts are separate in space.*
104.23 *Answer: All the parts have a common point of union in the head.*
105.22 *Local distance does not interfere with this union.*
105.26 *Not only is there a continuous body but every part is in touch with every other,*
105.34 *since each helps all,*
106.8 *and therefore is with it, since things that affect each other must be together.*

[104]Sed adhuc instant sophiste per hoc quod, si ecclesia catholica sit unum corpus et omne corpus est vere continuum, tunc ipsa ecclesia est vere continuum; consequens falsum, quia partes ecclesie distant per quotlibet miliaria sine parte ecclesie media intercepta.: Hic concedi debet conclusio quod ecclesia catholica est vere continuum. Nam omne corpus cuius partes copulantur ad terminum communem est vere contitinuum; dicta ecclesia est corpus huiusmodi, ergo conclusio. Assumptum patet per Aristotelem in Predicamentis, capitulo de quantitate, sic describentem quantitatem continuam. Si ergo dicte ecclesie sit quantitas continua secundum [105]quam est formaliter magna, tunc ipsa est vere continua, ymo non solum quelibet pars huius ecclesie continuatur cum aliqua alia eius parte, sed omnes simul copulantur ad eundem terminum communem. Pro quo declarando suppono quod, sicut ecclesia est unum aggregative, sic membrum eius et accidencia sua sunt unum aggregative. Aliter enim non

But the sophists still object, by appeal to this: that if the catholic church is one body, and every body is truly a continuum, then the church itself is truly a continuum; the consequent is false, since the parts of the church are distant by any number of miles, with no part of the church caught between them.[1] Here the conclusion should be granted that the catholic church is truly a continuum. For every body whose parts are joined at a common term is truly a continuum; the said church is a body of this kind; therefore the conclusion. The assumption is clear from Aristotle in the *Categories*, in the chapter on quantity, who defines continuous quantity thus.[2] If, then, the said church has a continuous quantity according to [105]which it is formally great, then it is truly continuous; indeed, not only is each part of this church continuous with some other part of it, but all together are joined at the same common term. To make this clear I suppose that, just as the church is one aggregatively, so its member

106.18 *Every thing that is is eternal, as well in its Causation as in its quidity.*
107.12 *All future things will happen of necessity, and nothing can be annihilated.*
107.23 *The grace and love of Christ is the common term uniting all the members of the Church.*

foret multitudinis credencium cor unum et anima una (ut scriptura sacra dicit Act. IV° 32). Ex quo patet quod omnes partes ecclesie collective intellecte copulantur ad eundem terminum communem ex omnibus communibus terminis ecclesie aggregatum. Nam iste communis terminus copulat quamlibet partem quantitativam ecclesie cum alia, hic secundum unam eius partem et hic secundum aliam. Ymo (ut logice loquar) sicut punctus replicatus est tota substancia linee superficiei et corporis quantitatis, sic substancia materialis aggregata est universum corporeum et eius partes sunt proporcionaliter partes mundi. Aliter enim Deus non est locutus per os sanctorum contra scripturam Luce 1°, 70, nec ecclesia foret unanimis uno ore honorificans Deum Rom. XV°. Nec distancia localis nec discontinuacio mathematice quantitatis obest, quia similitas secundum interiorem hominem et adnascencia membrorum ecclesie secundum caritatem excedit unitatem sensibilem. Ulterius, cum maior sit unitas gracie quam nature, ostendendum videtur quod non solum quelibet pars ecclesie continuatur cum alia, nec solum quod omnes partes ecclesie continuantur ad invicem, sed quod quelibet eius pars continuatur cum qualibet. Nam omnis pars ecclesie copulatur cuilibet per eundem terminum communem, ergo omnis pars ecclesie continuatur cuilibet. Pro assumpto suppono quod mediator Dei et hominum Christus Jesus plenus gracie et veritatis faciat quamlibet partem ecclesie prodesse [106] cuilibet. Aliter enim non iuvarent se ad integrandum matrem ecclesiam ad profectum cuiuslibet. Tunc arguo sic: Eo ipso quo creatura agendo prodest alteri quodammodo est cum ea, sed quelibet pars ecclesie agendo prodest cuilibet, ergo quelibet quodammodo est cum qualibet. Assumptum videtur ex hoc quod omne sic prodesse est meliorare, et per consequens, ex acquisicione qualitatis que est bonitas est alterare et sic movere, sed secundum philosophum VII°. Phisicorum: In omni motu movens et motum sunt simul. Sic enim concedunt quod sol secundum speciem suam que lumen dicitur est simul cum qualibet parte orbis subluminaris quam alterat, sensibile est ad omnem punctum medii ubi agit speciem suam, et res post sui corrupcionem est in suo effectu modo quo loquitur scriptura Ecclesiast. III° 14: Didici quod omnia opera que fecit dominus perseverent usque in eternum. Ex istis sequitur quod sicut quelibet res est simpliciter eterna secundum esse suum intelligibile, sic est perpetua nedum in sua specie et principiis quiditatis, sed in suis causis individuis et in sua causacione, cum semper sit causacio cuiuslibet rei. Et conformiter est ubique, licet non secundum existenciam individui; et idem videtur sapientem Salomonem sentire Eccl. III° (ubi supra): Quod factum est, inquit, ipsum permanet, que

and its accidents are one aggregatively. For otherwise "the multitude of believers" would not have "one heart and one soul" (as sacred scripture says, Acts 4:32).[3] From which it is clear that all the parts of the church, understood collectively, are joined at the same common term, aggregated from all the common terms of the church. For this common term joins each quantitative part of the church with another, here according to one part of it and there according to another. Indeed (to speak logically), just as the point replicated is the whole substance of the line, of the surface and of the body of quantity, so material substance aggregated is the corporeal universe, and its parts are proportionally the parts of the world.[4] For otherwise "God has not spoken by the mouth of the saints", against the scripture of Luke 1:70, nor would the church be "of one mind, with one mouth glorifying God", Romans 15.[5] Nor does local distance, or the discontinuity of mathematical quantity, stand in the way, since likeness according to the inner man, and the growing-together of the members of the church according to charity, exceeds perceptible unity. Further, since the unity of grace is greater than that of nature, it seems it should be shown, not only that each part of the church is continuous with another, nor only that all the parts of the church are continuous with one another, but that each part of it is continuous with each. For every part of the church is joined to every [part] by the same common term; therefore every part of the church is continuous with every [part].[6] For the assumption I suppose that the mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus, full of grace and truth, makes each part of the church be of profit [106] to each. For otherwise they would not help one another to make up mother church whole, to the profit of each.[7] Then I argue thus: by the very fact that a creature, by acting, profits another, it is in some manner with it; now each part of the church, by acting, profits each; therefore each is in some manner with each. The assumption appears from this, that all such profiting is bettering, and consequently, from the acquiring of a quality, which is goodness, it is altering, and so moving; now according to the Philosopher, *Physics* VII: "In every motion the mover and the moved are together." For thus they grant that the sun, according to its species, which is called light, is together with each part of the sublunary sphere that it alters; [that] the perceptible is at every point of the medium where it puts forth its species; and [that] a thing after its corruption is in its effect, in the way scripture speaks, Ecclesiastes 3:14: "I have learned that all the works which the Lord hath made, continue even for ever."[8] From these it follows that, just as each thing is eternal without qualification according

futura sunt iam fuerunt, et Deus instaurat quod abiit. Ecce quomodo primo proponit, quomodo quelibet creatura permanet perpetuo et probat hoc de nobis futuris, eo quod ipsa iam fuerunt, tam in suis causis quam in suis effectibus. Probat hoc iterum de preteritis, eo quod Deus instaurat in fructu operis [107] illud quod nobis preteriit; sicut enim sol non posset agere in orbe sublunari secundum suam speciem, nisi anima mundi vel forma eius que est mundialitas deferret speciem ipsam sustentans secundum aliquid sui, sic non esset possibile rem facere quicquam boni post suam corrupcionem, nisi Deus eternus instauret ipsam, causando eius pretericionem, causando eciam quod res succedens se habet in tali ordine. Et movetur quia res que preteriit pro suo tempore ita causat; sicut enim sequitur: Ista creatura hic causat, ergo hic est, ita sequitur: nunc causat, ergo nunc est.

to its intelligible being, so it is perpetual not only in its species and the principles of its quiddity, but in its individual causes and in its causation, since there is always the causation of each thing. And correspondingly it is everywhere, though not according to the existence of the individual; and the wise Solomon seems to mean the same, Ecclesiastes 3 (as above): "That which hath been made," he says, "the same continueth: the things that shall be, have already been: and God restoreth that which is past." See how first he proposes how each creature remains perpetually, and proves this of the things that are future to us, in that they have already been, both in their causes and in their effects.[9] He proves it again of things past, in that God restores in the fruit of the work [107] that which has passed from us; for just as the sun could not act on the sublunary sphere according to its species unless the soul of the world, or its form, which is worldhood, carried that species, sustaining it according to something of itself, so it would not be possible for a thing to do anything good after its corruption unless the eternal God restore it, causing its pastness, causing also that the thing succeeding stands in such an order. And he is moved [to say so] because the thing that has passed causes thus for its time; for just as it follows: "This creature causes here, therefore it is here," so it follows: "It causes now, therefore it is now."[10]

¶2 107.12–108.17
108.2 *Christ in all things loved the mean,*

[107] Ex istis videtur quod omnia futura de necessitate evenient et quod nichil anichilari potest. Nam Deus qui non potest impediri ordinat cuncta esse perpetua. Ideo dicit Ecclesiastes (ubi supra): Non possumus eis quicquam addere nec auferre que fecit Deus, ut timeatur. Si enim pretericio rei non potest destrui, multo minus eius esse quod est previe requisitum, nec aliter esset timendus ut Deus nisi sic fecerit. Quando autem variavi ab ista sentencia, non cognovi ut modo, quomodo res habet multiplex esse, sed omne esse posui existenciam individuam rei in suo genere. Sic redeundo ad propositum, patet quod gracia et caritas Jesu Christi que realiter est ipsemet Christus, est terminus communis copulans quodcunque membrum ecclesie cuilibet alteri. Ista autem copulacio per medium terminum communem tam nobilem est longe prestancior quam copulacio per terminum mathematicum. Et hinc reor Christum qui tantum amat communia tam crebro posuisse se medium. Nam ipse est Dei virtus que consistit in medio inter patrem et filium. Unde voluit concipi in equinoccio vernali quod [108] habet tam diem quam noctem pro medio diei naturalis Luce I° 36. Hic mensis est sextus illi qui vocatur sterilis. Voluit eciam nasci in medio noctis Sap. XVIII°

From these it seems that all future things will come about of necessity, and that nothing can be annihilated. For God, who cannot be hindered, ordains all things to be perpetual. Therefore Ecclesiastes says (as above): "We cannot add any thing, nor take away from those things which God hath made that he may be feared." For if the pastness of a thing cannot be destroyed, much less its being, which is required beforehand; nor would he otherwise be to be feared as God, unless he had made [them] so.[11] But when I varied from this teaching, I did not know, as I do now, how a thing has manifold being, but I took all being to be the individual existence of the thing in its genus.[12] So, returning to the purpose, it is clear that the grace and charity of Jesus Christ, which really is Christ himself, is the common term joining any member of the church to any other. And this joining through a middle common term so noble is far more excellent than joining through a mathematical term. And hence I think that Christ, who so loves common things, has so often set himself in the middle. For he is the power of God, which consists in the mean between the father and the son.[13] Hence he willed to be conceived at the vernal equinox, which [108] has both day and night as halves of the natural

14, 15. Cum enim quietum silencium contineret omnia, et nox in suo cursu medium iter haberet, omnipotens sermo tuus domine exiliens de celo a regalibus sedibus venit. Tercio voluit poni in diversorio, quod est hospitaliaria media inter duos vicos. Quarto voluit poni in medio duorum animalium, ut patet Luce, II°. Quinto voluit opponere in medio doctorum, Luce, II° 46. Sexto posuit se in medio discipulorum, ministrando, Luce, XXII° 27. Septimo positus est in medio latronum triumphando Joh. XIX°, 18. Octavo post resurreccionem stetit in medio discipulorum, informando, Joh. ultimo. Iste ergo est abbas promittens Matthei XVIII° 20, quod ubicunque duo vel tres congregati fuerint in nomine suo, in medio illorum est.

day, Luke 1:36: "This is the sixth month with her that is called barren." He willed also to be born in the middle of the night, Wisdom 18:14–15: "For while all things were in quiet silence, and the night was in the midst of her course, thy almighty word, O Lord, leaping from heaven, came from the royal throne."[14] Thirdly, he willed to be laid "in the inn", which is a hostelry in the middle between two streets. Fourthly, he willed to be laid in the middle of two animals, as is clear from Luke 2. Fifthly, he willed to dispute "in the midst of the doctors", Luke 2:46. Sixthly, he set himself in the midst of the disciples, "serving", Luke 22:27. Seventhly, he was set "in the midst" of thieves, triumphing, John 19:18. Eighthly, after the resurrection, he stood "in the midst of the disciples", instructing [them], John, the last [chapter]. This, then, is the abbot who promises, Matthew 18:20, that "wherever two or three are gathered together in his name, he is in the midst of them."[15]

Notes

1. A margin *Obieccio. Nota de continuitate ecclesie* (104.18). B *Antecedens falsum* (104.21) and *cum parte* for *sine parte* (104.22); the print is translated. *Instant* is the personal form of *instatur*. *Contitinuum* (p. 104) is a misprint in Loserth (plate), for *continuum*.
2. *Terminus communis*: Aristotle's common boundary, at which the parts of a continuum meet. Loserth (104.27): *Categories* 6, "so too in a body you can take a common term, a line or a surface, by which the parts of the body are joined". *Describentem*: defining (cf. *descripcio*, the glossary).
3. *Membrum eius* (p. 105): singular in the print, "its member", perhaps for *membra*; the print is translated. Acts 4:32, DR "And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul"; B *et scriptura*; A *Act. I°* (105.9).
4. *Punctus replicatus*: Wyclif's view (cf. 97.14–98.22) that a continuum is made of indivisible points, so that the point repeated is the whole substance of line, surface and body. *Ut logice loquar*: speaking as the logicians do, not as the mathematicians.
5. Luke 1:70, DR "As he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets": the saints speak with one mouth because they are one. Rom. 15:6, DR "That with one mind and with one mouth you may glorify God"; codd. *Joh. XV*, Loserth corrected to *Rom.* (105.22), translated.
6. *Adnascencia*: growing-together, as members on one body. A margin *Conclusio. Nota quelibet pars ecclesie continuatur cuilibet* (105.26). The quantifiers are kept: each with another, all with one another, each with each.
7. 1 Tim. 2:5, DR "one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus"; John 1:14, DR "full of grace and truth". *Matrem ecclesiam*: the church as mother (not the *matrix ecclesia* of the glossary).
8. A A_1 *bonitatis* (106.8); A margin *Aristoteles*. Aristotle, *Physics* VII.1 (Loserth: Bekker I, 243). *Species*: the likeness a body puts forth through the medium, as the writers on optics use it. *Subluminaris* (106.13): so the print (plate), for *sublunaris* (cf. 107.2); translated "sublunary". A *corrumpcionem*; A A_1 lack *effectu* (106.15). Eccl. 3:14: Wyclif *dominus ... usque in eternum*, the Vulgate *Deus ... in perpetuum* (Loserth); DR "which God hath made, continue for ever".
9. A margin *Conclusio. Quelibet res est perpetua in suis causis in divinis et in sua causacione* (106.16). Eccl. 3:15 (Loserth) agrees with the Vulgate; DR used. *De nobis futuris*: of things future to us.
10. A A_1 *idem quod* for *illud quod* (107.1). *Mundialitas*: worldhood, the form of the world taken as one whole. *Preteritio*: a thing's having passed. *Movetur*: we take Solomon as subject ("he is moved [to say so]"); it may be impersonal, "and the ground is". B *illa sequitur* (107.11).
11. A margin *Correlarium. Necessitas absoluta* (107.12). Codd. *impedire*, Loserth *impediri* (107.14), translated; B *cunta*. Eccl. 3:14b agrees with the Vulgate; DR used. A A_1 *Si pretericio* (107.17), without *enim*.
12. Codd. *variam*; Loserth *variavi* (107.20), translated. Wyclif marks a change in his own view of being; the earlier view is not identified here. *Sentencia*: the position just stated.
13. A margin (107.23) repeats the sentence on the common term; B margin, later hand, *Medium in omnibus tenuit Christus*; A margin *Quomodo Christus crebro se posuit in medio* and *Nota octo media*. *Dei virtus*: 1 Cor. 1:24, DR "Christ, the power of God"; *virtus* also means virtue, which "consists in the mean" (cf. 108.18–20). *Inter patrem et filium* stands as printed; the construal is doubtful.
14. *Pro medio diei naturalis*: day and night each as half of the natural day of twenty-four hours. Luke 1:36: Wyclif *qui*, the Vulgate *quae*; DR used. Wis. 18:14–15: codd. *Sap. VIII*, corrected by Loserth; A *contiret*, A_1 B *continerent*. Wyclif departs in v. 15: Vulgate *omnipotens sermo tuus de caelo a regalibus sedibus durus debellator in mediam exterminii terram prosilivit* (DR

"leaped down from heaven from thy royal throne, as a fierce conqueror"); his *domine ... venit* is from the introit *Dum medium silencium* of the Sunday within the octave of Christmas (Sarum, Legg p. 34: *omnipotens sermo tuus domine de celis a regalibus sedibus uenit*); *de celo* is the Vulgate's, *exiliens* Wyclif's own.

15. Luke 2:7 (Loserth): there the child is laid in a manger "because there was no room for them in the inn". The inn "between two streets" and the two animals (not in Luke) are from tradition; we have not traced their sources. *Opponere*: to act as opponent in disputation; Luke 2:46, DR "sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions". Luke 22:27, DR "I am in the midst of you, as he that serveth"; John 19:18, DR "and Jesus in the midst". *Stetit in medio* is John 20:19 (and 26), not the last chapter. Matt. 18:20, paraphrased; DR "there am I in the midst of them". *Abbas*: the father of the community (cf. *abba*), who keeps the mean.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 104: *ecclesia* (M is alinea letter)
  - 105: *locutus*
  - 105: *invicem* (print has invicem) [NW]
  - 106: *III°*
  - 106: *III°*
  - 107: *illud* (143a folio mark, N alinea)
  - 107: *quia* (143b folio mark)
  - 108: *naturalis* (natu-/ralis hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 108: *I°*
  - 108: *15* (arabic 15 (verse number, Sap. XVIII° 14, 15))
  - 108: *II°*
  - 108: *II°*
  - 104: *secundum* (se- here, 142d cundum on p.105; main token holds whole word)
  - 104: *Sed* (print has Sed before adhuc; not in neighbours) [DELX]
  - 105: *quantitatis obest,* (two printed words; * between them is the folio mark, dropped) [-MARK]
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin; plates for 104.5, 105.22): p. 104 *c ipitulo*; 105.22 *discontinuac*; p. 105 *aha*; 107.12 *nec essitate*. Doubts: 105 *membrum eius*; 107 *inter patrem et filium*. The stray *.:* after *intercepta* (104.22) is punctuation only.
- 104.25 *contitinuum*: kept as printed (plate; n. 1).

Part 5: Bernard's eight unities; one form of membership, predestination

Loserth pp. 108.18–112.9

¶1 108.18–110.8

108.18 *which Aristotle has shown to be the seat of virtue.*
109.18 *Unity may be supernatural, natural or virtual.*
110.1 *4th objection: If there is but one Church there should be but one way of membership, but we on earth have not the same form as the blessed.*
110.9 *Answer: We have the same form: God's predestination.*
110.18 *Moreover faith and charity are the same, only that in heaven they lose their imperfection.*

[108] Hec autem fecit abbas noster, ut doceat nos tenere medium virtutis in nostris operibus. Et ex II° Ethicorum extrema ab illo medio in quo virtus consistit deviancia corrumpunt virtutem; nec video quin, si quantitas mathematica continuat elementa, si humor aqueus continuat iuxta singenia, si armonia corporis animalis faciat membra adnata esse continua, quasi longe plus latitudo, longitudo, sublimitas et profundum (de quibus loquitur apostolus Eph. III° 18) facit unanimes vere unum. Illa eciam aqua sapiencie (de qua Ecclesiastici XV, 3) continuabit unius moris in domo, et demum armonia in trinitate fundata illapsa universali ecclesie ipsam ex membris compaginatam faciet unam sponsam. [109] Unde Bernhardus, De Consideracione, libro V°, ad Eugenium papam, ponit octo modos unitatum. Est, inquit, unitas que collectiva potest dici, ut multi lapides faciunt acervum unum. Est unitas constitutiva, cum multa membra unum corpus vel multe partes unum quodque totum constituunt. Est et coniugativa qua fit, ut duo iam non duo sint sed

And these things our abbot did to teach us to hold the mean of virtue in our works. And from *Ethics* II, the extremes that deviate from that mean in which virtue consists corrupt virtue;[1] nor do I see why, if mathematical quantity makes the elements continuous, if watery humour makes things continuous with their kin, if the harmony of an animal body makes the members grown on it to be continuous, the breadth, length, height and depth (of which the apostle speaks, Ephesians 3:18) should not, as it were far more, make those of one mind truly one.[2] That "water of wisdom" too (of which Ecclesiasticus 15:3 [speaks]) will make continuous [those] "of one manner in a house"; and finally the harmony founded in the Trinity, flowing into the universal church, will make it, joined together of members, one bride.[3] [109] Hence Bernard, *On Consideration*, book 5, to Pope Eugenius, sets out eight modes of unity. "There is," he says, "a unity that can be called collective, as many stones make one heap. There is a constitutive unity, when many members constitute one body, or many

una caro. Est et nativa qua anima et caro unus nascitur homo. Est unitas potestativa qua homo virtutis non instabilis non dissimilis sed unus sibimet semper nititur inveniri. Est consentanea, cum per caritatem multorum hominum est cor unum et anima una. Est et votiva, cum anima votis omnibus adherens Deo unus spiritus est. Et est dignativa unitas qua limus noster a Dei verbo in unam assumptus est personam. Et super istas octo unitates dicit in quodam sermone quod est unitas principalis qua tres persone divine sunt una indivisibilis essencia. Et sic omnis unitas potest dici supernaturalis, naturalis vel virtualis. Duo posteriora membra recipiunt divisiones multiplices et cum in equivocis non sit contradiccio, patet quod non repugnat corpus ecclesie non continuari, loquendo de continuacione naturali sensibili, cum quelibet pars eius quantitativa completa in actu non sic continuatur cum alia naturaliter incommunicante, et tamen continuatur alia continuacione spirituali plus forti per spiritum Dei diffusum in cordibus omnium membrorum ecclesie habencium omnia in communi. Quarto principaliter arguitur per hoc quod ad univocam racionem ecclesie requiritur univoca racio suarum [110] parcium, sed non est talis univocacio in peregrinantibus, dormientibus et beatis. Ergo non univoce constituunt Christi sanctam matrem ecclesiam que non potest dici etherogena, nam si fides ponatur forma constituens membrum ecclesie, videtur quod beati quibus inest clara visio, evacuata fide non sint de membris ecclesie, si caritas adhuc caritas patrie et caritas vie sunt disparium racionum.

parts any one whole. There is also a conjugal [unity], by which it comes about that two are no longer two, but one flesh. There is also a native [unity], by which soul and flesh are born one man.[4] There is a potestative unity, by which a man of virtue strives always to be found not unstable, not unlike himself, but one with himself. There is a consentient [unity], when through charity many men have one heart and one soul. There is also a votive [unity], when the soul, cleaving to God with all its desires, is one spirit [with him]. And there is a condescending unity, by which our clay was assumed by the Word of God into one person."[5] And above these eight unities he says in a certain sermon that there is a principal unity, by which the three divine persons are one indivisible essence.[6] And so every unity can be called supernatural, natural or virtual. The two latter members admit manifold divisions; and since there is no contradiction in equivocal [terms], it is clear that it is not repugnant that the body of the church is not continuous, speaking of natural, perceptible continuity, since each quantitative part of it, complete in act, is not so continuous with another that naturally does not communicate [with it]; and yet it is continuous by another, spiritual continuity, stronger, through the Spirit of God poured forth in the hearts of all the members of the church, who have all things in common.[7] Fourthly and principally, it is argued, by appeal to this: that for a univocal account of the church there is required a univocal account of its [110] parts; now there is no such univocity in those who are pilgrims, the sleeping and the blessed. Therefore they do not univocally constitute Christ's holy mother church, which cannot be called heterogeneous; for if faith is posited as the form constituting a member of the church, it seems that the blessed, in whom is clear vision, faith being done away, are not of the members of the church; if charity, still the charity of the homeland and the charity of the way are of disparate accounts.[8]

¶2 110.9–110.17

[110] Sed hic dicitur (ut supra) quod forma exemplaris eternaliter formans ab extra quodcunque membrum ecclesie est predestinacio Dei eterna. Forma autem per se et ab intrinseco constituens membrum ecclesie est predestinacio passiva. Ipsa enim non potest inesse multiplicative, nisi assit ecclesia. Et sic habet quilibet predestinatus fidem formatam caritate predestinacionis secundum quam constituitur ecclesia vel eius membrum. Et ita racio est univoca in quocunque salvando.

But here the answer is (as above) that the exemplar form, eternally forming from without any member of the church, is God's eternal predestination. And the form constituting a member of the church of itself and from within is passive predestination. For it cannot be present multiplicatively unless the church is there. And so every predestinate [person] has faith formed by the charity of predestination, according to which the church, or its member, is constituted. And so the account is univocal in anyone who is to be saved.[9]

¶3 110.18–112.9
111.1 *Difference of opinion as to what Faith is.*
111.8 *All the predestinate have faith and cannot lose iteven by mortal sin.*
111.21 *The Church may rightly excommunicate them for sin, but cannot cut them off from the body of Christ.*

[110]Unde sicut crementum et profectus persone non variat eius speciem, quia sic homo secundum variaciones etatum transiret de specie ad speciem, sic etas persone sancte matris ecclesie non variat eius speciem, sed corroborat per accidens racionem ecclesie. Ymmo manet eadem fides in mundo, in purgatorio et in celo. Sed imperfeccio que ex parte est hic evacuabitur in beatis; manebit, inquam, eadem fides que creditur, cum sit veritas eterna, et manebit eadem fides qua et secundum quam creditur, quia manebunt iidem actus et habitus. Est enim prima adhesio quam creatura habet de veritate credenda actus fidei cui accidit obscuritas enigmatica pro via que evacuatur in patria veniente intuicione clara, caritas autem eadem habens in patria confirmacionem loco incertitudinis. [111]Dissensio autem est aput doctores nostros, eo quod aliqui intelligunt fidem aggregative pro adhesione prima cum imperfeccione sequente. Aliqui autem intelligunt fidem personaliter pro illa adhesione cui inest per accidens intuicio vel enigma. Illa autem prima adhesio precedens racionem est eiusdem racionis hic et in patria, sed ibi validior (sicut alibi diffuse exposui). Et sic omnes predestinati habent continue fidem gracia predestinacionis formatam, et sic non cadit a membris ecclesie per mortale, ut patet III°, De Doctrina Christiana XXXII°, et epistola XXXIII ad Bonifacium. Explicat hoc de David et Petro; de David autem explanat hoc in libro De Octo Questionibus ad Dulcicium amicum suum; quorum omnium racio est quia Deus non potest quemquam noviter diligere vel odire, sed sub quocumque gradu amat vel odit aliquem, sub eodem gradu eternaliter sic amat vel odit. Nec est detestabile quod Deus semper odit beatos in celo, nam semper odit peccata eorum preterita, non pro semper, ideo semper amat eos pro sempiterna glorificacione. Unde ecclesia excommunicat tales cum, ipsis existentibus in mortali, notificat eos privari communione sanctorum secundum presentem iusticiam, cum humidum fluens ad tempus eis deficiat, nunquam autem anathematizat tales vel omnino dividit a corpore Christi nec potest. Et ista est plerumque sentencia Augustini, si bene inspicitur, non in dolo. Et patet ex solucione proximi argumenti et huius, quomodo intelliguntur sancti Ysidorus, De Summo Bono. [112]cap. XIX° et Augustinus, epistola XXXIII[a] ad Bonifacium, quomodo ecclesia fidelium est ubique diffusa, ecclesia autem hereticorum est in parvo angulo coartata. Predestinati nempe dilatant more celestium fructus suos, alii autem licet sint hinc plures in numero, more terrestrium constringuntur. Christus enim caput prioris ecclesie cui oportet ut secunda subserviat, est potencior patre

Hence, just as the growth and progress of a person does not vary his species (for so a man, according to the variations of his ages, would pass from species to species), so the age of the person of holy mother church does not vary its species, but strengthens by accident the account of the church. Indeed, the same faith remains in the world, in purgatory and in heaven. But the imperfection that is "in part" here will be done away in the blessed; there will remain, I say, the same faith which is believed, since it is eternal truth; and there will remain the same faith by which and according to which [one] believes, since the same acts and habits will remain. For the first adhesion which the creature has to the truth to be believed is the act of faith, to which, for the way, there befalls an enigmatic obscurity, which is done away in the homeland when clear intuition comes; and charity [remains] the same, having in the homeland confirmation in place of uncertainty.[10] [111]And there is disagreement among our doctors, in that some understand faith aggregatively, for the first adhesion together with the imperfection that follows; but others understand faith personally, for that adhesion in which intuition or enigma is present by accident. Now that first adhesion, preceding reason, is of the same account here and in the homeland, but stronger there (as I have expounded at length elsewhere).[11] And so all the predestinate continually have faith formed by the grace of predestination, and so [such a one] does not fall from the members of the church through mortal [sin], as is clear from *On Christian Doctrine* III, 32, and the letter 33 to Boniface. He explains this of David and Peter; and of David he explains it in the book *On Eight Questions* to his friend Dulcitius;[12] and the reason of all these is that God cannot love or hate anyone newly, but under whatever degree he loves or hates someone, under the same degree he eternally so loves or hates. Nor is it detestable that God always hates the blessed in heaven, for he always hates their past sins, [though] not for always; therefore he always loves them for everlasting glorification.[13] Hence the church excommunicates such [persons] when, while they are in mortal [sin], it makes known that they are deprived of the communion of saints according to present justice, since the flowing moisture fails them for a time; but it never anathematizes such, or wholly divides [them] from the body of Christ, nor can it. And this is for the most part the teaching of Augustine, if it is looked at well, not with guile.[14] And it is clear, from the solution of the last argument and of this one, how the saints are to be understood, Isidore, *On the Highest Good*, [112]chapter 19, and

mendacii quem sic ligat, hoc est, ipsum in membris suis penaliter sic constringit.

Augustine, letter 33 to Boniface, [when they say] that the church of the faithful is spread everywhere, but the church of the heretics is confined in a small corner. For the predestinate spread their fruits after the manner of heavenly things; but the others, although they are on this side more in number, are confined after the manner of earthly things. For Christ, head of the former church, which the second must serve, is mightier than the father of lies, whom he thus binds; that is, he thus confines him in hardship in his members.[15]

Notes

1. ***Abbas noster***: Christ, the "abbot" of 108.16. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* II (Loserth: II.7, Bekker II, 1107). A A_1 ***Et secundo*** (108.19).
2. ***Nec video quin ... facit***: "nor do I see but that ... makes"; we turn it as a question of "why not". ***Singenia***: Loserth's *syngeneia*, things of the same kind; A A_1 ***mixta singenia*** (108.23); B ***quin longe***, without ***quasi*** (108.24). Eph. 3:18, DR "what is the breadth and length and height and depth".
3. Ecclus. 15:3, DR "the water of wholesome wisdom"; ***unius moris in domo*** is Ps. 67:7, DR "God who maketh men of one manner to dwell in a house", taken into Wyclif's sentence.
4. ***143°*** at the head of 109 is a manuscript folio mark, not Wyclif's, and is not translated. A margin *Bernhardus*; A B margin *Unitatis octo modi*. Bernard, *De consideratione* V.8.18 (PL 182:799C–D; Loserth: *Opp.*, p. 1048), the same eight unities, near verbatim; ***inquit*** is Wyclif's. "Two ... one flesh": Matt. 19:6.
5. The adjectives are Bernard's terms, kept close: ***potestativa***, the unity of a man master of himself; ***consentanea***, of agreement (Acts 4:32); ***votiva***, of the will's desires (1 Cor. 6:17, DR "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit"); ***dignativa***, of God's condescension in the incarnation. B ***non instabit*** (109.10); B ***una assumptus*** (109.15).
6. Loserth (109.16): Bernard, *Sermones de diversis* 80, *De multiplici unitate* (PL 183:698D–699A; *Opp.*, p. 450): "the principal unity, which is also substantial, is in the Trinity".
7. ***Virtualis***: of power or virtue, as against substance and nature. ***Duo posteriora membra***: the natural and the virtual. ***In equivocis***: between terms taken in different senses there is no contradiction, so the church can be continuous in one sense and not in another. The Spirit "poured forth in the hearts": Rom. 5:5; "all things in common": Acts 4:32.
8. The stray *q* before *Quarto* (109.20) is an alinea or margin letter, not Wyclif's, and is not translated. A margin *Quarta obieccio. Hic nota. Nota materiam de univoca racione parcium ecclesie*; B margin, another hand, *Predestinacio ...* (garbled in the OCR). ***Racio***: the account or definition. The sleeping are the church in purgatory. A A_1 ***etheromogena*** (110.4). ***Si caritas adhuc ...***: we construe "if [charity is posited as the form], still ..."; the faith of the way is done away in the blessed (1 Cor. 13:10).
9. A margin *Responsio* (110.9). Active predestination is God's act (the exemplar form); passive predestination is the being-predestined of the member. ***Assit*** (plate): ***adsit***. ***Multiplicative***: in many subjects at once. ***Ecclesia vel eius membrum***: A ***membra***, B ***ut eius*** (110.16); B margin *Quid hominem constituit membrum ecclesie*. The closing ***faith*** (110.17) is a fragment of Loserth's English side-note at 110.18, not translated.
10. 1 Cor. 13:10, DR "that which is in part shall be done away"; ***obscuritas enigmatica***: 1 Cor. 13:12, DR "through a glass in a dark manner" (Vulgate ***in aenigmate***). ***Fides que creditur*** and ***fides qua creditur***: the faith believed and the faith by which one believes. A margin (110.32): ***Nota bene quomodo manet eadem fides in celis que est hic***.
11. B ***prima imperfeccione*** (111.2–3); A margin *Dupliciter dicitur fides*. ***Personaliter*** is set against ***aggregative***: faith taken by itself, apart from the accidents it has in each state; the word is doubtful. ***Alibi diffuse exposui***: the place is not identified here.
12. A margin *Augustinus* (111.10). *De doctrina christiana* III.32, as at 103.16. Codd. *epistola XXXII*, Loserth *XXXIII* (*Opp. Aug.* II, p. 263). Codd. A A_1 ***de decem questionibus***, B corrupt; Loserth corrected to *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* (*Opp. Aug.* VI, p. 121). David and Peter: *Ep.* 185.45–46 (PL 33:812–813), the letter to Boniface; David: *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* q. 5 (PL 40:167–169).
13. A margin *Deus odit ab eterno et diligit quos diligit et odit*; B ***sic amat*** (111.16). ***Diligere*** and ***amare*** are both "love". ***Non pro semper***: he hates their sins always, but not as lasting for all time; his love is for their everlasting glory.
14. ***Excommunicat ... anathematizat***: excommunication declares a present loss of communion; anathema would cut off from the body of Christ, which the church cannot do to the predestinate. ***Humidum fluens***: the flowing moisture that feeds a living body (the glossary), here the grace that fails them for a time. ***Non in dolo***: without guile, read honestly.
15. Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) I, chapter 19 (codd. *cap. XVI*), quoted by Loserth: the church is called catholic because spread through all the world, "but the churches of the heretics are confined in parts of the world". Wyclif's ***in parvo angulo*** is not Isidore's (cf. Grosseteste at 99.17). Codd. again ***epistola XXXII*** (112.1). A margin ***Ubi est ecclesia***. "The father of lies": John 8:44; binding the strong man: cf. Matt. 12:29.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 108: ***II°***
  - 109: ***partes*** (bold 3 is a margin enumeration)
  - 109: ***una*** (bold 4 is a margin enumeration)
  - 109: ***semper*** (bold 6 is a margin enumeration)

- **109: *Deo* (bold 8 is a margin enumeration)**
- **109: *loquendo***
- **109: *univocam* (uni-/vocam hyphenated; main token holds whole word)**
- **110: *Christi***
- **110: *assit* (print has assit) [NW]**
- **110: *non* (bold 1 is a margin enumeration) [NW]**
- **110: *evacuatur* (30 is the line number)**
- **111: *aput***
- **111: *III°***
- **109: *suarum* (sua- here, rum at top of p.110; main token holds whole word)**
- **112: *XXXIII[a]* (no comma; followed by ad) [-MARK]**

• **Not Wyclif's, not translated: 109.1 *143°* (folio mark); 109.20 *q* (alinea/margin letter); 110.17 *faith* (side-note fragment). OCR scars corrected in the Latin: p. 108 *111°* (Eph.); p. 109 *linquit*, *constitubtiva*; p. 110 *ecclesiavel eiusmembrum*. Doubt: p. 111 *personaliter*.**

Part 6: Ten arguments against a doctor's definition of the church

Loserth pp. 112.10–115.33

¶1 112.10–114.12

112.10 *Erroneous definition of the Church as the multitude of Christians who keep whole the true faith.*
112.20 *This definition excludes the O. T. Saints*
112.31 *and Christ himself,*
113.4 *so that he would not be the head of the Church.*
113.13 *The mass of Christians never keeps the faith quite whole.*
113.26 *The apostles would be out of the Church, with all who lived before general Councils had declared the faith.*
114.13 *Death and birth would be always making a new Church.*
114.23 *The Church would include all the foreknown in present grace and exclude all predestinate who were in error.*
114.31 *There would be no Church triumphant.*

[112]**In ista vero materia est quidam doctor describens ecclesiam sub hac forma: Ecclesia, inquit, est universalis multitudo omnium christianorum, habencium ex integro rectam et eandem fidem per Christum et apostolos divulgatam et a sanctis patribus et consiliis generalibus declaratam. Et patet quod loquitur de una sancta ecclesia catholica, quia aliter non assumeret pro genere quod ipsa ecclesia sit multitudo omnium christianorum. Primo, inquam, videtur quod nulli patres veteris testamenti fuerunt de illa ecclesia, quia illa non fuit antequam Christus eam genuit per effluxum sanguinis et aque de suo latere dormientis in cruce (ut dicitur Joh. XIX° 34), sed hoc non fuit pro tempore patrum veteris testamenti, ergo nec illa ecclesia. Ex quo sequitur quod cum extra illam ecclesiam non est salus (ut patet in extravagante Bonifacii VIII[i]. Unam sanctam), nullus patrum veteris testamenti salvabitur. Non enim foret pertinens decreto dicere quod extra unam sanctam et catholicam ecclesiam non est salus nisi intenderit quod nemo salvabitur nisi fuerit de illa. Secundo sequitur quod Christus non sit de illa ecclesia quia non est de universali multitudine omnium christianorum, eo quod non est** [113] **christianus, sed ipse Christus a quo dicitur quilibet christianus, et per consequens, nec est de numero salvandorum nec caput nec aliqua pars ecclesie catholice. Nam a Christo ut capite denominantur fideles servi Christi christiani (ut patet Act. XI°, 26). Ergo sicut Romanus non est Roma nec Israhelita ipse Israhel, et breviter, nulla generacio passiva est ipsum principium generans, sic nullus christianus est Christus sed Christi, et periret fides scripture de capite et de membris ecclesie; et multo evidencius sequitur quod beata virgo non fuit membrum illius ecclesie, quia in sancto triduo non fuit illa ecclesia**

But on this matter there is a certain doctor who defines the church in this form: "The church," he says, "is the universal multitude of all Christians, who hold wholly the right and same faith spread abroad by Christ and the apostles and declared by the holy fathers and the general councils."[1] And it is clear that he speaks of the one holy catholic church, for otherwise he would not take for genus that the church itself is the multitude of all Christians. First, I say, it seems that no fathers of the old testament were of that church, because that [church] did not exist before Christ begot it by the outflow of blood and water from his side as he slept on the cross (as is said in John 19:34); now this was not in the time of the fathers of the old testament; therefore neither was that church.[2] From which it follows that, since "outside that church there is no salvation" (as is clear in the extravagant of Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam*), none of the fathers of the old testament will be saved. For it would not be pertinent for the decree to say that outside the one holy and catholic church there is no salvation, unless it meant that no one will be saved unless he was of it.[3] Secondly it follows that Christ is not of that church, because he is not of the universal multitude of all Christians, in that he is not [113] **a Christian, but Christ himself, from whom every Christian is so called; and consequently he is neither of the number of those to be saved, nor head, nor any part of the catholic church. For it is from Christ as head that the faithful servants of Christ are named Christians (as is clear from Acts 11:26). Therefore, just as a Roman is not Rome, nor an Israelite Israel himself, and in short no passive generation is the generating principle**

nec fuit posterius sibi incorporata. Tercio sequitur quod nulla sit talis ecclesia, quia nulla multitudo omnium christianorum habet ex integro eandem rectam fidem, tum quia defective et corrupte habet multitudo omnium christianorum fidem Christi, tum eciam quia nullam unam fidem habent omnes illi christiani nec pro specie nec pro aggregato. Nec valet hoc sophisma: Isti habent fidem, sed nullam fidem habent. Nec valet fingere fidem que creditur, quia talia negantur a sic describente, et illis positis inculte aggregantur in descripcione tam anxie elaborata. Nam multi christiani habent fidem valde peccatis obliquatam, tam presciti quam predestinati, et multi simpliciter infideles habent fidem creditam valde rectam. Quarto sequitur quod nec apostoli nec alii fideles erant de ecclesia, antequam fides fuit per Christum et apostolos divulgata et a sanctis patribus in consiliis generalibus declarata; quod fuit diu post ascensionem domini et mortem apostolorum. Nam nemo fuit de ecclesia catholica, antequam illa fuit, sed illa non fuit, antequam fuit ita quod illa est: sed cum non fuit ita quod illa [114]est, antequam dicta conscripcio sibi compeciit, sequitur quod tunc primo fuit ecclesia; quod esset valde inconveniens, primo quia Christus ex latere suo non formasset ecclesiam, secundo quia nulli fideles fuissent de ecclesia ante consilia dicta generalia, et sic beatus Stephanus et multi alii christiani fuissent mortui extra fidem ecclesie; tercio quia complentes prima consilia post ascensionem fecissent primo ecclesiam catholicam, quia posito quod essemus per diem ante prima consilia, post ascensionem foret nobis verum quod nondum est ecclesia catholica, quia nondum verificata est descripcio.

itself, so no Christian is Christ, but Christ's; and the faith of scripture concerning the head and the members of the church would perish; and much more evidently it follows that the blessed Virgin was not a member of that church, because in the holy three days that church did not exist, nor was she afterwards incorporated into it.[4] Thirdly it follows that there is no such church, because no multitude of all Christians has wholly the same right faith: both because the multitude of all Christians has the faith of Christ defectively and corruptly, and also because all those Christians have no one faith, neither as a species nor as an aggregate. Nor does this sophism avail: "These have faith, but they have no faith." Nor does it avail to feign the faith which is believed, because such things are denied by the one who defines thus, and, if they are posited, they are crudely heaped together in a definition so anxiously worked out.[5] For many Christians, the foreknown as well as the predestinate, have a faith much bent by sins, and many who are unbelievers without qualification have a believed faith that is very right.[6] Fourthly it follows that neither the apostles nor other faithful were of the church before the faith was spread abroad by Christ and the apostles and declared by the holy fathers in the general councils; which was long after the ascension of the Lord and the death of the apostles. For no one was of the catholic church before it existed; now it did not exist before it was the case that it is; now since it was not the case that it [114]is before the said written [definition] applied to it, it follows that it was then first the church.[7] This would be very absurd: first, because Christ would not have formed the church from his side; secondly, because no faithful would have been of the church before the said general councils, and so blessed Stephen and many other Christians would have died outside the faith of the church; thirdly, because those who held the first councils after the ascension would first have made the catholic church; for supposing that we were [living] a day before the first councils after the ascension, it would be true for us that there is not yet a catholic church, because the definition has not yet been verified.[8]

¶2 114.13–114.22

[114]Quinto sequitur quod, ut generabuntur et morientur fideles, erit nova et nova ecclesia catholica, et per consequens, forent plures quam mille ecclesie catholice; quod est contra decretalem Bonifacii Unam sanctam. Et consequencia videtur ex hoc quod ut sic erunt nove et nove multitudines christianorum, et per consequens, non manebit per tot et tantas transmutaciones eadem ecclesia in numero, sicut patet querenti diligenter quid foret illa ecclesia que sic continue remaneret.

Fifthly it follows that, as the faithful are born and die, there will be a new and ever new catholic church, and consequently there would be more than a thousand catholic churches; which is against Boniface's decretal *Unam sanctam*. And the inference appears from this: that in this way there will be new and ever new multitudes of Christians, and consequently the same church in number will not remain through so many and so great changes,

¶3 114.23–114.30

[114]Sexto sequitur quod omnes presciti in gracia forent membra ecclesie catholice, et nulli predestinati dum erraverint in fide forent partes sancte matris ecclesie; quorum primum videtur falsum de Scarioth et aliis hereticis, et secundum videtur fuisse falsum de David, Petro, Paulo et eis similibus pro tempore quo fuerunt infideles. Quorum utrumque est contra sanctorum sentencias et raciones factas superius.

as is clear to one who asks diligently what that church would be which would thus continuously remain.[9]

Sixthly it follows that all the foreknown in grace would be members of the catholic church, and no predestinate, while they erred in the faith, would be parts of holy mother church; of which the first seems false of Iscariot and other heretics, and the second seems to have been false of David, Peter, Paul and those like them for the time in which they were unbelievers. Each of these is against the teachings of the saints and the reasons given above.[10]

¶4 114.31–115.33
115.1 *The Catholic Church would be nothing.*
115.5 *These opinions really follow from the premisses.*
115.13 *There would be no single head to the Church.*
115.23 *The Church would lose all the attributes that Scripture assigns to her.*

[114]Septimo videtur quod non sit ecclesia triumphans, eo quod in patria non habuit fidem ut dicitur. Et sic nulla multitudo erit perpetuo ecclesia sponsa Christi, vel aliter ecclesia ad sui perfeccionem fiet non ecclesia quod est contra scripturam et racionem. [115]Octavo videtur quod ecclesia catholica nullibi sit nec aliquam partem habet, cum nichil sit, et sic ecclesia Romana non foret dignior aut indignior quam ecclesia catholica. Istas evidencias facio, ut dicatur seriose ad materiam et formam racionum, nullibi declinando a veritate de virtute sermonis, quia sentenciam quam ego exposui de ecclesia volo defendere de virtute sermonis, communicando capciosissime sophiste et cuicunque fideli vel infideli volenti quantumlibet protervire. Si autem ista descripcio non sit valida, ad quid ponitur pro cognoscenda sancta matre ecclesia? Nono videtur, supposita communi logica iam currente, quod ecclesia universalis non sit aliquid, quia nec substancia nec accidens, et per consequens, cum nulla sit pars universalis ecclesie, ipsa foret tam quantitative quam qualitative indivisibilis, et per consequens, nec dominus papa nec Romana ecclesia foret caput universalis ecclesie, eo quod non sequitur: Si ipse exercet officium capitis in aliquos istorum, ergo in istos, quia pari evidencia diabolus foret caput eiusdem ecclesie et haberet quotlibet capita tam bona quam mala. Decimo et ultimo videtur quoad proprietates et accidencia ecclesie quod ipsa non habet sexus distinccionem, virginitatem, etatem vel alia accidencia que fides scripture sibi attribuit, et per idem, non habet privilegium vel peccatum, temporalia vel regulam vivendi, cum non magis tendat ad unitatem quam membra diaboli, cum in illis sit pax quam Christus Matthei X°, 34, dicit venire dissolvere. Istas instancias pueriles contra rudimenta fidei oportet fidelem clare dissolvere, quia in principiis errorum oportet diligenter obstare, cum eorum admissio abducit in devium.

Seventhly it seems that there is no church triumphant, in that in the homeland it has not had faith, as is said. And so no multitude will perpetually be the church, the bride of Christ; or else the church at its perfection will become not-church, which is against scripture and reason.[11] [115]Eighthly it seems that the catholic church is nowhere, nor has any part, since it is nothing; and so the Roman church would be neither worthier nor less worthy than the catholic church. I set out these evidences so that the answer may be made seriously to the matter and form of the arguments, nowhere turning aside from the truth in the proper sense of the words; for the teaching which I have expounded concerning the church I am willing to defend in the proper sense of the words, sharing it with the most captious sophist and with anyone, believer or unbeliever, who wishes to be as wanton as he likes.[12] But if this definition is not valid, to what purpose is it set down for knowing holy mother church? Ninthly it seems, supposing the common logic now current, that the universal church is not anything, because [it is] neither substance nor accident; and consequently, since there is no part of the universal church, it would be indivisible both quantitatively and qualitatively; and consequently neither the lord pope nor the Roman church would be head of the universal church, since it does not follow: "If he exercises the office of head over some of these, therefore over these"; for by equal evidence the devil would be head of the same church, and it would have any number of heads, good as well as bad.[13] Tenth and last, it seems, as to the properties and accidents of the church, that it does not have distinction of sex, virginity, age or the other accidents that the faith of scripture attributes to it; and by the same token it does not have privilege or sin, temporal goods or a rule of living, since it tends no more to unity than the members of the devil, since in them is the

peace which Christ, Matthew 10:34, says he came to dissolve.[14] These childish objections against the rudiments of the faith the faithful man must clearly dissolve, because one must diligently resist errors at their beginnings, since admitting them leads astray.[15]

Notes

1. A margin *Quedam descripcio ecclesie*; B margin, another hand, *Diffinicio ecclesie* (112.10). *Describens*: "defining", the verb of *descripcio*. The doctor is not identified by Loserth here, nor by us. *Consiliis*: the codd. mostly write *consiliis* for *conciliis* (Loserth, 113.29): councils.
2. John 19:34, DR "one of the soldiers with a spear opened his side: and immediately there came out blood and water"; *dormientis* (Christ asleep in death) is Wyclif's. A *assummeret* (112.16–17). *Sed hoc non fuit*: the minor premiss.
3. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam*, *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1 (the form is ours). *VIII*^{i}: the raised ordinal *i* is the print's (plate). 112.23–26: A *patrinum*, B *patuum*, A_1 corrected *patrum*; A B lack *quod*, A_1 *sequitur quod*; B *nullus patruum*, A_1 *nullum patrum*. B margin, a recent hand: *Extra ecclesiam non est salus*.
4. *Christi*: "Christ's", the genitive of belonging; *generacio passiva*: what is generated, as against the principle that generates it. Acts 11:26, DR "at Antioch the disciples were first named Christians". A A_1 *capite et membris* (113.9); A A_1 lack *et multo ... ecclesie* (113.10). *In sancto triduo*: the three days from the Passion to the Resurrection.
5. B *hoc solum: Isti* (113.20); A A_1 *fingere que creditur*, without *fidem* (113.21). *Fides que creditur*: the faith that is believed (its content), as against the faith by which one believes (cf. 110.24, 05-e). *Talia negantur ... aggregantur*: we take it that the doctor denies any such common faith, and that if it is posited it is heaped crudely into his definition; the construal is doubtful. A margin, printed below 144a without mark (113.27): *Argumenta contra quandam descripcionem ecclesie continue infra*.
6. *Simpliciter infideles*: unbelievers without qualification, outside the faith altogether; *fidem creditam valde rectam*: what they believe is very largely right. *Obliquatam*: bent, made crooked.
7. *Fuit ita quod illa est*: "it was the case that it is", that is, that the definition held of it. *Conscripcio* as printed: "the written [definition]"; *compeciit*, from *competere*, "applied to".
8. *Inconveniens* here is an absurdity in argument (CONTEXTUAL, the glossary). B *stetissent* (114.8). We read *ante prima consilia post ascensionem* together, as in the clause before; the print's comma after *consilia* would give "after the ascension it would be true for us ...". Stephen died before any council (Acts 7).
9. A A_1 lack *et per consequens ... catholice* (114.15–16). *Eadem ... in numero*: numerically the same. *Unam sanctam* teaches one church; on the doctor's definition there would be as many as there are changes in the multitude.
10. *In gracia*: in present grace (cf. Loserth's side-note, 114.23). *Scarioth*: Judas Iscariot. *Infideles*: unbelievers, for the time of their fall, David, Peter, Paul (the persecutor).
11. A_1 *habent fidem* (114.32). In the homeland faith has given way to sight, so the church triumphant has no faith and on this definition is no church.
12. The *V* before *Istas* (115.5) is not Wyclif's (an alinea or margin letter) and is not translated. *De virtute sermonis*: in the proper sense of the words (the glossary). *Communicando*: putting [the teaching] to any disputant; *protervire*: to argue wantonly.
13. B *ipse exercitet* (115.19). *In aliquos istorum, ergo in istos*: from headship over some members to headship over them all together. If the church were nothing, whoever is head of some of its members would be its head, so the devil too, head of the foreknown.
14. Matt. 10:34, DR "I came not to send peace, but the sword"; Wyclif's *pacem ... venire dissolvere* paraphrases it. A_1 *temporale* (115.27). *Dissolvere* comes back in the next sentence for answering the objections; "dissolve" keeps the echo.
15. A_1 *pluries* for *pueriles* (115.31). *In principiis ... obstare* echoes the commonplace *principiis obsta* (Ovid, *Remedia amoris* 91). Loserth on chapter 5 (115.33): cf. Hus, *De ecclesia*, fol. 205.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 112: ∅ (print: In ista vero materia; no de)
  - 112: *quod* (1 is a margin enumeration)
  - 112: *quia*
  - 112: *fuit*
  - 112: *Christus*
  - 112: *sit*
  - 112: *ecclesia*
  - 112: ∅ (only one ecclesia in print (pos 232) before quia)
  - 113: *Christus*
  - 113: *generalibus* (genera-/libus hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 114: *patria* (print has patria) [NW]
  - 115: *distinccionem* (distinc-/cionem hyphenated, 144c folio mark glued; main token holds whole word)
  - 115: *34* (arabic verse number)
  - 112: *illa* (output token \\\a stands for printed illa) [-MARK]
  - 112: *de illa* (box spans de illa; output has only ^e before ecclesia, illa missing) [-MARK]

- **Not Wyclif's, not translated: 115.5 *V* (alinea or margin letter). OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 112 *VIII1.* (read *VIII*); p. 114 *Jit* (read *Et*). Doubt: p. 114 *conscripcio*.**

Chapter 6

Part 1: Objections answered: many heads, virgin and bride, the church as nothing

Loserth pp. 116.2–120.13

¶1 116.2–118.5

116.2
1. We have to solve the difficulties that we have raised against our adversaries
116.7 *that the Church is a monster, having a thousand heads, and that she is a virgin and a corrupt synagogue, and Christ's Church.*
116.19 *The difficulty as to heads rests on an equivocation. A head may belong to the Church without being the head of the Church.*
117.9
2. The Church is a virgin, polluted now by sins of her members, but to be purified for final glory.
117.19
3. Every synagogue that is a part of Holy Church is a Church.
117.26 *It is objected that Christ would be at once son, father ind husband of the Church.*
118.1 *There is no reason why such relations should not exist spiritually;*
118.13 *as the Church is truly all the things that she is called in Scripture.*

[116]**Sed adhuc instatur finaliter deducendo ad conformia inconveniencia ad qualia adversarii deducuntur. Primo enim videtur quod ecclesia tamquam monstrum habeat mille capita, et sic de aliis membris monstruose fabricatis, et sic foret simul virgo et corruptissima synagoga et Christi ecclesia. Hic dicitur (ut sepe) negando assumptum; nam non sequitur: Ista capita sunt istius, demonstrando sanctam matrem ecclesiam, ergo sunt capita istius, nec sequitur: Ista sunt capita istorum qui sunt ista ecclesia, ergo sunt capita huius ecclesie, quia sunt capita istorum singillatim. Et tamen nullum eorum est caput istorum. Ad hoc ergo quod sint capita ecclesie, oportet quod ecclesia habeat illa omnia et singula tamquam eius capita. Cum enim caput iuxta Aristotelem dicatur ad aliquid, patet sophistis quod non sequitur: Hoc caput, hic pater vel hoc membrum est huiusmodi, ergo est caput, pater vel membrum illius, nec sequitur: Hoc est caput naturale huius capitanei, existentis caput date ecclesie, ergo hoc est caput illius ecclesie. Non enim oportet equivocando in capite, si hoc sit caput capitis, tunc hoc est caput cuiuscunque capitati ab illo capite, et correspondenter de aliis membris. Quelibet enim pars predestinati potest dici pars corporis ecclesie, nullum tamen est membrum ecclesie nisi persona predestinata, et omnis talis est membrum ecclesie sicut proporcionaliter dicendum est in humano corpore. Et patet quod ad noticiam illius materie de sancta matre ecclesia nedum oportet scire theologiam et iura canonica, sed omnino logicam, phisicam et ethicam que omnes subserviunt** [117] **matri nostre. Sicut enim non sequitur: Pater in divinis generat, et ipse est natura divina, ergo ipsa generat, ita non sequitur: Ista persona capitatur istis capitibus, et ista persona est hec ecclesia, ergo hec ecclesia sic capitatur. Nam ecclesia dicit abstractive multitudinem fidelium secundum racionem qua uniunturin capite; ad quem sensum ecclesia non potest esse non ecclesia vel dampnari. Ecclesia ergo non est monstruose composita. Sed quoad secundum, conceditur quod ecclesia est virgo, cum sit sponsa virginis Jesu Christi ex qua ut vera matre spiritualiter procreamur, et sic est castissima secundum se totam in patria; hic tamen, fornicando cum adulterante diabolo et sic membris eius, multis criminibus parcialiter est corrupta (ut**

But it is still objected, finally, by leading [us] to absurdities of the same form as those to which [our] adversaries are led.[1] For first it seems that the church, like a monster, would have a thousand heads, and so of the other members monstrously fashioned; and so she would be at once a virgin and a most corrupt synagogue and the church of Christ. Here the answer is (as often) by denying the assumption; for it does not follow: "These heads are this one's" (pointing to holy mother church), "therefore they are heads of this one"; nor does it follow: "These are the heads of those who are this church, therefore they are heads of this church"; for they are heads of these severally. And yet none of them is head of these [together].[2] For them to be heads of the church, therefore, the church must have them all and each as its heads. For since "head", according to Aristotle, is said relatively, it is clear to sophists that it does not follow: "This head, this father or this member is such a one's, therefore it is the head, father or member of that one"; nor does it follow: "This is the natural head of this captain, who is head of a given church, therefore this is the head of that church."[3] For it is not necessary, equivocating on "head", that if this is the head of a head, then this is the head of whatever is headed by that head; and correspondingly of the other members. For any part of a predestinate [person] can be called a part of the body of the church; yet nothing is a member of the church except a predestinate person, and every such [person] is a member of the church, as is to be said proportionally in the human body.[4] And it is clear that for knowledge of this matter of holy mother church one must know not only theology and the canon laws but altogether logic, physics and ethics, which all serve [117] **our mother. For just as it does not follow: "The Father in divine things generates, and he is the divine nature, therefore it generates", so it does not follow: "This person is headed by these heads, and this person is this church, therefore this church is so headed."[5] For "church" signifies abstractly the multitude of the faithful in the respect in which they are united in the head; in which sense the church cannot be not-church or be damned. The church therefore is not monstrously composed. But as to**

patet ex fide scripture Ezechielis XVIII°). Verumptamen nunquam recipitur ut sponsa beatifice amplexanda in dextera in lecto sponsi, antequam fuerit pura virgo omnimode sine ruga; Christus enim est sponsus virginitatis. Et quantum ad tercium punctum, dicitur quod omnis sinagoga que est pars sancte matris ecclesie est ecclesia, non econtra. Et ideo tam crebro vocatur synagoga in veteri testamento ecclesia, sed non memini quod in novo testamento aliqua particularis ecclesia dicitur synagoga (cuius racio dicta est alibi). Secundo obicitur per hoc quod iuxta dicta sequitur eandem personam verbi esse filium, patrem et sponsum ecclesie; quod est contra leges tam nature quam ecclesie, cum nunquam desponsavit quis licite matrem suam. Hic dicitur concedendo conclusionem assumptam, cum Christus nedum desponsat universalem ecclesiam sed desponsacione perpetua quodlibet membrum eius. Et quantum ad leges allegandas in contrarium, patet quod [118] loquuntur de contractu, de cognacione et desponsacione carnali, non autem spirituali, sicut debemus loqui in proposito et eo debemus eam magis attendere, quo est preciosior, proprior et in scriptura sacra expressior.

the second [point], it is granted that the church is a virgin, since she is the bride of the virgin Jesus Christ, and from her, as from a true mother, we are spiritually begotten; and so she is most chaste as a whole in the homeland; here, however, committing fornication with the adulterous devil, and so with his members, she is partly corrupted by many crimes (as is clear from the faith of scripture, Ezekiel 18).[6] Nevertheless she is never received as bride, to be embraced in blessedness at the right hand in the bridegroom's bed, before she is a pure virgin in every way, without wrinkle; for Christ is the bridegroom of virginity.[7] And as to the third point, the answer is that every synagogue that is part of holy mother church is church, not conversely. And therefore a synagogue is so often called church in the old testament; but I do not remember that in the new testament any particular church is called a synagogue (the reason for which has been given elsewhere).[8] Secondly, it is objected, by appeal to this: that according to what has been said it follows that the same person of the Word is son, father and bridegroom of the church; which is against the laws both of nature and of the church, since no one ever lawfully espoused his own mother. Here the answer is by granting the conclusion assumed, since Christ espouses not only the universal church but, with a perpetual espousal, each member of it. And as to the laws to be alleged to the contrary, it is clear that [118] they speak of contract, of kinship and of espousal that is carnal, but not of spiritual, as we must speak in the present matter; and we must attend to it the more, the more precious, the more proper and the more explicit in holy scripture it is.[9]

¶2 118.6–118.32

[118] Nam secundum illam omnes salvandi sunt filii Dei et veri fratres ex utroque parente, ymo secundum logicam Christi rectissimam Matthei XII°, 50: Quicunque filius regni voluntatem patris sui fecerit qui in celis est, ipse suus frater, soror et mater est. Et sic sine distinccione sexus spiritualis omnis christianus predestinatus, sive masculus sive femina, est frater, soror, mater et sponsa Christi. Ideo Canticorum V°, 1, dicitur ecclesie Veni in ortum meum soror mea sponsa. Ymo ecclesia est vere domus Dei, civitas regis iusticie, regnum celorum, ortus conclusus, fons signatus et alia que scriptura ad sensum misticum sibi attribuit. Nam in spiritualibus eadem substancia habet in se sine repugnancia quotlibet raciones vere earum denominaciones, ut exemplariter videre possumus quomodo contrariorum species et intenciones sunt simul in medio et in mente. Et ille qui ignorat hoc est valde indispositus ad cognoscendum catholice illud celeste coniugium. Nam Ysaie XXVI°, 1, dicitur de Christo et sancta

For according to that [spiritual kinship] all who are to be saved are sons of God and true brothers on both parents' side; indeed, according to Christ's most correct logic, Matthew 12:50: "Whatever son of the kingdom shall do the will of his Father who is in heaven, he is his brother, sister and mother."[10] And so, without distinction of spiritual sex, every predestinate Christian, whether male or female, is brother, sister, mother and bride of Christ. Therefore in Canticles 5:1 it is said to the church: "I am come into my garden, O my sister, my spouse." Indeed the church is truly the house of God, the city of the king of justice, the kingdom of heaven, a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up, and the other things that scripture attributes to her in the mystical sense.[11] For in spiritual things the same substance has in itself without repugnance any number of aspects, truly their namings, as by way of example we can see how the species and intentions of contraries are together in the medium and in the

ecclesia: Salvator ponetur in ea murus et antemurale. Christus enim secundum divinitatem inmediate complectitur sponsam suam, et secundum humanitatem qua minutus est paulominus ab angelis est antemurale, quia dux belli diro certamine superans hostes ecclesie, et sic de quotlibet racionibus quas omnes apostolus Iª Corinth. XV°, 28 compendiose complectitur, dicens quod Christus est omnia in omnibus.

mind. And he who is ignorant of this is very unfit to know in a catholic way that heavenly marriage.[12] For Isaiah 26:1 says of Christ and holy church: "A saviour, a wall and a bulwark shall be set therein." For Christ according to his divinity embraces his bride immediately, and according to his humanity, by which he was made a little less than the angels, he is the bulwark, because as leader in war he overcomes the enemies of the church in dire combat; and so of any number of aspects, all of which the apostle, 1 Corinthians 15:28, comprehends in brief, saying that "Christ is all in all".[13]

¶3 118.33–119.11
119.1 *Some say that the Catholic Church (as an universal) has no real existence.*
119.12 *If the Church is nothing it cannot be good.*
119.17 *Any local church may be something and so a thousand somethings may make up one which, in spite of all it does and is, we are to call nothing.*
119.26 *By similar reasoning we might conclude a house or a corporation has no continuous existence, since the parts vary.*

[118] Unde ignari scripture divertunt ad tales pueriles instancias, quando aliunde deficiunt argumenta et dicunt quod scriptura nostra est impossibilis in tantum [119] quod quidam dicunt nullam esse ecclesiam catholicam. quia non est dare universalia ex parte rei. Quidam vero dicunt quod ecclesia est ecclesia, sed non est aliquid sed aliqua, nec aliquod est membrum ecclesie, et sic scriptura sacra de capite ecclesie, de anima eius et de aliis eius membris est manifeste impossibilis. Et sic videtur quod habent dicere communiter quod, sicut ecclesia nichil est, ita nichil valet, et sic Christus foret mercator stultissimus qui tradidit semet ipsum pro dicta ecclesia et nimis illuderet christianis de sponsalibus, de privilegiis et de attributis ecclesie.

Hence those ignorant of scripture turn aside to such childish objections when arguments fail them from elsewhere, and they say that our scripture is impossible, so much [119] that some say there is no catholic church, because one cannot grant universals on the side of the thing. But others say that the church is the church, but is not something but some things, nor is anything a member of the church; and so holy scripture concerning the head of the church, its soul and its other members is manifestly impossible.[14] And so it seems they have to say commonly that, as the church is nothing, so it is worth nothing; and so Christ would be a most foolish merchant, who delivered himself up for the said church, and he would mock Christians too much with the espousals, the privileges and the attributes of the church.[15]

¶4 119.12–120.2
120.3 *Objection: If a whole is all that its parts are, man is at once the body of Christ and the body of the devil.*

[119] Nam si ecclesia non sit ens vel aliquid, tunc non est verum nec bonum, et cum nichil valet nisi proporcionaliter ut est bonum, sequitur quod ecclesia nichil valet. Sequitur enim secundum rudimenta discipline: Utrumque istorum est bonum, deducendo duas particulares ecclesias, ergo utrumque istorum est res aliqua, et sic mille res forent una res que, licet raciocinetur, vivat bene, male, exercens actus humanos, subiectans accidencia velut substancia, tamen nichil est. Unde habet partes et est satis sensibilis, divisibilis et sic de aliis denominacionibus, sed nullum est caput vel membrum eius, nec aliquid est intra, extra vel pars ecclesie, cum nunquam incepit, incipit vel desinet. Et sic nedum domus materiales non manebunt post ablacionem minime partis materialis per auram vel avem, et sic oporteret indies de novo consecrare ecclesias, sed et communitates, ut conventus, abbathie, atque religio deficerent continue et innovarentur, ut quevis persona de talibus deficit, vel quomodolibet innovatur, et periret appropriacio temporalium, eo

For if the church is not a being or something, then it is not true nor good; and since nothing is worth anything except in proportion as it is good, it follows that the church is worth nothing. For it follows according to the rudiments of the discipline: "Each of these is good" (adducing two particular churches), "therefore each of these is some thing"; and so a thousand things would be one thing which, although it reasons, lives well [or] ill, performs human acts [and] underlies accidents as a substance does, yet is nothing.[16] Hence it has parts and is quite perceptible, divisible, and so of the other namings; but nothing is its head or member, nor is anything within, outside, or a part of the church, since it never began, begins, or will cease. And so not only will material houses not remain after the removal of the least material part by the wind or a bird, so that churches would have to be consecrated anew daily, but communities too, such as convents, abbeys and a religious order, would continually fail and be renewed as any person of them fails or is in any way renewed; and

quod non superesset collegium cui temporalia sunt donata. Non enim iure hereditario carnali sed imitacione [120] spirituali a qua forte degenerantur, debent tales elemosinas vendicare.

the appropriation of temporal goods would perish, in that the college to which the temporal goods were given would not survive.[17] For not by right of fleshly inheritance but by spiritual [120] imitation, from which perhaps they degenerate, ought such [men] to claim alms.[18]

¶5 120.3–120.13

[120] Item, iuxta dicta totum genus humanum est unus homo, divisus in duos homines, et uterque eorum habet Deum et dominum Jesum Christum pro capite, ergo uterque eorum est corpus domini, et per consequens, ille totus homo foret corpus domini et sic sine racione reprobaret Augustinus Ticonium de corpore domini bipertito. Nec est evidencia quod exercitus vel populus facit quidquid facit pars eius, quin per idem ille magnus homo foret simul corpus Christi et corpus diaboli, salvatus et dampnatus, quia secundum partes, ergo etc.

Again, according to what has been said, the whole human race is one man, divided into two men, and each of them has God and the Lord Jesus Christ for head; therefore each of them is the body of the Lord, and consequently that whole man would be the body of the Lord; and so Augustine would without reason reprove Tyconius concerning the bipartite body of the Lord.[19] Nor is there evidence that an army or a people does whatever a part of it does, without that great man, by the same token, being at once the body of Christ and the body of the devil, saved and damned, since [he is so] according to [his] parts; therefore etc.[20]

Notes

1. The *to* at the head of 116.2 is not Wyclif's (a line number or the side-note's numeral) and is not translated. A margin *Prima obieccio* (116.3). *Inconveniencia*: absurdities in argument (CONTEXTUAL, the glossary). The objector turns on Wyclif the method of 112–115 (05-f): he reduces Wyclif's account to absurdities like those Wyclif drew from the doctor's definition.
2. A margin *Responsio* (116.7). *Istius ... istius*: the same genitive twice, first of belonging (heads found in the church, the heads of its members), then of headship over it. *Singillatim* A B, A_1 *sigillatim* (116.12). *Istorum* in the last clause: of these taken together.
3. B *de sophistis* (116.16); B *membrum est huius* (116.17–18); the print has *huiusmodi* ("of this sort"), which gives the inference no correlate; "such a one's" follows B's sense (*huius*), a departure from the print. Head as a relative term: Aristotle, *Categories* 7, 7a15–17 (head the correlative of the headed; but cf. 8b15–21). *Capitaneus*: a captain of a church, not its head (the glossary).
4. *Equivocando in capite*: "head" as the bodily head and as the ruling person. *Pars* and *membrum*: any part of a predestinate person is part of the church's body, but only a whole predestinate person is a member of it. A margin *Correlarium* (116.28).
5. The Father generates and is the divine nature, yet the nature does not generate: the scholastic rule, as in Lateran IV, *Damnamus* (*X* 1.1.2: *illa res non est generans, neque genita, nec procedens; sed est Pater, qui generat*; Friedberg II, 7). *Capitatur*: "is headed" (the glossary). A margin, printed below 144c without mark (117.9): *Nota argumenta logica de materia capitis ecclesie*. B lacks *sic* (117.13). Loserth (117.9): cf. Hus, *De ecclesia*, *Opp.* I, fol. 198 (the OCR of the folio is unclear).
6. *Secundum racionem qua*: "in the respect in which". *Ex qua*: from the church, not from Christ. A margin *Nota* (117.15). Ezekiel 18 as printed; the figure of the unfaithful bride is Ezek. 16 (16:15, DR "thou playedst the harlot") and 23, so the printed chapter number is not reconciled with them.
7. Cant. 2:6, DR "his right hand shall embrace me"; "without wrinkle": Eph. 5:27, DR "not having spot or wrinkle".
8. *Est ecclesia, non econtra*: every synagogue that is part of the church is a church, not every church a synagogue. *Alibi*: the place is not identified here.
9. A margin *Secunda obieccio. Item est filius pater et sponsus ecclesie, puta Christus etc.* (117.24); *Responsio* (117.29). *Conclusionem assumptam*: the conclusion the objector drew, which Wyclif grants. *Eam* (118.4): spiritual kinship and espousal.
10. Matt. 12:50, Vulgate *Quicumque enim fecerit voluntatem Patris mei ... ipse meus frater*, DR "whosoever shall do the will of my Father ... he is my brother"; Wyclif adds *filius regni* (roman in the print) and puts Christ's words in the third person (*patris sui ... suus*). *Ex utroque parente*: God as father, the church as mother.
11. *Sexus spiritualis*: we take *spiritualis* with *sexus*; it could go with *christianus* ("every spiritual predestinate Christian"). Cant. 5:1 and 4:12 agree with the Vulgate; DR.
12. *Raciones vere earum denominaciones*: we construe "aspects, [which are] truly their namings", the aspects giving the names; the construal is doubtful. *Species et intenciones*: the likenesses of contraries (white and black) present together in the medium and in the mind.
13. Codd. *Ysidorus*; Loserth corrected *Ysaie* (118.24). Isa. 26:1 agrees with the Vulgate; DR. Ps. 8:6, DR "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels". 1 Cor. 15:28 reads "that God may be all in all"; "Christ is all and in all" is Col. 3:11. A margin *Christi respectus ad ecclesiam* (118.26).
14. A margin *Duplex opinio* (118.33). A A_1 *quidam diceret* (119.1). The *145a* folio mark and the alinea *D* at 119.1 are not Wyclif's. Loserth notes codd. *scriptura sacra* at 119.5. *Universalia ex parte rei*: universals in the things themselves, which the first group denies. *Non aliquid sed aliqua*: not one something but several.
15. Eph. 5:25, DR "delivered himself up for it"; the merchant: cf. Matt. 13:45–46.
16. A margin *Obieccio* (119.12). *Ens ... verum ... bonum*: what is not a being is neither true nor good. *Deducendo*: adducing, pointing to. *Raciocinetur ... nichil est*: Wyclif's irony, a thing that reasons and acts and is nothing.

17. B lacks *sed* (119.22); B *vel partes* (119.23–24); B *vel delinet* (119.24); B *innovearuntur* (119.29). *Religio*: a religious order. *Deficit*: fails, by death or departure. *Appropriacio*: the canon-law annexation of revenues to a college or house (the glossary).
18. B *elemosina* (120.2). *Imitacione spirituali*: their title is by imitating their founders (cf. *filii imitacionis*, the glossary), not by fleshly descent.
19. The *E* before *homo* (120.3) is an alinea letter, not translated. A margin *Tercia obieccio* (120.3). Tyconius's second rule, on the bipartite body of the Lord: Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.32 (Loserth, 120.8).
20. *Nec est evidencia ... quin*: we construe "nor is there evidence that ... without its following by the same token that ...": the argument from what a part does to what the whole army or people does would prove too much.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 116: *CAP. VI.*
  - 116: *mille*
  - 116: *est* (25 is the line number)
  - 117: *matri* (144c folio mark)
  - 117: *Christi*
  - 118: *loquuntur*
  - 118: *debemus*
  - 118: *loqui*
  - 118: *Christi*
  - 118: *ecclesie* (she is the English side-note)
  - 118: *1* (short old-style arabic 1 (verse), not capital I)
  - 118: *Christus*
  - 118: *Iª*
  - 118: *28* (print: Corinth. XV°, 28 compendiose)
  - 119: *quod* (145a folio mark glued, D alinea)
  - 119: *quidam*
  - 119: *nullam*
  - 119: *quevis* (30 is the line number)
- Not Wyclif's, not translated: 116.2 *to* (line number or side-note numeral); 120.3 *E* (alinea letter). OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 116 *sinta* (read *sint*), *huiusb* (read *huius*). Doubt: p. 116 *huiusmodi* (B *huius*).

Part 2: Mankind as two men; no member of the devil in the church

Loserth pp. 120.14–123.27

¶1 120.14–121.28
120.14 *Answer: Mankind is divided into two, and in a sense they both have God for their head, but only one is the body of the Lord.*
121.16 *Mankind is not the Church.*
121.29 *Mankind does whatever each of its parts does,*

[120]Hic dicitur concedendo assumptum, cum non possunt esse plures quam duo homines, et ita conceditur quod uterque istorum duorum hominum habet Deum pro capite, non pro parte eius, sed principaliter extrinsecus influente, et sic unus eorum est corpus domini quod est sancta ecclesia, sed alter non est corpus domini, sed corpus diaboli. Et sic non sequitur: Hoc corpus est domini, ergo hoc est corpus domini. Et hoc intendit Augustinus, III° De Doctrina Christiana, XXXII° cap., increpans Ticonium, quia vocavit prescitos corpus dominicum. Non enim est totum corpus naturale corpus domini bipertitum, nisi utraque pars fuerit corpus domini. Et cum Augustinus XXXII° postquam ostendit quod Christus et corpus suum quod est ecclesia sunt una persona, increpat eum in secunda regula qua vocat totum genus hominum corpus domini bipartitum. Non, inquit, sic debuit appellare. Non enim revera domini corpus est

Here the answer is by granting the assumption, since there cannot be more than two men; and so it is granted that each of these two men has God for head, not as a part of it, but as principally flowing in from without; and so one of them is the body of the Lord, which is holy church, but the other is not the body of the Lord, but the body of the devil.[1] And so it does not follow: "This body is the Lord's, therefore this is the body of the Lord." And this is what Augustine means, *On Christian Doctrine* III, chapter 32, rebuking Tyconius because he called the foreknown the Lord's body. For the whole natural body is not the bipartite body of the Lord unless each part were the body of the Lord.[2] And Augustine, in [chapter] 32, after he has shown that Christ and his body, which is the church, are one person, rebukes him in the second rule, in which he calls

quod cum ipso non [121]erit in eternum, sed dicendum fuitde corpore domini vero atque permixto, aut vero atque simulato, quia non solum in eternum, verum eciam nunc ypocrite non cum illo esse dicendi sunt. Ecce quam plane iste sanctus diffinit quod presciti non sunt de Christi ecclesia. Unde De Consecracione, d. IIª Hoc sacramentum, dicit canon quod per cibacionem eucaristie societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum quod est ecclesia in predestinatis. Et De Penitencia, d. IVª, Si ex bono; et sepe infra habetur quod nemo est de regno Christi quod est ecclesia, nisi vere filius quem pater dedit sibi. De quo dicit Joh. 111°, 16, quod oportet ut non pereat, sed habeat vitam eternam. Et sic multi sunt in ecclesia qui vocantur filii nuncupatim qui non sunt de ecclesia. Conceditur ergo quod homo qui est humanum genus est partim prescitus et partim predestinatus, et sic tempore suo partim salvatus et partim dampnatus, sed ille non est ecclesia, quamvis faciat quidquid facit aliquis homo, quia ad unitatem requiritur unitas capitis, sed ut dicit apostolus IIª Cor. VI°, 15. Que convencio Christi ad Belial? Non ergo sunt duo capita ex equo vel subordinata, cum secundum apostolum que a Deo sunt ordinata, sunt. Et sic homo humani generis est corpus naturale sed non corpus ecclesie propter diversitatem contrarietatis capitum et equivocacionem ordinacionis divine ad gloriam et ad penam.

the whole race of men the bipartite body of the Lord. "He ought not," he says, "so to have called it. For that is not truly the Lord's body which will not [121]be with him for ever; but he should have spoken of the Lord's body true and mixed, or true and feigned; for not only for ever, but even now hypocrites are not to be said to be with him."[3] See how plainly this saint defines that the foreknown are not of Christ's church. Hence in *De consecratione*, distinction 2, *Hoc sacramentum*, the canon says that by the eating of the eucharist he wishes to be understood the fellowship of the body and members, which is the church in the predestinate.[4] And in *De penitencia*, distinction 4, *Si ex bono*, and often below, it is held that no one is of the kingdom of Christ, which is the church, unless [he is] truly a son whom the Father has given him; of whom John 3:16 says that he must "not perish, but have life everlasting". And so there are many in the church, called sons by name, who are not of the church.[5] It is granted, therefore, that the man who is the human race is partly foreknown and partly predestinate, and so in his time partly saved and partly damned; but he is not the church, although he does whatever any man does; for unity requires unity of the head; now, as the apostle says, 2 Corinthians 6:15, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" There are not, therefore, two heads on an equal footing or subordinated, since according to the apostle the things that are from God are ordered.[6] And so the man of the human race is a natural body, but not the body of the church, because of the diversity of contrariety of the heads and the equivocation of the divine ordinance to glory and to punishment.[7]

¶2 121.29–122.6
122.1 *but it is not the body of the Lord or the body of the devil.*
122.5 *A whole is not its part, but its parts.*
122.7 *It is a slander on the Church 10 say that the reprobate form part of her.*

[121]Et patet quid concedi debeat et quid negari in ista materia. Nam concedi debet quod homo generis humani facit quidquid aliqua eius pars facit, et simul est [122]beatus in celo et dampnatus in inferno, et est ambe iste ecclesie sed neutra illarum, et corpus illud secundum se totum est domini, sed non est corpus domini nec est corpus diaboli, cum totum integrale non est eius pars quantitativa sed est eius partes quantitative, et sic est collectim corpus domini et corpus diaboli.

And it is clear what ought to be granted and what denied in this matter. For it ought to be granted that the man of the human race does whatever any part of him does, and is at once [122]blessed in heaven and damned in hell, and is both these churches but neither of them; and that body as a whole is the Lord's, but is not the body of the Lord nor the body of the devil, since an integral whole is not its quantitative part but is its quantitative parts; and so it is collectively the body of the Lord and the body of the devil.[8]

¶3 122.7–123.10
123.12
4. The Church of the O. T. would have been headless, since Christ was not then its head.
123.25 *Christ before his incarnation was not*

[122]Unde videtur mihi quod illi non minus heretice quam blaspheme scandalizant sanctam matrem ecclesiam qui dicunt quod habet ut partes componencia tot membra diaboli, quia indubie tunc foret turpissima et a Deo maxime odita, quia secundum magnam partem. Et cum Canticorum IV°, 7, de illa dicitur: Tota pulchra es amica

Hence it seems to me that those give scandal to holy mother church, not less heretically than blasphemously, who say that she has as composing parts so many members of the devil; for then without doubt she would be most foul and most hated by God, since [she would be so] in a great part.[9] And since in Canticles 4:7 it is said of her, "Thou art all fair, O my

intrinsically head of the Church,

mea et macula non est in te, et apostolus Eph. V°, 27, dicit illam esse ecclesiam, non habentem maculam neque rugam, et illud dicit decretum (ut patet in fine XIII cap.): cum ergo nullus debet dubitare quin omnia ista loquuntur de sancta matre ecclesia, manifestum videtur quod illa non habet in sui composicionem aliquod membrum diaboli, sed sicut prudens paterfamilias non adoptat in filium quem scit perdere patrem suum, sic de Deo, quia iuxta apostolum, si ordinaret filios, et heredes. Cum ergo iuxta decreta ille cadit in heresim qui aliter exponit scripturam sacram quam spiritus sanctus flagitat, sicut et ille qui imponit tantum vicium sancte Romane ecclesie, et indubie scandalum tale redundaret in Dei blasphemiam, quomodo rogo foret gratus matri ecclesie vel sponso suo qui imponeret eis tantam calumpniam? Nonne Exodi XXI°, 17 cap., precipitur lege sponsi: Qui maledixerit patri vel matri moriatur? Non ergo imponamus matri nostre maledicionem et heresim cuiusmodi necessario est singulus prescitorum. [123]Sed instatur quod, sicut omnes partes predestinatorum sunt partes ecclesie, ita omnia capita predestinatorum sunt ecclesie capita, et sic caput aggregatum foret caput ecclesie. Hic dicitur (ut supra tetigi) quod illud probabiliter concedi potest de capite naturali et, intelligendo ecclesiam personaliter ut per accidens vel contingenter, est ecclesia, cum partes quantitative predestinati ordinantur ad beatitudinem. Sed locuti sumus communiter equivoce de capite, ut est persona regens capitaliter; quod est Christo proprium quoad totam ecclesiam.

love, and there is not a spot in thee", and the apostle, Ephesians 5:27, says that she is the church "not having spot or wrinkle", and the decree says this (as is clear at the end of chapter 13): since therefore no one ought to doubt that all these speak of holy mother church, it seems manifest that she has not in her composition any member of the devil.[10] But as a prudent father of a household does not adopt as a son one whom he knows will destroy his father, so of God; for according to the apostle, if he ordained [them] sons, [they are] heirs also.[11] Since, therefore, according to the decrees he falls into heresy who expounds holy scripture otherwise than the Holy Spirit demands, as does he also who imputes so great a vice to the holy Roman church, and without doubt such scandal would redound to the blasphemy of God, how, I ask, would he be pleasing to mother church or to her bridegroom who imputed to them so great a calumny?[12] Is it not commanded in Exodus 21:17 by the law of the bridegroom: "He that curseth father or mother, let him die"? Let us not, therefore, impute to our mother a curse and a heresy, such as each one of the foreknown necessarily is.[13] [123]But it is objected that, as all the parts of the predestinate are parts of the church, so all the heads of the predestinate are heads of the church; and so the aggregated head would be head of the church. Here the answer is (as I touched on above) that this can be granted as probable of the natural head and, understanding the church personally, as by accident or contingently, [it] is church, since the quantitative parts of a predestinate [person] are ordered to blessedness. But we have spoken commonly, [and] equivocally, of "head" as it is the person ruling as head; which is proper to Christ with respect to the whole church.[14]

¶4 123.11–123.27

[123]Quarto arguitur per hoc quod iuxta dicta ecclesia foret per totum tempus veteris testamenti acephala, eo quod non potest habere caput nisi Christum, sed tunc non habuit Christum caput, ergo tunc non habuit caput. Et per idem videtur sequi quod eadem ecclesia fuit pro tempore crementi quotlibet membra sua, quia pro nullo instanti fuit nisi fideles qui tunc fuerunt. Unde in exemplo tacto in fine secundi argumenti videtur quod non manet eadem domus, quacunque parte ablata vel noviter veniente, quia per idem ablata iterum tanta et alia noviter veniente, et sic qualibet parte domus corrupta et una secundum se totam noviter generata, maneret eadem domus, sicut est de domo ecclesie. Hic sunt tres difficultates. Prima, utrum Christus fuit ante incarnacionem, quia certum est quod eternaliter fuit verbum

Fourthly, it is argued, by appeal to this: that according to what has been said the church would have been headless through the whole time of the old testament, in that it cannot have a head except Christ; now at that time it did not have Christ as head; therefore then it had no head. And by the same token it seems to follow that the same church was, for the time of its growth, any number of its members, because at no instant was it anything but the faithful who then were.[15] Hence in the example touched on at the end of the second argument, it seems that the same house does not remain when any part is taken away or newly comes; for by the same token, when as much again is taken away and another newly comes, and so every part of the house is corrupted and one [house] is newly generated as a whole, the same house would remain, as is the case with the house of

Dei et semper caput ecclesie. Sed videtur non fuisse caput eius intrinsecum antequam fuit homo.

the church.[16] Here there are three difficulties. The first, whether Christ existed before the incarnation; for it is certain that he was eternally the Word of God and always head of the church. But he seems not to have been its intrinsic head before he was man.[17]

Notes

1. A margin *Responsio. Totum genus humanum est unus homo divisus in duos homines et unus illorum est corpus domini et alius est corpus diaboli. Contra Ticonium* (120.14). *Cum non possunt esse plures quam duo*: in this figure mankind divides into two men only. *Non pro parte eius*: God is head as an outside principle, not as a part of either man.
2. *Hoc corpus est domini ... corpus domini*: "the Lord's" as owner of every body, against "the body of the Lord", the church. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.32 (Loserth, 120.8). A margin *Augustinus contra Ticonium* (120.23). Loserth (120.22): cf. Hus, *De ecclesia*, *Opp.* I, fol. 206b.
3. *Et cum Augustinus ... increpat*: the *cum* clause has no main clause; we render it as a statement. The rule in which Augustine shows Christ and his body one person is Tyconius's first, *de Domino et eius corpore*; it is *De doctr. chr.* III.31 (§ 44; PL 34:82). Wyclif's quotation is found in Augustine's text (*De doctr. chr.* III.32; PL 34:82–83). *Bipartitum* here, *bipertitum* above, both as printed. The *145b* folio mark at 121.1 is not Wyclif's.
4. A margin *Presciti non sunt de Christi ecclesia* (121.6). Loserth: Decretum III, *De cons.* D.2 c.63 (the form is ours), whose incipit is *Hoc sacramentum pietatis est*, as Wyclif names it; Loserth quotes its § 1, *Hunc itaque cibum et potum* (PL 187:1762A). *Cibacio*: eating.
5. Loserth: Decretum II, C.33 q.3 (*De pen.*) D.4 c.8 (the form is ours), *Si ex bono in malum deficiente*, from Augustine's *De correptione et gratia* (PL 187:1620A). John 3:16, DR "may not perish, but may have life everlasting"; *oportet ut* is Wyclif's frame. *Nuncupatim*: by name only. *In ecclesia ... de ecclesia*: in the church, but not of it.
6. Codd. *que communicacio*; Loserth corrected *que convencio* from 2 Cor. 6:15 (121.22), DR "And what concord hath Christ with Belial?"; the print has *15* in old-style figures (plate). Rom. 13:1 (Loserth, 121.24), Vulgate *quae autem sunt, a Deo ordinatae sunt*; we follow its sense, since the print's comma (*ordinata, sunt*) would give "the things ordained by God, are". *Ex equo*: on an equal footing.
7. *Ordinacio ... ad gloriam et ad penam*: God's ordering of one man to glory, the other to punishment; "ordained" is said of the two equivocally.
8. *Totum integrale*: a whole made of quantitative parts, which is those parts taken together, not any one of them; *collectim*: collectively. *Ambe iste ecclesie*: the two "churches", of Christ and of the devil.
9. *Scandalizant*: give scandal to, defame. *Odita* as printed, a late form for *exosa*, "hated". *Secundum magnam partem*: foul in a great part of herself.
10. Cant. 4:7 and Eph. 5:27 agree with the Vulgate; DR. A A_1 *illam esse*, then a lacuna, wanting *ecclesiam* (122.14); B *sicut dicit* (122.15). *Decretum ... in fine XIII cap.*: the decree and the chapter are not traced.
11. Rom. 8:17, DR "And if sons, heirs also"; Wyclif's *si ordinaret filios* turns it to God's ordaining. A A_1 lack *in ... ordinaret* (122.20–22); B *quem sit*. *Perdere patrem*: to ruin his father.
12. Two canons are meant: that whoever expounds scripture otherwise than the Holy Spirit's sense demands is a heretic (Decretum C.24 q.3 c.27, from Jerome; PL 187:1306B), and that whoever imputes such vice to the Roman church falls into heresy (no canon says this in terms; nearest, D.22 c.1 § 1, on taking away the Roman church's privilege, Friedberg I, 73–74). *Calumpnia*: calumny.
13. Exod. 21:17, Vulgate *Qui maledixerit patri suo, vel matri, morte moriatur*, DR "He that curseth his father or mother, shall die the death"; Wyclif lacks *suo* and *morte*. A *Nonne eodem XXI*, A_1 corrected in the margin (122.29); A_1 adds *morte* in the margin (122.30). *Lege sponsi*: the law of Christ the bridegroom. *Cuiusmodi ... singulus prescitorum*: we take it that each foreknown person, counted as her part, would be such a curse and heresy laid on her; doubtful.
14. A margin *Nota; replicacio* (123.1); *Responsio. Omnia predestinatorum capita sunt capita ecclesie* (123.4). *Capite naturali*: the bodily heads of the predestinate; *personaliter*: the church taken as one person. *Est ecclesia* (123.6) as printed, "is church"; *ecclesie*, "is the church's", would fit better. *Ut supra tetigi*: 116.12–117.13 (06-a).
15. A margin *Quarta obieccio* (123.11). *Acephala*: headless. *Fuit ... quotlibet membra sua*: the church would be identical with whatever members it had at each instant.
16. A *corrumpta* (123.21); A A_1 *manet* (123.22). *Exemplo ... secundi argumenti*: the house, 119.26–29 (06-a). *Domus ecclesie*: the church as the house of God (118.13).
17. A margin *Responsio. Prima difficultas*; B margin *Utrum Christus fuit ante incarnacionem* (123.25). *Intrinsecum*: a head within the body, as against the head "flowing in from without" of 120.16.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 121: *II*[a]
  - 121: *IV*[a]
  - 121: *II*[a]
  - 122: *corpus*
  - 122: *odita* (print has odita) [NW]
  - 123: *Christum*
  - 123: *Christum*

- 123: ***fuit***
- 123: ***Christus***
- 123: ***fuit***
- 121: ***erit*** (145b folio mark glued)
- 121: ***eternum***
- 121: ***dicendum***

• OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 120 ***111°*** (read ***III°***); p. 121 ***Joh. 111°*** (read ***III°***), ***VI°, 1.*** (read ***15***); p. 123 ***eo quod.*** (stray point). Doubts: p. 122 ***odita***; p. 123 ***est ecclesia***.

Part 3: The first difficulty answered: Christ's three weddings, and the temple as figure of the church

Loserth pp. 123.28–126.13

¶1 123.28–125.32
123.29 *but he was always head by predestination.*
124.4 *In the incarnation he made second nuptials, raising a part of the Church to be Queen.*
124.22 *At the last advent the Lamb will make marriage consummate and the whole Church will be crowned as Queen.*
125.4 *Solomon's queens, concubines and virgins figure the three states that compose the Church.*

[123] **Ad illud autem videtur dicendum iuxta sepe dicta quod Christus in primo instanti mundi fuit sponsus ecclesie predestinacione, in confirmacione autem angelorum dedit dotem parti sponse sue et sic in confirmacione** [124] **Abel iusti et aliorum sanctorum usque ad incarnacionem, manente continue eadem desponsacione, cum Cesar semper Augustus continue auget dotem. In incarnacione vero fecit secundas nupcias, creando quandam reginam partem tocius ecclesie que quadam proprietate dicitur ecclesia christiana. Tunc enim dux et legifer noster familiarius alloquens sponsam suam (ut dicit apostolus Hebr. 1°) per assumpcionem humanitatis inducit arma nostra et ut gigas superavit hostes ecclesie, redimens partem sponse incarceratam et docens aliam quomodo sequeretur eius vestigia. Unde tota doctrina christiana stat in ista oracione ecclesie qua rogamus sponsum per adventum eius in carnem, ut doceat nos terrena despicere et amare celestia. Despicere, id est, in affeccione postponere. Ille enim despicit temporalia qui a summa sede anime ipsa abicit et facit ipsa intencioni celestium abiectissime ministrare. Et bene foret sibi qui perfecte didicerit istam regulam religionis, tunc enim foret in recta via sequendi sponsum et assumptam iuvenculam in regnum celorum. Tercio vero in ultimo adventu faciet agnus nupcias consummatas, coronando et confirmando reginam integram que est una columba et universalis ecclesia, non pars alterius ecclesie (ut patet Apoc. XXI°). Et super ista consideracione dependet magna pars sensus scripture et servicii ecclesie. Nam ex fide erit una totalis ecclesia glorificata post diem iudicii, et illa secundum magnam partem est modo sponsa in celo, in purgatorio et in mundo. Ideo illa est continue una universalis et sancta mater ecclesia, et illa est quam** [125] **debent leges intelligere et omnis christianus reverenter intendere; illa, inquam, figurata est in Salomone et templo, ut canit ecclesia. Frustra namque ordinaretur vel legeretur quod Salomon haberet tot reginas, tot concubinas et tot adolescentulas, nisi ut figurando Christum significet nobis suum coniugium cum spiritibus celestibus, tam angelis quam animabus,**

And to that, it seems, the answer must be, according to what has often been said, that Christ at the first instant of the world was the bridegroom of the church by predestination; and at the confirmation of the angels he gave a dowry to part of his bride, and so at the confirmation of [124] **Abel the just and of the other saints up to the incarnation, the same espousal remaining continuously, since Caesar ever Augustus continually increases the dowry.[1] And at the incarnation he held a second wedding, creating a certain part of the whole church a queen, which by a certain propriety is called the christian church.[2] For then our leader and lawgiver, speaking more familiarly to his bride (as the apostle says, Hebrews 1), through the assumption of humanity puts on our armour, and as a giant overcame the enemies of the church, redeeming the imprisoned part of the bride and teaching the other how it should follow his footsteps.[3] Hence the whole christian doctrine stands in this prayer of the church, in which we ask the bridegroom, by his coming into the flesh, to teach us to despise earthly things and to love heavenly. To despise, that is, to put after in affection. For he despises temporal goods who casts them away from the highest seat of the soul and makes them serve, most abjectly, the intention of heavenly things.[4] And it would be well with him who had perfectly learned this rule of religion; for then he would be on the right way of following the bridegroom and the young girl he has taken to himself into the kingdom of heaven.[5] And thirdly, at the last coming the Lamb will make the nuptials consummate, crowning and confirming the queen entire, which is one dove and the universal church, not part of another church (as is clear, Apocalypse 21).[6] And on this consideration depends a great part of the sense of scripture and of the church's service. For as faith teaches there will be one total church glorified after the day of judgment, and that [church] is now, in great part, the bride in heaven, in purgatory and in the world. Therefore she is continuously one universal and holy**

quam cum adolescentibus viantibus; ex quibus omnibus componitur una columba que est universalis ecclesia, eadem que coronabitur in patria, quia aliter foret continue alia et alia universalis ecclesia. Frustra eciam ordinaretur et legeretur construccio templi Salomonis (de quo III° Reg. VI° cap.) ad figurandum Christum et ecclesiam, que est templum suum (ut dicit apostolus Iª Cor. III° 17). Sicut enim fuerunt tres partes templi: prima in quam totum vulgus et alienigene intraverunt, quam sacerdotes in tempore Christi negociacionibus occuparunt (ut patet Matthei XXI°, 12). Et illa signat militantem ecclesiam in qua sunt eciam alienigene ut presciti. Secunda vero fuit corpus ecclesie populo Israhelitico deputata, signans perfecciores pure Israhelitas a rugis in purgatorio depurandos. Tercia vero fuit sancta sanctorum in quam soli sacerdotes intrarunt solempniter semel in anno. Et illa signat triumphantes, ut exponit apostolus Hebr. IX°, 11: Christus assistens pontifex etc. Sic, inquam, tota fabrica templi signat universalem ecclesiam iuxta fidem. Unde istum articulum fidei tenentur episcopi docere inferiores sacerdotes et populum, quia aliter ignorarent usum servicii ecclesie ad cuius noticiam obligantur, et specialiter illum articulum fidei ecclesiam sanctam catholicam quem omnis catholicus debet scire.

mother church, and she it is whom [125] the laws ought to understand and every christian reverently to attend to; she, I say, was figured in Solomon and the temple, as the church sings.[7] For in vain would it be ordained or read that Solomon had so many queens, so many concubines and so many young maidens, unless it were that, by figuring Christ, he signifies to us his marriage with the heavenly spirits, angels as well as souls, as well as with the young ones who are on the road; of all of whom is composed one dove, which is the universal church, the same that will be crowned in the homeland; for otherwise there would continually be one universal church after another.[8] In vain, too, would the building of Solomon's temple (of which 3 Kings, chapter 6) be ordained and read, [were it not] to figure Christ and the church, which is his temple (as the apostle says, 1 Corinthians 3:17).[9] For just as there were three parts of the temple: the first, into which the whole common people and the foreigners entered, which the priests in Christ's time occupied with their trafficking (as is clear, Matthew 21:12). And that signifies the church militant, in which there are foreigners too, as the foreknown.[10] And the second was the body of the church, assigned to the people of Israel, signifying the more perfect, purely Israelites, who are to be cleansed of their wrinkles in purgatory. And the third was the holy of holies, into which the priests alone entered solemnly once a year. And that signifies the triumphant, as the apostle expounds, Hebrews 9:11: "Christ, being come an high priest" etc.[11] So, I say, the whole fabric of the temple signifies the universal church, according to faith. Hence the bishops are bound to teach this article of faith to the lower priests and to the people, since otherwise they would be ignorant of the use of the church's service, to the knowledge of which they are obliged; and especially that article of faith, "the holy catholic church", which every catholic ought to know.[12]

¶2 126.1–126.13
126.1 *A good bishop remains after death patron of his (local) Church.*

[126] Et patet quod Christus semper est caput ecclesie. Unde ego credo quod, quicunque episcopus vere presidet in particulari ecclesia, remanet post mortem suam caput vel patronus eiusdem ecclesie. Quamvis enim moriatur in corpore, procurat tamen in spiritu pro subditis eciam fervencius quam in via, et post diem iudicii habebit quandam preeminenciam et illuminacionem, sicut in angelis longe alterius racionis quam prepositura viancium. Ideo rogamus, ut sanctos episcopos semper habeamus patronos in celis. Sed illi non contendebant circa primatus, adulterantes scripturam sacram, ut populus astringatur in via credere quod ipsi sunt capita sancte matris ecclesie.

And it is clear that Christ is always head of the church. Hence I believe that whatever bishop truly presides in a particular church remains after his death head or patron of that same church.[13] For although he dies in the body, yet in spirit he acts for his subjects even more fervently than on the way, and after the day of judgment he will have a certain pre-eminence and illumination, as among the angels, of a far other kind than the office of superior of those on the road. Therefore we pray that we may always have holy bishops as patrons in heaven. But they did not contend about primacies, adulterating holy scripture, so that the people on the

way should be bound to believe that they themselves are heads of holy mother church.[14]

Notes

1. A margin *Christus in primo instanti mundi fuit sponsus ecclesie* (123.30); Loserth (123.30): cf. Hus, *De ecclesia*, *Opp.* I, 198b. *Ad illud*: the first difficulty, whether Christ was before the incarnation (123.24–27, 06-b). *Cesar semper Augustus*: the imperial style "ever Augustus", taken from *augere*: he who ever increases (*auget*) the dowry. Loserth (124.3): cf. Wyclif, *De benedicta incarnacione* c. 5, p. 67.
2. A margin *Christus in incarnacione originavit ecclesiam christianam* (124.4), *Nupcie Christi per incarnacionem* (124.8). *Vero* here and at *Tercio vero* marks the stages of a series: "and". *Quadam proprietate*: by a certain propriety of name; the part of the church since the incarnation is "christian" in a proper sense.
3. Heb. 1:1–2: God, who "spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by his Son" (DR); hence *familiarius*. *Ut gigas*: Ps. 18:6, the bridegroom "hath rejoiced as a giant to run the way" (DR). *Inducit*: "puts on" (of armour or clothing), a present beside the perfect *superavit*, as printed. *Partem ... incarceratam*: the fathers held below until Christ's descent. *Dux et legifer noster*: after the Advent antiphon *O Emmanuel, rex et legifer noster* (Sarum Breviary, Procter–Wordsworth I, col. clvi), which some copies read *dux et legifer noster* (Thomas Cisterciensis, *In Cant.*, PL 206:616A).
4. B margin *Tota doctrina christiana stat in una oracione* (124.12). The petition *ut ... terrena despicere et amare celestia* is the postcommunion of the second Sunday of Advent, *doceas nos terrena despicere et amare celestia* (Sarum, Legg p. 17; Gregorian Sacr., PL 78:192A). B *preponere* for *postponere* (124.15), which reverses the sense; the print is translated. *Abicit ... abiectissime*: Wyclif's play, "casts away ... most abjectly".
5. *Regula religionis*: a rule of life, with a glance at the rules of the orders. *Assumptam iuvenculam*: the church militant, taken as bride at the incarnation (*assumere*, as in *assumpcio humanitatis*). We take *in regnum celorum* with *sequendi*: following into the kingdom.
6. The token *ad-* before *Tercio* (124.22) is not Wyclif's and is not translated. A margin *Nupcie consumacionis*; B *nupcias consumptas* (124.22). *Una columba*: Cant. 6:8, "One is my dove" (DR). Apoc. 21:2, 9: the city "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband", "the bride, the wife of the Lamb" (DR). The page foot gives "B: Moralium XXI" (124.25), apparently in place of *Apoc. XXI°*; the print is translated.
7. *Secundum magnam partem*: the greater part of that church is already the bride, in its three states (triumphant, sleeping, militant). *Servicium ecclesie*: the liturgy (untagged, the glossary *servicium*). *Intendere*: to attend to, not the thesis sense "maintain". *Ut canit ecclesia*: the office and mass of the dedication of a church: the Sarum sequence *Jerusalem et Syon filie*, where Christ *desponsat hodie matrem nostram ... ecclesiam*, praised *a reginis* (Cant. 6:8), and the queen of the south comes to Solomon (Legg pp. 203, 473–74); and the dedication lessons on Solomon and the temple (Sarum Breviary, Procter–Wordsworth I, cols. mcccclvi–lix). Loserth (125.3): cf. above, 97.5.
8. Cant. 6:7, "There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and young maidens without number" (DR), with Solomon taken as the Song's speaker. A *regninas*; A margin *Concubine, regine, adolescentule Salomonis* (125.4). *Tam angelis quam animabus, quam cum adolescentibus viantibus*: three classes, answering the three of the Song; *adolescentibus viantibus*, "the young ones on the road", picks up *adolescentulas*.
9. 3 Kings 6 (1 Kings 6 in modern numbering); A *III Reg. VI cap.* (125.13). 1 Cor. 3:17, "For the temple of God is holy, which you are" (DR). *Frustra ... ad figurandum*: the parallel with *nisi ut figurando* above gives "in vain, unless to figure"; hence our "[were it not]". A margin *Distinccio templi Salomonis ad ecclesiam* (125.15).
10. A *primam in*, *aligenigene* (125.16); B margin (later hand) *Templi partes tres*. *Sicut enim* has no answering *sic* until *Sic, inquam* below; the period is left open as printed. Matt. 21:12, the sellers cast out of the temple, is cited, not quoted. *Ut presciti*: the foreknown are such foreigners in the church militant.
11. *Corpus ecclesie*: the nave, the church-building's word given to the temple's holy place. *Pure Israhelitas*: Israelites without admixture; *a rugis ... depurandos*: the church sleeping, still to be cleansed of the "wrinkle" of Eph. 5:27. The page foot gives "Codd.: qua" (125.23, cut short), apparently against the print's *quam*, which we follow. Heb. 9:7 has the high priest alone (*solus pontifex*) enter once a year; *soli sacerdotes* is Wyclif's. Heb. 9:11 agrees with the Vulgate less *autem*.
12. *Iuxta fidem*: according to faith, not the formula *ex fide*. *Usum servicii ecclesie*: the meaning of the church's rites, as of the temple-figure above. *Ecclesiam sanctam catholicam*: the creed's article, quoted in the accusative it has after *credo*.
13. A margin *Conclusio* (126.1). At 126.4 the page foot reads "A: est (in red ink) suam est caput": A apparently has *post mortem suam est caput*, with *est* for *remanet*; the OCR is unclear. *Patronus*: the bishop as patron in heaven of his church, not the patron of a benefice; *caput vel patronus* grants him "headship" of a particular church only in that sense.
14. *Procurat ... pro subditis*: acts on his subjects' behalf, as a proctor would. B *quandam primiciam* (126.7), apparently for *quandam preeminenciam*. *Alterius racionis*: of another kind. *Illi*: the holy bishops of old, against present prelates who claim to be *capita*; *in via* goes with *populus*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 123: *Christus*
  - 124: *familiarius*
  - 125: *III°*
  - 125: *Iª* (15 is the line number)
  - 125: *12* (print "XXI°, 12)."; main token holds the whole number, lost its 1)

- 126: *illi* (10 is the line number)
- 125: *debent* (145c folio mark glued)

- Not Wyclif's, not translated: p. 124 *ad-* before *Tercio vero* (124.22).
- OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 125 *Cor. 111°* (read *III°*), *Hebr. IX°, 1 1* (read *11*).

Part 4: The second and third difficulties; honour due to prelates is judged by their works

Loserth pp. 126.14–130.17

¶1 126.14–128.9

126.14 *A difficulty: Whether before the incarnation the Word was the man Christ Jesus. Yes; for he was so both ideally and potentially.*
126.24 *Confirmation: In the three days the body to which he was afterwards united was his.*
127.1 *Confirmation: Otherwise the Church must have been headless.*
127.10 *Reply. The fathers of the O. T. believed in the incarnation,*
127.19 *so far that Christ would be man in due time.*
128.1 *We must be careful to distinguish between potential and actual being.*
128.10 *Christ assumed the human body with the soul. He had the soul in the three days but not in O. T. times.*
128.18 *The Church would not be headless, for the word was always its head, but in another way since the incarnation.*

[126] **Secunda difficultas logica est, utrum debet concedi, posito quod essemus ante incarnacionem, quod verbum est homo Christus Jesus. Et videtur quod sic, nam secundum rectam philosophiam et logicam creatura nedum habet existenciam in suo singulari sed tam esse ydeale in verbo quam esse potenciale in causis secundis. Cum ergo ante incarnacionem fuit illa sancta massa materialis in patribus, quam postmodum assumpsit de virgine, et spiritus habuit esse in humana specie, videtur quod totus Christus habuit humanitus esse potenciale, et sic esse. Confirmatur secundo ex hoc quod sacerdos conficiens in sancto triduo vere conficeret corpus Christi, sicut dicunt doctores concorditer, in tantum quod hoc foret tunc verum hoc est corpus Christi (ut recitavi in tractatu De Incarnacione); quare ergo non foret verum ante incarnacionem quod verbum est Christus, cum tunc habet corpus quod post unit sibi, sicut est de corpore suo pro triduo?** [127] **Tercio confirmatur ex hoc quod ecclesia foret aliter acephala, cum tunc non haberet caput intrinsecum sicut post, et cum non potest habere taliter nisi unum caput, videtur quod Christus ante incarnacionem fuit caput sponse sue intrinsecum, quia aliter vel haberet duo capita vel idem foret caput extrinsecum et caput intrinsecum. Et ad illud sonant quotlibet scripture (ut allegavi alias de beato Jeronymo in quadam epistola ad Paulum et Eustochium). Hic dicitur quod patribus veteris testamenti fuit hec vera: verbum est homo Christus Jesus. Ipsi enim secundum sanctos habuerunt eandem fidem quam nos habemus. Ideo sicut nos credimus creacionem mundi, carnis resurreccionem et vitam eternam, hoc est quod Deus tempore suo creat mundum, quod mortui resurgent, et quod beati vivunt eternaliter post diem iudicii, ita utraque ecclesia credit incarnacionem, scilicet quod Christus pro suo tempore incarnatur. Et sic proposicio nostra: Christus est homo, foret in signo utrobique vera, non quia tunc est quod Christus est homo, sed quia verum est quod Christus est homo pro suo tempore. Nec video quod Christus est homo pro illo tempore, cum tunc componeretur ex corpore et anima quam assumeret pro illo tempore, et potissime foret primus Adam secundum materiam et non secundum raciones seminales, qualiter**

The second difficulty is a logical one: whether, supposing that we were before the incarnation, it ought to be granted that the Word is the man Christ Jesus.[1] And it seems that it ought: for according to right philosophy and logic a creature not only has existence in its singular, but both ideal being in the Word and potential being in secondary causes. Since, therefore, before the incarnation that holy material mass which he afterwards assumed from the virgin was in the fathers, and the spirit had being in the human species, it seems that the whole Christ had potential being as man, and so being.[2] It is confirmed, secondly, from this: that a priest consecrating in the holy three days would truly consecrate the body of Christ, as the doctors say with one accord, so much so that this would then be true, "This is the body of Christ" (as I have recounted in the treatise *On the Incarnation*); why, then, would it not be true before the incarnation that the Word is Christ, since he then has the body which he afterwards unites to himself, as is the case with his body for the three days?[3] [127] **Thirdly, it is confirmed from this: that otherwise the church would be headless, since it would not then have an intrinsic head as afterwards; and since it cannot have more than one head in this way, it seems that Christ before the incarnation was the intrinsic head of his bride; for otherwise either it would have two heads, or the same [one] would be extrinsic head and intrinsic head. And any number of scriptures sound to that effect (as I have alleged elsewhere from blessed Jerome, in a certain letter to Paula and Eustochium).[4] Here the answer is that for the fathers of the old testament this was true: "The Word is the man Christ Jesus." For they, according to the saints, had the same faith that we have. Therefore, just as we believe the creation of the world, the resurrection of the flesh and life everlasting, that is, that God in his time creates the world, that the dead will rise, and that the blessed live eternally after the day of judgment, so each church believes the incarnation, namely that Christ for his time is incarnate.[5] And so our proposition, "Christ is man", would be true in the sign on both sides, not because it is then [the case]**

apostolus dicit Levi fuisse in lumbis Abrahe, et qualiter Anselmus dicit: Omnes nos fuisse Adam, sed limitatum est ad existenciam individuam humanitatis Christi. Et ad primam instanciam dicitur quod non sequitur: Hoc eternaliter fuit et hoc est iste homo, ergo iste homo eternaliter fuit, deducendo pure creaturam. [128] Conceditur tamen de Christo quod ipse eternaliter fuit Deus; nec sequitur: Si iste homo habet esse potenciale in causis secundis, ergo iste homo est pro eadem mensura, quia tunc omne individuum quod posset esse foret, et sic esse in potencia est distrahens. Vel concesso quod Christus habet esse creatum pro mensura data, quod est, esse cause secunde, tamen tunc non habet esse Christi, quia tunc haberet existenciam humanitus singularem.

that Christ is man, but because it is true that Christ is man for his time.[6] Nor do I see that Christ is man for that time, since then he would be composed of a body and a soul which he would assume for that time; and above all he would be the first Adam according to matter and not according to seminal reasons, in the way in which the apostle says "Levi was in the loins of Abraham", and in which Anselm says "that we all were Adam"; but it is limited to the individual existence of Christ's humanity.[7] And to the first objection the answer is that it does not follow, "This was eternally, and this is this man, therefore this man was eternally", when "this" points to a mere creature. [128] Yet it is granted of Christ that he was eternally God; nor does it follow, "If this man has potential being in secondary causes, therefore this man is for the same measure", for then every individual that could be would be; and so "being in potency" is a diminishing qualifier. Or, granted that Christ has created being for the given measure, that is, the being of the secondary cause, yet he does not then have the being of Christ, for then he would have singular existence as man.[8]

¶2 128.10–128.17

[128] Et sic respondetur ad secundam instanciam con- cedendo assumptum, cum Christus fuit in triduo tam corpus quam anima, sed cum Christus non assumit corpus ypostatice nisi mediante anima, patet, cum nondum creata est anima Christi pro tempore veteris testamenti, non pro illo tempore est Christus, nec sufficit ad esse individuum esse specificum, quia tunc omnes effectus absolute necessario evenirent.

And so the reply is to the second objection by granting the assumption, since Christ was in the three days both body and soul; but since Christ does not assume a body hypostatically except by means of the soul, it is clear, since the soul of Christ was not yet created for the time of the old testament, that Christ is not for that time; nor does specific being suffice for individual being, for then all effects would come about with absolute necessity.[9]

¶3 128.18–128.28

[128] Ad tercium negatur assumptum, cum ecclesia semper fuit capitata per verbum quod mansit perpetue eadem persona et sic idem caput post et ante. Conceditur tamen quod post illas nupcias celebratas in utero virginis, quando Christus fuit murus et antemurale sponse sue, fuit caput racionis duplicis et duplicis nature et sic simul caput intrinsecum et caput extrinsecum eiusdem ecclesie. Et sic ad auctoritates potest dici (ut alias) quod Christus est pro tempore veteris testamenti nedum secundum deitatem sed secundum causas secundas, et sic possunt ipsi dici christiani.

To the third, the assumption is denied, since the church was always headed by the Word, which remained perpetually the same person, and so the same head after and before. Yet it is granted that after those nuptials celebrated in the virgin's womb, when Christ was the wall and the bulwark of his bride, he was head of a twofold aspect and of a twofold nature, and so at once intrinsic head and extrinsic head of the same church. And so to the authorities it can be said (as elsewhere) that Christ is, for the time of the old testament, not only according to the Godhead but according to secondary causes; and so they can be called Christians.[10]

¶4 128.29–129.11
129.12 *Objection: We should not know to whom to pay honour or even debt.*

[128] Tercia difficultas naturalis est, quomodo manet idem corpus inanimatum aliis partibus corruptis continue generatis. Sed ad illud dictum est alias quod est dare corpus successivum tam continue

The third difficulty is a natural one: how the same inanimate body remains when some parts are corrupted and [others] continually generated.[11] But to that it has been said elsewhere that there is such a

129.18 *Answer: As to honouring prelates we must judge them by their works.*
129.25 *Prevailing abuses.*

quam interpolate, et ita est de domo materiali, sive ecclesia, sic quod existente secundum totam aliquam fuit illa que permansit [129]in principio, adhuc manet; et est eadem domus successiva que fuit a principio usque in finem; sicut posito quod ignis incipiat partibiliter generari et cum hoc corrumpi, tunc ignis successivus mensurat secundum partes utrumque motum, et sic corrumpitur inanimatum ad corrupcionem tocius et manet continue, dum corrumpitur. Et si queratur, quando consecrande forent ecclesie, dicitur quod ille est ritus humanitus introductus, ideo non est vis de tali consecracione assistente sanctitate persone incolentis. Istam autem materiam relinquo aliis.

thing as a successive body, both continuous and interrupted; and so it is with a material house, or church, so that, while some [part] exists as a whole, that which has remained [129]from the beginning still remains; and it is the same successive house that was from the beginning to the end;[12] as, supposing that a fire begins to be generated part by part and at the same time to be corrupted, then the successive fire measures each motion according to its parts; and so the inanimate thing is corrupted to the corruption of the whole, and remains continuously while it is being corrupted. And if it is asked when churches would have to be consecrated, the answer is that that is a rite introduced by men; therefore there is no weight in such consecration, so long as the holiness of the person who dwells there is present. But this matter I leave to others.[13]

¶5 129.12–129.17

[129]Sed quinto arguitur, probando sequi ex dictis omnem honorem et obedienciam inpendendam prelato confundi et omnem exaccionem corporalis debiti, cum deficeret probacio predestinacionis vel sanctitatis, et illud secundum racionem foret fundamentum talia vendicandi.

But fifthly it is argued, by proving that it follows from what has been said that all honour and obedience to be paid to a prelate are thrown into confusion, and every exaction of a bodily debt, since proof of predestination or holiness would be lacking; and that, according to reason, would be the foundation for claiming such things.[14]

¶6 129.18–130.17

[129]Hic negatur assumptum, quia (ut patet alibi) operibus debet credi, nec licet prelato aspirare ad lucrum vel honores illis dimissis, quia ut sic redderet se indignum illis lucris atque honoribus. Unde oraremus omnes, ut ecclesia sicut in suis primitivis attendat pure fructuoso operi sine ambicione temporalis commodi vel honoris. Modo vero ad tantum invalescebat oppositum quod de clero nostro potest dici illud Ysaie III°, 12: Populum meum exactores sui spoliaverunt et mulieres dominate sunt eius. Et sequitur: Popule meus qui beatum te dicunt, ipsi te decipiunt. Nam qui olim erant rectores anime, iam perversi sunt in exactores pecunie; qui olim zelabant pro honore divino contempto honore mundano, modo econtra lege Dei et per consequens honore eius postposito, preponderantes tradiciones [130]humanas nimis dediti sunt mundo, qui olim dediti sunt ministerio apostolico, contempto temporali lucro, modo econtra totaliter inhiant temporali comodo, insolencia mundana et ocio introducto. Et tum extorta sunt nomina: Nam qui olim nominarunt se a Deo vocatos apostolos, hodie contendunt se permissione divina ab homine nude electos; qui olim nominarunt se servos domini Jesu Christi, hodie retorquent, ut nominentur domini reverendissimi et patres beatissimi, et (quod est summus gradus ypocrisis) vocant se servos servorum Dei, licet sint in opere, et per consequens, in

Here the assumption is denied, for (as is clear elsewhere) works ought to be believed; nor is it lawful for a prelate to aspire to gain or honours with those [works] set aside, for as such he would render himself unworthy of those gains and honours.[15] Hence we should all pray that the church, as in its first [days], may attend purely to fruitful work without ambition of temporal advantage or honour. But now the opposite has grown so strong that of our clergy can be said that of Isaiah 3:12: "As for my people, their oppressors have stripped them, and women have ruled over them." And it follows: "O my people, they that call thee blessed, the same deceive thee."[16] For those who were once rulers of the soul are now perverted into exactors of money; those who were once zealous for God's honour, worldly honour despised, now on the contrary, God's law and consequently his honour being put after, and weighting the scale with [130]human traditions, are too much given over to the world; those who were once given to the apostolic ministry, temporal gain despised, now on the contrary gape wholly after temporal advantage, worldly insolence and idleness being brought in.[17] And then the names were wrested: for those who once named themselves apostles called by God today contend that they are elected barely by man, by divine permission; those who once named themselves servants of the Lord Jesus Christ today twist it round,

nomine reali servi precipui patris mendacii et mendacissima membra diaboli. Et sic necesse est iuxta propheciam scripture ut pervertantur mendacio et ypocrisi singuli non electi. Tales autem, ut docet Augustinus in libro De Vita Christiana, non sunt veraciter christiani.

so that they are named most reverend lords and most blessed fathers; and (what is the highest degree of hypocrisy) they call themselves servants of the servants of God, although in work, and consequently in real name, they are chief servants of the father of lies and most lying members of the devil.[18] And so it is necessary, according to the prophecy of scripture, that every one of the non-elect be perverted by lying and hypocrisy. And such men, as Augustine teaches in the book *On the Christian Life*, are not truly Christians.[19]

Notes

1. A margin *Secunda difficultas. Utrum verbum est homo Christus Jesus ante incarnacionem*; B margin (later hand) *Ante incarnacionem verbum est homo Christus Jesus* (126.14). The second of the three difficulties announced at 123.24 (06-b). *Posito quod essemus*: a supposition in the manner of the schools, testing the proposition's truth at that time.
2. *Esse ydeale ... esse potenciale*: ideal being in the divine Word, potential being in secondary causes (his ancestors). *Massa materialis in patribus*: the matter of Christ's body, in his forefathers. We take *spiritus habuit esse in humana specie* of the human soul, having being in the species; doubtful. *Humanitus*: as man.
3. The page foot gives "B: missa" (126.21) without the word it replaces; B margin (later hand) *In triduo* (126.32). *Sanctum triduum*: the three days of Christ's death; *conficere*: to consecrate the sacrament. The doctors' common teaching is in, e.g., Aquinas, *ST* III q.81 a.4 ad 2–3 (consecrated during the passion, the body alone under the bread, without the soul); Wyclif's place in *De incarnacione* is not traced.
4. *Intrinsecum ... extrinsecum*: a head within the body (as man) and a head flowing in from without (as God), as at 123.26 (06-b); *taliter*: as intrinsic head. Print *Paulum* (127.9, plate); Jerome's addressees are Paula and Eustochium, and we give "Paula" (our emendation; the print has *Paulum*). The letter is the pseudo-Jerome *Cogitis me* to Paula and Eustochium (Ep. 9, on the Assumption): Christ *jam esset in illo per unitatem personae ab initio saeculi ... quod multis Scripturarum declaratur indiciis* (PL 30:132C). Wyclif had cited it for the same point in *De benedicta incarnacione* (7, 53, 109).
5. A margin *Responsio* (127.10). A A_1 lack *Deus*, B *resurgunt* (127.15). The presents (*creat*, *vivunt*, *incarnatur*) are Wyclif's: each article is true "for its time", past or to come. *Utraque ecclesia*: the church of the old and of the new testament.
6. *In signo*: in the proposition taken as a sign, spoken or written; *utrobique*: in both churches (or "at both times"). The proposition is true not because the thing then is, but because it is true of its time.
7. *Nec video quod*: we take it, "I do not see [how it could be granted] that Christ is man for that time". *Primus Adam secundum materiam et non secundum raciones seminales*: Christ was in Adam by his body's matter, not by seminal reasons; the *qualiter* clauses illustrate the seminal way, in which Levi "was yet in the loins of his father" (Heb. 7:10, DR; Loserth, 127.24, cites Heb. 7:5) and all men were Adam. The distinction recalls Augustine on Christ's not paying tithes in Abraham (*De Gen. ad litt.* X.19.34, PL 34:423: *non est decimatus Christus, quia non erat in lumbis Abrahae ... secundum carnem ibi fuisse*). Anselm, *De conceptu virginali* c. 11 (Loserth 127.27): the words are not in c. 11 (PL 158:445A–446C); the nearest is *Omnis autem homo aut Adam est, aut de Adam* (446C). *Sed limitatum est*: we take the subject as "man" said of Christ, restricted to his humanity's individual existence; doubtful.
8. *Primam instanciam*: the argument from ideal and potential being (126.15–23). *Deducendo pure creaturam*: pointing to a mere creature (cf. *deducendo*, 119.16, 06-a). Of a mere creature the inference fails; of Christ, who is not a mere creature, it is granted that he was eternally God (128.1). B *Concedit* (128.1); B *esse in persona* (128.5, its place unclear). *Mensura*: the measure of time. *Distrahens*: a qualifier that takes away from what it qualifies (as "dead" in "a dead man"), so that "being in potency" does not yield "being" (the glossary). *Esse cause secunde*: the being Christ has in his causes, which is not his own.
9. *Concedendo assumptum*: that a priest consecrating in the three days would consecrate Christ's body; for then his body and soul, though parted, were each Christ's. *Non pro illo tempore est Christus*: Christ does not exist for that time. The page foot (128.16) reads "In cod. A_1 spec"ra; A B: speculum" (OCR rough): the manuscripts appear corrupt where the print has *specificum*; we translate the print.
10. Isa. 26:1, "a wall and a bulwark shall be set therein" (DR). *Caput racionis duplicis*: head under two aspects, as God and as man. *Ad auctoritates*: the scriptures and Jerome of 127.8–9. *Ipsi*: the fathers of the old testament.
11. A margin *Tercia difficultas* (128.29). *Aliis partibus corruptis continue generatis*: printed with one *aliis*; we read "some parts corrupted, [others] continually generated". The difficulty is the house of 123.17–22 (06-b).
12. *Est dare*: there is such a thing as; *interpolate*: with interruption. *Existente secundum totam aliquam fuit illa que permansit* does not construe as printed (no noun for *existente ... aliquam*, and *fuit* stands unconnected); we give the likeliest sense, that the house remains while some part persists through the replacements. The *146b* folio mark at 129.1 is not Wyclif's.
13. A *ad corrumpcionem*; A margin *Nota* (129.6). *Mensurat ... utrumque motum*: the fire, itself successive, measures both its generation and its corruption. *Quando consecrande forent ecclesie*: when a church renewed part by part would need consecrating again. *Non est vis de*: it is of no weight. *Persone incolentis*: the person who dwells in the church, whether minister or faithful; doubtful.

14. A margin *Quinta obieccio* (129.12). *Confundi*: since no one could know to whom honour and dues are owed. *Corporalis debiti*: dues in temporal goods. *Illud*: the proof of predestination or holiness.
15. A margin *Responsio* (129.18), *Nota processum* (129.20). *Operibus debet credi*: John 10:38, "believe the works" (DR). *Illis dimissis*: the works set aside; *ut sic*: as such, without the works.
16. B lacks *attendat* (129.22). *In suis primitivis*: in its first days, the primitive church (or "its first members"). Isa. 3:12 agrees with the Vulgate except *eius* for *eis*; DR's "oppressors" renders *exactores*, the word Wyclif takes up below ("exactors of money"). A margin *Is. Illa* (129.25).
17. A A_1 lack *sunt* (129.29); A margin *Avaricia cleri* (129.31). At 130.1 the codd. read *sumus*, which Loserth corrected (presumably *dediti sunt mundo*); we translate his text. *Preponderantes tradiciones humanas*: making human traditions outweigh God's law. *Dediti sunt* with *olim* (130.1–2): "were given", as the series requires.
18. B *extorquent ut vocentur* (130.8) for *retorquent, ut nominentur*; A margin *papa* (130.9) at *servos servorum Dei*, the papal style. *Permissione divina*: the style of a bishop's title; against Gal. 1:1, "not of men, neither by man" (DR). *Patris mendacii*: John 8:44, the devil "is a liar, and the father thereof" (DR). We take *in opere* and *in nomine reali* both with *servi precipui*.
19. *Propheciam scripture*: not identified; cf. 1 Tim. 4:2, "Speaking lies in hypocrisy" (DR). *Non electi*: *electi*, "the elect", not *predestinati*. Loserth (130.16): *De vita christiana* c. 6, in the appendix to Augustine's works (*Opp.* VI, 186); PL 40:1036–37; it is not Augustine's (PL: *auctor incertus*).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 126: *incarnacionem* (print has incarnacionem) [NW]
  - 126: *conficeret*
  - 126: *Christi*
  - 127: *cum* (146a folio mark)
  - 127: *Christus*
  - 127: *Christus*
  - 127: *Christus*
  - 127: *signo*
  - 127: *Christus*
  - 127: *Christus*
  - 127: *Christi*
  - 128: *con-* (con-/cedendo hyphenated; main token holds first half (b is the margin alinea letter))
  - 128: *Christi*
  - 128: *eadem*
  - 129: *III°*
  - 128: *permansit* (per- here, 146b mansit at top of p.129; main token holds whole word)
  - 130: *nimis*
- OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 126 *ht* (read *Et*), *exb* (read *ex*, alinea *b*); p. 127 *hoc est.* (stray point), *nostra!* (read a colon). Doubts: p. 127 *Paulum*; pp. 128–129 *existente ... permansit*; p. 128 *specificum* against the page foot.

Part 5: A theriac against exactors; Christ espoused his mother; Christ's humanity as form of the church

Loserth pp. 130.18–133.25

¶1 130.18–131.28
130.18 *A cure is wanted for the evils of extortion which infest the Church.*
131.9 *We ought to see that we pay dues only to those who claim them rightly.*
131.23 *Objection: If Christ was a son of the Church he was older than his mother.*
131.29 *Answer: His mother was the Synagogue,*

[130] **Unde si quis zelans pro profectu sancte matris ecclesie, habens in animo scintillam virtutis constancie, posset dicere quod tyriaca est contra exactores huiusmodi, extorquentes sine recompensa plus debita bona pauperum sancte matris ecclesie ex titulo quod sunt membra principalia eiusdem matris sine macula vel ruga, qui possunt temptacionibus et tribulacionibus adversancium concuti sed non superari a membris diaboli vel submergi, ut dicunt iura canonica de sancta matre ecclesia: ideo ex ore proprio debent potentes mundi ab eis requirere quod ostendant secundum eadem iura procuratorium sufficiens in fructu operis quod sunt illi quibus bona sancte matris ecclesie sunt debita vel donata, quia dist. XL[a] scribitur: Non**

Hence, if anyone zealous for the advancement of holy mother church, having in his mind a spark of the virtue of constancy, could say that there is a theriac against exactors of this kind, who extort without recompense, beyond what is due, the goods of the poor of holy mother church, on the title that they are principal members of the same mother, without spot or wrinkle, who can be shaken by the temptations and tribulations of adversaries but not overcome by the members of the devil, nor submerged, as the canon laws say of holy mother church:[1] therefore, out of their own mouth, the powerful of the world ought to require of them that they show, according to the same laws, a sufficient proctor's

sanctorum filii sunt qui tenent loca sanctorum, sed [131]qui exercent opera eorum. Et ista tyriaca obtunderet cauterium rubiginosum diaboli quod non gracia sanacionis sed gracia spoliacionis apponitur membris Christi. Conceditur ergo quod tam honor quam stipendium sunt impendenda Christi sacerdotibus, sed oportet eos ex operibus dare probabilem evidenciam quod sunt tales, cum nemo contra consciencium daret bona sancte matris ecclesie membris diaboli; nam secundum leges humanas qui dat pseudoprocuratori debitum creditoris, tenetur in penam negligencie, et si perdiderit datum creditori tribuere quod est suum. Multo plus creditor matris sue, et specialiter si negligit discernere utrum exactor sit fidelis procurator sancte matris ecclesie, quod iudicabit secundum opera et regulas scripture. Nam liquido constat fidelibus quod decime, oblaciones et alie private elemosine debentur sancte matri ecclesie. Qua fronte ergo excomunicaret infructuosus operibus evangelicis subiectos simplices, nisi dent sibi bona sancte matris ecclesie, cum sit evidens ipsum non esse de illa, sed in illa, tamquam eius hostem precipuum et ypocrisi atque mendaciis eius infidelissimum proditorem. De isto inferius. Sexto arguitur contra dicta in racione secunda; videtur enim, si Christus desponsavit matrem ecclesiam cuius fuit filius, quod filius foret senior matre sua, sicut est honorabilior, melior et formalior quam est illa, et sic ydemptificaret sibi omne membrum ecclesie (ut sepe innuitur in sanctis doctoribus et scriptura).

mandate in the fruit of their work, that they are those to whom the goods of holy mother church are due or given; for in distinction 40 it is written: "They are not the sons of the saints who hold the places of the saints, but [131]those who do their works."[2] And this theriac would blunt the devil's rusty cautery, which is applied to the members of Christ not by way of healing but by way of despoiling.[3] It is granted, therefore, that both honour and stipend are to be paid to Christ's priests; but they must give, from their works, probable evidence that they are such, since no one against conscience would give the goods of holy mother church to members of the devil; for according to human laws he who gives a creditor's due to a false proctor is bound, as the penalty of negligence, even if he has lost what was given, to render to the creditor what is his.[4] Much more [is] the debtor of his mother [so bound], and especially if he neglects to discern whether the exactor is a faithful proctor of holy mother church, which he will judge according to works and the rules of scripture.[5] For it is plainly evident to the faithful that tithes, oblations and other private alms are owed to holy mother church. With what face, then, would one who is unfruitful in gospel works excommunicate simple subjects unless they give him the goods of holy mother church, since it is evident that he is not of her but in her, as her chief enemy and, by his hypocrisy and lies, her most faithless traitor?[6] Of this below. Sixthly, it is argued against what was said in the second reason; for it seems, if Christ espoused mother church, whose son he was, that the son would be older than his mother, as he is more honourable, better and more formal than she is; and so he would identify every member of the church with himself (as is often hinted in the holy doctors and scripture).[7]

¶2 131.29–132.29
132.9 *which he left for the "Church of the Gentiles".*
132.30 *Christ's humanity is the form (i. e. the organic principle) of the Church.*

[131]Hic dicitur quod Christus desponsavit matrem suam que est totalis ecclesia non secundum se totam, sed secundum synagogam ex qua Christus secundum carnem prodiit, et sic reliquit patrem et matrem (ut sancti doctores exponunt dictum suum Matthei XIX°, 5) [132]et adhesit uxori sue, sed illud dictum oportet sane intelligi. Nam Christus assumens illud quod prius non erat non perdidit vel desiit esse illud quod erat, quia manet absolute necessario eternaliter plenus Deus, sed reliquit assumendo humanitatem esse solum Deus, cum fuit humanitas que est aliud quam deitas. Et sic ubi prius fuit summe beatus cum patre stante illa beatitudine cum patre assumpsit miseriam fraternam condicionis humane, et sic reliquit matrem synagogam, non deserendo membra predestinata in veteri testamento, sed cum eis assumendo ecclesiam gencium, (ut docet

Here the answer is that Christ espoused his mother, which is the total church, not as a whole, but as to the synagogue, from which Christ came forth according to the flesh; and so he left father and mother (as the holy doctors expound his saying, Matthew 19:5) [132]and cleaved to his wife; but that saying must be soundly understood.[8] For Christ, assuming what he was not before, did not lose or cease to be what he was, for he remains with absolute necessity eternally full God; but by assuming humanity he left being God alone, since he was humanity, which is other than the Godhead.[9] And so, whereas before he was supremely blessed with the Father, that blessedness with the Father remaining, he assumed the brotherly misery of the human condition; and so he left his mother, the synagogue, not by deserting the predestinate members in the old

Apostolus Romanorum IX°, 24). Verumptamen multos carnaliter Iudeos reliquit tamquam ineptos ad fabricam sancte matris ecclesie et secundum dotem novam adhesit uxori sue que fit plurimum ex gentibus, et sic honorat matrem ecclesiam tamquam ipso priorem et superiorem eo quod est duarum naturarum creatarum utraque. Et secundum corpus erat subditus parentibus suis carnalibus, ergo multo magis parentibus suis spiritualibus, hoc est, sibi et sancte matri ecclesie. Sicut enim tam secundum corpus quam animam erat subditus trinitati, sic secundum corpus erat subditus sibi secundum animam. Verumptamen videtur quod non sit senior quam universalis ecclesia sed econtra, cum ipsa sit coetanea cum mundo et senium dicit rei mortalis periodum naturalem. Sed est antiquior quam creatura alia, cum sit antiquus dierum, et sic est honorabilior et melior quam mater ecclesia, proporcionaliter ut deitas excedit creaturam.

testament, but by assuming with them the church of the gentiles (as the Apostle teaches, Romans 9:24).[10] Nevertheless he left many carnal Jews as unfit for the building of holy mother church, and according to the new dowry cleaved to his wife, who is made for the most part from the gentiles; and so he honours mother church as prior to himself and superior, in that she is each of the two created natures.[11] And according to the body he was subject to his carnal parents; therefore much more to his spiritual parents, that is, to himself and to holy mother church. For just as, both according to body and according to soul, he was subject to the Trinity, so according to the body he was subject to himself according to the soul.[12] Nevertheless it seems that he is not older than the universal church, but the reverse, since she is coeval with the world, and "old age" means the natural period of a mortal thing. But he is more ancient than any other creature, since he is the ancient of days; and so he is more honourable and better than mother church, in proportion as the Godhead exceeds the creature.[13]

¶3 132.30–133.25

[132]Sed difficultas est, utrum Christus secundum humanitatem sit forma ecclesie. Et videtur mihi quod sic; nam sicut forma vivificat et movet corpus ad actus [133]suos, limitans sibi et partibus suis crementum et alia accidentia naturalia, sic se habet nedum divinitas Christi extrinsecus sed humanitas eius intrinsecus ad sanctam matrem ecclesiam; unde blasphemum est cogitare quod subest potestati humane posse celebrare divorcium inter Christum et matrem suam, sicut carnaliter ymaginamur de defectu in carnali coniugio. Ecclesia enim est virgo spiritualiter intelligendo sicut tota multitudo celestium civium agnum sequencium (ut dicitur Apocalyps. XIV°, 1), unde tales virgines possunt post corrupcionem recuperare virginitatem, sicut non contingit de virginitate carnali, quamvis semper possunt esse virgines. Nam eo ipso, quo predestinatus habet celibatum, recipiens a sponso ecclesie semen fidei, gignendo filium Dei, est virgo, sponsa Christi, et per consequens, soror et frater eius germanus, et per idem, mater eius, cum gignit Christum spiritualiter ex semine sponsi in anima conversa ad Christum. Et istam materiam pulchre tangit decretum ex doctrina Augustini, ut patet XXVII q. prima: Nupciarum, ubi dicitur quod ecclesia tota virgo est, cum Apostolus IIª. Corinthiorum XI°, 2 dicit: Aptavi vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo. Et ab illo viro cum vivit perpetuo, non licet recedere spiritualiter fornicando, ideo coniugatus manet spiritualiter virgo. Sed

But there is a difficulty, whether Christ according to his humanity is the form of the church. And it seems to me that he is: for just as the form quickens the body and moves it to its [133]acts, assigning to it and its parts growth and the other natural accidents, so not only Christ's divinity from without but his humanity from within stands to holy mother church; hence it is blasphemous to think that it lies within human power to be able to celebrate a divorce between Christ and his mother, as we carnally imagine [it] from a defect in carnal marriage.[14] For the church is a virgin, understanding it spiritually, as is the whole multitude of the heavenly citizens following the Lamb (as is said, Apocalypse 14:1); hence such virgins can recover virginity after corruption, which does not happen with carnal virginity, although they can always be virgins.[15] For by the very fact that a predestinate [person] has celibacy, receiving from the bridegroom of the church the seed of faith, by begetting the Son of God he is a virgin, a bride of Christ, and consequently his sister and own brother, and by the same token his mother, since he begets Christ spiritually from the bridegroom's seed in a soul converted to Christ.[16] And this matter the decree touches finely, from the teaching of Augustine, as is clear in [Causa] 27, question 1, *Nuptiarum*, where it is said that the whole church is a virgin, since the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 11:2, says: "I have fitted you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."[17] And since that husband lives for ever, it is not

lawful to depart from him by fornicating spiritually; therefore one who is married remains spiritually a virgin. But ...[18]

Notes

1. ***Si quis ... posset dicere quod tyriaca est ... : ideo ...*****: the condition has no main clause;** ***ideo*** **opens the theriac itself.** ***Tyriaca*****: theriac, the physicians' antidote to poison (Glossary proposals).** ***Plus debita*****: beyond what is due.** ***Membra principalia ... sine macula vel ruga*****: the exactors claim for themselves what is said of the church (Eph. 5:27, "not having spot or wrinkle", DR). The canons that say the church is shaken but not overcome are not traced.**
2. ***Ex ore proprio*****: out of their own claim, turned against them.** ***Procuratorium*****: a proctor's letter of mandate. B** ***quod sint*** **(130.30). A margin** ***Dist. XL. Hic nota contra sanctitatem pape*** **(130.31). Loserth (130.31): Decretum I, D.40 c.2,** ***Non est facile*** **(the form is ours), Jerome to Heliodorus:** ***non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum, sed qui exercent opera eorum*** **(PL 187:213C–214B).**
3. ***Cauterium*****: the surgeon's searing iron; cf. 1 Tim. 4:2, "having their conscience seared" (DR,** ***cauteriatam*****). The cautery is presumably the censure by which the exactors extort (131.17).** ***Gracia*** **with a genitive: for the sake of.**
4. ***Probabilem evidenciam*****: evidence that makes it probable, not proof. The rule of "human laws" on payment to a false proctor is not traced.** ***Et si*****: even if.** ***In penam negligencie*****: as penalty for his negligence.**
5. Print ***creditor*****; Loserth's page foot (131.12): "perhaps** ***debitor*** **should be read". The one who owes tithes to the mother church is her debtor, and** ***creditor*** **gives no sense in the argument, so we translate** ***debitor*****. B** ***est fidelis*** **(131.13).**
6. ***Qua fronte*****: with what face, how shamelessly.** ***Non ... de illa, sed in illa*****: in the church but not of it (cf. 121.12, 06-b).** ***Ypocrisi atque mendaciis eius*****: we take** ***eius*** **with** ***proditorem*****, "her traitor".** ***De isto inferius*****: a cross-reference forward, not identified.**
7. A margin ***Sexta obieccio*** **(131.23); B lacks** ***sua*** **(131.25);** A_1 ***formosior*****, "more beautiful", for** ***formalior*** **(131.26).** ***Formalior*****: more of the nature of form, preparing the question of 132.30.** ***In racione secunda*****: the second argument of this chapter (06-a), presumably.** ***Ydemptificaret sibi*****: would make identical with himself.**
8. A margin ***Nota bene. Responsio: Christus desponsavit sibi matrem suam ecclesiam non secundum se totam*** **(131.29). Matt. 19:5, "shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife" (DR); Wyclif's past tenses (*reliquit ... adhesit*) apply it to Christ. The holy doctors' exposition is not traced. A** A_1 ***sane intelligere*** **(132.1–2).**
9. A margin ***De incarnacione*** **(132.3); A** ***assummendo*** **(132.5).** ***Assumens illud quod prius non erat*****: after the antiphon** ***Mirabile mysterium*** **of the Circumcision (octave of Christmas),** ***id quod fuit permansit, et quod non erat assumpsit*** **(Sarum Breviary, Procter–Wordsworth I, col. ccxciii); Wyclif's words echo the antiphon rather than quote it.** ***Reliquit ... esse solum Deus*****: this is his leaving of the father.** ***Cum fuit humanitas*****: "since he was [also] humanity", or "since there was [in him] a humanity"; doubtful.**
10. ***Ubi prius*****: whereas before. Rom. 9:24, "not only of the Jews but also of the Gentiles" (DR), is cited, not quoted; A B have** ***Romanorum*** **and a gap for the chapter (132.12), which Loserth filled.**
11. ***Carnaliter Iudeos*****: Jews after the flesh.** ***Secundum dotem novam*****: the new dowry of the incarnation (124.4–8, 06-c).** ***Duarum naturarum creatarum utraque*****: we take it of the church as made of both created natures, angelic and human, whereas Christ's created nature is human only; doubtful.**
12. Luke 2:51, "was subject to them" (DR), is alluded to. ***Sibi*****: to himself as God;** ***subditus sibi secundum animam*****: his body subject to his own soul.**
13. B ***ut ita sit*** **(132.25); A margin** ***Differencia inter senium et antiquitatem*** **(132.27). Dan. 7:9, "the ancient of days" (DR).** ***Senium*****: old age, the natural span of a mortal thing, said of creatures;** ***antiquior*****: more ancient, said of the Word.** ***Creatura alia*****: "any other cresture", as printed; as man he is also a creature.**
14. B margin (later hand) ***Utrum Christus secundum humanitatem sit forma ecclesie*****; A margin** ***Dubium*** **(132.30).** ***Forma*****: as the soul is the form of the body, giving it life, motion and growth, so Christ's humanity is to the church from within, his divinity from without.** ***De defectu in carnali coniugio*****: from the defects for which a carnal marriage may be dissolved.**
15. Apoc. 14:1 (as printed) shows the Lamb with the hundred forty-four thousand; ***agnum sequencium*** **is the language of 14:4, "for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth" (DR).** ***Quamvis semper possunt esse virgines*****: we take it that the carnally corrupted can always still be virgins in spirit; doubtful. A margin** ***Sponsa Christi*** **(133.7).**
16. B ***sponso semen fidei gignendi*** **(133.14).** ***Soror et frater ... mater*****: cf. Matt. 12:50, "he is my brother, and sister, and mother" (DR).** ***Germanus*****: full brother.** ***Habet celibatum*****: keeps the celibacy of the soul faithful to its one bridegroom.**
17. Loserth (133.19): Decretum II, C.27 q.1 c.41, ***Nuptiarum*** **(the form is ours), from Augustine,** ***De bono viduitatis*** **10.13 (Gratian "c. 8"; PL 187:1388B–1390A; PL 40:438). 2 Cor. 11:2, Vulgate** ***Despondi enim vos uni viro*****, DR "For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ"; Wyclif's** ***Aptavi*****, "I have fitted", is Augustine's reading (Gratian** ***Aptavit*****), translated. A B** ***II Cor. X*****, A corrected in the margin to** ***XI*** **(133.21).**
18. ***Cum vivit perpetuo*****: cf. Rom. 7:2, the woman "whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law" (DR). B** ***idem coniugatus*** **(133.24–25). The final** ***Sed*** **opens a sentence that continues in the next part (06-f, 133.26), where A has the margin** ***Dubium*****.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **130:** ***matris*** **(N is alinea letter)**
  - **130:** XL^a
  - **131:** ***filius***
  - **131:** ***melior***

- **131: *formalior* (print has formalior) [NW]**
- **132: *huma-* (huma-/nitatem hyphenated; main token holds first half (P is alinea letter))**
- **133: *II*ª**
- **132: ∅ (second half of huma-nitatem; JOIN onto 225 huma- -> humanitatem) [DELX]**
- **132: *humanitatem* (print: huma-/nitatem (agent 13); scan split)**
- **132: ∅ (margin mark)**
- **132: ∅ (joined at 225)**

• **OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 132 *Verumptamem* (read *Verumptamen*), *vivmcat* (read *vivificat*); p. 133 *II*ª. (stray point). Doubts: p. 131 *creditor* (Loserth: *debitor*); p. 132 *duarum naturarum creatarum utraque*.**

Part 6: Whether each member of the church is Christ; unity of person rightly understood

Loserth pp. 133.26–137.11

¶1 133.26–136.8

133.26 *Christ and every one of his members make up one Church,*
134.16 *We must be careful to understand rightly what is unity of person.*
135.4 *The predestinate may be truly said to be Christ.*
135.25 *To gain this unity with Christ we must throw awa all worldly affections.*
136.9 *This oneness with his members does not take from Christ's separate personality as head.*

[133] **dubium est tactum in quarto argumento de unitate numerali ecclesie, utrum Christus et quodlibet membrum ecclesie sit eadem ecclesia in numero, et videtur quod sic ex triplici conveniencia numerali. Primo, inquam, videtur quod quantumcunque partem anima hominis adequate actuaverit, quantumcunque materia corporea** [134] **varietur, manet continue idem homo, ut hic supponitur. Quare ergo non sic de homine ecclesie cuius forma est Christus manens in eternum? Secundum exemplum naturale est quod anima cuicunque membro copulata fuerit remanet tam anima quam membrum eadem persona hominis. Quare ergo non sic de Christo et ecclesia, sic quod quodlibet membrum eius sit Christus, ut sonant multe auctoritates? Tercio videtur quod sicut Christus mansit eadem persona in numero pro tempore mortis sue, tam in sepulchro mortuus quam in inferno vivus, ita videtur eandem personam ecclesie disiunctive regnantem in celo et peregrinantem in mundo, et sic Christus assumpsit ypostatice personam ecclesie peregrinantis in beata virgine. Hic oportet prudenter intelligere unitatem persone quam sancti exprimunt ex scriptura, ut patet de octo generibus unitatum quas exprimit beatus Bernhardus, ut recitatur in proximo capitulo in responsione ad tercium argumentum. Et tunc loquendo ad sensum doctorum concedenda videtur sentencia cuiuslibet horum trium argumentorum. Nam primo concedi potest quod manet continue eadem ecclesia que est collectim omnes predestinati et singillatim singuli, ac singulus eorundem omnes uniti in Christo capite, sed tunc oportet intelligere personam ut caput, basim tocius compositi et quodlibet membrum suum confuse tamquam absorptum in Christo absconditum, sic quod ecclesia Christi dicat Christum cum quocunque fideli sibi incorporatum. Si enim papa dicitur ecclesia propter virtutem quam influit in ecclesiam,** [135] **ut dicitur XXIV**ª**, q. prima: Quodcunque, et VII**ª**, q. prima Scire debes, multo**

There is a difficulty, touched on in the fourth argument, about the numerical unity of the church: whether Christ and each member of the church are the same church in number. And it seems that they are, from a threefold numerical agreement.[1] First, I say, it seems that, however great the part that the soul of a man has adequately actuated, and however much the bodily matter [134] **varies, the same man remains continuously, as is supposed here. Why then is it not so with the man of the church, whose form is Christ, abiding for ever? The second natural example is that, to whatever member the soul has been joined, both the soul and the member remain the same person of the man. Why then is it not so with Christ and the church, so that each member of it is Christ, as many authorities sound?[2] Thirdly, it seems that, just as Christ remained the same person in number for the time of his death, both dead in the sepulchre and alive in hell, so it seems that the same person of the church [remains], disjunctively reigning in heaven and on pilgrimage in the world; and so Christ assumed hypostatically the person of the pilgrim church in the blessed Virgin.[3] Here one must understand prudently the unity of person which the saints express from scripture, as is clear from the eight kinds of unity which blessed Bernard expresses, as is recited in the preceding chapter in the reply to the third argument.[4] And then, speaking according to the sense of the doctors, the teaching of each of these three arguments seems to be granted. For, first, it can be granted that there remains continuously the same church, which is collectively all the predestinate and severally each one, and each one of them [is] all, united in Christ the head; but then one must understand the person as the head, the base of the whole composite, and each of its members indistinctly, as absorbed, hidden in Christ, so that "the church of Christ"**

magis primus papa admirabilis dominus Jesus Christus. Iterum, si procedentes carnaliter ab Adam primo dicuntur fuisse ipse in quo originaliter peccaverunt, multo evidencius descendentes a secundo Adam dicentur fore secundus Adam in quo finaliter requiescent. Nam semen fidei quod est veritas est magis communicativum quam semen corporeum. Iterum, si combustibile vel ignibile ut lignum, carbo vel ferrum dicitur post ignicionem vulgariter esse ignis, cum alium ignem non percipimus hic nobiscum, multo magis spiritualiter comestus a Christo et plene digestus ab eo usque ad quartam digestionem que est glorificacio; ille ergo cui vivere Christus est, sicut sunt omnes sancti qui vivunt Deum: manifestum videtur ad hunc sensum quod sunt vita eorum que Christus est. Et patet quomodo verum est quod benefaciendo vel persequendo membra Christi, ut sic, taliter respicitur ipse Christus (ut patet Matthei XXV°, et Act. IX°, 5). Patet secundo quod martires nunquam possent sustinuisse tot passiones et fecisse tot mirabilia nisi per incorporantem et assimilantem membra capiti loquentem et operantem in eis dominum Jesum Christum. Et patet tercio causa quare Christus precepit suis declinare a mundo et sensibilibus et proicere totam scienciam, curam et affeccionem in ipsum, quia aliter non assimilantur sibi, quia nichil plus obstat assimilacioni cordi, capiti et corpori ecclesie quod est Christus, quam mundana affeccio. Ipse enim sepe in evangelio vocatur regnum celorum, corpus quod sequuntur aquile, et vita omnibus ipsum viventibus. Et patet [136] quomodo dicendum est ad secundam racionem et terciam, concedendo sentenciam catholicam, in qua manuducunt, et cavendo diligenter ab errore intellectus et scandalo auditorii. Posset enim seductus credere quod omnis christianus foret idem personaliter cum Christo secundum corpus et animam, ita quod non forent dispares persone essencie vel nature, quod foret nimis erroneum.

means Christ with every faithful [person] incorporated in him.[5] For if the pope is called the church on account of the power that he makes flow into the church, [135] as is said in [Causa] 24, question 1, *Quodcunque*, and [Causa] 7, question 1, *Scire debes*, much more the first pope, the wonderful Lord Jesus Christ.[6] Again, if those who proceed carnally from the first Adam are said to have been him in whom they originally sinned, much more evidently will those descending from the second Adam be said to be the second Adam, in whom they will finally rest. For the seed of faith, which is truth, is more communicative than bodily seed.[7] Again, if a combustible or ignitable thing, such as wood, coal or iron, is commonly said after ignition to be fire, since we perceive no other fire here with us, much more [is he Christ who is] spiritually eaten by Christ and fully digested by him, up to the fourth digestion, which is glorification; he, therefore, for whom to live is Christ, as are all the saints who live God: ... it seems manifest in this sense that they are their life, which is Christ.[8] And it is clear how it is true that, in doing good to or persecuting the members of Christ, as such, Christ himself is thus regarded (as is clear, Matthew 25, and Acts 9:5). It is clear, secondly, that the martyrs could never have endured so many sufferings and done so many wonders except through the Lord Jesus Christ, incorporating and assimilating the members to the head, speaking and working in them. And it is clear, thirdly, why Christ commanded his own to turn aside from the world and from perceptible things, and to cast all their knowledge, care and affection upon him: because otherwise they are not assimilated to him; for nothing hinders assimilation to the heart, the head and the body of the church, which is Christ, more than worldly affection.[9] For he is often called in the gospel the kingdom of heaven, the body which the eagles follow, and the life for all who live him. And it is clear [136] how one must answer the second and the third reason: by granting the catholic teaching to which they lead by the hand, and by guarding diligently against error of understanding and the scandal of the audience. For one led astray could believe that every Christian would be the same in person with Christ according to body and soul, so that they would not be disparate persons, essences or natures; which would be too erroneous.[10]

¶2 136.9–136.30

[136] Unde ne darem scandalum scole, distuli istam materiam. Aliquis enim est participative Christus ut quodlibet membrum eius, et aliquis personaliter ut solum ipsum caput, et illi qui non capiunt istam distinccionem, non capiunt sensum huius scripture Qui adheret

Hence, so as not to give scandal to the schools, I put off this matter. For someone is Christ by participation, as each member of his, and someone personally, as the head itself alone; and those who do not grasp this distinction do not grasp the sense of this scripture, "He who is joined to

Deo, unus spiritus est, et quomodo vinculum caritatis vel gracie est forcius quam vinculum naturale, ut dicit Augustinus in libro De Vera Religione XCI°, et tactum est cap. proximo in solucione tercii argumenti. Et patet quomodo intelligendi sunt doctores sancti, concedentes istam sentenciam, ut Augustinus, Crisostomus et Bernardus cum aliis qui sapiunt Deum et legem scripture. Et patet secundo quomodo tolli debent argumenta sophistica in ista materia, ut hii instant, si beati singuli sunt persona Christi, tunc sunt personaliter ipse Christus, et sic tantum Christus est homo, et omnis homo est omnis homo, cum aliis arguciis multipliciter in materia de trinitate. Sed hii non considerant quod multa possunt esse eadem persona communicative, participative vel secundum esse intelligibile, licet non personaliter, et patet quod consequencie multiplicate non procedunt.

God is one spirit", nor how the bond of charity or of grace is stronger than the natural bond, as Augustine says in the book *On True Religion*, 91, and as was touched on in the preceding chapter in the solution of the third argument.[11] And it is clear how the holy doctors are to be understood who grant this teaching, such as Augustine, Chrysostom and Bernard, with others who savour God and the law of scripture. And it is clear, secondly, how the sophistical arguments in this matter must be removed, as these [men] object: if the blessed, each of them, are the person of Christ, then they are personally Christ himself, and so only Christ is a man, and every man is every man, with other quibbles in manifold ways in the matter of the Trinity. But these do not consider that many things can be the same person communicatively, by participation, or according to intelligible being, though not personally; and it is clear that the multiplied inferences do not proceed.[12]

¶3 136.31–137.11

137.1 *In many cases the same words may be affirmed or denied according to the sense in which they are used,*

[136] Ultimo patet quod non est repugnancia in equivoce concedentibus et negantibus eandem proposicionem [137] sensibilem, ut unus catholice negat quod ipse est Christus, sicut fecit Baptista, quia non fuit personaliter ipse Christus, et alius concedit quod omnis qui Christum induit est Christus (ut patet de sanctis predictis). Unde captandum est auditorium cui sic varie est loquendum, nec videtur esse concedendum quod omnis christianus sit Deus, licet omnis res sit Deus, et omnis substancia secundum esse intelligibile est Deus (ut patet in materia De Ideis), ut omnis homo est idem Christo, quia eadem species, et Christus est deitas, et tamen non est idem deitati.

Lastly, it is clear that there is no repugnance in those who equivocally grant and deny the same [137] perceptible proposition: as one, in a catholic way, denies that he is Christ, as the Baptist did, because he was not personally Christ himself, and another grants that everyone who has put on Christ is Christ (as is clear of the saints aforesaid).[13] Hence one must take the measure of the audience to which one is to speak so variously; nor does it seem that it is to be granted that every Christian is God, although every thing is God, and every substance according to intelligible being is God (as is clear in the matter *On Ideas*); just as every man is the same as Christ, because [of] the same species, and Christ is the Godhead, and yet [a man] is not the same as the Godhead.[14]

Notes

1. The *Sed* that opens this sentence stands at the end of 06-e (133.25). A margin *Dubium*; A and B margin *Utrum Christus et quodlibet membrum ecclesie sit eadem ecclesia in numero* (A lacks *in*; in B by a later hand) (133.26). *Conveniencia numeralis*: agreement bearing on numerical identity; three analogies follow, which the answer grants in a sense (134.18 ff.).
2. B lacks *anima* (133.30). *Quantumcunque partem ... adequate actuaverit*: however much matter the soul informs as its adequate subject, the man is the same though the matter changes. *De homine ecclesie*: the church taken as one man, whose form is Christ (cf. 132.30–133.3, 06-e). *Persona hominis*: the man's one person, which soul and member alike are said to be. *Ut sonant*: as the words of many authorities run.
3. Loserth (134.11): a word seems to have dropped out; we supply "[remains]" from *mansit* before. *Disiunctive*: as either reigning in heaven or on pilgrimage in the world. *Ypostatice*: in the unity of the hypostasis (person); the claim is the objector's, and the answer guards it (136.3–8).
4. The tokens *be* before *Hic* and *j.* after *persone* (134.16–17) are not Wyclif's text and are not translated. A margin *Responsio. Nota quomodo omnia membra Christi sunt Christus cum correspondenciis* (134.16). *Hic* opens the answer. Bernard's eight kinds of unity: *De consideratione* V.8.18 (PL 182:799C–D). The back-reference is to ch. 5, the reply to its third argument (cf. Loserth's "above pag. 109" at 136.17).
5. *Collectim ... singillatim*: the church is all the predestinate taken together and each taken singly. *Ac singulus eorundem omnes uniti in Christo capite*: we take *omnes uniti* as predicate, "each of them [is] all, united in Christ the head"; "and each of them, all being united in Christ the head" is possible; doubtful. *Basim tocius compositi*: the head as the base of the whole composite. *Absconditum*: cf. Col. 3:3, "your life is hid with Christ in God" (DR).

6. A margin *Papa quomodo dicitur ecclesia* (135.1). Loserth (135.1): Decretum II, C.24 q.1 c.6, *Quodcumque*, and C.7 q.1 c.7, *Scire debes* (the form is ours): in the first (Augustine, *In Ioh.* 50) Peter, receiving the keys, signified the church; in the second (Cyprian) the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop (PL 187:1267A–B, 746B). *Virtutem quam influit*: the power he makes flow in (glossary: *influere*). "The first pope" is Wyclif's title for Christ.
7. B lacks *ab* (135.4). *In quo originaliter peccaverunt*: cf. Rom. 5:12 and the first and second Adam of 1 Cor. 15:45 (cited by sense only). *Communicativum*: apt to communicate itself.
8. The sentence after *multo magis* has no verb; we supply "[is he Christ who is]". Loserth (135.16): after *Deum* some words seem to have fallen out; we mark the gap "..." and translate what stands. *Quartam digestionem ... glorificacio*: the fourth of the four digestions (the glossary; Rom. 8:30). *Cui vivere Christus est*: Phil. 1:21, "For to me, to live is Christ" (DR; Loserth 135.15). *Vivunt Deum*: "live God", transitive, as printed (so *ipsum viventibus*, 135.30).
9. Matt. 25 (no verse printed): "as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (25:40, DR); Acts 9:5, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (DR). *Respicitur*: it is Christ himself who is regarded, that is, touched. B *assimulantur ... assimulacioni* (135.28–29). *Assimilacioni cordi, capiti et corpori ecclesie, quod est Christus*: datives of what one is assimilated to; the relative takes the whole.
10. *Corpus quod sequuntur aquile*: cf. Matt. 24:28, "Wheresoever the body shall be, there shall the eagles also be gathered together" (DR). *In qua manuducunt*: the second and third arguments lead by the hand to a catholic teaching, which is granted. B margin *Error intellectus et scandalum sunt cavenda* (136.3). *Dispares persone essencie vel nature*: printed without commas; we take three nouns.
11. A margin *Christus dupliciter dicitur* (136.9). *Scandalum scole*: offence to the schools (the university). *Solum ipsum caput*: A and B *Salomon* for *solum*; A_1 corrects in the margin to *solum* (136.12); Loserth prints *solum*, translated. 1 Cor. 6:17, Vulgate *Qui autem adhæret Domino*, DR "But he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit"; Wyclif's *Deo* translated (Loserth 136.14). *De vera religione* "XCI": B *de una religione* (136.17); §91 (PL 34:163): the union of minds outweighs ties of place and birth, which Wyclif paraphrases loosely.
12. A margin *Contra dicta* (136.21); B *Sed hiis* (136.27). *Sapiunt*: savour, have a taste for. The sophisms run from "the blessed are the person of Christ" to "only Christ is a man" and "every man is every man". *Secundum esse intelligibile*: in intelligible being, as a thing is in God's idea (cf. 137.6–8). *Consequencie multiplicate non procedunt*: the inferences so multiplied do not hold.
13. John 1:20, "I am not the Christ" (DR), cited by sense; *omnis qui Christum induit*: cf. Gal. 3:27, "have put on Christ" (DR). *Eandem proposicionem sensibilem*: the same perceptible proposition, the sentence spoken or written, granted by one in one sense and denied by another in another; hence "equivocally".
14. *Captandum est auditorium*: one must take the measure of the audience. *In materia De Ideis*: Wyclif's own treatment, the treatise *De ideis* (*Summa de ente* II, tract. 5; not read), which Wyclif cites for this same thesis in *De dominio divino* II c. 5 (197) and *De civili dominio* I c. 43 (369). *Ut omnis homo ...*: we take *ut* as "just as", illustrating the *licet*: every man is the same as Christ in species, and Christ is the Godhead, yet a man is not the same as the Godhead; doubtful.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 133: *Sed* (print: Q (alinea) Sed dubium; main lacks Sed, Q is not text)
  - 133: ∅ (the 1 is a margin enumeration; print: quod sic ex)
  - 134: *Tercio* (3 is a margin enumeration)
  - 134: *tam*
  - 135: *ut* (147b folio mark, Q alinea)
  - 135: *VII^a*
  - 135: *Christo*
  - 135: *Christus*
  - 135: *Christus*
  - 136: *et* (147b folio mark, R alinea glued)
  - 136: *sunt* (a is a margin letter)
  - 136: *secundo* (b is a margin letter) [NW]
  - 137: *fuit*
  - 137: *Christus*
  - 135: *XXIV^a*
  - 135: *q*
  - 135: *Quodcunque*
  - 136: *dicendum*
  - 134: ∅ (English side-note (careful to under-), not text) [-MARK]
  - 135: *XXV°*, [-VERSE]
- Not Wyclif's text, not translated: p. 134.16–17 *be* (before *Hic*) and *j.* (after *persone*), stray marks left in the Latin. Gaps marked by Loserth: 134.11 (verb supplied), 135.16 (marked "..."). Doubts: 134.20–21 *ac singulus eorundem omnes uniti*; 137.8 *ut omnis homo*.

Part 7: The eucharistic body and the church; the seventh argument: the grace of predestination and mortal sin

¶1 137.12–138.8
138.9 *Objection: Difficulties in the doctrine of predestination.*
138.17 *Answer: It is involved in Bradwardine's doctrine of God's unchangeableness in love or hate.*

[137]**Et ista sentencia tangitur in decretis, De Consecracione, d. II[a]. Quia passus, ubi Augustinus dicit quod Christus in eucaristia commendavit corpus suum quod eciam fecit nosmet ipsos. Nec aliter digne accipimus quoad beatitudinem, nisi simus predestinati ad corpus eius, ut vivamus in eternum (ut exponit Augustinus super Joh. in omelia). Glosa ergo sic distinguit: Non, inquit, fecit nos corpus suum quod natum est de virgine et sumitur in altari, sed corpus suum spirituale quod est ecclesia. Et illa unio est pure res huius sacramenti (ut dicam alibi). Videtur tamen planius dicendum et modo loquendi sanctorum conformius quod idem est corpus in numero quod est ecclesia, et corpus in sacramento ac natum de virgine, cum sit ipse Christus. Aliter tamen est Christus ipsum corpus quia personaliter, et aliter christianus quia sacramentaliter, unus proprie et alius participative; et sic credo ego propheciam Christi intelligi** [138] **Matth. XXIV°, 5: Multi venient in nomine meo, dicentes quia ego sum Christus, et multos seducent. Non enim reor aliquem christianum vel pseudoapostolum dicere quod ipse est Christus personaliter, sed sacramentaliter per incorporacionem in corpus Christi misticum; nam Ephesiorum V°, 27, scribitur: Dico autem sacramentum magnum in Christo et ecclesia. Illa autem pretensio solum nuncupative ecclesiasticorum seducit plurimos.**

And this teaching is touched on in the decrees, *De consecratione*, distinction 2, *Quia passus*, where Augustine says that "Christ in the eucharist commended his body, which he also made [to be] ourselves." Nor do we receive worthily, as regards blessedness, unless we are predestinate to his body, so that we may live for ever (as Augustine expounds on John, in a homily).[1] The gloss, therefore, distinguishes thus: "He did not," it says, "make us his body which was born of the virgin and is taken at the altar, but his spiritual body, which is the church." And that union is purely the reality of this sacrament (as I shall say elsewhere).[2] Yet it seems that one should say more plainly, and more in conformity with the saints' manner of speaking, that it is the same body in number which is the church, and the body in the sacrament and [the body] born of the virgin, since it is Christ himself. Yet Christ is that body in one way, because personally, and a Christian in another, because sacramentally: the one properly and the other participatively;[3] and so I believe Christ's prophecy is to be understood, [138] **Matthew 24:5: "Many will come in my name saying, I am Christ. And they will seduce many." For I do not think that any Christian or false apostle says that he is Christ personally, but sacramentally, through incorporation into the mystical body of Christ; for in Ephesians 5:32 it is written: "But I speak of a great sacrament in Christ and the church." And that pretension of those who are clergy only in name seduces very many.[4]**

¶2 138.9–138.16

[138]**Septimo et ultimo arguitur contra dicta de gracia predestinacionis que est insolubile ligamentum membrorum ecclesie. Mirum namque videtur multis quomodo aliquod accidens absolutum non potest perdi, quomodo ipsum stat cum mortali, et quomodo ipsa semper rectificat verum dominium, sic quod verum dominium stet cum mortali sicut stat cum prescito ad tempus iustificacio.**

Seventhly and lastly, it is argued against what was said of the grace of predestination, which is the indissoluble bond of the members of the church. For it seems a marvel to many how any absolute accident cannot be lost, how it stands with mortal [sin], and how it always rectifies true lordship, so that true lordship would stand with mortal [sin], as justification stands for a time with a foreknown [man].[5]

¶3 138.17–138.23

[138]**Hic dicitur quod quicunque posuerit sentenciam doctoris profundi in correlario XXIII[i] cap., libri primi, scilicet quod Deus non potest quicquam noviter diligere vel odire nec vicissim aliquid odire vel diligere plus vel minus. Quicunque, inquam illud concesserit habet ponere graciam predestinacionis ad sensum expositum.**

Here the answer is that whoever has posited the teaching of the profound doctor in the corollary of the twenty-third chapter of the first book, namely that God cannot newly love or hate anything, nor in turn hate or love anything more or less: whoever, I say, has granted that, has to posit the grace of predestination in the sense expounded.[6]

¶4 138.24–141.31
139.5 *Predestination is God's chief gift, and from its nature it cannot be given at all unless carried to fulfilment.*
139.20 *The predestinate may sin mortally,*
140.8 *but they have in them the grace of final perseverance.*
140.22 *Grace is not a thing but a quality by which man is pleasing to God.*
141.5 *A predestinate man sinning mortally, forfeits his dominion for the time.*

[138]**Unde non credo quemquam posse falsificare hoc fundamentum, quia indubie si est falsum est summe hereticum. Nam dato quod Deus quemquam predestinavit, sicut oportet ex fide scripture concedere Rom. VIII°, 30, de quadruplici gradu assimilacionis membrorum ecclesie, scilicet vocacione, predestinacione,** [139] **iustificacione et glorificacione, patet quod est dare correspondenter ad predestinacionem Dei eternam unam predestinacionem passivam que incepit sicut incepit esse, quod iste est predestinatus. Et illa predestinacio cum sit precipuum donum Dei gratissime datum, cum nemo potest mereri suam predestinacionem, eo quod non potest inesse nisi insit primo instanti predestinati, ideo patet ex communi sermone dicto de gracia quod illa predestinacio est gracia precipua, sed dicitur ad aliquid, sicut sciencia, meritum et multa talia que vocantur qualitates. Nulla enim qualitas est res absoluta, potens per se existere, et sic conceditur quod non potest perdi, cum sit fundamentum glorificacioni vel beatitudini, que nec eciam potest perdi. Nam si alterum istorum perditur, ipsum fuit, et si unquam fuit, cum non potest esse accidenter predestinacio vel beatitudo, ipsum semper erit, et per consequens, non perditur, ideo si perditur, non perditur; et patet ad primum mirum. Quo ad secundum dicitur, cum nemo dubitat quin multi predestinati peccarunt mortaliter, tam peccato originali quam actuali, ut patet de David, Petro et Paulo, et predestinacio non potest perdi iuxta dicta, manifestum est quod gracia predestinacionis stat cum peccato mortali, verumptamen repugnat peccato in spiritum sanctum, sicut gracia presciti secundum presentem iusticiam repugnat dampnacioni, licet aggregatum ex illa gracia et presciencia inferat necessario dampnacionem (ut patet XXXIII[a] q. quarta, Vasis ire, et capitulo sequenti ex testimonio Augustini). Unde concedendum est quod Deus infinitum plus diligit Petrum quoad mores eciam dum negat eum, quam diligit Scarioth dum est** [140] **in gracia, quia cum necessario semper eque diligit, semper diligit Petrum ad beatitudinem, cum scit eum finaliter converti, Scarioth autem semper diligit ad penam perpetuam, cum eternaliter videt omnia preterita vel futura sibi presencia, ut hic supponitur. Et patet quod gracia predestinacionis quam quidam vocant graciam prevenientem est quantumlibet melior quam gracia nude secundum presentem iusticiam quam quidam vocant graciam comitantem. Sed optima est gracia qua homo finaliter perseverat, que ducit ad confirmacionem et gloriam quam quidam vocant graciam consumantem. Et iste gracie sunt naturarum disparium, cum preter bonitatem supernaturalem dicunt relacionem ad mercedem.**

Hence I do not believe that anyone can falsify this foundation, for without doubt, if it is false, it is supremely heretical. For, granted that God has predestined anyone, as must be granted from the faith of scripture, Romans 8:30, concerning the fourfold degree of the assimilation of the members of the church, namely calling, predestination, [139] **justification and glorification, it is clear that one must grant, corresponding to God's eternal predestination, a passive predestination, which began as it began to be [true] that this man is predestinate.[7] And since that predestination is God's chief gift, most freely given, since no one can merit his own predestination, because it cannot be in [him] unless it is in [him] at the first instant of the predestinate [person], therefore it is clear from the common account given of grace that that predestination is a chief grace; but it is said relatively, like knowledge, merit and many such things that are called qualities. For no quality is an absolute thing able to exist by itself; and so it is granted that it cannot be lost, since it is the foundation of glorification or blessedness, which also cannot be lost. For if either of them is lost, it has been; and if it ever has been, since predestination or blessedness cannot be so accidentally, it will always be, and consequently it is not lost: therefore, if it is lost, it is not lost; and the answer to the first marvel is clear.[8] As to the second, the answer is: since no one doubts that many predestinate [persons] have sinned mortally, by original as well as by actual sin, as is clear of David, Peter and Paul, and predestination cannot be lost, according to what has been said, it is manifest that the grace of predestination stands with mortal sin; yet it is repugnant to the sin against the Holy Spirit, just as the grace of a foreknown [man] according to present justice is repugnant to damnation, although the aggregate of that grace and foreknowledge necessarily implies damnation (as is clear in [Causa] 23, question 4, *Vasis ire*, and in the following chapter, from the testimony of Augustine).[9] Hence it must be granted that God loves Peter infinitely more, even as to conduct, even while he denies him, than he loves Iscariot while he is** [140] **in grace; for since he necessarily always loves equally, he always loves Peter to blessedness, since he knows that he will finally be converted, but Iscariot he always loves to perpetual punishment, since he eternally sees all things past or future as present to him, as is supposed here.[10] And it is clear that the grace of predestination, which some call prevenient grace, is better to any degree whatever than grace merely according to present justice, which some call accompanying**

Nec est negandum quin prescitus habet graciam prevenientem, concomitantem et eciam consumantem opus aliquod bonum, sicut predestinatus habet graciam secundum presentem iusticiam. Sed sic contendens equivocat gratis eciam in signis nec effugiet, volens concordare in principiis fidei de modo diligendi Dei et methaphisica de quiditate gratie, quin proporcionaliter ut Deus diligit hominem est ipse gratus Deo, et proporcionaliter habet graciam, non quod illa gracia sit res, que posset per se existere, ut grosse et heretice concepit Pelagius, sed quod gracia sit qualitas spiritualis vel denominacio qua quis est formaliter gratus Deo. Et patet quod homo potest esse episcopus, dominus et minister ecclesie, eciam prescitus, existens in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, sed homo non est cum hoc membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Unde sicut heres parvulus caret dominio, dum tamen tempore suo sit [141]dominus omnium, sic predestinatus in mortali caret dominio, dum tamen alio tempore habet dominium, cum Deus eternaliter vult quod illud habeat pro suo tempore. Et si queratur, quare repugnat dominium in predestinato peccante mortaliter, dicitur quod ipse est tunc expers iusticie et cuiuscunque virtutis moralis, et per consequens, expers dominii quod oportet fundari in iusticia morali. Habet tamen iusticiam naturalem ad membra et omne quod placet Deo ut habeat, sicut et habet prescitus, et supra hoc habet iusticiam in predestinacione fundatam quam ad tempus obscurat piaculo. Unde non audeo dicere quod omnis peccans mortaliter non sit tunc membrum ecclesie, sicut videtur decretum dicere De Consecracione, d. I, Ecclesia, quia tunc esset tanta vel maior ambiguitas de prelatis, utrum sint membra ecclesie, sicut est de eis, ponendo solum predestinatos esse membra ecclesie, quia suspicionem probabilem habemus de mortali, qualem non habemus quod prepositi sunt presciti, et periret obediencia prelatis, cum non sic debemus honorare membra diaboli nec dare eis elemosinam, cum scimus quod egenis membris Christi est debita; sic enim vacaret beneficium intrusoris cotidie tam de iure quam de facto, et sic contra testimonia sanctorum nimis perturbaretur ecclesia. Alia autem sunt dubia concernencia ecclesiam que patent alibi, ut quod Christus existens humanitus fons vivus plenus gracie est quantumlibet melior moraliter quam totum residuum corpus ecclesie, cum gracia unionis sit alterius racionis quam gracia posteris derivata.

grace. But best is the grace by which a man finally perseveres, which leads to confirmation and glory, which some call consummating grace. And these graces are of disparate natures, since besides supernatural goodness they denote a relation to the reward.[11] Nor is it to be denied that a foreknown [man] has prevenient grace, concomitant grace, and also grace consummating some good work, just as a predestinate [man] has grace according to present justice. But one who contends thus equivocates gratuitously, even in the signs, and will not escape, if he will agree with the principles of faith on God's manner of loving and with metaphysics on the quiddity of grace, [from granting] that in proportion as God loves a man he is pleasing to God, and in proportion he has grace: not that that grace is a thing that could exist by itself, as Pelagius grossly and heretically conceived, but that grace is a spiritual quality or naming by which someone is formally pleasing to God.[12] And it is clear that a man can be a bishop, lord and minister of the church, even [one] foreknown, existing in grace according to present justice; but with this the man is not a member of holy mother church. Hence, just as a little heir lacks lordship, though in his own time he is to be [141]lord of all, so a predestinate [man] in mortal [sin] lacks lordship, though at another time he has lordship, since God eternally wills that he have it for his time.[13] And if it is asked why lordship is repugnant to a predestinate [man] sinning mortally, the answer is that he is then without justice and every moral virtue, and consequently without lordship, which must be founded in moral justice. Yet he has natural justice towards [his] members, and everything that it pleases God that he should have, as a foreknown [man] also has; and above this he has a justice founded in predestination, which for a time he obscures by sin.[14] Hence I do not dare to say that no one sinning mortally is then a member of the church, as the decree seems to say, *De consecratione*, distinction 1, *Ecclesia*; for then there would be as great or greater ambiguity about prelates, whether they are members of the church, as there is about them on positing that only the predestinate are members of the church, since we have a probable suspicion of mortal [sin], such as we do not have that superiors are foreknown; and obedience to prelates would perish, since we ought not so to honour the members of the devil, nor give them alms, since we know that [alms] are due to the needy members of Christ; for so the benefice of an intruder would be vacant daily, as much by right as in fact, and so, against the testimonies of the saints, the church would be too much disturbed.[15] And there are other doubts concerning the church which are clear elsewhere, such as that

Christ, existing as man a living fountain full of grace, is better morally to any degree whatever than the whole remaining body of the church, since the grace of union is of another kind than the grace derived to those who come after.[16]

Notes

1. Loserth (137.13): Decretum III, De cons. D.2 c.36, *Quia passus* (the form is ours); not found in Augustine; perhaps collected by Bede on 1 Cor. 10 from Augustine, *In Iohannem* tract. 26–27; see Friedberg's note 455. B margin, later hand, *Unio Christi cum ecclesia est res pure sacramenti* (137.13). *Quod eciam fecit nosmet ipsos*: "which he also made [to be] ourselves", as printed. *Super Joh. in omelia*: *In Ioh.* tract. 26 (PL 35:1612–1615). The canon is inscribed *Item Augustinus* (PL 187:1746C–1747A); Wyclif's wording follows Friedberg's text.
2. *Glosa*: the ordinary gloss on this canon, v. *quod etiam fecit*: *non ergo fecit nos corpus suum quod natum est de Virgine, & sumitur in altari ... sed fecit nos Christus corpus suum spirituale, scilicet ecclesiam fidelium* (glossed Decretum, 1588), quoted closely. *Res ... sacramenti*: the reality of the sacrament (what it signifies), against the sign. *Ut dicam alibi*: *De eucharistia* c. 5 (126: *panem et vinum figurare unionem ecclesie cum Christo qui est res huius sacramenti*).
3. B margins *Christianus sacramentaliter et participative* and *Corpus est Christus personaliter* (Loserth's line numbers 137.21 and 137.26, as the OCR gives them). *Planius*: against the gloss, Wyclif holds one body in number (church, sacrament, body born of the virgin), distinguished by mode: Christ personally, the Christian sacramentally.
4. A lacks *Matth. XXIV* and leaves a gap (138.1); A lacks *V* (138.6); A, wrongly, *ecclesiasticorum sacramentorum* (138.8). Matt. 24:5 as DR, less its "For" (Wyclif lacks *enim*; *dicentes quia* is recitative). The Ephesians words are 5:32 (printed 27): Vulgate *Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia*, DR "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church"; Wyclif's reordered Latin translated. *Solum nuncupative ecclesiasticorum*: we take *ecclesiastici* as the clergy (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), the false apostles of the prophecy; "those who belong to the church only in name" is possible.
5. A margin *VII. obieccio* (138.9); B margin, another hand, *Gracia predestinacionis non potest perdi. Stat cum mortali* (138.12). At 138.13 B reads *ipsa non* and A_1 *ipsum*; Loserth prefers A's *ipsa* (the grace). A and B *iustificato* for Loserth's *iustificacio* (138.16); the print is translated. *Accidens absolutum*: an accident that is a thing in its own right, not a relation. The three marvels are answered at 139.17, 139.20 ff. and 140.22 ff.
6. A margin *Responsio, utrum predestinacio stat in eodem cum mortali* (138.17). The manuscripts read *XXXII*; Loserth prints *XXIIIi* (an ordinal genitive) and refers to p. 79 above, naming the *doctor profundus* as Bradwardine (138.18): *De causa Dei* I, corollary to ch. 23 (Loserth's identification; the place is not independently checked).
7. A margin *De predestinacione* (138.24). Rom. 8:30 is cited, not quoted; Wyclif's list puts calling before predestination, where the verse has "whom he predestinated, them he also called" (DR). *Predestinacio passiva*: predestination as it is in the creature. *Incepit sicut incepit esse, quod iste est predestinatus*: we take *esse* with the *quod* clause, "began to be [true] that"; doubtful.
8. B *principium domini* for *precipuum donum* (139.5); A *nisi nisi* (139.7). *Dicitur ad aliquid*: it is said relatively (in the category of relation), like knowledge and merit, which are called qualities though they are not absolute things. The proof that it cannot be lost: what is lost must have been, and what has been predestination or blessedness was not so by accident, so it will always be; hence "if it is lost, it is not lost". The stray *X* before *Quo ad secundum* (139.20) is not Wyclif's and is not translated.
9. A *repungnat* (139.27); A A_1 lack *patet* (139.28). The text reads *XXXIII[a] q. quarta*; Loserth's reference is Decretum II, C.23 q.4 c.23, *Vasis ire* (139.29; the form is ours): the print's *XXXIII[a]* is given as 23 in the English, following Loserth's own reference. *Capitulo sequenti*: the next canon, or the next chapter of this treatise; we leave it open. *Aggregatum ... inferat*: the grace together with foreknowledge implies damnation, the grace alone does not.
10. Loserth (140.1): cf. Hus, *De ecclesia* (Opp. I, 200). B *ad peccatum* (140.2). *Quoad mores eciam*: "even as to conduct", as printed: the love follows the predestined end, not the present conduct; doubtful. *Scarioth*: Judas Iscariot.
11. A margin *Nota de gracia triplici*; B margin, another hand, *Gracia predestinacionis preveniens* (140.4); B margins *comitantem* (140.10), *Consumantem* (140.16). *Quantumlibet melior*: better to any degree one pleases. *Comitantem*, then *concomitantem* (140.17): "accompanying", "concomitant", kept apart as printed. *Dicunt relacionem ad mercedem*: denote a relation to the reward.
12. A margin *Quid est gracia*; B lacks *ut deus — habet* (140.21). *Equivocat gratis eciam in signis*: we take *gratis* as the adverb, "gratuitously", with a play on *gracia* and *gratus*; "equivocates on 'grace'" would want *gracia*; doubtful. *Nec effugiet ... quin*: will not escape [granting] that. *Gratus Deo*: pleasing to God. *Denominacio*: a naming taken from a relation to God's love.
13. B *et prescitus* (140.28); B lacks *tempore — alio* (140.31). *Heres parvulus ... dominus omnium*: Gal. 4:1, "As long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all" (DR). *In mortali*: in mortal sin. The stray *Y* before *Et si queratur* (141.5) is not Wyclif's and is not translated; A margin *Nota* (141.5).
14. *Iusticiam naturalem ad membra*: we take *membra* as the bodily members (natural justice in their ordering), which even the foreknown keeps, not the members of the church; doubtful. *Piaculo*: by sin. *Et omne quod placet Deo ut habeat*: we take it as a second object of *habet*; it may also depend on *ad* ("natural justice towards [his] members and towards everything that it pleases God that he should have"); doubtful.
15. A margin *Utrum omnis peccans mortaliter non sit tunc membrum ecclesie*; B margin *Episcopus in mortali non est protunc membrum ecclesie* (141.15). Loserth (141.13): Decretum III, De cons. D.1 c.8, *Ecclesia* (the form is ours). A has an erasure, *suspi ... bilem* (141.18–19). The argument: if mortal sin excluded from membership, doubt about prelates would be greater than on the predestinate-only definition, since mortal sin is often probably suspected and foreknowledge is not; obedience and alms would fail, and every intruder's benefice would fall vacant daily. *Tam de iure quam de facto*: by right (law) as well as in fact.

16. B lacks *cum* (141.30). *Fons vivus plenus gracie*: cf. John 1:14 (cited by sense). *Gracia unionis*: the grace of the hypostatic union, of another kind (*alterius racionis*, untagged here) than the grace derived to *posteris*, "those who come after", the members.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 137: *Consecracione*
  - 137: *II*^{a}
  - 137: *cum*
  - 137: *Christus*
  - 138: *Christus*
  - 138: *Christi*
  - 138: ∅ (print: Illa autem pretensio; no a)
  - 138: *pretensio* (print has pretensio) [NW]
  - 138: ∅ (of is the English side-note)
  - 138: *XXIII*^{i} (leaf zoom: dotted superscript i after XXIII)
  - 138: *membrorum*
  - 140: *gracia*
  - 141: *Christi*
  - 141: *intrusoris* (print has intrusoris) [NW]
  - 141: *Christus*
- Not Wyclif's text, not translated: p. 139.20 *X* (before *Quo ad secundum*), p. 141.5 *Y* (before *Et si queratur*), alinea letters left in the Latin. OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 139 *eracia* (read *gracia*); p. 140 *nnahter* (read *finaliter*). Printed references corrected in the English (modern references, card): 138.6 *V°, 27* → Eph. 5:32; 139.29 *XXXIII*^{a} → C.23 (Loserth's own reference). Doubts: p. 140.18 *gratis*; p. 139.30 *quoad mores*.

Chapter 7

Part 1: The Westminster sanctuary case: it is lawful to take the fugitives out

Loserth pp. 142.3–146.28

¶1 142.3–143.30
142.3 *As commanded by the king, we give our honest opinion on the case laid before us.*
143.5 *The question is whether it was lawful to take certain prisoners out of sanctuary at Westminster.*
143.14 *Taking the case stated as true, it was lawful for three reasons:*
143.18
1. God's law as given Ex. XXI, 14.
143.31
2. The precedent of Solomon with Joab,

[142]**Convenimus ex mandato domini regis ad dicendum secundum videre nostrum veritatem in casu nobis exposito ad honorem Dei, ad profectum ecclesie et ad stabilimentum prosperum regni nostri, et hec tria in tractatu nostro se invicem consequuntur. Casus autem nobis expositus in compendio fuit iste: Duo viri armorum, homines legii regis nostri fuerunt inobedientes regi et legibus suis, et per consequens regno, in redempcione unius captivi Hyspaniensis, filii comitis de Dene in cuius custodia et redempcione rex noster secundum leges suas debuit habere precipuum interesse. Unde quia noluerunt reddere regi nostro captivi custodiam per quem captivum regnum redimeret multos milites suos in Hispania captivatos, mandati sunt per regem et regnum tuciori regis carcere mancipari. Sed secundo superaddentes inobediencie priori exierunt contra mandatum regis violente de carcere et prostrato custode carceris intrarunt septa Westmonasterii, in quibus vendicarunt omnino eximi a subieccione regis ex illius ecclesie libertate. Et tercio,** [143]**minando quod exirent de terra nostra coniuncti nostris capitalibus inimicis, dicuntur arma sibi parasse, literas salvi conductus ab hostibus procurasse et consilium domini nostri regis tamquam falsum publice difidasse. Istis suppositis cum multis aliis que nunc esset nimis longum disserere, queritur utrum licet regi et regno suo in casu isto facere ut dicti captivi de Westmonasterio extrahantur. Et dicunt canoniste et civiliste tam regni nostri quam imperii quod, supposita veritate casus, non obstante quocunque privilegio Westmonasterii licet eos extrahere. Theologi autem dicunt concorditer quod, supposita veritate casus expositi, licet eos extrahere, servando tamen eos in vita et membris incolumes. In isto autem articulo intendo condicionaliter ex supposicione veritatis casus narrati procedere, et nec invasionem occisi nec suam occisionem propter ignoranciam occulte circumstancie comprobare. Quibus suppositis conclusio theologorum suadetur tripliciter. Pro primo argumento suppono primo legem domini Exodi XXI° capitulo, 14, datam Moysi: Si quis de industria occiderit proximum suum et per insidias, ab altari meo evellas eum, ut occidatur, ubi notatur primo ex natura condicionalis quod lex ista debet esse perpetua. Secundo notatur quod mora talis**

We have come together at the command of our lord the king to speak the truth, as we see it, on the case set before us, to the honour of God, to the profit of the church and to the prosperous establishment of our kingdom; and these three follow one another in our treatise.[1] And the case set before us was, in brief, this: two men-at-arms, liege men of our king, were disobedient to the king and to his laws, and consequently to the kingdom, in the ransom of a Spanish captive, the son of the count of Dene, in whose custody and ransom our king, according to his laws, ought to have had the chief interest. Hence, because they would not render to our king the custody of the captive, through which captive the kingdom might ransom many of its knights taken captive in Spain, they were ordered by the king and the kingdom to be committed to the king's safer prison. But, secondly, adding to their former disobedience, they went out of prison violently, against the king's command, and, having struck down the keeper of the prison, entered the precincts of Westminster, in which they claimed to be wholly exempt from subjection to the king by the liberty of that church.[2] And thirdly, [143]**threatening that they would leave our land, joined to our chief enemies, they are said to have prepared arms for themselves, to have procured letters of safe-conduct from the enemy, and publicly to have defied the council of our lord the king as false. These things supposed, with many others which it would now be too long to discuss, it is asked whether it is lawful for the king and his kingdom, in this case, to cause the said captives to be taken out of Westminster.[3] And the canonists and civilians, both of our kingdom and of the empire, say that, the truth of the case being supposed, notwithstanding any privilege of Westminster, it is lawful to take them out. But the theologians say with one accord that, the truth of the case set forth being supposed, it is lawful to take them out, yet keeping them unharmed in life and limb.[4] And in this article I intend to proceed conditionally, on supposition of the truth of the case narrated, and, from ignorance of a hidden circumstance, to approve neither the assault on the man who was killed nor his killing.[5] These things supposed, the conclusion of the theologians is argued for in**

in sanctuario non debet esse ex aliquo privilegio perpetuo constipata, ideo dicit evellas eum. Tercio notatur quod summus gradus sanctitatis loci non debet aliquem talem in immunitate ecclesiastica conservare, cum ab altari qui est locus dignissimus ecclesie talis homicida evelli debeat.

three ways. For the first argument I suppose, first, the law of the Lord given to Moses, Exodus 21:14: "If a man kill his neighbour on set purpose and by lying in wait, take him away from my altar, that he may be killed"; where it is noted, first, from the nature of the conditional, that this law ought to be perpetual. Secondly, it is noted that such a stay in sanctuary ought not to be made fast by any perpetual privilege; hence it says "take him away". Thirdly, it is noted that the highest degree of the holiness of a place ought not to keep any such man in ecclesiastical immunity, since such a homicide must be taken away from the altar, which is the worthiest place of the church.[6]

¶2 143.31–144.22
144.13
3. because of danger to the realm.
144.23 *O. T. precedents are valid, or there is no authority for, tithes.*

[143]Secundo supponatur factum sapientis regis Salomonis III° Regum 2° cap., ubi fecit occidi Joab ad cornu [144]altaris in tabernaculo domini, non obstante quod in exercitu patris sui David plus aliis militibus laboravit. Cuius occisionis doctores triplicem causam eliciunt ex scriptura. Primo, quia occidit Abner et Amasan tempore pacis ex vulpina industria, et tunc non gauderet immunitate ecclesie ex lege iam proximo allegata. Secundo, quia conspiravit cum Adonia et Abiathar contra regem. Et tercio precipue, quia rex timuit sibi quod Joab superstes in regno pacem populi perturbaret. Ideo subditur: David autem et semini eius et domui et trono eius sit pax in eternum a domino. Ex istis tercio sic arguitur ex lege Dei quam non est fas homini inpugnare, licet nedum de altari Dei propter timorem perturbacionis regni fugitivum ad occidendum extrahere, sed ibidem eum occidere, ut patet ex dictis; sed infinitum minus esset fugitivum salvum in vita et membris extrahere; ergo, posita vehementi suspicione regis et sui consilii de prodicione vel perturbacione regni per tales fugitivos futura, licet eos secundum formam predictam extrahere et in tuta custodia conservare.

Secondly, let the deed of the wise king Solomon be supposed, 3 Kings 2, where he had Joab killed at the horn [144]of the altar in the tabernacle of the Lord, notwithstanding that in the army of his father David he had laboured more than the other knights.[7] Of this killing the doctors draw a threefold cause from scripture. First, because he killed Abner and Amasa in time of peace with a fox's cunning, and so would not enjoy the immunity of the church, by the law just cited. Secondly, because he conspired with Adonias and Abiathar against the king. And thirdly and chiefly, because the king feared for himself that Joab, surviving in the kingdom, would disturb the peace of the people. Hence it is added: "But to David and his seed, and his house, and to his throne, be peace for ever from the Lord."[8] From these, thirdly, it is argued thus, from the law of God, which it is not right for man to impugn: it is lawful not only to drag a fugitive from God's altar to be killed, for fear of disturbance of the kingdom, but to kill him there, as is clear from what has been said; now it would be infinitely less to take a fugitive out safe in life and limb; therefore, granted a vehement suspicion on the part of the king and his council of treason or disturbance of the kingdom to come through such fugitives, it is lawful to take them out in the aforesaid form and to keep them in safe custody.[9]

¶3 144.23–145.18
145.1
2. In this case there are the same grounds for action as in Joab's.
145.10
3. It is unsafe to wait until treason is completed.
145.19

[144]Nec valet dicere quod lex antiqua non obligat homines legis nove, tum quia super ista lege veteri fundant leges ecclesie iura sua, ut patet de quattuor qui non gaudebunt immunitate ecclesie, non licet ergo destruere principia legis ecclesie, tum quia arguitur ex legis divine iusticia per locum a maiori facti nostri iusticia, tum eciam quia tunc non remaneret nobis ecclesiasticis titulus decimas vendicandi, cum non ex lege nova sed veteri autorizatur nobis solucio decimarum.

Nor does it avail to say that the old law does not bind men of the new law: both because the laws of the church found their rights on this old law, as is clear of the four who shall not enjoy the immunity of the church (it is not lawful, therefore, to destroy the principles of the church's law); and because the justice of our deed is argued from the justice of the divine law by the topic from the greater; and also because then there would not remain to us churchmen a title for claiming tithes, since the payment of

4. Solomon's act is approved by Scripture.

[145]Nec valet secundo quod Joab commisit peccata gravia, que plus movebant quam suspicio de perturbacione futura, tum quia sic est in casu nostro de superba eorum inobediencia, tum eciam quia certum videtur ex textu quod timor perturbacionis regni Salomonis fuit causa occidendi Joab precipua, quia ignoravit si priora crimina sint dimissa; ideo punicio quattuor personarum de quibus ibi fit mentio fuit precipue ad pacificandum in posterum regnum suum. Nec valet tercio dicere quod expectaretur quousque probata fuerit regni perturbacio sive prodicio, quia illa probacio foret nimis diutina contra prudenciam precavendi regno pericula; sed hoc videtur probabile quod non inferretur eis lesio corporalis, antequam culpa eorum fuerit notoria vel secundum leges patrie probata legitime. Aliud enim est dampnare hominem de reatu et aliud ad tutelam regni servare ipsum vehementer suspectum in salva custodia.

tithes is authorized to us not by the new law but by the old.[10] [145]Nor does it avail, secondly, [to say] that Joab committed grave sins, which moved [Solomon] more than the suspicion of future disturbance: both because it is so in our case with their proud disobedience, and also because it seems certain from the text that fear of the disturbance of Solomon's kingdom was the chief cause of killing Joab, since he did not know whether the earlier crimes had been forgiven; hence the punishment of the four persons of whom mention is made there was chiefly to pacify his kingdom for the future.[11] Nor does it avail, thirdly, to say that one should wait until the disturbance of the kingdom or the treason has been proved, for that proof would be too protracted, against the prudence of guarding the kingdom from dangers beforehand; but this seems probable, that bodily harm should not be inflicted on them before their guilt is notorious or legitimately proved according to the laws of the homeland. For it is one thing to condemn a man for his guilt, and another to keep him, vehemently suspected, in safe custody for the protection of the kingdom.[12]

¶4 145.19–146.28
146.1
2. The King's subjects should obey him in everything not contrary to God's law.

[145]Quarta ficticia qua dicitur Salomonem in proposito illicite iudicasse non habet colorem, cum sic diceretur de opere legitimo aliorum quos sequimur ex auctoritate scripture. Cum enim scriptura tantum commendat sapienciam suam et non reprobat sed multiplici municione approbat illud factum, videtur ex sufficiencia scripture quod fuit factum legitimum. Sic enim supponunt leges humane bonitatem persone quousque probetur contrarium; immo omnes leges humane approbant iudicis inferioris iudicium quousque eius iniusticia convincatur. Secundo principaliter arguitur sic ad idem: Videtur quod quilibet legius homo regis Anglie tenetur tantum [146] vel plus obedire sibi, sicut monachus abbati in quibuscunque que non sunt contraria legi Dei, sed monachus tenetur virtute obediencie et sub pena carceris obedire abbati in hiis que non sunt contraria legi Dei: ergo multo magis ad tantam obedienciam tenetur quilibet Anglicus suo regi specialiter in necessariis regimini regni sui. Ex quo sequitur quod servientes regis de sua privata familia tenentur parere sibi et suo sapienti consilio in huiusmodi licitis et honestis; sed mandatum est per regem et dictum consilium (sicut narratur) ut ad pacificandum regnum extrahant a Westmonasterio inobedienciarios predictos; ergo cum mandatum hoc vergit ad necessitatem regiminis regni sui, non obvians sed consonans legi Dei, sequitur quod dicti subditi tenentur in hoc parere monitis regis sui. Assumptum patet ex hoc quod obligacio regi est maior, cura regiminis regni est necessarior

The fourth fiction, by which it is said that Solomon judged unlawfully in the matter in hand, has no colour, since so it would be said of the lawful work of others whom we follow on the authority of scripture. For since scripture so commends his wisdom, and does not reprove but approves that deed with manifold defence, it seems from the sufficiency of scripture that it was a lawful deed. For so human laws presume the goodness of a person until the contrary is proved; indeed, all human laws approve the judgment of a lower judge until his injustice is proved against him.[13] Secondly and principally, it is argued thus to the same [end]: it seems that any liege man of the king of England is bound to obey him as much [146]or more than a monk his abbot, in whatever things are not contrary to God's law; now a monk is bound, by virtue of obedience and under pain of prison, to obey his abbot in those things that are not contrary to God's law: therefore much more is every Englishman bound to such obedience to his king, especially in things necessary to the government of his kingdom.[14] From which it follows that the king's servants of his private household are bound to obey him and his wise council in lawful and honest things of this kind; now it was commanded by the king and the said council (as is narrated) that, to pacify the kingdom, they should take the aforesaid disobedient men out of Westminster; therefore, since this command tends to the necessity of the government of his kingdom,

et pena delinquencium in regem est ex scriptura fundabilior. Nam beatus Petrus precipit christianis quod sint subiecti regibus Iª Petri II°, 13, et Apostolus precipit Rom. XIII°, 1 et Heb. XIII°, 17, Christi discipulis obedire prepositis, immo in veteri lege, quia Semei egressus est extra Jerusalem contra monita regis sui, ideo ex precepto sapientis Salomonis iustissime est occisus. Patet historia III° Reg. II° cap. Non autem inveniuntur tante evidencie ex scriptura quod monachus sub tanta pena parere debet abbati in monitis preter fidem.

not opposing but agreeing with God's law, it follows that the said subjects are bound in this to obey the admonitions of their king.[15] The assumption is clear from this, that the obligation to the king is greater, the care of governing the kingdom is more necessary, and the punishment of offenders against the king is better grounded in scripture. For blessed Peter commands Christians to be subject to kings, 1 Peter 2:13, and the Apostle commands the disciples of Christ, Romans 13:1 and Hebrews 13:17, to obey superiors; indeed, in the old law, because Semei went out of Jerusalem against the admonitions of his king, therefore by the command of the wise Solomon he was most justly killed. The story is clear, 3 Kings 2. But such great evidence is not found in scripture that a monk must obey his abbot under so great a penalty in admonitions outside the faith.[16]

Notes

1. Chapter 7 opens with Wyclif's determination on the Westminster sanctuary case of 1378, given "at the command of our lord the king"; the occasion was the violation of the abbey's sanctuary on 11 August 1378, and Wyclif's opinion was given at the parliament held at Gloucester (20 October–16 November 1378) (Loserth, Introduction, pp. ix–x, xxv). For this chapter Loserth also collates D (Dublin, TCD C.1.23). B *ad dicendam* (142.2); D *et stabilimentum* (142.4). *In tractatu nostro*: in our treatment [of the case].
2. A margin *Casus* (142.6); B *fuerint* (142.9). Loserth's foot-note (p. 142) quotes the continuation of the *Eulogium historiarum*: the two would not produce their prisoner at the king's mandate, were sent to the Tower, struck down their keeper and fled to Westminster, where the constable of the Tower came to take them back and "Johannes Haule", resisting, was killed, while "Ricardus Shakille" went with him (names as Loserth prints them; usually given as Robert Hauley and John Shakell); he also cites the Rolls of Parliament III. *Filii comitis de Dene*: the son of the count of Denia, taken at Nájera in 1367; the son was held as hostage for his father's ransom (Loserth, Introduction, p. ix). *Tuciori regis carcere*: the Tower, by the *Eulogium*. A A_1 B *exui a* (142.21–22); Loserth prints *eximi a*, translated. *Vendicarunt*: claimed.
3. A A_1 *convicti* for *coniuncti* (143.1). A margins *Utrum licet in casu infra posito invadere monasterium* (143.4), *Questio* (143.6). *Difidasse*: defied, renounced as an enemy (the feudal *diffidatio*). *Captivi*: Wyclif now calls the two men-at-arms "captives", that is, prisoners.
4. A margins *Responsio legistarum* (143.8), *Responsio theologorum* (143.11). A A_1 B lack *casus* (143.15). *Civiliste*: the civilians, doctors of the civil (Roman) law. *Theologi autem*: adversative, since the theologians add the condition.
5. *Nec invasionem occisi nec suam occisionem*: we take *occisi* as the man killed in the sanctuary (Haule, by Loserth's note) and *suam* as his; "the assault made by the slain man" is grammatically possible; doubtful. Wyclif withholds judgment on both.
6. Exod. 21:14, Vulgate *Si quis per industriam ... evelles eum, ut moriatur*, DR "If a man kill his neighbour on set purpose, and by lying in wait for him: thou shalt take him away from my altar that he may die"; Wyclif's *de industria ... evellas ... ut occidatur* translated. A margin *Duplex supposicio* (143.22). D *natura condicionali* (143.23); the print *ex natura condicionalis*, "from the nature of the conditional [proposition]", is translated: a conditional law holds whenever its condition is met. *Constipata*: made fast, secured.
7. B lacks *Salomonis — in thabernaculo* (143.31). 3 Kings 2:28–34: Joab flees to the tabernacle and takes hold of the horn of the altar, and Solomon has him killed there (cited, not quoted).
8. D *Prima* (144.4). Abner and Amasa: 3 Kings 2:5, 32; Adonias and Abiathar: 2:22, 28 (cited). 3 Kings 2:33 as DR (Loserth 144.10); Wyclif has *trono eius* and *in eternum* for the Vulgate's *throno illius* and *usque in æternum*.
9. The stray *of* before *Ex istis* (144.13) is the English side-note, not translated. D *Ex istis tribus* (144.13); A margin *Prima responsio* (144.13); B margin *iubet occidere* (144.16). *Sed infinitum minus ...*: the minor premiss ("now"). *Secundum formam predictam*: unharmed in life and limb, as the theologians said.
10. A margin *Ficticia* (144.23); A so marks each answered pretext (145.1, 145.10, 145.19). D *qui nunc gaudebunt* (144.26); B *distrahere principia* (144.26–27); B *facti ut nostri* (144.28); D *ecclesiasticus* (144.29–30). *Quattuor qui non gaudebunt*: the canon law's classes excluded from sanctuary: the public highwayman and the nocturnal despoiler of fields (*X* 3.49.6) and those who kill or maim in church (3.49.10); no text counts four (the ordinary gloss on 3.49.10 and Hostiensis both say *Inter alia* excepts only two); four results if those who kill and those who maim in church are counted apart. *Per locum a maiori*: by the topic from the greater: if the divine law permits killing at the altar, the lesser act is just (the glossary). *Nobis ecclesiasticis*: Wyclif counts himself among the clergy (glossary: *ecclesiastici*, CONTEXTUAL).
11. A B *superbia* (145.4); B margin, later hand, *Absque completa investigacione suspicionis est occidendus* (145.6); B *Ideo punicior* (145.7–8). *Quattuor personarum*: Adonias, Abiathar, Joab and Semei (3 Kings 2:25, 27, 34, 46; cited). *Ignoravit*: Solomon did not know.
12. D *illa paracio* (145.11–12) and *diutina que excluderet prudenciam* (145.12). The manuscripts read *inferreretur*; Loserth prints *inferretur* (145.17). *Leges patrie*: "the laws of the homeland" (glossary: *patria*, earthly sense), that is, the laws of the land.

13. A B *tante commendat* (145.22); D *bonitates persone quousque probatur* (145.26). *Ficticia*: a fiction, a feigned ground (the glossary). *Colorem*: colour, a plausible ground (the glossary), not "pretext". *Municione*: defence, support. The presumption of goodness until the contrary is proved is a maxim of the laws, not traced to a single text; cf. X 2.19.7, where the ordinary's letters stand *donec probetur contrarium*. *Convincatur*: is proved against him.
14. B *Tercio principaliter* (145.30); A margin *Secunda responsio* (145.30). *Legius homo*: liege man. *Sed monachus …*: the minor premiss. D lacks *specialiter* (146.6); A margin *Nota de obediencia ad regem continue infra* (146.6).
15. D *supradictos* (146.12) and *mandatum huiusmodi* (146.13). *Inobedienciarios*: the disobedient men, the negative of the glossary *obedienciarius* (the glossary).
16. D *egressus fuit* (146.23). 1 Pet. 2:13, Rom. 13:1 and Heb. 13:17 are cited, not quoted; DR's "Obey your prelates" (Heb. 13:17) renders the Vulgate *præpositis*, here "superiors" (the glossary). Semei: 3 Kings 2:36–46. *Assumptum*: the minor premiss of the second argument. *Fundabilior*: better grounded. *Preter fidem*: outside matters of faith.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 142: *CAP. VII.*
  - 143: *minando* (148b folio mark, A alinea)
  - 143: *condicionaliter* (condicio-/naliter hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 143: *primo* (print: suppono primo legem)
  - 143: *Regum*
  - 143: *2°* (arabic 2 with degree sign)
  - 144: *semini* (10 is the line number)
  - 144: *lege* (30 is the line number)
  - 145: *gravia*
  - 146: *Iª*
  - 146: *II°*
  - 146: *13*
  - 146: *III°*
  - 146: *II°*
  - 145: *Nec* (148c folio mark glued)
- Not Wyclif's text, not translated: p. 144.13 *of* (before *Ex istis*), a word of the English side-note left in the Latin. OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 143.17 *ventatis* (read *veritatis*); p. 143.31 *111°* (read *III°*); p. 145.1 *peccata.* (stray point). Doubts: p. 143.18 *invasionem occisi*.

Part 2: The king's command does not oppose God's law, and the privilege does not cover the case

Loserth pp. 146.29–148.24

¶1 146.29–147.24

146.29 *This command was not so contrary to the law of God.*

147.1 *God's law provides no refuge for debtors or criminals.*

147.25 *It is said that Westminster has a privilege to shelter all criminals,*

[146] Quod autem preceptum regis in hac parte non obviat legi Dei nec veris privilegiis Westmonasterii sic ostendo: Scrutetur homo totam scripturam et non inveniet quod pro debito, pro occisione iniusta, [147] immo generaliter pro quocunque peccato debet pro fugus habere refugium, quia tunc Deus foveret proditorem proprium in suo crimine; quod non potest. Unde Deuteronomii XIX° et Josue XX°, ubi datur lex profugorum et constituuntur civitates refugii, limitatur quod solum occidentes nescii et inmunes criminis debent ibi habere refugium, ne a cognacione occisi effundatur sanguis innoxius, nec habitabant ibi perpetuo, sed Levite habebant custodiam sex civitatum refugii, nec acceptarent nisi insontes qui a casu preter intentum fratrem suum occiderint; illi autem non exibant civitatem nisi ad purgandum se in loco occisionis quod ignoranter occiderint fratrem suum usque ad mortem summi pontificis. Tunc enim redirent libere in domum propriam extra civitatem refugii; patet ista lex Numeri

Now, that the king's command in this matter does not oppose God's law, nor the true privileges of Westminster, I show thus.[1] Let a man search the whole of scripture, and he will not find that for debt, for unjust killing, [147] indeed in general for any sin whatever, a fugitive ought to have refuge; for then God would cherish his own traitor in his crime, which he cannot do.[2] Hence in Deuteronomy 19 and Joshua 20, where the law of fugitives is given and the cities of refuge are appointed, it is assigned that only those who kill unknowingly and are free of crime ought to have refuge there, lest innocent blood be shed by the kindred of the slain; nor did they dwell there for ever, but the Levites had the custody of the six cities of refuge, and were to accept none but the guiltless who had killed their brother by chance, beyond their intent; and these did not go out of the city, except to clear themselves at the place of the killing [of the charge, showing] that they had killed their brother unknowingly, until

XXXV° et Josue XX°. Si ergo in tota lege nova et veteri (ubi diffuse tangitur ista materia) non limitatur locus refugii nisi insontibus qui casualiter fratrem suum occiderint, que foret in christianis ceca presumpcio sub colore pietatis defendere hostes Dei, regis et regni? Per hec patet responsio ad argumentum quod fundatur in privilegio concesso a rege monasterio supradicto.

the death of the high priest. For then they would return freely to their own house outside the city of refuge; this law is clear in Numbers 35 and Joshua 20.[3] If, therefore, in the whole law, new and old (where this matter is touched on at length), the place of refuge is assigned only to the guiltless who have killed their brother by chance, what blind presumption would it be in Christians, under colour of piety, to defend the enemies of God, of the king and of the kingdom? By these things the answer is clear to the argument that is founded on the privilege granted by the king to the aforesaid monastery.[4]

¶2 147.25–148.24
148.1 *Such a privilege does not go beyond the explicit intentions of the granter,* 148.8 *or the grant would be invalid as injurious to God and the kingdom.*

[147]Supponitur autem quod habeat privilegium sub isto tenore verborum quod liceat sibi tueri quoscunque fugitivos ex quacunque causa, eciam in causa lese regie maiestatis, adhuc totum istud est generalis concessio sed secundum leges hominum in generali concessione principis nunquam veniet speciale, nisi quod concederetur a principe in casu quo fuerit particulariter [148] explicatum. Cum ergo non sit in potestate principis concedere quod vergeret ad Dei iniuriam, ad destruccionem regni sui, ad enervacionem regalie et legum per quas regeret regnum suum, patet quod illud suppositum in casu nobis exposito non includitur in illo privilegio generali. Quid queso foret magis ad Dei iniuriam quam facere domum suam speluncam latronum? aut quid foret magis destructivum regnorum quam protegere in nidis ad hoc deputatis hostes Dei ecclesie atque regni. Ecclesiastici X°, 8 scribitur: Regnum de gente in gentem transfertur propter iniusticias, iniurias, contumelias et diversos dolos. Cum ergo secundum sanctos qui emendare potest et negligit absque dubio participem criminis ut sic se constituit, ideo patet quam patenter minaretur ruinam regno talis erroris tolerancia sive defensio. Unde alias ostensum est quod monasterium, habens facultatem ad defendendum proditores Dei, cuiusmodi sunt singuli criminosi, non habet ut sic privilegium, sed pocius corruptelam. Unde sicut monti Ethne non sonat in privilegium quod includat ultra alios montes ignem suimet consumptivum, sic nec dicto monasterio foret privilegium facultas fovendi proditorem Dei tam sui quam totius Anglie destructivum.

And suppose that it has a privilege in this form of words, that it may protect any fugitives whatever for any cause whatever, even in a case of injured royal majesty: still all this is a general grant; but according to the laws of men a special case never comes under a prince's general grant, except what would be granted by the prince in a case that has been particularly [148] set out.[5] Since, therefore, it is not in a prince's power to grant what would tend to the wrong of God, to the destruction of his kingdom, to the enervation of the regality and of the laws by which he should rule his kingdom, it is clear that what is supposed in the case set before us is not included in that general privilege. What, I ask, would be more to the wrong of God than to make his house "a den of thieves"? Or what would be more destructive of kingdoms than to protect, in nests appointed for this, the enemies of God, of the church and of the kingdom?[6] In Ecclesiasticus 10:8 it is written: "A kingdom is translated from one people to another, because of injustices, and wrongs, and injuries, and divers deceits." Since, therefore, according to the saints, he who can amend and neglects to do so without doubt makes himself, as such, a sharer in the crime, therefore it is clear how plainly the toleration or defence of such an error would threaten ruin to the kingdom.[7] Hence it has been shown elsewhere that a monastery that has the power to defend traitors of God, such as every criminal is, does not, as such, have a privilege, but rather a corruption. Hence, just as it does not count as a privilege for Mount Etna that it contains, beyond other mountains, a fire that consumes itself, so neither would it be a privilege for the said monastery to have the power of cherishing a traitor of God, destructive both of itself and of all England.[8]

Notes

1. ***Quod autem ... sic ostendo***: "now", since Wyclif here proves a premiss of the second argument, that the king's command is "not opposing but agreeing with God's law" (146.16–17, 07-a). D *debito et pro occisione iniusta nimis generaliter* (146.32). *Pro fugus* (146.33–147.1) is *profugus* divided at the line (OCR scar), translated "a fugitive".
2. A margin *Nota de refugiis profugorum insoncium; iniusti occidentis nullus est locus refugii* (147.1). D *quod esse non potest* (147.3). *Proditorem proprium*: his own traitor, one who betrays God himself (cf. *proditores Dei*, 148.20).
3. Deut. 19:1–13, Josh. 20 and Num. 35:6–28 are cited, not quoted; the six cities, Num. 35:6. B *Josue X* (147.4); A B *quod soli*, B *occidentes vestigii* (147.6); the print is translated. *Limitatur*: the glossary *limitare*, "assign". *Ad purgandum se ... quod ignoranter occiderint*: we take the *quod*-clause as what they clear themselves of; *usque ad mortem summi pontificis* goes with *non exibant* (as Num. 35:25, 28).
4. ***Sub colore pietatis***: colour, a plausible ground (glossary: *color*), not "pretext". D *Per hoc* (147.22). *Argumentum quod fundatur in privilegio*: the case for sanctuary from Westminster's royal charter, which the next paragraph takes up.
5. D *habet privilegium sub isto colore* (147.25–26); A *teneri* for *tueri* (147.26); the print is translated. *Supponitur*: concessive, "suppose". *Lese regie maiestatis*: injured royal majesty, i.e. treason. The rule that a general grant does not reach a special case is cited from "the laws of men"; it is the rule of law of the *Liber Sextus*, VI 5.12 reg. 81, *In generali concessione non veniunt ea, quae quis non esset verisimiliter in specie concessurus* (Friedberg II, 1124).
6. D *istud* (148.5). *Illud suppositum*: we take it as the situation supposed in the case (the fugitives' crimes); "that supposed [privilege]" is possible but makes the privilege include itself. *Regalie*: the regality, the king's royal right (no the glossary row; proposed). *Speluncam latronum*: Matt. 21:13, DR "a den of thieves" (alluded; *domum suam*, God's house).
7. Ecclus. 10:8 as DR (Loserth 148.10–11); Wyclif *de gente* for the Vulgate's *a gente*, the same in English. D *Eccl. XX* (148.10–11); A B *transferetur*, "will be translated" (148.11). *Secundum sanctos*: the saying is John VIII in Gratian D.86 c.3, *Facientis culpam proculdubio habet, qui quod potest corrigere negligit emendare* (PL 187:406). D lacks *ideo* (148.15).
8. ***Alias ostensum est***: where Wyclif showed this is not identified. *Ignem suimet consumptivum*: we take *suimet* as the mountain, "a fire that consumes [the mountain] itself", matching *tam sui ... destructivum* of the monastery; "a self-consuming fire" is also possible.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 146: *non* (E at line end is the margin letter)
  - 147: *immo* (148d is the folio mark)
  - 147: *generaliter*
  - 147: *fugus* (second half of pro-/fugus) [NW]
  - 147: *quoscun-* (first half of quoscun-/que; has is the English side-note)
  - 147: *que* (second half of quoscun-/que)
  - 147: *fugitivos*
  - 148: *explicatum*
  - 148: *Cum*
  - 148: *8* (print: Ecclesiastici X°, 8 scribitur)
  - 148: *Cum* (round C, not g)
  - 147: *XX°*, [-VERSE]
- OCR scars corrected in the Latin: p. 146.33–147.1 *pro fugus* (read *profugus*); p. 147.25 *quoscun- que* (read *quoscunque*). Doubts: p. 148.5 *illud suppositum* (construal, n. 6). Side-note 147.1 *Jaw* is OCR for "law" (reported, not edited).

Part 3: No privilege licenses sin, and he who offends against the law cannot claim its aid

Loserth pp. 148.25–152.13

¶1 148.25–151.33
148.25 *All royal grants must be for the good of the people,*
149.1 *but the grant claimed would be simply a license to sin.*
149.15 *Therefore the privilege even if granted must be taken conditionally.*
149.24

[148] Item, nec regi licet privilegium tale concedere nec sacerdoti suo accipere nisi ex titulo elemosine vel misericordie et ad augendum in populo caritatem, sed constat quod non est elemosina vel opus misericordie dare abbathie licenciam, ut sustineat perpetuo debitorem, ne unquam satisfaciat, vel quod voluptuose vivendo aliena consumat, quousque factus fuerit inpotens ad solvendum. Cum enim secundum Augustinum non dimittitur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum, [149] patet quod licenciare ad hoc foret licenciare hominem ad peccandum, quod Deus non potest, et per consequens non continetur

Again, it is neither lawful for the king to grant such a privilege nor for his priest to accept it, except by title of alms or of mercy and to increase charity in the people; now it is evident that it is no alms or work of mercy to give an abbey licence to maintain a debtor perpetually, so that he never pays, or so that by living in pleasure he consumes what is another's, until he has been made unable to pay. For since, according to Augustine, sin is not forgiven unless what was taken is restored, [149] it is clear that to license [anyone] to this would be to license a man to sin, which God

3. He who breaks the law cannot claim its help.
150.10 *These fugitives were offenders against the law of God and the Church;*
150.18 *and the man slain was the first to fight in the Church.*
151.1 *There can be no greater disobedience than to withdraw oneself from the law.*
151.24 *The realm cannot stand if the Church protects sedition,*

sub opere misericordie privilegium tale concedere, nec tenderet ad augmentum amicicie vel caritatis in populo communi commune ius de satisfaccione debitoris precludere. Et patet tam ex parte donatoris quam receptoris quod ad tale privilegium est indisposicio utrobique. Nec moveat quod ex tali privilegio quandoque bonum contingeret, ut puta debitoris depredati misericors expectacio vel aliter criminosi ex tutela refugii finalis conversio, quia Deus non posset permittere peccatum fieri, nisi exinde occasionaliter bonum contingeret. Ideo absit, dicit Apostolus, ut faciamus mala, ut bona eveniant. Docto igitur quod libertas talis sonaret in caritatem et elemosinam, posset concedi singulariter illi loco privilegium sub ista condicione quam necesse est in omni donacione legitima habere tacitam vel expressam. Unde videtur quod prelati nostri debent humiliter pulsare dominos, ut tales errores nostre ecclesie previe corrigantur, antequam invadant hostes forinsecus, quia ex testimonis Christi Matth. X°, 36 nulli plus infestant matrem ecclesiam quam eius domestici inimici. Tercio principaliter arguitur sic ad idem de iure nature: Frustra invocat legis auxilium qui offendit in eam, sed dicti fugitivi rebellando offenderunt in legem Dei, ecclesie et in legem regni: ergo iustum est pro tempore sue obstinacie quod careant in omnibus istis legis suffragio. Maior autem capitur ut regula per se nota in iure canonico et demonstrari potest ex fide evangelii Matthei V°, 25, ubi Christus precipit: Esto consenciens adversario tuo cito, dum es in via cum eo, ne forte adversarius tuus tradat te iudici et iudex [150] **tradat te ministro et in carcerem mittaris, ubi secundum exposicionem beati Augustini oportet intelligere legem Dei adversantem cuilibet peccatori, quia nisi sibi consenserit hic in via, accusabit eum in finali iudicio cum demonibus detrudendum. Si ergo lex Dei mitissima non potest non adversari suo offendenti, quia tunc sequeretur quod falsitatis malicia superet veritatem, manifestum videtur quod omnis alia lex secundaria non excusat sed accusat, non iuvat sed reprobat, stante obstinacia offensoris. Dicti autem fugitivi iuxta nobis exposita offenderunt in legem Dei ex inobediencia suis prepositis, offenderant insuper in legem ecclesie racione multiplici, quia (ut dicunt docti in illis iuribus) inobedientes mandatis suorum principum committunt quoddam genus sacrilegii, et cum inobedientes remanserint legi Dei de obediendo legibus regis sui, que lex iusta illos protegeret? Et insuper secundum quod informati sumus occisus erat primus invasor et ecclesie pollutor. Quomodo ergo lex libertatis illius ecclesie defenderet tam ingratum et illegitimum eius pollutorem excommunicatum de iure? Non enim palliari potest defensio arrestati legittime et intenti salvari in vita et membris, ut invadat contra legem**

cannot do; and consequently to grant such a privilege is not contained under a work of mercy, nor would it tend to the increase of friendship or charity in the common people to shut off the common law concerning a debtor's satisfaction.[1] And it is clear, both on the side of the giver and on that of the receiver, that there is unfitness for such a privilege on both sides. Nor let it move [anyone] that from such a privilege some good would sometimes come about, as, for example, a merciful waiting on a debtor who has plundered, or otherwise the final conversion of a criminal through the protection of refuge; for God could not permit sin to be done unless some good came of it by occasion. Therefore "God forbid," says the Apostle, "that we should do evil, that good may come."[2] Therefore, once it is shown that such a liberty would make for charity and alms, a privilege could be granted singly to that place under this condition, which in every lawful gift must be had, tacit or express. Hence it seems that our prelates ought humbly to press the lords, so that such errors of our church may be corrected beforehand, before enemies invade from outside; for by the testimony of Christ, Matthew 10:36, none harry mother church more than her enemies of her own household.[3] Thirdly and principally, it is argued thus to the same [end], from the law of nature: he invokes the help of the law in vain who offends against it; now the said fugitives, by rebelling, have offended against the law of God, of the church, and against the law of the kingdom: therefore it is just, for the time of their obstinacy, that they lack the aid of law in all of these.[4] And the major is taken as a rule self-evident in canon law, and can be demonstrated from the faith of the gospel, Matthew 5:25, where Christ commands: "Be at agreement with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest perhaps thy adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge [150] **deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison"; where, according to the exposition of blessed Augustine, we must understand God's law as the adversary of every sinner; for unless he agree with it here, in the way, it will accuse him at the final judgment, to be thrust down with the demons.[5] If, then, God's most gentle law cannot but oppose him who offends against it (for then it would follow that the malice of falsity overcomes truth), it seems manifest that every other, secondary law does not excuse but accuses, does not help but condemns, while the offender's obstinacy stands.[6] Now the said fugitives, by what has been set before us, offended against the law of God by disobedience to their superiors; they had besides offended against the law of the church for many reasons, because (as those learned in those laws say) those who**

Anglie suos legitimos arrestantes. Cum enim arrestacio et occisio sunt contraria, patet quod miles arrestans sine extraccione gladii vel cultelli non ostendit occiso necessitatem se defendendi sed pocius legitime paciendi; et patet ex facto multiplici, supposita veritate narrati, quod erant inobedientes patriis legibus pro qua inobediencia continuanda querebant subterfugia [151]dicti loci. Que queso maior inobediencia regi nostro quam nolle tractari secundum leges suas, sed proprias leges proponere secundum quas et non secundum alias velint tractari, et illis, non regni legibus, obedire? Revera sic hostes crudelissimi depopulantes regnum offerrent regnicolis quod si velint consentire legibus quas illi volunt statuere concordabunt, sed non exinde gauderent privilegiis regni nostri. Mirum itaque foret quod rex et regnum tales hostes intra se defenderent. Idem enim foret contradicere legibus regis per quas regeret regnum suum et contradicere regalie, cum rex non foret rex nisi propter preeminenciam et officium legis sue. Ideo dicit beatus Gregorius quod qui diligit regem diligit eius legem et demonstrari potest ex illo Johannis XIV°, 23. Si quis diligit me, sermonem meum servabit; idem enim est Deum diligere et sermonem vel legem eius servare, et sic indubie est de rege. Unde inobediencia legibus est radix tocius nequicie. Exhinc enim ceciderunt angeli de celo, expulsus fuit Adam de paradiso et breviter sine contumacia que est inobediencia non recte denunciatur heresis vel excommunicacio; nec est possibile regnum dissolvi nisi ex inobediencia legi sue. Si enim maior pars regni nostri vel prope nollet stare legibus regni nostri, sed sparsim acciperet municionem ecclesie commovendo sedicionem in populo, pretendendo utrobique libertatem ecclesie, quomodo staret regnum? Et si non licet regi talem hostem domesticum de castris ecclesie sue extrahere, quomodo liceret in regno non tantum subiecto ecclesias Dei invadere et remissius proditores vel hostes occidere? Nam ubi est maior falsitas atque iniuria coloracior, ibi est pena iustior.

disobey the commands of their princes commit a kind of sacrilege; and since they have remained disobedient to God's law on obeying the laws of their king, what just law would protect them? And besides, according to what we have been informed, the man who was killed was the first assailant and the polluter of the church. How then would the law of the liberty of that church defend so displeasing and unlawful a polluter of it, excommunicated by law?[7] For the defence of one lawfully arrested, and meant to be kept safe in life and limb, cannot be cloaked so that he may assault, against the law of England, those who lawfully arrest him. For since arrest and killing are contraries, it is clear that a knight making an arrest without drawing sword or knife showed the slain man no necessity of defending himself, but rather of lawfully submitting; and it is clear from many deeds, the truth of the narrative being supposed, that they were disobedient to the laws of their homeland, to continue in which disobedience they sought the hiding-places [151]of the said place.[8] What greater disobedience, I ask, [could there be] to our king than to refuse to be dealt with according to his laws, but to put forward their own laws, according to which, and not according to others, they would be dealt with, and to obey those and not the laws of the kingdom? In truth, so the cruellest enemies laying waste the kingdom would offer the inhabitants that, if they will consent to the laws which they choose to lay down, they will be at peace; but they would not on that account enjoy the privileges of our kingdom. It would therefore be a marvel that the king and the kingdom should defend such enemies within themselves. For it would be the same to gainsay the king's laws, by which he should rule his kingdom, and to gainsay the regality, since the king would not be king except for the pre-eminence and office of his law.[9] Therefore blessed Gregory says that he who loves the king loves his law; and it can be demonstrated from that [text], John 14:23: "If any one love me, he will keep my word"; for it is the same to love God and to keep his word or law, and so beyond doubt it is with the king. Hence disobedience to laws is the root of all wickedness. For from this the angels fell from heaven, Adam was driven out of paradise, and, in short, without contumacy, which is disobedience, neither heresy nor excommunication is rightly declared; nor is it possible for a kingdom to be dissolved except by disobedience to its law.[10] For if the greater part of our kingdom, or nearly so, would not stand by the laws of our kingdom, but here and there took the defence of the church, stirring up sedition in the people, pretending on both counts the liberty of the church, how would the kingdom stand? And if it is not lawful for

the king to drag such a household enemy out of the strongholds of his church, how would it be lawful, in a kingdom not so subject [to him], to invade the churches of God and, on lighter grounds, to kill traitors or enemies? For where the falsity is greater and the wrong more coloured, there the penalty is more just.[11]

¶2 152.1–152.13
152.1 *The refugees had renounced their allegiance.*

[152] **Ex istis colligitur, supposita veritate informacionis, quod dicti duo profugi post tantam inobedienciam non sunt homines legii regis nostri, nam idem est derelinquere dominum et derelinquere legem suam; sed ipsi patenter dereliquerant legem regis, cum invaserant citantem ad standum legi regni, volentes cum hoc rege invito incolere terram suam. Ideo omne suffragium privilegii regis tenentur amittere, et cum in eadem dampnacione sint omnes qui fovent aut favent iniuriam dicte cause in contemptum regis et regni, et specialiter hii qui sub pena excommunicacionis ad defensionem legum regni et regalie regis specialiter sunt iurati, patet quante illi forisfaciunt contra regem.**

From these things it is gathered, the truth of the information being supposed, that the said two fugitives, after so great a disobedience, are not liege men of our king; for it is the same to forsake a lord and to forsake his law; now they had plainly forsaken the king's law, since they had assaulted the man summoning [them] to stand to the law of the kingdom, wishing withal to inhabit his land against the king's will. Therefore they are bound to lose every aid of the king's privilege; and since all who cherish or favour the wrong of the said cause, in contempt of the king and the kingdom, are in the same condemnation, and especially those who, under pain of excommunication, are specially sworn to the defence of the laws of the kingdom and of the king's regality, it is clear how gravely they commit forfeiture against the king.[12]

Notes

1. D *Iterum nec* (148.26); D *factus sit* (148.31). Augustine, Ep. 153 to Macedonius: Loserth 148.32 (Opp. II, 532 A); *Ep.* 153.20, PL 33:662: *non remittetur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum* (with his proviso *cum restitui potest*); Wyclif paraphrases with *dimittitur*. *Sacerdoti suo*: "his priest", the abbot holding of the king. *Solvendum*: pay (a debt). D lacks *communi* (149.5). *Commune ius*: "the common law" in the sense of the general rule of right on satisfaction; whether Wyclif means the English common law is not clear.
2. B *ut patet* (149.6). *Indisposicio*: "unfitness" (glossary: *indispositus*). *Debitoris depredati misericors expectacio*: we take *depredati* as active (deponent *depredari*), forbearance shown to a debtor who has plundered his creditor; passive "a plundered debtor" construes poorly. *Quia Deus non posset …*: good coming of a sin does not excuse it, since God permits every sin only for a good that follows by occasion. Rom. 3:8 (Loserth 149.14), Vulgate *et non … faciamus mala ut veniant bona*, DR "let us do evil that there may come good"; Wyclif's *absit … ut faciamus mala, ut bona eveniant* translated.
3. *Docto*: ablative absolute, "it having been shown". *Singulariter*: singly, as a particular grant. D *ecclesie privilegiate* (149.20–21). *Pulsare*: urge. Matt. 10:36, DR "a man's enemies shall be they of his own household", alluded; Wyclif's paraphrase translated.
4. A margin *Tercia responsio* (149.24). *Tercio principaliter*: the third principal argument (the first two, 07-a). *Frustra invocat legis auxilium …*: the canonists' maxim, in Friedberg *frustra legis auxilium invocet qui committit in legem* (*X* 3.49.10, II, 658; also *X* 1.6.23, 5.19.14, 5.39.45); Wyclif's *offendit in eam* is his own wording. *Sed dicti fugitivi*: the minor premiss. *Legis suffragio*: "the aid of law", as in the glossary *suffragium sensus*; not the church's suffrages.
5. Matt. 5:25 as DR; Wyclif has *adversarius tuus tradat te* for the Vulgate's *tradat te adversarius*, hence "thy adversary". A margins *Augustinus* (150.2) and *Lex Dei est noster adversarius*. Loserth (150.2) refers to Augustine, Sermo 9 (*De decem chordis*) c. 3 (Opp. V, 49), PL 38:76 (*Sermo Dei adversarius tuus est*), and *Sermo* 251.8, PL 38:1171 (*Sermo Legis*). B *detradendum* (150.5). *Hic in via*: here in this life (glossary: *via / patria*).
6. A A_1 *lex Dei iustissima*, "most just" (150.5–6); D *non potest adversari*, without the second *non*; D *lex contraria* (150.8). The print is translated. *Secundaria*: secondary, i.e. human law beneath God's.
7. *Offenderant* (150.12) is the reading of A B D, which Loserth prints; A_1 corrects to *offenderunt*. Translated as pluperfect. D *committant* (150.15). *Docti in illis iuribus*: the canonists and civilians; the "kind of sacrilege" is not found as such; nearest, Gratian C.17 q.4 d.p.c.29 § 1 (Friedberg I, 823–24; PL 187:1071A–B), after *Cod.* 9.29.2, sacrilege in disputing a prince's judgment. *Occisus*: Haule (07-a n. 2). *Ingratum*: displeasing (glossary: *ingratus*), here to the church. *Excommunicatum de iure*: excommunicated by the law itself, presumably for violence in a church.

8. ***Non enim palliari potest … ut invadat***: we take ***ut invadat*** as what the cloak would cover; or "cannot be pleaded as a defence for his assaulting". D ***occisio et arrestacio*** (150.25); A A_1 lack ***vel cultelli — defendendi***, and B lacks ***se*** (150.26–27); A A_1 lack ***erant*** (150.29). ***Miles arrestans***: the knight who made the arrest. ***Paciendi***: submitting. ***Patriis legibus***: the laws of the land (glossary: ***patria***, earthly sense). ***Subterfugia***: places of escape.
9. D ***nolle tractare*** (151.2). ***Defenderent***: the manuscripts have ***defenderet*** (151.9–10); Loserth's plural is printed and translated. A margin ***Legi regis esse inobedientem nocet multum*** (151.11). ***Concordabunt***: they will be at peace. ***Regalie***: the regality (proposed the glossary row).
10. A margin ***Gregorius*** (151.14); the saying is not identified. D ***demonstrare*** (151.15). John 14:23 as DR. A B lack ***enim*** (151.17). D ***non rite*** (151.22). ***Inobedie ncia*** (151.23) is one word, an OCR scar. ***Contumacia***: contumacy, the refusal to appear or submit.
11. D ***liceret*** (151.29). ***Sparsim acciperet municionem ecclesie***: took sanctuary here and there. ***In regno non tantum subiecto***: we take it as a kingdom not so subject to the king, i.e. enemy country in war; ***remissius***, "on lighter grounds"; doubtful, and "more mildly" is possible. ***Coloracior***: more coloured, more plausibly cloaked (glossary: ***color***).
12. A margin ***Conclusio*** (152.1). B D lack ***regis*** (152.3); B ***rege invicto***, "the king unconquered" (152.7); D ***sunt omnes*** (152.9); D ***favent dicti cause*** (152.9–10). ***Citantem***: the officer who summoned them. ***Hii qui … iurati***: presumably the bishops, sworn to the king; Wyclif does not name them. ***Forisfaciunt***: commit forfeiture.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 148: ***in***
  - 149: ***patet*** (149a folio mark, G margin letter)
  - 149: ***licenciare***
  - 149: ***aliter*** (149b is the folio mark)
  - 149: ***ut***
  - 149: ***obstinacie*** (print spelling) [NW]
  - 150: ***offenderunt***
  - 150: ***in***
  - 150: ***invasor***
  - 151: ***proprias*** [NW]
  - 149: ***et***
  - 150: ***subterfugia*** (subter- here, 149c fugia at top of p.151; main token holds whole word)
- ***Testimonis*** (149.22): so the print (plate), Loserth's misprint; translated as ***testimonio*** (our emendation; ***testimoniis*** equally possible).
- OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 151.23 ***inobedie ncia*** (read ***inobediencia***). Doubts: p. 149.8 ***debitoris depredati*** (n. 2); p. 151.30 ***in regno non tantum subiecto … remissius*** (n. 11).

Part 4: Unjust excommunication, and the three wonders of the laity

Loserth pp. 152.14–156.14

¶1 152.14–154.25
152.14 *It is an offence to excommunicate the King's servants without careful enquiry.*
152.27 *Persons in authority are not to be condemned for wrong done by their subordinates without their consent.*
153.10 *Excommunication is unjust: 1. if inflicted from spite, 2. from avarice;*
153.15 *3. if undeserved.*
153.25 *Unjust excommunication is worse than murder.*

[152]**Ex quibus videtur quod publice excomunicantes ministros regis sine examinacione diligenti delicti, et specialiter si iurati sunt legem ipsam defendere, offendunt nimium. Nam Gen. XVIII°, 20, 21, dicit omnisciens ad dandum exemplum iudicibus, quomodo diligenter examinent causam, antequam ferant iudicium: Clamor, inquit, Sodomorum multiplicatus est; descendam et videbo utrum clamorem opere compleverint an non est ita ut sciam. Nec sufficit notorietas substancie facti, sed oportet quod sit notorium qualitate; quia notum est quod excommunicans propter operacionem legitimam iniuriatur excommunicato excommunicando se ipsum. Nec est color excommunicare capitaneos operacionis legitime propter hoc quod preter eorum consensum, auctorisacionem vel occasionem datam aliquis de comitiva fecit opus indebitum, quia sic Christus foret excommunicandus pro facto Scarioth, et quilibet dux exercitus pro quocunque facinore commisso a**

From which it seems that those who publicly excommunicate the king's ministers without diligent examination of the offence, and especially if they are sworn to defend that very law, offend exceedingly. For in Genesis 18:20–21 the all-knowing [God], to give an example to judges how diligently they should examine a cause before they give judgment, says: "The cry," he says, "of the Sodomites is multiplied; I will go down and see whether they have fulfilled the cry in deed, or whether it be not so, that I may know."[1] Nor is the notoriety of the substance of the deed enough, but it must be notorious in its quality; for it is known that one who excommunicates for a lawful act wrongs the excommunicate, excommunicating himself. Nor is there colour for excommunicating the captains of a lawful operation because, beyond their consent, authorization or occasion given, someone of the company did an undue deed; for so Christ would have to be excommunicated for the deed of

154.15 *Men want to know why the wicked clergy are not excommunicated.*

persona sui exercitus et (quod evidencius est) quilibet prelatus [153]pro quocunque scelere subditi sui gregis; que si essent vera tolleretur a prelatis potestas excommunicandi subiectos, cum non licet excommunicato excommunicare quemquam, ymmo cum ut sic sit hereticus, non licet sibi ministrare aliqua sacramenta. Nec cadit excusacio quod prelatus non excommunicat, sed denunciat tales excommunicatos de iure, quia talis denunciacio est defamacio minimis; et ve illi qui taliter scandalizat fratrem suum. Est autem excommunicacio iniusta tripliciter: Primo quando sacerdos ex rancore et zelo vindicte excommunicat subditum licet reum. Secundo quando prelatus pocius pro temporalibus quam pro amore et correccione subditi eum excommunicat, licet excomunicandus fuerit bono modo. Et tercio quando indiscrete excommunicat subditum propter factum legitimum. Talis autem excommunicator videtur plus polluere sanctam ecclesiam quam corporaliter occidens hominem ad altare; pro quo notandum quod corporalis pollucio videtur esse excommunicacioni inpertinens, nisi de quanto sapit peccatum, tum quia pollucio per sputum vel alia pondera nature foret turpior quam pollucio per semen vel sanguinem, tum eciam quia illa pollucio deletur per locionem corpoream. Ex istis videtur, cum iniuste excommunicans fratrem suum (quantum in eo est) occidit animam et virtutes, sed corporalis homicida non occidit ut sic nisi corpus solummodo, sequitur quod, sicut anima excedit corpus, sic occisio in animam perpetrata excedit in malicia occisionem corporis. Ex quo videtur, cum peccatum non potest subiectari in lapide vel edificio corporali, quod locus per se non polluit suos incolas, sed [154]econtra, cum II° Machab. V°, 19, scribitur: Non propter locum gentem, sed propter gentem locum dominus elegit. Et patet quod pollucio loci non impediret racionabiliter cultum Dei, nisi de quanto horrorem incuteret ex peccato, et cum maius peccatum maiorem horrorem incuteret, sequitur quod peccatum gravius commissum in sanctuario pocius retraheret a divino servitio. Nec aliud volunt leges ecclesie debite intellecte. Non enim licet clerico Christi cecari in stulticia phariseica (de qua Matthei XV°), plus appreciando locionem corporalem ex pluri horrore sordis corporee quam locionem spiritualem a sorde anime, cum secundum diffinicionem Christi, que exeunt a corde interioris hominis, hec sunt que preponderanter coinquinant hominem. Et hic miratur tota ecclesia laycalis quare clerus excommunicat cum tanta instancia et fervore pro suo debito corporali, vel pro sensibili privilegio ex tradicionibus hominum introducto; clericos autem non sic excomunicant pro rependendo debito spirituali, cum tamen peccatum sit infinitum gravius et

[Is]cariot, and every leader of an army for any crime committed by a person of his army, and (what is more evident) every prelate [153]for any crime of a subject of his flock; and if these things were true, the power of excommunicating subjects would be taken away from prelates, since it is not lawful for one excommunicated to excommunicate anyone; indeed, since as such he is a heretic, it is not lawful for him to administer any sacraments.[2] Nor does the excuse hold that the prelate does not excommunicate, but declares such men excommunicated by law; for such a declaration is a defamation to the least; and woe to him who so scandalizes his brother.[3] And excommunication is unjust in three ways. First, when a priest out of rancour and zeal for vengeance excommunicates a subject, though guilty. Secondly, when a prelate excommunicates a subject rather for temporal goods than for the love and correction of the subject, though he deserved excommunication in a good manner. And thirdly, when he indiscreetly excommunicates a subject for a lawful deed.[4] And such an excommunicator seems to pollute holy church more than one who bodily kills a man at the altar. For which it is to be noted that bodily pollution seems to be irrelevant to excommunication, except in so far as it savours of sin: both because pollution by spittle or other burdens of nature would be fouler than pollution by semen or blood, and also because that pollution is wiped out by a bodily washing.[5] From these things it seems, since one who unjustly excommunicates his brother (as far as in him lies) kills the soul and the virtues, but the bodily homicide as such kills only the body, [that] it follows that, as the soul exceeds the body, so the killing perpetrated on the soul exceeds in malice the killing of the body. From which it seems, since sin cannot have its subject in a stone or a bodily building, that the place of itself does not pollute its inhabitants, but [154] the reverse; since in 2 Maccabees 5:19 it is written: "The Lord did not choose the people for the place's sake, but the place for the people's sake."[6] And it is clear that the pollution of a place would not reasonably hinder the worship of God except in so far as it struck horror from the sin; and since a greater sin would strike a greater horror, it follows that a graver sin committed in the sanctuary would rather draw [men] back from divine service. Nor do the laws of the church, rightly understood, mean anything else. For it is not lawful for a cleric of Christ to be blinded in the Pharisaic folly (of which Matthew 15), valuing a bodily washing, from greater horror of bodily filth, more than a spiritual washing from the filth of the soul; since, according to Christ's definition, the things that come forth from the heart of the inner man, these are what preponderantly

debitum illud quoad Deum sit obligacius. Plus eciam foret ad privilegium et iustificacionem ecclesie quod prevaricatores mandati Dei per censuras ecclesie sint correcti quam quod omnes ritus humani legi Christi superadditi sint quantumcunque multipliciter regulariter ac solempniter observati.

defile a man.[7] And here the whole lay church wonders why the clergy excommunicate with such urgency and fervour for their bodily debt, or for a perceptible privilege brought in by the traditions of men; but they do not so excommunicate clerics for the repaying of a spiritual debt, although the sin is infinitely graver and that debt as regards God more binding.[8] It would also be more to the privilege and justification of the church that transgressors of God's command be corrected by the censures of the church than that all human rites added on to the law of Christ be observed, however manifoldly, regularly and solemnly.[9]

¶2 154.26–156.2
155.6 *The rules as to relations with excommunicated persons are bad.*
155.28 *No such relation is dangerous except a share in the crime.*
156.3 *The Prelates' privilege of imprisoning excommunicated persons should be taken away,*

[154]Recoleremus siquidem quod propter preponderan- ciam ritus phariseici legi Dei destructe sunt Jerusalem et Judea (ut patet Matthei XV° et Luce XIX°). Recoleremus eciam quomodo privilegium est lex privata ad commodum privilegiati concessa a principe, [155]et per consequens foret clero magnum privilegium quod adiutorio dominorum temporalium foret exoneratus ab istis cerimoniis humanitus introductis, propinquius sequendo Christum pure secundum regulas primevas a Christo traditas. In hoc enim habemus supra laycos privilegium singulare. Mirantur insuper seculares quomodo non licet eis communicare cum excommunicato a sacerdote pro questu suo vel excellencia seculari, et hoc sub pena excommunicacionis maioris, licet autem communicare cum gravius excommunicatis a Deo sine inferencia tante pene, ut patet de simoniacis, de sacerdote fornicario et eius amasia. Ymmo licet cardinales tamquam heretici vel scismatici sint divisi a capite, tamen dicimus seculares excommunicatissimos, si ab eis subtrahant elemosinas suas que sunt bona pauperum, licet iniustissime peius predonibus occupent aliena. Licet autem (ut inquiunt in Westmonasterio) communicare cum excomunicato quoad Deum racione iniuste detencionis debiti vel iniuste occisionis proximi, eciam sustinendo eum in sua malicia, sed laicis non licet communicare cum minus excommunicatis ab eis pro bonis ecclesie. Talia autem multa deliramenta finguntur per que layci mendaciter illuduntur; licet enim falsitates ficte quandoque prosunt per accidens, subditos a facinore deterrendo, absit tamen christianum contra fidem scripture uti istis fallaciis pro hoc fine. Notum est enim ex fide scripture quod nemo ad sui dampnum excommunicatur, nisi racione delicti proprii excommunicatus fuerit quoad Deum. Notum est iterum quod nemo propter corporalem communicacionem cum excommunicato incurrit periculum, nisi sit particeps criminis cum eodem. Et notum est tercio quod infinitum periculosius est communicare culpabiliter cum

Let us recall, indeed, that for the preponderance of the Pharisaic rite over God's law Jerusalem and Judea were destroyed (as is clear in Matthew 15 and Luke 19). Let us recall also how a privilege is a private law granted by a prince for the advantage of the privileged, [155]and consequently it would be a great privilege for the clergy to be relieved, with the help of the temporal lords, of these ceremonies brought in by men, following Christ more nearly, purely, according to the first rules handed down by Christ. For in this we have a singular privilege above the laity.[10] The seculars wonder besides how it is not lawful for them to communicate with one excommunicated by a priest for his own gain or secular eminence, and this under pain of the greater excommunication; but it is lawful to communicate with those more gravely excommunicated by God without the infliction of so great a penalty, as is clear of simoniacs, of a fornicating priest and his mistress. Indeed, although the cardinals, as heretics or schismatics, are divided from the head, yet we declare seculars most excommunicate if they withdraw from them their alms, which are the goods of the poor, although they, most unjustly and worse than robbers, occupy what is another's.[11] And it is lawful (as they say at Westminster) to communicate with one excommunicated as regards God by reason of the unjust detention of a debt or the unjust killing of a neighbour, even maintaining him in his malice; but it is not lawful for the laity to communicate with those less excommunicated by them for the goods of the church. And many such ravings are feigned, by which the laity are deceived with lies; for although feigned falsehoods are sometimes of use by accident, deterring subjects from crime, yet God forbid that a Christian should use these fallacies for this end against the faith of scripture.[12] For it is known from the faith of scripture that no one is excommunicated to his own harm unless by reason of his own offence he has been excommunicated as regards God. It is known again that no one

excommunicato a Deo, qui solum excommunicat [156]pro mortali, quam communicare nude corporaliter cum excommunicato solum ab homine.

incurs danger through bodily communication with one excommunicated unless he is a sharer in the crime with him. And it is known, thirdly, that it is infinitely more dangerous to communicate culpably with one excommunicated by God, who excommunicates only [156]for mortal [sin], than to communicate merely bodily with one excommunicated only by man.[13]

¶3 156.3–156.14

[156]Tercio miratur secularis ecclesia quod clerus instat erga brachium seculare, ut omnes excommunicati sui per quadraginta dies, remanentes a prelatis quos ipsi signaverint non soluti, mancipentur carceri seculari, quousque secundum eorum arbitrium satisfecerint, quantumcunque sophistice sint ligati. Non enim meretur eorum ingratitudo tale subsidium, cum regula iuris divini sentenciat quod privilegium indultum tenetur amittere qui sibi concessa abutitur potestate. Abusus ergo tendens ad enervacionem regni et bonum privatum bono communi preponderans meretur ablacionem privilegii sic abusi.

Thirdly, the secular church wonders that the clergy press upon the secular arm that all their excommunicates who remain for forty days unabsolved by the prelates, [being those] whom they themselves have signified, be committed to secular prison until they have made satisfaction at their discretion, however sophistically they may have been bound. For their ingratitude does not merit such assistance, since a rule of divine law pronounces that he who abuses the power granted to him is bound to lose the privilege bestowed. Therefore an abuse tending to the enervation of the kingdom, and putting a private good above the common good, deserves the taking away of the privilege so abused.[14]

Notes

1. A margin *Conclusio* (152.14). *Si iurati sunt*: we take the excommunicators as the subject (those sworn to the king's laws, 152.11–13); it could be the king's ministers. The excommunications are those pronounced after the Westminster killing by the archbishop and four suffragans on its instigators and perpetrators, with the king, his mother and the duke of Lancaster excepted, and published by the bishop of London at St Paul's (Loserth, Introduction, p. x). Gen. 18:20–21: Wyclif shortens the Vulgate (*Clamor Sodomorum et Gomorrhae ... utrum clamorem qui venit ad me opere compleverint*); DR "The cry of Sodom and Gomorrha is multiplied ... whether they have done according to the cry that is come to me"; his Latin translated, DR kept where it agrees.
2. D *notandum* (152.24); B *excommunicatus propter* (152.24). *Color*: a plausible ground (the glossary), not "pretext". D *facit* (152.30). A A_1 B lack *quocunque* (152.32). *Scarioth*: Judas Iscariot. *Ut sic sit hereticus*: the excommunicator, as one himself excommunicate.
3. *Defamacio minimis*: we take *minimis* as dative, "to the least ones" (cf. Matt. 18:6, cited, not quoted); a reading *nimis*, "an excessive defamation", would construe more easily, but no witness gives it; the print is translated. *Ve illi ...*: cf. Matt. 18:7 (alluded).
4. A margin *Tripliciter facit excommunicacio iniusta* (153.10); B margin, another hand, *Excommunicacio tripliciter*. A A_1 lack *fuerit* (153.15). *Licet reum*: "though guilty". *Bono modo*: in a right manner.
5. A margin *Nota; De excommunicacione persone vel loci* (153.15). *Excommunicacioni inpertinens*: having no bearing on excommunication. *Pondera nature*: bodily evacuations. Canon law treats blood or semen as polluting a church (*X* 3.40.10, Friedberg II, 636; cf. *X* 3.39); Wyclif's point is a hypothetical: spittle would be fouler still, so bodily pollution cannot be what excommunication is about. No canon on spittle was found.
6. D *corporalem. Ex istis videtur, quod* (153.24); A B *solo modo* (153.28); D *p' = persone*, rightly *per se* (153.32, Loserth's note). *Subiectari*: to have as its subject, to inhere in. 2 Macc. 5:19: A B *I. Mach.*, D *Mach. VI* (154.1); Wyclif has *dominus* for the Vulgate's *Deus*, so DR with "the Lord".
7. B *honorem* for *horrorem* (154.4, 5); D *errorem*, D *cum magis* (154.5); A *quam* corrected from *quando* (154.11); B *exemit* for *exeunt* (154.13). Matt. 15:1–20 (the unwashed hands); Loserth refers to 15:18–20, Vulgate *quae ... de corde exeunt, et ea coinquinant hominem ... haec sunt, quae coinquinant hominem*; Wyclif's paraphrase translated, "defile" as DR.
8. *Eta* (154.15) is *Et* with Loserth's alinea letter *a*, keyed by the A margin *Nota tres miraculose questiones laicales a, b, c* (154.15); the letter is not translated. The three wonders: here, 155.6 (*Mirantur insuper*) and 156.3 (*Tercio miratur*). D *sensuali* (154.17); D *non excommunicant*, with *non* added in the margin by another hand (154.18). *Instancia*: urgency, not the glossary "objection". *Pro rependendo debito spirituali*: to have a spiritual debt repaid, i.e. clerics' sins.
9. D *censure*, corrected in the margin *censuras* (154.23). *Regulariter*: by rule.
10. D *recoleremus propter*; A lacks *propter* (154.26); D *distincte* for *destructe* (154.27). Matt. 15 and Luke 19:41–44 cited. *Privilegium est lex privata*: Isidore, *Etym.* V.18.1 (PL 82:202A–B), taken into Gratian D.3 c.3 (PL 187:34B). B *sequendo exemplum* (155.4).

11. ***Pro questu suo***: for the priest's gain. ***Excommunicacionis maioris***: the greater excommunication. D ***in capite*** (155.14). ***Cardinales … divisi a capite***: the Schism of 1378; Wyclif does not say which cardinals. ***Dicimus***: "we", Wyclif speaking in the person of the clergy. ***Occupent***: the cardinals.
12. ***Ut inquiunt in Westmonasterio***: the Westminster party's teaching. ***Minus excommunicatis ab eis***: those excommunicated by the clergy, less gravely than God's excommunicates; or "under the lesser excommunication". ***Contra fidem scripture***: "against the faith of scripture", as the glossary ***ex fide scripture***.
13. ***Nude*** (156.1), "merely". D ***pro mortalibus*** (156.1).
14. D ***quomodo clerus*** (156.3); A margin ***Brachium seculare*** (156.4); D ***satisfecerunt*** (156.7). ***Quos ipsi signaverint***: grammatically the prelates, but in sense the excommunicates whom the prelates have "signified" to the king; the procedure is the writ ***de excommunicato capiendo***: after forty days' obstinacy, on the bishop's letters patent (***significavit***), the sheriff takes the excommunicate until he satisfies (Bracton f. 426b–427, ed. Thorne IV, 327). ***Instat erga***: presses upon, not the disputation's ***instatur***. ***Ingratitudo***: ingratitude toward the king who lends his aid, not the glossary ***ingratus*** "displeasing [to God]". The rule that one who abuses a granted power loses the privilege is Gregory in Gratian C.11 q.3 c.63, ***Privilegium omnino meretur amittere qui permissa sibi abutitur potestate*** (PL 187:862; also D.74).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 152: ***et*** (15 is the line number)
  - 153: ***pro*** (149d is the folio mark)
  - 153: ∅ (pre-/latus is one word, already whole at pos 80 (prelatus))
  - 153: ***excomunicandus*** (excomuni-/candus, single m as printed)
  - 153: ***factum***
  - 153: ***edificio*** [NW]
  - 154: ***II°***
  - 154: ***Christi***
  - 155: ***et*** (150a is the folio mark, N margin letter)
  - 155: ∅ (nothing between et and per; these words are the last lines of p.154 (already in p.154))
  - 156: ***instat*** (print: clerus instat; the trailing c is the margin alinea letter) [NW]
  - 153: ***incolas***
  - 155: ***excommunicat*** (ex- here, communicat at top of p.156; main token holds whole word)
- Not Wyclif's text, not translated: p. 152.27 ***in*** (stray token before ***Nec est color***); p. 154.15 the ***a*** of ***Eta***, Loserth's alinea letter. OCR scars, translated as corrected: p. 152.29 ***auctonsacionem*** (read ***auctorisacionem***); p. 154.26 ***preponderan- ciam*** (one word); p. 156.1 ***nudei5o"0*** (read ***nude***). Doubts: p. 153.5 ***defamacio minimis*** (n. 3).

Part 5: The laity must not consent unexamined; three exhortations to the secular lords

Loserth pp. 156.15–157.24

¶1 156.15–157.13
156.23 *or allowed only after lay trial.*
157.14 *Lay rulers must, however, be reminded of their duties to the Church.*

[156]**Et iterum videtur clerum tam leviter et incircum- specte excommunicantem involvere seculares in sua excommunicacione erronea, cum ex eorum ducatu sepe per talem excommunicacionem pretensam puniunt innocentes, et per consequens, cum nec tenentur credere quod eorum quelibet excommunicacio sit iusta, nec ex fide scripture vel racione tenentur obedire clero in ista incarceracione servili, videtur ex timore peccati consensus quod non debent ante legitimam examinacionem cause et forme excommunicacionis punicioni huiusmodi consentire. Cum enim racio scripture sacre sit optimus legum interpres, patet quod adiutorium promissum a principibus in hac parte debet intelligi cum condicione quod talis incarceracio sit de numero operum elemosine pro quibus punientes sunt in finali iudicio premiandi. Sed scrutetur fidelis evangelium Matthei XXV° et videat si incarceracio excommunicatorum iniuste in aliquo operum misericordie sit contenta. Nec ignorancia excusat**

And again, it seems that the clergy, excommunicating so lightly and incautiously, involve the seculars in their erroneous excommunication, since under their leading [the seculars] often punish innocent men through such a pretended excommunication; and consequently, since they are neither bound to believe that every excommunication of theirs is just, nor bound, from the faith of scripture or by reason, to obey the clergy in this servile imprisonment, it seems, out of fear of the sin of consent, that they ought not to consent to a punishment of this kind before a lawful examination of the cause and form of the excommunication.[1] For since the reason of holy scripture is the best interpreter of laws, it is clear that the help promised by princes in this matter must be understood with the condition that such imprisonment be among the works of alms for which those who punish are to be rewarded at the final judgment. But let the faithful man search the gospel, Matthew 25, and see whether the

simpliciter ne peccetur, cum Paulus ex ignorancia veritatis scripture commisit blasphemiam, [157]o(ut patet I^{a} Thymothei 1°). Nec dicat aliquis quod Anglia processit prospere, quando ecclesia habuit talia privilegia sic defensa, quia audacter assero quod non exinde promeruit, sed sicut iniquitas Amorreorum fuit in congregari per CCCC^{tos} annos et amplius (ut patet Gen. XV°); ex cuius cremento finaliter sunt destructi: sic timendum est de gente Anglie, nisi clerus redeat ad spiritualem humilitatem, ut olim, cum clerus ut anima et secularis ut corpus debent concorditer constituere virum unum; quod non potest fieri nisi ex mutua observancia legis Christi. Sepe enim in pruritu prosperitatis mundane est populus insensibiliter quoad Deum amplius peioratus.

imprisonment of the unjustly excommunicated is contained in any of the works of mercy.[2] Nor does ignorance excuse without qualification from sinning, since Paul, from ignorance of the truth of scripture, committed blasphemy [157](as is clear in 1 Timothy 1).[3] Nor let anyone say that England prospered when the church had such privileges so defended; for I boldly assert that it did not merit it on that account; but just as the iniquity of the Amorrhites was gathering for four hundred years and more (as is clear in Genesis 15), from whose growth they were finally destroyed, so it is to be feared of the English people, unless the clergy return to spiritual humility, as of old, when the clergy as soul and the secular as body ought in concord to make up one man; which cannot be done except by mutual observance of the law of Christ. For often in the itch of worldly prosperity the people is imperceptibly made worse as regards God.[4]

¶2 157.14–157.24

[157]Hortandi tamen sunt domini seculares ne arguendo per locum ab insufficienti similitudine auferant vera privilegia ecclesie propter cupidinem temporalium vel vindictam. Hortandi sunt secundo ne ex invidia vel alia causa pretergrediente caritatis regulas sit fugitivo culpa imposita vel prodicionis suspicio palliata. Et hortandi sunt tercio ne alicubi et specialiter infra septa ecclesie sanguinem effundant innoxium, sed honorent sanctam matrem ecclesiam secundum regulas quas Christus sibi instituit; ad que omnia oportet omnino consulere sensum catholicum scripturarum.

Yet the secular lords are to be exhorted not, by arguing through the topic from insufficient likeness, to take away the true privileges of the church out of greed for temporal goods or out of vengeance. They are to be exhorted, secondly, that no guilt be laid on a fugitive, nor suspicion of treason cloaked, out of envy or any other cause going beyond the rules of charity. And they are to be exhorted, thirdly, not to shed innocent blood anywhere, and especially within the precincts of the church, but to honour holy mother church according to the rules which Christ instituted for her; for all of which it is wholly necessary to consult the catholic sense of the scriptures.[5]

Notes

1. ***Ex eorum ducatu***: under the clergy's leading; the subject of ***puniunt*** is the seculars. ***Ex timore peccati consensus***: we take ***consensus*** as genitive, "the sin of consent"; a nominative ("consent [is withheld] out of fear of sin") is possible. B ***punicionis*** (156.25).
2. ***Racio scripture ... optimus legum interpres***: Wyclif adapts the legal maxim that custom is the best interpreter of laws (Paul, Digest 1.3.37, ***optima enim est legum interpres consuetudo***; also ***X*** 1.4.8, Friedberg II, 39–40). Matt. 25:31–46, the works of mercy, among them 25:36, DR "I was in prison, and you came to me" (cited, not quoted).
3. A margin ***Ignorancia non excusat*** (156.35). The ***o*** before ***(ut*** (157.1) is a stray token (OCR scar), not translated. 1 Tim. 1:13 (cited): DR "I did it ignorantly in unbelief". ***Simpliciter***: without qualification (the glossary).
4. B ***exinde proverant*** (sic) (157.4). ***Fuit in congregari***: an infinitive after ***in***, as if ***in congregando***; translated "was gathering"; doubtful. Gen. 15:13, 16 (cited): the four hundred years of 15:13 and DR "the iniquities of the Amorrhites are not at the full" (15:16). ***Clerus ut anima et secularis ut corpus***: the clergy as soul, the lay estate as body. A A_1 ***peioratur*** (157.13); the print ***est ... peioratus*** is translated.
5. A margin ***Nota bonas hortaciones*** (157.14). D ***ne aliter*** (157.20); D ***infra cepta*** (157.20–21); A A_1 B lack ***Christus*** (157.21), which Loserth prints and we translate. ***Per locum ab insufficienti similitudine***: the topic from likeness (glossary: ***locus a simili***), here a likeness that does not suffice. ***Palliata***: cloaked, given a false show. At the chapter's end (157.24) the A margin has a Czech note, printed by Loserth as ***Nu zbohem mylym potahnyem dale*** and rendered ***Age, cum Deo caro (materiam) porro tractabo***, "Come, with dear God I shall treat [the matter] further"; it is the scribe's, not Wyclif's.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **157: *Iª* (150b folio mark; print Iª Thymothei)**
  - **157: *CCCC^{tos}* (superscript tos as printed)**
  - **157: *olim***
  - **157: *peioratus* [NW]**
  - **157: *culpa* (150c is the folio mark)**
- **Not Wyclif's text, not translated: p. 157.1 *o* before *(ut*. OCR scars, translated as one word: p. 156.15–16 *incircum- specte*. Doubts: p. 157.5 *fuit in congregari* (n. 4).**

Chapter 8

Part 1: A digression on the Westminster case; two suppositions; would lying be a virtue?

Loserth pp. 157.26–160.24

¶1 157.26–160.12
157.26 *Digression on the shameful event which has lately happened in England and in Rome.*
158.1 *Three postulates: 1. The quidity of the Church as already explained.*
158.30
2. That we abjure all falsehood.
159.10 *Some doctors say that it is right to give false opinions in such a case,*
159.20 *for the sake of one's OWN reputation,*
159.24 *or to maintain the privileges of the Church.*
160.2 *This would make lying a virtue,*
160.19 *and God a liar.*

[157] **Quia sciencia secundum philosophos gaudet extraneis ac sciencie de sancta matre ecclesia sit nimis extraneus infamis casus qui contigit nuper in Anglia et in Roma, ideo gracia declaracionis fidei et cavendorum errorum ecclesie restat parumper disgredi circa** [158] **ista, primo supponendo tria per ordinem. Primo, inquam, ex supradictis supponatur predicta sentencia de quiditate sancte matris ecclesie, nec est illa abicienda a Christi ecclesia, cum nec contingit ecclesiam speculative nec practice quicquam cognoscere nec meritorie debite conversari, si sit omnino destituta ab eius noticia. Nam iuxta dicta XV[i] cap. theologus foret nimis inscius racionum scripture et fidei orthodoxe qui omnino ignoraret quiditatem sancte matris ecclesie. Nec dubito quin deest decretistis, legistis et philosophis fructuosa speculacio qui omnino ignorant quid sit sancta mater ecclesia. Nam omnes leges humane sunt finaliter ad defendendum iusticiam huius matris et purgandum eam ab erroribus quibus pro tempore vie temptacionum adversitatibus implicatur. Cum ergo finis inponit maximam necessitatem operibus, ex II° Phisicorum manifestum est quod oportet omnes doctores speculativos statuere matrem nostram ut regulam ad tractatum speculabilium mensurandum, et per idem nemo intendit praxi laudabili, nisi in quantum tenderet ad honorem vel commodum huius matris; nec dubium quin nemo viat meritorie secundum beneplacitum sponsi ecclesie, nisi de quanto operatur ad honorem et commodum sponse sue. Et hinc precipitur in primo mandato secunde tabule quod fidelis honoret patrem et matrem, quod indubie principaliter intelligitur de Christo et sua ecclesia. Nec honorat eam vel diligit fideliter quam non noscit. Ideo necesse est, ut omnis fidelis det operam ad cognoscendum direccius matrem suam. Secundo supponitur quod procedatur in isto tractatu sine duplicitate mendacii. Nam mendacium est precisa cautela per quam diabolus illudit fidelibus, ut** [159] **honorent meretricem secum adulteram tamquam reginam et matrem fidelium sponsam Christi. Unde istam sentenciam de quiditate sancte matris ecclesie oportet ut fundamentum supponere, ut sciatur qui procurant pro eius veris privilegiis et qui degenerant, in quo consistit verum privilegium ac edificacio ecclesie et in quo stat eius oppositum secundum fidem**

Since knowledge, according to the philosophers, delights in things foreign [to it], and the infamous case which lately befell in England and in Rome is all too foreign to the knowledge of holy mother church, therefore, for the sake of declaring the faith and of the church's errors that are to be guarded against, it remains to digress a little concerning [158] **these things, first supposing three things in order.[1] First, I say, let the aforesaid teaching on the quiddity of holy mother church be supposed from what was said above; nor is it to be cast out of Christ's church, since it is not possible for the church to know anything, speculatively or practically, or to live meritoriously as it ought, if it is wholly destitute of the knowledge of it. For, according to what was said in chapter 15, a theologian would be all too ignorant of the reasons of scripture and of the orthodox faith who was wholly ignorant of the quiddity of holy mother church.[2] Nor do I doubt that fruitful speculation is lacking to decretists, legists and philosophers who are wholly ignorant of what holy mother church is. For all human laws exist, as their end, to defend the justice of this mother and to purge her of the errors in which, for the time of the way, she is entangled by the adversities of temptations. Since, then, the end imposes the greatest necessity on works, it is manifest from Physics II that all speculative doctors must set up our mother as the rule for measuring the treatment of things that are objects of speculation; and by the same token no one applies himself to praiseworthy practice except in so far as he would tend to the honour or benefit of this mother; nor is there doubt that no one is a wayfarer meritoriously, according to the good pleasure of the bridegroom of the church, except in so far as he works for the honour and benefit of his bride.[3] And hence it is commanded in the first commandment of the second table that the faithful man honour father and mother (Exodus 20:12), which is without doubt understood principally of Christ and his church. Nor does he honour or love faithfully her whom he does not know. Therefore it is necessary that every faithful man give effort to knowing his mother more directly.[4] Secondly, it is supposed that one proceed in this treatise without**

scripture, et de congruitate status moderni in comparacione ad florem etatis ecclesie iuxta modum loquendi scripture. Sed in ista materia sunt quidam moderni doctores approbantes mendacium et dicentes quod veritates tales scripture non sunt dicende tum propter perturbacionem ecclesie, tum eciam propter scelera que hostes ecclesie ex eorum audacia perpetrarent. Unde arguitur et tenetur quod doctores vocati ex mandato domini regis et iurati ad dicendum veritatem de casu qui nuper contigit in Westmonasterio ad honorem Dei, ad utilitatem ecclesie et ad expurgacionem errorum in regno, ut exinde stet constancius in virtute, mentiri debuerant propter duo: primo pro fama sua servanda qui actenus reputati sunt hostes ecclesie; quilibet autem debet diligencius servare famam propriam quam famam alienam pro qua in casu mentiri est licitum. Secundo debuerant mentiri ad conservandum privilegia ecclesie que essent aliter destructa, veritate detecta dominis temporalibus et patronis. Cum autem dicta privilegia sint prestanciora quam vita hominis pro qua servanda licitum est mentiri, multo magis debuerunt mentiri pro illis privilegiis conservandis. Quantum ad principium illius sentencie patet ex tractatu De Mendacio quod est cuilibet fideli detestabile ut hereticum et blasphemum. Nam si aliquod mendacium sit meritorium et aliquod superhabundans [160] in menciente ultra quam oportet, aliquod autem in extremo deficiente apud eum qui ex cauterizata consciencia nimis parce mentitur, sequitur quod habitus mendacii inter hec duo extrema tenens medium foret virtus. Patet consequencia ex diffinicione virtutis posita II° Eth. VI°, cap.: Virtus est habitus electivus in medietate consistens quoad nos determinatus racione. Hoc tamen abhorreret gentilis philosophus Aristoteles, cum IV° Ethicorum, C. IV°, tractans de virtute veridici et duplici vicio falsidici, ita scribit: Per se autem mendacium pravum et fugiendum, verum autem et bonum laudabile.

the doubleness of lying. For lying is precisely the wile by which the devil deludes the faithful, so that [159] they honour a harlot, adulterous with him, as the queen and mother of the faithful, the bride of Christ.[5] Hence this teaching on the quiddity of holy mother church must be supposed as a foundation, so that it may be known who act on behalf of her true privileges and who degenerate; in what the true privilege and edification of the church consists, and in what its opposite stands, according to the faith of scripture; and [what is to be said] of the fittingness of the modern state in comparison with the flower of the church's age, according to scripture's manner of speaking. But in this matter there are certain modern doctors approving lying and saying that such truths of scripture are not to be spoken, both on account of the disturbance of the church and also on account of the crimes which the church's enemies would commit from their boldness.[6] Hence it is argued and held that the doctors called by command of the lord king, and sworn to tell the truth about the case which lately befell at Westminster, for the honour of God, for the profit of the church and for the purging of errors in the kingdom, so that it might thenceforth stand more constantly in virtue, ought to have lied, for two reasons: first, to preserve their own reputation, they who hitherto have been reputed enemies of the church; now each man ought to preserve his own reputation more carefully than another's, for which [another's], in a given case, it is lawful to lie.[7] Secondly, they ought to have lied to preserve the privileges of the church, which would otherwise have been destroyed, once the truth was exposed to the temporal lords and patrons. Now since the said privileges are more excellent than the life of a man, to save which it is lawful to lie, much more ought they to have lied to preserve those privileges.[8] As to the principle of that teaching, it is clear from the treatise On Lying that it is detestable to every faithful man, as heretical and blasphemous. For if some lie is meritorious, and some is superabundant [160] in the liar beyond what is fitting, and some, again, is in the deficient extreme in him who from a seared conscience lies too sparingly, it follows that the habit of lying, holding the mean between these two extremes, would be a virtue.[9] The inference is clear from the definition of virtue laid down in Ethics II, chapter 6: "Virtue is an elective habit consisting in a mean relative to us, determined by reason."[10] Yet the gentile philosopher Aristotle would abhor this, since in Ethics IV, chapter 4, treating of the virtue of the truthful man and of the twofold vice of the false-speaker, he writes thus: "And in itself the lie is base and to be shunned, but the true is good and praiseworthy."[11]

¶2 160.13–160.24

[160]Item, cum omnis virtus sit de genere tertii boni maximi, descendens desursum a patre luminum qua virtute nemo abuti potest (ut sepe meminit beatus Augustinus), sequitur quod omnis virtus mendacii sit a Deo, et cum omnis pater et auctor virtutis sit autonomatice virtuosus, sequitur quod Deus, pater et auctor mendacii, sit summe mendax, sicut Christus secundum humanitatem foret homo mendacissimus potens esse, et per consequens, nullus fidelis dubitat esse blasphemum, cum Manichei blasfemi dixerunt micius quod non Deus bonus, sed Deus malus sit origo et principium talis mali.

Again, since every virtue is of the kind of the third and greatest good, coming down from above from the Father of lights, a virtue which no one can abuse (as blessed Augustine often recalls), it follows that every virtue of lying is from God; and since every father and author of virtue is by antonomasia virtuous, it follows that God, the father and author of lying, is supremely a liar, just as Christ according to his humanity would be the most lying man that could be; and consequently [it follows that] which no faithful man doubts to be blasphemous, since the blasphemous Manichees said more mildly that not the good God but an evil God is the origin and principle of such evil.[12]

Notes

1. ***Sciencia ... gaudet extraneis***: we take it as a maxim that licenses the digression ("knowledge delights in things foreign [to it]"); its source is not identified. The "infamous case" is placed by Wyclif at Westminster (159.13); in England it is the violation of Westminster's sanctuary on 11 August 1378 (Wyclif names Westminster at 159.13); the Roman half is presumably the disorder of the papal election of April 1378 (our inference).
2. A margin ***Tres suppositiones***; B margin, another hand, ***Posteriora prius dicit***, "he says the later things first" (158.1). ***Iuxta dicta XV^{i} cap.***: no fifteenth chapter precedes in ***De ecclesia***; the reference may be to another of Wyclif's works; not traced. A margin ***Racio: Necessaria est noticia de sancta matre ecclesia*** (158.12).
3. Physics II: Loserth refers to ***Phys.*** II.2, 194a, where the end is "that for the sake of which". ***Ex II° Phisicorum*** may instead belong to the ***cum*** clause ("since, as Physics II shows, the end imposes ..."). ***Viat***: the verb of ***viator***, to be on the way.
4. Loserth refers to p. 1 above, where the treatise opens with this commandment applied to Christ and the church. Exod. 20:12 DR "Honour thy father and thy mother" (cited, not quoted). The second supposition (158.30) is announced by the side-note.
5. B ***meretricium*** (159.1); the print ***meretricem*** is translated. ***Secum adulteram***: adulterous with him, the devil, who deludes the faithful into honouring her as Christ's bride.
6. B ***quod eius veris*** (159.5). ***Procurant pro***: act on behalf of (the verb of ***procurator***). A margin ***Opinio*** (159.14), marking the opponents' position.
7. The doctors summoned by the king and sworn on the Westminster case, among whom Wyclif counts himself (***debuissemus***, "we ought", 162.6); the hearing was at the Gloucester parliament (20 October–16 November 1378) (Loserth, Introduction, pp. x, xxv). B margin ***Fame causa licet mentiri***, "for reputation's sake it is lawful to lie" (159.22); B ***quibus autem debet*** (159.22). ***Pro qua***: we take the antecedent as ***famam alienam***, another's reputation.
8. The codices read ***debuerunt*** (159.24), where Loserth prints ***debuerant***; the print is translated, and the sense is the same. ***Patroni***: patrons of benefices.
9. A margin ***Responsio. Contra sentenciam que dicit licitum est mentiri*** (159.30). ***Tractatus De mendacio***: probably Wyclif's own treatment of lying, ***De veritate sacrae scripturae*** cap. 16, which he cites at 44.22 as ***libro sexto, tractatu de mendacio*** (Loserth there: book 6 = ***De veritate***); it argues, as here, that a God who approved a lie would be ***summe deceptivus***. It builds on Augustine's ***De mendacio***. ***Ex cauterizata consciencia*** echoes 1 Tim. 4:2, DR "having their conscience seared".
10. Loserth refers to Wyclif, ***Trialogus*** III.1 (ed. Lechler, p. 128), and Aristotle, ***Eth. Nic.*** II.6, 1106b36. ***Electivus***: by choice.
11. Wyclif's "Ethics IV, chapter 4" answers to ***Eth. Nic.*** IV.7, 1127a28–30, in the modern division; the Latin chapter numbering differs. ***Veridicus / falsidicus***: the truthful man and the false-speaker, who errs in two directions.
12. James 1:17, DR "coming down from the Father of lights" (adapted). Augustine: Loserth refers to ***Retract.*** I.9 and ***De lib. arb.*** II.19, on the virtues as great goods that no one uses ill (***De lib. arb.*** II.19.50, PL 32:1267–68, quoted in the ***Retractationes***). ***De genere tertii boni maximi***: so printed (plate); Augustine's order there is great, least, middle, so the "third" is not his numbering; we translate the print. The subjunctives (***sit ... sit***) carry the opponents' premiss to its conclusion. The Manichees, who set an evil God as the principle of evil, are milder than a doctrine that makes the good God the author of lying (side-note 160.19).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 157: ***CAP. VIII.***
  - 158: ***II°***
  - 159: ***honorent*** (150c folio mark, A margin letter)
  - 159: ***consistit*** (150d is the folio mark)
  - 160: ***II°***
  - 160: ***C*** (print: Ethicorum, C. IV°; round C)

▸ **158:** ***supponendo***

Part 2: A lying God would deceive the whole church; the oath before the king's council; the midwives of Exodus

Loserth pp. 160.25–163.27

¶1 160.25–162.5
161.26 *So the whole Christian faith would fall to pieces.*
162.6 *No worse doctrine was ever propounded than this, that we ought to lie to the King's Council.*
162.20 *No case can be imagined in which it is lawful to lie.*

[160] **Nec dubium quin non sit dare virtutem in homine, quin eius ydea vel exemplar sit in Deo et Deus virtute supra genus est taliter virtuosus, ut non posset exemplare iusticiam, misericordiam, patienciam, liberalitatem, et sic de et aliis, nisi ipse foret summe iustus, misericors, paciens et liberalis, et sic de principiis cuiuscunque generis virtutis. Et sic antecedenter ad virtutem mendacii** [161] **oportet Deum esse summe mendacem. Non enim est fingendum quomodo pertinencius denominaret habitus mendacii subiectum suum quam mendax, cum mentiri sit opus virtutis. Item, suppono ex fide scripture quod Deus dicit quicquid creatura aliqua bene dicit; patet ex hoc quod omnis creatura ut sic est organum Dei principalius dicentis quam sua fistula, iuxta modum loquendi Psalmi LXXXIV, 9: Audiam quid loquatur in me dominus Deus. Et Apostolus IIª, Corinthiorum XIII°, 3: An experimentum queritis eius qui in me loquitur Christus. Ex quibus cum veris sequitur quod tam trinitas quam Christus humanitus facit in omni christiano mendace quodcunque mendacium virtuosum, et cum virtuosum non sit distrahens sed pocius viciosum, sequitur quod Deus simpliciter facit mendacium, et cum dicit falsum eadem intencione qua christianus pie menciens, sequitur quod Deus principalissime mentitur et per consequens mendax est, ut pater eius, ut Christus dicit Johannis VIII°, 44 de ipso diabolo. Cum enim Deus illo modo mendacium loquitur, ex propriis loquitur, cum sit fons et origo mendacii, et ita cum dicit angelis veritatem in verbo, nobis menciendo foret duplex animo, et forent in eo est et non contra Apostolum IIª, Cor. 1°, 17. Ymo, cum ipse sit omnis veritas, negando veritatem virtute mendacii, se ipsum negare posset, contra Apostolum IIª Thymotei II°, 13, et foret racione mendacis principii cateclismus tocius fidei christiane. Cum enim Deus mentiri potest iuxta sic opinantes nec potest habere denominacionem virtutis, nisi habeat ipsam in summo et quodam modo infinite, sequitur ex infinitate sue mendacitatis immense quod in tota fide sue scripture potuit totam ecclesiam decepisse** [162] **dolose. Aliter enim esset dare finem sue mendacitatis immense, usque ad quem et non ultra potuit decepisse; quod credo non dabitur, cum dicitur communiter quod sit infinitum misericors sed finite solum modo miserator.**

Nor is there doubt that no virtue is to be found in man whose idea or exemplar is not in God; and God, by a virtue above every genus, is so virtuous that he could not be the exemplar of justice, mercy, patience, liberality, and so of the others, unless he were himself supremely just, merciful, patient and liberal; and so of the principles of every genus of virtue.[1] And so, antecedently to the virtue of lying, [161] **God must be supremely a liar. For it is not to be imagined how the habit of lying would more fittingly denominate its subject than as "liar", since to lie would be a work of virtue. Again, I suppose from the faith of scripture that God says whatever any creature says well. This is clear from the fact that every creature, as such, is the instrument of God, who speaks more principally than his pipe, according to the manner of speaking of Psalm 84:9: "I will hear what the Lord God will speak in me"; and the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 13:3: "Do you seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me?"[2] From which, together with true [premisses], it follows that both the Trinity and Christ in his humanity make, in every Christian liar, whatever virtuous lie [he tells]; and since "virtuous" is not a diminishing qualifier, but rather "vicious" is, it follows that God makes a lie without qualification; and since he says what is false with the same intention as the Christian who lies piously, it follows that God lies most principally, and consequently is "a liar, and the father thereof", as Christ says of the devil himself, John 8:44.[3] For when God speaks a lie in that way, "he speaketh of his own", since he is the fount and origin of lying; and so, when he tells the angels the truth in the Word, by lying to us he would be double-minded, and there would be in him "It is, and It is not", against the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 1:17. Indeed, since he himself is all truth, by denying the truth by virtue of lying he could deny himself, against the Apostle, 2 Timothy 2:13 ("he cannot deny himself"); and there would be, by reason of a lying principle, a cataclysm of the whole Christian faith.[4] For since, according to those who hold this opinion, God can lie, and cannot have the denomination of a virtue unless he has it in the highest degree and in a certain way infinitely, it follows from the infinity of his immense mendacity that in the whole faith of his scripture he could have deceived**

¶2 162.6–163.27
163.1 *The false doctrine is supported by false quotation.*

[162]Quantum ad illas duas evidencias quod debuissemus mentiri contra iuramentum nostrum tam pium atque legitimum coram consilio regis nostri, Deum contestor et numina quod inter omnes doctrinas vel consilia que audivi non occurrit mihi aliquod difficilius aut detestabilius. Ideo videtur mihi quod minus male potuit fuisse dictum ad partem quam publice sic in scolis, nam sic menciens manifeste incurrisset periurium et infamiam quam vitabat, et ita conclusisset culpabiliter, secundum metam redargucionis maxime sibi ipsi. Ideo minus malum est sine dampno anime pacienter pati detracciones et scandala, quam menciendo et per consequens iniuriando toti universitati create, offendere dominum veritatis. Non enim ymaginari potest casus nec inveniri ficticia in quo vel qua licitum est mentiri, immo crescente mendacio eciam in clero plus solito esset opus doctoris proferre de thesauro scripture raciones et sanctorum testimonia in detestacionem mendacii et non fovere mendacium mendaciis allegacionum et sophisticis argumentis. Ego quippe horrerem introducere scolam istam tamquam doctor mendacii, cum ex fragilitate nimis proni sumus ad hoc sine abduccione peregrina per scienciam menciendi; doctor itaque, docens quod licitum est mentiri, inperfecte procedit, nisi doceat quomodo licitum est mentiri, et per consequens, nisi doceat quomodo debemus mentiri, et sic secundum scolam mendacii foret laudabile mentiri fingendo false doctores extraneos [163]et dicta sanctorum doctorum pro ista sentencia coloranda. Sed quis crederet tali scole: Et dico mendaciis allegacionum, quia allegatum est contra me dictum Augustini, super illo Psalmi V[i], 7: Perdes omnes qui loquntur mendacium, sub hac forma: Multa, inquit, videntur pro salute aut commodo alicuius non malicia, sed benignitate mendacia: quale fuit illarum obstetricum in Exodo que Pharaoni falsum renunciaverunt, ut infantes filiorum Israel non necarentur, sed eciam ista non in re, sed in dolo laudantur. Et hic notant allegantes hanc formam verborum quomodo aliquis est pius dolus quo licet nobis proximum menciendo decipere. Sed ego respexi multos libros Augustini in quibus dicit concorditer quod iste obstetrices in isto mendacio peccaverunt, licet peccatum fuerit Hebreis proficuum, unde cum nullum bonum sit irremuneratum, Deus pro pietate quam habuerant fecit eas taliter premiari. Unde Magister Historiarum super Exodi cap. III° quod sic incipit: De

the whole church [162]guilefully. For otherwise an end would have to be assigned to his immense mendacity, up to which and not beyond he could have deceived; which I believe will not be granted, since it is commonly said that he is infinitely merciful, but only finitely one who shows mercy.[5]

As to those two pieces of evidence, that we ought to have lied against our oath, so pious and lawful, before the council of our king, I call God and the divine powers to witness that among all the doctrines or counsels I have heard none has met me harder or more detestable.[6] Therefore it seems to me that it could have been said less badly in private than thus publicly in the schools; for one lying thus would manifestly have incurred perjury and the infamy which he was avoiding, and so would culpably have inferred, according to the goal of refutation, chiefly against himself.[7] Therefore it is less evil, without damage to the soul, patiently to suffer detractions and scandals, than, by lying and consequently wronging the whole created universe, to offend the lord of truth. For no case can be imagined, nor fiction found, in which it is lawful to lie; rather, as lying grows, even among the clergy, more than usual, it would be the doctor's work to bring forth from the treasury of scripture reasons and testimonies of the saints in detestation of lying, and not to foster lying with lies of allegation and with sophistical arguments.[8] I for my part would shudder to bring in this school as a doctor of lying, since from frailty we are all too prone to it without being led further astray by a foreign science of lying; and so a doctor teaching that it is lawful to lie proceeds imperfectly unless he teaches how it is lawful to lie, and consequently unless he teaches how we ought to lie; and so, according to the school of lying, it would be praiseworthy to lie by falsely feigning foreign doctors [163]and sayings of holy doctors, to give colour to this teaching.[9] But who would believe such a school? And I say "with lies of allegation" because the saying of Augustine on that [verse] of Psalm 5:7, "Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie", was alleged against me in this form: "Many lies," he says, "seem [to be told] for someone's safety or advantage, not from malice but from kindness: such was that of the midwives in Exodus, who reported what was false to Pharaoh, so that the infants of the sons of Israel should not be killed; but even these are praised not in the thing but in the guile."[10] And here those who allege this form of words note how there is a pious guile by which it is lawful for us to deceive our neighbour by lying. But I have looked into many books of Augustine in which he says consistently that those midwives sinned

indole obstetricum, sic loquitur: Quia timuerunt Deum, edificavit illis domos, id est, locupletavit eas, cum essent pauperes, vel fecundavit eas, cum essent steriles. Augustinus vero dicit obstetrices venialiter peccasse, Gregorius vero videtur velle quod mortaliter; dicit enim quod merces benignitatis earum non potuit in eterna vita retribui, sed pro culpa mendacii in terrenam compensacionem declinata est.

in that lie, although the sin was profitable to the Hebrews; hence, since no good is unrewarded, God, for the piety which they had, caused them to be rewarded in such a way.[11] Hence the Master of the Histories, on Exodus, chapter 3, which begins thus, "On the promise of the midwives", speaks thus: "Because they feared God, he built them houses, that is, he enriched them, since they were poor, or made them fruitful, since they were barren." Augustine indeed says that the midwives sinned venially, but Gregory seems to hold that [they sinned] mortally; for he says that the reward of their kindness could not be repaid in eternal life, but because of the fault of lying was turned aside into an earthly recompense.[12]

Notes

1. ***Deus virtute supra genus est taliter virtuosus***: we take ***virtute supra genus*** together, "by a virtue above every genus"; it may also be read "God, above genus, is by virtue so virtuous". The argument runs from the opponents' premiss (a lie can be a virtue) through the exemplarism of the virtues in God.
2. A A_1 lack ***II.*** (161.10), apparently of ***II^a Corinthiorum***. Ps. 84:9 (Ps. 85:8 in the Hebrew numbering) and 2 Cor. 13:3 are quoted in the Douay–Rheims. ***Fistula***: the pipe through which the player speaks, the creature as God's instrument.
3. ***Cum veris***: so the codices (Loserth, 161.12): "together with true [premisses]". ***Distrahens***: "virtuous" does not take away from "lie" as "dead" takes away from "man", so a virtuous lie is a lie without qualification. A margin ***Arguitur quod Deus non potest mentiri*** (161.20). John 8:44 DR "he is a liar, and the father thereof"; Wyclif's ***ut pater eius*** turns the verse on God, and we give it in the DR wording.
4. B lacks ***sit*** (161.22). A reads ***Cor. I***, A_1 ***I Cor. I*** (161.25); 2 Cor. 1:17 DR "It is, and It is not". ***In verbo***: we take it as the Word, the Son, in whom the angels see the truth; "in speech" is possible. The codices read ***Thymotei II*** (161.28); 2 Tim. 2:13 DR. ***Cateclismus***: cataclysm, a deluge; Loserth's side-note (161.26) gives "fall to pieces".
5. B margin, another hand: ***Misericors est Deus infinite, sed finite est miserator*** (162.5). ***Miserator***: one who shows mercy in act, as against the infinite attribute.
6. Wyclif counts himself among the sworn doctors (***debuissemus***, "we"; see 08-a, n. 7). B margin, another hand, ***Jurat***, "he swears" (162.8). ***Deum contestor et numina***: an oath formula; ***numina***, "the divine powers", is Wyclif's word.
7. ***Ad partem***: in private. ***Secundum metam redargucionis***: the goals (***metae***) of the sophistical arguer as set out in Aristotle's ***Sophistici elenchi*** 3 (165b12–22), of which refutation is the first. The liar refutes himself, incurring the perjury and infamy he lied to avoid. A margin ***Conclusio*** (162.17).
8. B margin, another hand, ***Nota de non committendo mendacio*** (162.20). A ***thezauro*** (162.23), a spelling. ***Mendaciis allegacionum***: lies in the citing of authorities (***allegacio***, the alleging of a text), as the next sentences show.
9. ***Sine abduccione peregrina***: without being led astray by something alien, the "science of lying". ***Coloranda***: "to give colour to", the verb beside the glossary ***color*** (a plausible ground), not "to disguise".
10. A margin ***Augustinus. Nota. Pro mendacio obstitricum in Exodo et contra***; B margin, another hand, ***De obstetricum mendacio*** (163.4). Augustine, ***Enarr. in Ps.*** 5 (PL 36:85; Loserth: Opp. IV, p. 18), which has the ***non*** and ***indole***. The codices lack ***non*** before ***malicia*** (163.9); Loserth supplies it from Augustine, and it is translated. Loserth gives Augustine's words as ***Sed etiam ista non re, sed indole laudantur*** (163.10): the opponents' ***non in re, sed in dolo*** is the reading Wyclif contests at 164.1–12. The midwives: Exod. 1:15–19 (cited).
11. "Many books of Augustine": e.g. ***Contra mendacium*** 15.31–32 (PL 40:539–40), ***De mendacio*** (PL 40:491–92), ***Quaest. in Hept.*** II.1 (PL 34:597, ***potuit non ad laudem, sed ad veniam pertinere***).
12. ***Exodi cap. III°***: the codices have a lacuna, and Loserth supplies the chapter from Peter Comestor, ***Historia scholastica***, Exod. 3 (163.19; he cites the Strassburg edition of 1515; PL 198:1142B–C, ***De dolo obstetricum***). Loserth notes that in Comestor one reads ***de dolo***, not ***de indole*** (163.20), which bears on Wyclif's argument at 164.3. A margin ***Magister historiarum*** (163.19). "He built them houses": Exod. 1:21 DR. Gregory: ***Moralia*** XVIII.3 (PL 76:41A–B; Loserth: Opp. I, p. 559): the midwives' reward ***in terrenam ... recompensationem declinata***; Comestor himself reports Augustine (***venialiter***) and Gregory (***mortaliter***). Where Comestor's words end is not marked; we close the quotation after "barren" and take the report of Augustine and Gregory as Wyclif's, though it may continue Comestor.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 161: ***oportet*** (151a folio mark, C margin letter)
  - 161: ***Deum***
  - 161: ***esse***
  - 161: ***est*** (short ascender with crossbar = t)

- **161:** ***in*** **(10 is the line number)**
- **161:** ***II²***
- **161:** ***Christus***
- **161:** ***Christus***
- **161:** ***II²***
- **161:** ***II²***
- **161:** ***13***
- **162:** ***∅*** **(debuisse-/mus is one word, already whole at pos 39)**
- **162:** ***regis***
- **163:** ***V¹*** **(superscript i after V (Psalmi V^{i}, 7))**
- **163:** ***III°***
- **163:** ***Quia***
- **161:** ***decepisse***

Part 3: Augustine on the midwives; lying cannot defend the church's privileges; what a privilege is

Loserth pp. 164.1–168.3

¶1 164.1–166.15
164.21 *Augustine does not praise the Egyptian midwives for lying.*
165.14 *To allow lying on behalf of the Church would make her advocates suspected;*
166.20 *and throw doubt on all her rights and privileges.*

[164]**Unde in textu originalis beati Augustini inveni sic scriptum: ista non re, sed indole laudantur. Nec dubium quin sic habent libri correcti, tum quia magnus ille doctor Petrus Comestor intitulat capitulum suum De indole obstetricum, et sic loquitur sanctus Thomas secunda secunde q. CX²; tum secundo quia tunc textus Augustini diceret non in re, sed in dolo laudantur, nunc autem dicitur non re, sed indole laudantur; tum tercio quia dato hoc textu sic perverso adhuc militat in oppositum pervertentis, cum textus dicit quod non laudantur re. Certum est tamen quod in re fecerunt bonum opus de genere, quod fuisset virtuosum, si fuisset non infectum mendacio. Unde econtra est sentencia Augustini quod obstetrices laudantur in re vel opere, non autem in dolo quo regem mendaciter fefellerunt. Unde inveni in margine originalis beati Augustini sic scriptum: indolem vocat profectum; sicut enim est corporalis indoles corporaliter crescencium, sic est spiritualis indoles spiritualiter proficiencium. Vult ergo Augustinus dicere quod ista verba mendacia obstetricum non laudantur in re mendacii, sed in profectu vel fructu qui exinde provenit crescencie Hebreorum. Est ergo sentencia Augustini quod Deus non posset sinere peccatum fieri, nisi exinde bonum proveniat; unde propter bonum exinde occasionaliter proveniens vocatur peccatum Ade a beato Gregorio necessarium atque felix. Et dicitur a beato Augustino expediens; unde XIV°, De Civitate Dei, cap. XIII°, sic scribit: Audeo dicere superbis esse utile cadere in aliquod apertum manifestumque peccatum, unde sibi displiceant qui iam sibi placendo ceciderant. Salubrius enim** [165]**Petrus sibi displicuit quando flevit quam sibi placuit quando presumpsit. Sed per se notum est theologis quod non exinde peccandum est, quod bonum ex gracia**

Hence in the text of the original of blessed Augustine I found it written thus: "these are praised not for the thing but for the promise".[1] Nor is there doubt that the corrected books have it so: first, because that great doctor Peter Comestor entitles his chapter "On the promise of the midwives", and so speaks Saint Thomas, Secunda secundae, question 110;[2] secondly, because then the text of Augustine would say "they are praised not in the thing but in the guile", whereas in fact it says "they are praised not for the thing but for the promise"; thirdly, because, granted this text so perverted, it still tells against the one who perverts it, since the text says that they are not praised for the thing.[3] Yet it is certain that in the thing they did a work good in its kind, which would have been virtuous had it not been infected with lying. Hence, on the contrary, the teaching of Augustine is that the midwives are praised in the thing or work, but not in the guile by which they deceived the king with a lie. Hence I found written in the margin of the original of blessed Augustine thus: "He calls 'promise' progress; for just as there is a bodily promise of those who grow bodily, so there is a spiritual promise of those who advance spiritually." Augustine, therefore, means to say that those lying words of the midwives are not praised in the thing of lying, but in the progress or fruit which came of it for the increase of the Hebrews.[4] It is, therefore, the teaching of Augustine that God could not permit sin to be done unless good came of it; hence, because of the good that came of it by occasion, the sin of Adam is called by blessed Gregory necessary and happy. And it is called expedient by blessed Augustine; hence in De

Dei exinde proveniat. Unde credo quod peccatum publicum doctorum quo manifeste approbant mendacium ut virtutem, et mendax allegacio originalium, ut mendacio pallient dictum suum, vertetur ex gracia Dei illis in commodum, dum tamen in isto se corrigant et recognoscentes defectum suum humiliter resipiscant. Quis rogo aliter caperet eos in testimonium vel allegacioni eorum crederet, dum dicerent quod privatum commodum meritorium sit mentiri; revera nescio que opinio redderet hominem plus infamem. Quantum ad secundam evidenciam quod propter salvanda privilegia ecclesie sicut in casu qui nuper contigit meritorium sit mentiri, manifestum est quod dogma illud inficiendo privilegia redderet procuratorem ecclesie nimis suspectum; cum enim omne privilegium vel libertas sit fundatum in veritate que est sponsus ecclesie, manifestum est quod professione veritatis et non mendacii veritati oppositi defenderetur, dicente eadem veritate Joh. VIII°, 31, 32: Si vos manseritis in sermone meo, vere discipuli mei eritis, et vos cognoscetis veritatem, et veritas liberabit vos. Ex quibus patet cum fide scripture quod, de quanto orator ecclesie declinat a sermone Dei qui est veritas in verba mendacii que sunt sermones diaboli, ut sic se ipsum inhabilitat ad privilegia et libertates ecclesie procurandum; nam nulla talia dantur nisi per sponsum ecclesie, veritatem que odit omne mendacium. Ideo dicit Joh. VIII°, 34: Omnis qui facit peccatum servus est peccati. Nec dubium quin omnis faciens mendacium ut sic peccat, ideo mendacium est pessimum medium ad procurandum bona ecclesie. Nam mentitor ut sic offendit in naturam divinam a qua [166] omne bonum profluit sponse Christi, et ut sic offendit in totam ecclesiam, quia contra hoc mandatum domini: Non loqueris contra proximum tuum falsum testimonium, Exod. XX°, 16, iniuriatur ut sic sancte matri ecclesie: ideo absit ecclesiam expetere huiusmodi oratorem. Nam secundum Augustinum super Psalmum V^{um}: Si hoc dicitur quod est, verum dicitur, et ut sic ad eum qui est acceditur; si autem hoc dicitur quod non est, mendacium fit et a veritate receditur. Ideo dicit propheta: Perdes omnes qui loquuntur mendacium. Unde ne quis arbitretur perfectum et spiritualem hominem pro ista temporali vita in cuius morte non occiditur anima, sive sua sive alterius, debere mentiri, non inmerito in alio loco scriptum est: Os quod mentitur occidit animam.

civitate Dei XIV, chapter 13, he writes thus: "I dare to say that it is useful for the proud to fall into some open and manifest sin, whereby they may be displeased with themselves, who had already fallen by pleasing themselves. For more wholesomely [165] was Peter displeased with himself when he wept than pleased with himself when he presumed."[5] But it is self-evident to theologians that one is not to sin on the ground that good comes of it by the grace of God. Hence I believe that the public sin of the doctors, by which they openly approve lying as a virtue, and the lying allegation of the originals, to cloak their saying with a lie, will by the grace of God be turned to their benefit, provided that they correct themselves in this and, acknowledging their defect, humbly come to their senses. Who, I ask, would otherwise take them as witnesses, or believe their allegation, while they said that to lie is a meritorious private advantage? Truly I do not know what opinion would make a man more infamous.[6] As to the second evidence, that for the saving of the privileges of the church, as in the case which lately befell, it is meritorious to lie, it is manifest that that dogma, by infecting the privileges, would render the proctor of the church all too suspect; for since every privilege or liberty is founded in the truth, which is the bridegroom of the church, it is manifest that it would be defended by the profession of truth, and not of the lie opposed to the truth, as the same truth says, John 8:31–32: "If you continue in my word, you shall be my disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth: and the truth shall make you free."[7] From which it is clear, together with the faith of scripture, that in so far as an advocate of the church turns aside from the word of God, which is truth, to words of lying, which are the speeches of the devil, to that extent he makes himself unqualified for procuring the privileges and liberties of the church; for none such are given except through the bridegroom of the church, the truth, which hates every lie.[8] Therefore he says, John 8:34: "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." Nor is there doubt that everyone who makes a lie sins as such; therefore lying is the worst means for procuring the goods of the church. For the liar as such offends against the divine nature, from which [166] every good flows forth to the bride of Christ; and as such he offends against the whole church, because, against this commandment of the Lord, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour", Exodus 20:16, he as such wrongs holy mother church: therefore far be it that the church should seek out an advocate of this kind. For according to Augustine on Psalm 5: "If what is is said, the truth is said, and so one draws near to him who is; but if what is not is said, a lie is made, and one

withdraws from the truth. Therefore the prophet says: Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie. Hence, lest anyone should think that the perfect and spiritual man ought to lie for this temporal life, in whose death the soul is not slain, whether his own or another's, not undeservedly is it written in another place: The mouth that belieth, killeth the soul."[9]

¶2 166.16–168.3
167.9 *Christ spoke truth without regard to his reputation.*
167.18 *All laws made for the benefit of the Church may be called privileges, as being in some degree private laws.*
167.29 *The universal law is that of charity.*

[166]Ex quo patet quod pro tota universali ecclesia salvanda nullus sapiens mentiretur, nam cum omne mendacium sit peccatum contra naturam, eo quod tota natura fuit pure in veritate sine mendacio primitus instituta, quis procuraret pro bono ecclesie per verba mendacia? Nonne domini seculares audientes quod per dogma falsum, quia per mendacium, sit privilegium ecclesie defendendum, ex naturali lumine statim convincerent quod totum privilegium sit mendax et frivolum quod indiget sic fulciri mendaciis? Nonne iterum audientes doctorem ecclesie dogmatizare publice quod privilegia ecclesie sunt per mendacia inpetranda, suspicarentur probabiliter quod tota suggestio qua impetrantur bona ecclesie sit mendax et falsa, et per consequens, omnia illa bona forent ex defectu fundamenti stabilis auferenda? Nonne tercio credens ecclesiam sic privilegiatam [167]approbare mendacia diffideret quod ecclesia illa recipiens ex titulo elemosine a seculari principe bona huiusmodi sub condicione quod rependat spirituale suffragium, mentiretur in defraudando a promisso suffragio. Ideo ista opinio foret pessima ad bona ecclesie fideliter procurandum. Et eadem est consideracio de causis civilibus, quod inpossibile est ut mendacia illas vel contenciones aliquas legitime promoverent. Consideremus ergo quod Christus incurrebat aput sacerdotes, phariseos et scribas apparenciam diffamacionis, maxime ex hoc quod detegendo veritatem et reprobando eorum vicia purgavit ecclesiam et ut sic aquisivit sibi nomen quod est super omne nomen, superans quamlibet famam mundi. Sic nos christiani debemus tenere veritatem et privilegia ecclesie Christi defendere quantum sufficimus nec curare de fama alia, nisi de quanto adicitur ex virtute. Sed tercio notandum pro ulteriori declaracione privilegiorum ecclesie quod privilegium est privata lex, concessa a principe ad commodum ecclesie vel persone. Unde (si non fallor) omnis bona lex temporalis vel humanitus adinventa pro utilitate ecclesie vocari potest privilegium ecclesie, cum omnis talis lex sit privata quoad tempus et populum. Unde quod legiste vocant talia iura communia non obest quin sint privata, quia in communitate legum est dare quotlibet gradus, et lex privata potest crescere in communitate quoad tempus, locum et personam. Lex autem caritatis quam omnis homo debet semper et ubique tenere est ius communissimum sicut alie leges condicionales

From which it is clear that to save the whole universal church no wise man would lie; for since every lie is a sin against nature, because the whole of nature was at first instituted purely in truth without a lie, who would procure the good of the church by lying words? Would not the secular lords, hearing that a privilege of the church is to be defended by a false dogma, because by a lie, at once establish by the natural light that the whole privilege that needs to be propped up thus with lies is lying and frivolous?[10] Would they not, again, hearing a doctor of the church dogmatize publicly that the privileges of the church are to be obtained by lies, suspect with probability that the whole suggestion by which the goods of the church are obtained is lying and false, and consequently that all those goods are to be taken away for want of a stable foundation? Would not, thirdly, one who believed that the church so privileged [167] approves lies lose confidence, [fearing] that that church, receiving goods of this kind by title of alms from a secular prince on condition that it repay a spiritual suffrage, would lie in defrauding [him] of the promised suffrage?[11] Therefore this [opinion] would be the worst for faithfully procuring the goods of the church. And the same is the consideration of civil causes: it is impossible that lies should lawfully promote them, or any contentions. Let us consider, then, that Christ incurred among the priests, Pharisees and scribes the appearance of disrepute, chiefly from this, that by exposing the truth and reproving their vices he purged the church, and as such acquired for himself the name which is above all names, surpassing every fame of the world.[12] So we Christians ought to hold the truth and defend the privileges of the church of Christ as far as we are able, and not care for other fame, except in so far as it is added from virtue. But, thirdly, it is to be noted, for the further declaration of the privileges of the church, that a privilege is a private law granted by a prince for the benefit of the church or of a person.[13] Hence (if I am not mistaken) every good temporal law, or [law] humanly devised for the profit of the church, can be called a privilege of the church, since every such law is private as to time and people. Hence that the legists call such laws common does not prevent their being private, because in the

quas ipsa implicat. Addo eciam distinccionem ecclesie vel persone, quia si tantum esset una creatura racionalis privilegiata, tunc non privilegiaretur ecclesia. Privilegium ergo est specialis licencia [168] creature utendi utibili vel fruendi fruibili, et illud speciale vel privatum licere est lex, ut patet in communi sermone de lege.

commonness of laws there are as many degrees as you please, and a private law can grow in commonness as to time, place and person.[14] But the law of charity, which every man ought always and everywhere to keep, is the most common law, as are the other conditional laws which it implies. I add also the distinction "of the church or of a person", because if only one rational creature were privileged, then the church would not be privileged. A privilege, therefore, is a special licence [168] for a creature to use what is usable or to enjoy what is enjoyable; and that special or private being-allowed is law, as is clear in common speech about law.[15]

Notes

1. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 5 (Loserth, "ut supra", 164.2); cf. 08-b, n. 10. *Originale*: the Father's own work, as against a florilegium or a citation. *Indoles*: native quality, the promise of growth, as the margin gloss below explains; rendered "promise" throughout.
2. Comestor's heading: Loserth reports that in Comestor one reads *de dolo*, not *de indole* (08-b, n. 12). Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* II-II q. 110 (Loserth: Opp., Venice 1774, tom. IV); the article, and whether Thomas reads *indole*, are not independently checked.
3. B lacks *nunc — laudantur* (164.8–9). *Militat in oppositum pervertentis*: tells against the one who perverted it, since even the perverted text denies that they are praised "in the thing".
4. The margin gloss in Wyclif's copy of Augustine is not identified; not traced. *Profectus*: progress, growth. Side-note 164.21.
5. Gregory: the words "necessary" and "happy" of Adam's sin are the Easter *Exsultet*, *O certe necessarium Ade peccatum … O felix culpa* (Sarum, Legg p. 117), which Wyclif regularly ascribes to Gregory (so *De civili dominio* III, *De dominio divino*); it is not in the Gregorian sacramentary as printed (PL 78). Augustine's "expedient": *De civ. Dei* XIV.13 says *utile* (PL 41:422, *superbis esse utile cadere*); *expediens* is Wyclif's word. *De civ. Dei* XIV.13 (Loserth: Opp. VII, p. 366 A). A margin *Nota Augustinum, quod utile est in casu peccare* (164.30).
6. A margin *Conclusio* (165.4). A_1 adds *propter* before *privatum* (165.11–12), "that for private advantage it is meritorious to lie"; A_1 alone does not outweigh the print, which is translated. *Mendax allegacio originalium*: the lying citation of the Fathers' works. *Resipiscant*: come to their senses, repent.
7. John 8:31–32 DR; Wyclif's *et vos cognoscetis* adds *vos*, not rendered. *Procurator*: the church's proctor, its agent in suing for privileges (side-note 165.14, "her advocates").
8. *Orator ecclesie* (also 166.4): here the church's advocate or spokesman, who sues for her privileges, as Loserth's side-note has it; the glossary *oratores*, "bedesmen", does not fit this sense, and the term is left untagged. *De quanto … ut sic*: in so far as …, to that extent.
9. A margin *Augustinus* (166.6). Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 5 (Loserth 166.7). Loserth gives Augustine's words as *Si enim hoc dicitur quod est, verum dicitur; si autem hoc dicitur quod non est, mendacium est*; Wyclif's "and so one draws near to him who is" and "and one withdraws from the truth" are not in Loserth's quotation; the full source wording is not independently checked. Ps. 5:7 DR; Wis. 1:11 DR "the mouth that belieth, killeth the soul" (Loserth 166.16); Exod. 20:16 DR.
10. B *ex natura lumine* (166.23). B *convinceret*; Loserth's apparatus judges *convincerentur*, "would they not be convinced", the better reading (166.23), but he prints *convincerent*, which is translated, "establish". Side-note 166.20.
11. *Diffideret quod … mentiretur*: the construction is loose; we take it as "would lose confidence [in the church], fearing that it would lie". *Ex titulo elemosine*: by title of alms, the endowment received as alms and repaid with suffrages.
12. Phil. 2:9 DR "a name which is above all names". Side-note 167.9.
13. A_1 *Sed ulterius* for *Sed tercio* (167.18); the print is translated. "Thirdly": the third of the suppositions announced at 158.1 (08-a). A margin *Quid est privilegium?* (167.19). The definition recalls the etymology of *privilegium* as a private law (Isidore, *Etym.* V.18, taken into Gratian, *Decretum* D.3 c.3).
14. A margin *Omnis lex humanitus adinventa utilis est privilegium* (167.22). A_1 *iuriste* for *legiste* (167.25). *Ius* here is law, a body of law, not a right (the glossary).
15. The codices read *distinctim*; Loserth prints *distinccionem* (167.32), translated. The codices read *usibili*; Loserth prints *utibili* (168.1), translated; B *et fruendi* for *vel fruendi*. *Utendi … fruendi*: the pair "use" and "enjoy" is Augustine's *uti / frui* (*De doctr. chr.* I.3–4, PL 34:20). *Licere*: the infinitive used as a noun, "being-allowed".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 164: *profectu* (leaf zoom: tall hooked f, not t)
  - 165: *Petrus* (151c is the folio mark)
  - 165: *privilegia*
  - 165: *in*
  - 166: *Christi*
  - 166: *16*
  - 166: *V^{um}* (superscript um after V (Psalmum V^{um}))

- **166: *per* (round p)**
- **166: *privilegiatam* (main token holds the whole word privi-/legiatam; glued 3 is the bold argument numeral)**
- **167: *suffragio* (5 is the line number) [NW]**
- **167: *Christus***
- **167: *Christi***
- **167: *legiste* (print spelling) [NW]**
- **168: *creature***
- **164: *textu***
- **164: *beati***
- **164: *inveni* (v as printed)**
- **164: *sic* (151b folio mark and alinea E glued)**

Part 4: Corollaries of the definition of privilege; the sons of Zebedee and the cup

Loserth pp. 168.4–172.24

¶1 168.4–169.28
168.4 *Only a creature can have privilege;*
168.9 *a true privilege must really benefit the grantee:*
168.19 *Consequently there is no privilege except what is granted by Christ.*
169.5 *The highest privilege is to be allowed to follow Christ in poverty.*
169.28 *Instance of the mother of Zebedee's children.*

[168]**Ex istis patet primo non equivocantibus quod proprietates que naturaliter competunt trinitati non sunt earum privilegia, cum omne privilegium principaliter ab extrinseco pro utilitate inest privilegiato, et sic solum creatura racionalis est capax privilegii. Patet secundo quod privilegiante aut privilegiato decepto in credendo privilegium vergere privilegiando ad commodum, dum tamen concessum privilegiando cedat ad dampnum tamquam utilitati sue contrarium, non est privilegium sed pocius corruptela. Patet ex hoc quod privilegium (in quantum huiusmodi) est bonum utile, ut non est privilegium infidelibus quod liberati a iusticia exonerati sunt a iugo domini et effrenes ad peccandum subiecti iugo diaboli, nisi forte equivocetur, vocando privilegium quodlibet privans legem. Tercio sequitur quod non est aliquod privilegium, nisi quod princeps pacis concesserit, caput universalis ecclesie, dominus Jesus Christus. Patet ex hoc quod non potest esse bonum ecclesie, nisi primo venerit per derivacionem a capite. Si enim primas privatus concedit aliquid et Deus illud non concedit, tunc vel oportet concedere quod Deus non prevenit ipsum in agendo, et per consequens non est causa essencialis cuiuslibet creature, vel aliter quod non est bonum vel rationale quod privilegiatus illud habeat, quia si esset sapiencia Dei, eternaliter ordinaret ut habeat, et cum clemencia spiritus sancti graciose illud donaret; cum Johannis XV°, 5, 4, dicit caput: Sine me nichil potestis facere, sicut palmes non potest facere fructum, nisi manserit in vite, sic** [169]**enim privilegium concessum domesticis non est ratum, dum tamen ab essenciali patrefamilias omnipotente et omnisciente indultum non fuerit et optenta eius licencia confirmatum. Ex istis colligitur quod summum privilegium concessum christiano pro via foret quod, exproprietarie vivendo, Christo similius foret anterior**

From these things it is clear, first, to those who do not equivocate, that the properties which belong naturally to the Trinity are not its privileges, since every privilege is in the one privileged principally from without, for his profit; and so only a rational creature is capable of privilege.[1] It is clear, secondly, that when the one granting or the one privileged is deceived in believing that the privilege tends to the benefit of the one being privileged, while yet what is granted to the one being privileged turns to his harm, as contrary to his profit, it is not a privilege but rather a corruption.[2] This is clear from the fact that a privilege (in so far as it is such) is a useful good; so it is no privilege for unbelievers that, set free from justice, they are discharged from the yoke of the Lord and, unbridled for sinning, made subject to the yoke of the devil, unless perhaps the word is used equivocally, calling a privilege anything that deprives of law.[3] Thirdly, it follows that there is no privilege except what the Prince of Peace has granted, the head of the universal church, the Lord Jesus Christ. This is clear from the fact that there cannot be a good of the church unless it has first come by derivation from the head. For if a primate on his own grants something and God does not grant it, then either one must grant that God does not go before him in acting, and consequently is not the essential cause of every creature, or else that it is not good or reasonable that the one privileged should have it; because if it were the wisdom of God, he would eternally ordain that he should have it, and with the clemency of the Holy Spirit would graciously give it;[4] since, John 15:5, 4, the head says: "Without me you can do nothing"; for as "the branch cannot bear fruit, unless it abide in the vine", so [169]**a privilege granted to the members of the household is not valid so long as it has**

in exercitu christiano. Patet primo sic: Iuxta proximum corellarium nullum est privilegium nisi concessum a Christo, ipse autem non potest concedere maius privilegium quam plus assimilando subditum sibi ipsi, ergo etc. Unde Matthei XVIII°, 1, quando discipuli quesierunt a Christo: Quis putas maior est in regno celorum, ipse advocans parvulum sine malicia statuit eum in medio illorum dixitque re et sermone quod qui sic plus se humiliaverit hic maior est in ecclesia militante. Item, cuicunque militi pro statu milicie foret aptacius quod armatus decencius et adiutus specialius ponatur in acie belli, ubi forcior est conflictus, in hoc enim consistit militaris strenuitas. Sed ut dicitur Job VII°, 1: Milicia est tota vita hominis super terram, et iuxta Apostolum Eph. VI°, 12: Non est nobis colluctacio adversus carnem et sanguinem, sed adversus principes et potestates, adversus mundi rectores tenebrarum harum, contra spiritualia nequicie. Ideo patet quod, quanto quis fuerit sic positus anterius in dicto exercitu, indultum est sibi privilegium eo maius quo amplius coronabitur. Et patet ista sentencia de matre

not been granted by the essential father of the household, almighty and all-knowing, and confirmed by his licence obtained.[5] From these things it is gathered that the highest privilege granted to a Christian for the way would be that, living without property, he should, being more like Christ, be further forward in the Christian army.[6] It is clear, first, thus: by the next corollary there is no privilege except one granted by Christ; now he cannot grant a greater privilege than by making the subject more like himself; therefore etc. Hence, Matthew 18:1, when the disciples asked Christ, "Who, thinkest thou, is the greater in the kingdom of heaven?", he, calling a little child without malice, set him in the midst of them, and said in deed and in word that he who has humbled himself more in this way, he is the greater in the church militant.[7] Again, for any knight it would be more fitting, for the state of knighthood, that, armed more becomingly and aided more specially, he should be placed in the line of battle where the fight is fiercer; for in this consists military vigour.[8] Now, as is said, Job 7:1: "The whole life of man upon earth is a warfare"; and according to the Apostle, Ephesians 6:12: "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness." Therefore it is clear that the further forward anyone has been placed thus in the said army, the greater the privilege granted him, by as much as he will be the more fully crowned.[9] And this teaching is clear from the mother

¶2 169.29–170.4
170.21 *Primacy is to be desired in labour, not in honour.*

[169] filiorum Zebedei que ex instigacione filiorum petebat privilegium a Christo, ut hii sederent in regno suo unus ad dexteram et alius ad sinistram (ut patet Matthei XX°, 22). Sed pueri petentes illud implicite audierunt divinum responsum: Nescitis quid petatis. Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum [170] Quo concesso concessit eis privilegium consequenter Calicem, inquit, meum bibetis, sedere autem ad dexteram meam vel sinistram non est meum dare vobis, sed quibus paratum est a patre meo.

of the sons of Zebedee, who at the instigation of her sons asked a privilege of Christ, that these might sit in his kingdom, the one on the right hand and the other on the left (as is clear, Matthew 20:21). But the boys, asking it implicitly, heard the divine answer: "You know not what you ask. Can you drink the chalice that I shall drink?" [170] This being granted, he granted them a privilege in consequence: "My chalice," he says, "you shall drink; but to sit on my right or left hand is not mine to give to you, but to them for whom it is prepared by my Father."[10]

¶3 170.5–170.20

[170] Super quo Crisostomus, Omelia XXXV° Operis In-, perfecti notat primo quod diabolus qui seduxit primum virum per feminam movit ut dicti apostoli seducerentur per feminam. Notat secundo quomodo Christus dirigens sermonem ad illos discipulos docet quod illi ex ceca presumpcione atque superba primatum culpabiliter pecierunt, aliter enim non direxisset omnisciens increpativum

On this Chrysostom, in Homily 35 of the Opus imperfectum, notes, first, that the devil, who seduced the first man through a woman, contrived that the said apostles should be seduced through a woman. He notes, secondly, how Christ, directing his speech to those disciples, teaches that they culpably sought the primacy out of blind and proud presumption; for otherwise the all-knowing one would not have directed a rebuking

sermonem ad illos discipulos dimissa femina procurante: Nescitis, inquit, quid petatis. Ideo dicit Cristostomus: O error salutaris qui tocius mundi solvit errorem. Si enim apostoli non sic errassent, unde nos cognoscere poteramus quod non omne quod videtur bonum desiderare bonum est? Cum enim scimus quod aliud est opus bonum et aliud primatus honoris. Et opus quidem bonum desiderare bonum est, primatum autem honoris vanitas est.

speech to those disciples, passing over the woman who was acting on their behalf: "You know not," he says, "what you ask." Therefore Chrysostom says: "O salutary error, which loosed the error of the whole world! For if the apostles had not erred thus, whence could we have known that not everything that seems good is good to desire? For we know that a good work is one thing and the primacy of honour another. And to desire a good work is good, but [to desire] the primacy of honour is vanity,"[11]

¶4 170.21–172.7
171.5 *Christ's treatment of his disciples' ambition.*
171.23 *He refused their request but granted that they should drink his cup.*
172.3 *Two kinds of martyrdom.*
172.8 *Lesson of humility.*

[170] Tercio notandum quod sive apostoli errore seducti pecierunt primatum in regno temporali sive in regno celorum, sicut videtur ex textu convinci, stulta fuit eorum peticio, cum debuerunt laborem certaminis humiliter petivisse, et ad hoc sine iactancia primatus honor beatitudinis secutus fuisset; honor enim fugientem se sequitur et refugit affectantem. Unde dicit Crisostomus: Desiderium primatus ex iactancia nascitur cordis; qui, inquit, humilis est indigniorem se aliis arbitratur [171] iuxta apostolicum preceptum: Alter alterum existimans superiorem. Et hec racio (ut tactum est superius), quare membra ecclesie et gradus quibus Deus ipsos diligit sunt nobis abscondita. Quarto notandum quod Christus videns alienum spiritum in cordibus templi sui, non more conquirencium castra sua corporalia, disrupit muros castri, sed hostem expulit alliciens eos ad humilitatem qua ipsimet superent tyrannum qui eos turpiter superavit. Potestis, inquit, bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum? Ex qua interrogacione mulcente docemur, primo quod oportet victoriam esse voluntariam, si debet esse meritoria, ideo querit Christus ab eis modeste, si possunt pati voluntarie instar sui. Secundo docentur ceteri apostoli non indignari contra duos fratres, cum dominus eorum, contra quem principaliter usurpata fuit iniuria, tam urbane optulit eis idem medium quo ipse meruit dignitatem. Tercio docentur omnes christiani quod pati propter iusticiam sit necessarium cuilibet volenti beatifice premiari, cum dominus incessit per summum gradum illius medii; ideo vocat Christus hoc singulariter suum calicem. Quinto docemur quomodo Christus non potest suis deficere in concedendo privilegia, et consequenter mercedem ex eorum usu sequentem, cum statim post humilem consensum fraternum quo dixerunt possumus, statim concessit: calicem quidem meum bibetis, ubi non licet fideli ambigere quin concessit duobus fratribus quos prius gratificavit privilegium singulare. Si enim terreni patres noverunt bona data dare filiis suis, quanto plus pater primus post tam gloriosam victoriam quam per alios fecit in principem huius mundi? Lex ergo privata quam princeps pacis, et per consequens tocius ecclesie concessit hiis fratribus ad commodum eorum maximum [172] quod possint

Thirdly, it is to be noted that whether the apostles, seduced by error, sought primacy in a temporal kingdom or in the kingdom of heaven, as the text seems to establish, their petition was foolish, since they ought to have asked humbly for the labour of the contest, and upon this the primacy of honour of blessedness would have followed without boasting; for honour follows the one who flees it and flees the one who desires it.[12] Hence Chrysostom says: "The desire of primacy is born of boasting of heart; he who is humble," he says, "judges himself less worthy than others, [171] according to the apostolic precept: Each esteeming the other superior." And this is the reason (as was touched on above) why the members of the church, and the degrees in which God loves them, are hidden from us.[13] Fourthly, it is to be noted that Christ, seeing an alien spirit in the hearts of his temple, did not, in the manner of those who conquer their bodily castles, break down the walls of the castle, but drove out the enemy, enticing them to the humility by which they themselves might overcome the tyrant who had foully overcome them. "Can you," he says, "drink the chalice that I shall drink?"[14] From this soothing question we are taught, first, that the victory must be voluntary if it is to be meritorious; therefore Christ asks them modestly whether they can suffer voluntarily after his likeness. Secondly, the other apostles are taught not to be indignant against the two brothers, since their Lord, against whom chiefly the wrong had been usurped, so courteously offered them the same means by which he himself merited dignity. Thirdly, all Christians are taught that to suffer for justice is necessary for anyone who wishes to be rewarded with blessedness, since the Lord went by the highest degree of that means; therefore Christ calls this, singularly, his chalice.[15] Fifthly, we are taught how Christ cannot fail his own in granting privileges, and consequently the reward following from their use, since immediately after the humble brotherly consent by which they said "We can", he at once granted: "My chalice indeed you shall drink"; where it is not lawful for a believer to doubt that he granted to the two brothers, whom he

regnum celorum rapere armis suis, fuit privilegium singulare. Et ex isto eliciunt doctores quod est dare duplex genus martirii, scilicet affeccione et corporali passione; cum beatus Evangelista non fuit sic passus corporaliter usque ad mortem ut Jacobus, sed uterque iuxta vocem predicti Christi veridicam bibit calicem passionis.

had first favoured, a singular privilege. For if earthly fathers "know how to give good gifts to their children", how much more the first Father, after so glorious a victory as he has won through others over the prince of this world?[16] The private law, therefore, which the Prince of Peace, and consequently [Prince] of the whole church, granted to these brothers for their greatest benefit, [172] that they might seize the kingdom of heaven by their arms, was a singular privilege. And from this the doctors draw out that there is a twofold kind of martyrdom, namely by affection and by bodily suffering; since the blessed Evangelist did not suffer thus bodily unto death, as James did, but each, according to the truthful word of the aforesaid Christ, drank the chalice of the passion.[17]

¶5 172.8–172.24

[172] Sexto docentur omnes fideles et specialiter prelati non pompare vel alta sapere de gradus excellencia vel primatu, cum Christus coniungit: Sedere autem ad dexteram vel ad sinistram non est meum dare vobis, sed quibus paratum est a patre meo. Quamvis enim Christus sit omnipotens et eiusdem auctoritatis et operacionis cum patre, pater ex se et ipse per se, tamen Christus more suo loquens humanitus prefert patrem, dicens quod nullum membrum ecclesie habebit mansionem in celo, nisi qui ex auctoritate patris eternaliter inscribitur libro vite; quod licet eleccione eterna sit factum per filium, quia tamen discipuli considerarunt Christum secundum humanitatem, ideo univocando cum eis fuit pertinens Christum vere atque humiliter ostendere minoritatem suam secundum humanitatem, cum non sit menciendum propter devocionem.

Sixthly, all the faithful, and especially prelates, are taught not to make a show, nor to mind high things, about excellence of degree or primacy, since Christ adds: "But to sit on the right or on the left hand is not mine to give to you, but to them for whom it is prepared by my Father." For although Christ is almighty and of the same authority and operation with the Father, the Father from himself and he through himself, yet Christ, speaking after his manner as a man, puts the Father first, saying that no member of the church will have a mansion in heaven except one who by the authority of the Father is eternally written in the book of life; and although this was done by eternal election through the Son, yet because the disciples considered Christ according to his humanity, it was therefore fitting, speaking univocally with them, that Christ should truly and humbly show his lesser standing according to his humanity, since one must not lie for the sake of devotion.[18]

Notes

1. These are corollaries of the definition of privilege at 167.32–168.3 (08-c): a special licence granted to a creature. A margin *Nota de privilegiis ecclesie continue infra* (168.7). *Non equivocantibus*: for those who use the word in its proper sense, not equivocally. *Earum*: plural, of the divine persons. Side-note 168.4.
2. *Privilegiante aut privilegiato decepto ...*: an ablative absolute. We take *privilegiando* (twice) as a dative gerundive, "to the one being privileged". It could also be an ablative gerund, "in the privileging". Side-note 168.9.
3. B lacks *ut* (168.15). *Privans legem*: the wordplay on *privi-legium* as "depriving of law" sets it against the true sense, a private law (08-c, 167.18).
4. *Primas privatus*: a primate acting on his own authority, without God. *Prevenit*: God goes before every agent as first cause (cf. *gracia preveniens*). The codices read *racio'*; Loserth prints *racionale* (168.28), translated "reasonable".
5. John 15:5, then 15:4. Wyclif has *facere fructum* where the Vulgate has *ferre fructum a semetipso*, and he lacks "of itself". *Domesticis*: the members of the household (Eph. 2:19), that is, the church. *Dum tamen ... non fuerit*: "so long as it has not been".
6. A margin *Prima conclusio* (169.5). A reads *anteterior* (169.7). *Exproprietarie*: the adverb of *exproprietarii*, "the propertyless" (the glossary). *Anterior in exercitu*: further forward in the battle line, the figure worked out in the next sentences. Side-note 169.5.
7. Matt. 18:1–4: the question is in the DR's words. "Without malice", "in deed and in word" and "in the church militant" are Wyclif's own glosses. Where the Vulgate has *in regno caelorum* at 18:4, Wyclif reads it of the church militant.

8. A reads *optacius* for *aptacius* (169.17). A and A$_1$ read *specialiter* for *specialius* (169.18). *Milicia* here is the estate of knighthood (the glossary). In Job 7:1, which follows, the same word is the DR's "warfare".
9. Job 7:1: Wyclif adds *tota*, "the whole", which the Vulgate lacks. Eph. 6:12 DR: he stops before *in caelestibus*, "in the high places". *Coronabitur*: the crown of the one who strives lawfully (cf. 2 Tim. 2:5).
10. Matt. 20:20–23 DR. The petition is 20:21, but the print cites XX°, 22. *Quo concesso*: once they had granted it, that is, once they had answered "We can" (20:22), which Wyclif does not quote here but recalls at 171.25. B reads *patet ex ista* (169.28). A reads *Zebei* (169.29) and *Noscitis* (169.33). B reads *consessit illis privilegium in* (170.1). Side-note 169.28.
11. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 35. Loserth gives "l.c., CLII E" and compares Richard FitzRalph, *Defensio curatorum* (Goldast, *Monarchia* II.ii, p. 1403). The codices read *Omelia XXVIII*; Loserth prints XXXV, translated. Three of his corrections from the *Opus imperfectum* are translated: *poteramus* where the codices have *poterimus* (170.16); *omne quod videtur bonum* where they have *omne bonum* (170.17); and *opus quidem bonum desiderare* where they lack *bonum* (170.19). B lacks *illos* (170.9). *Femina procurante*: the mother, acting as their agent. "To desire a good work is good" recalls 1 Tim. 3:1.
12. *Honor ... fugientem se sequitur*: a proverbial saying. No source found; cf. the *Vita Bernardi* III (PL 185:304A), *prosequebatur gloria fugientem*. *Sicut videtur ex textu convinci*: Matt. 20:21 has "in thy kingdom". Side-note 170.21.
13. Chrysostom: the same homily, *Opus imperfectum* hom. 35 (PG 56:822–32): *desiderium primatus ex jactantia nascitur cordis ... Alter alterum aestimans superiorem se*. The non-Vulgate form of Phil. 2:3 comes from the homily; it is not the Vulgate (*superiores sibi invicem arbitrantes*, DR "let each esteem others better than themselves"); his Latin is translated. "As was touched on above": the hiddenness of the church's members is a theme of the earlier chapters.
14. A and A$_1$ read *turpiter superant*, "who foully overcome them" (171.9). *In cordibus templi sui*: the apostles are his temple. *Castra ... corporalia* is set against the spiritual conquest. Side-note 171.5.
15. *Medium*: the means, suffering, by which Christ merited exaltation (cf. Phil. 2:8–9). *Singulariter suum*: "my chalice" (Matt. 20:23). Side-note 171.23.
16. A and A$_1$ read *assensum* for *consensum* (171.26). Matt. 20:22–23 DR. "Know how to give good gifts to their children": Matt. 7:11 DR. Wyclif's *terreni patres* stands where the Vulgate has *vos, cum sitis mali*. *Quam per alios fecit in principem huius mundi*: the victory over the devil (John 12:31) won through others, here the brothers' humble consent.
17. *Et per consequens tocius ecclesie*: we supply [Prince]. The genitive could instead go with *lex privata*, "the private law ... of the whole church". *Regnum celorum rapere*: cf. Matt. 11:12. A margin *Martirium*. A margin note *Martir affeccione*, with a second hand's *passione corporali* (172.3). "The doctors" on the twofold martyrdom are not identified; not traced. James: Acts 12:2. The Evangelist is John, his brother. Side-note 172.3.
18. A margin *humilitas* (172.9). A second hand in B's margin: *Primatus est fructus humilitatis* (172.9). Loserth prints *tamen*; the codices read *tum* (172.19). His reading is translated. A second hand in B's margin: *Menciendum non est in causa devocionis* (172.23). *Alta sapere*: cf. Rom. 12:16, 11:20. Matt. 20:23: Wyclif lacks *meam*. *Mansionem*: cf. John 14:2. *Univocando cum eis*: using words in the sense the disciples gave them. *Minoritatem*: his being less than the Father according to his humanity (cf. John 14:28). Side-note 172.8.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 168: *quod* (glued I is the bold argument numeral 1)
  - 168: *proprietates* [NW]
  - 168: *non* (glued 1 is a margin numeral, not text)
  - 168: *princeps* [NW]
  - 168: *Christus*
  - 169: *corellarium* (corella-/rium; main token holds the whole word) [NW]
  - 169: *Item* (glued 2 is the bold argument numeral)
  - 169: *VII°*
  - 169: *1* (x-height old-style arabic 1 (Job VII°, 1))
  - 169: *tenebrarum* (tenebra-/rum; main token holds the whole word)
  - 169: *amplius* (glued 3 is the bold argument numeral)
  - 169: *filiorum* (print: filiorum Zebedei)
  - 169: *filiorum*
  - 169: *Matthei* (152b is the folio mark)
  - 170: *Crisostomus* (round C, not G)
  - 170: *In-* (first half of In-/perfecti; main token is In- plus margin M)
  - 170: *perfecti* (second half of In-/perfecti at start of next line, before notat; missing from main scan)
  - 170: *primum* (trailing a is the margin letter)
  - 170: *Christus* (trailing b is the margin letter)
  - 170: ∅ (be is English side-note text (Primacy is to be desired))
  - 171: *Christus*
  - 171: *corporalia* [NW]
  - 171: *disrupit* [NW]

- **171:** ***filiis***
- **172:** ***martirii***
- **172: ∅ (Sexto already at pos 50; nothing between it and docentur)**
- **169:** ***enim*** **(152a folio mark glued)**
- **170:** ***concessit***
- **172:** ***regnum***
- **172:** ***armis*** **(152c folio mark glued)**
- **172:** ***privilegium***
- **172: ∅ (box is English side-note word of (Two kinds of martyrdom))**

Part 5: No true privilege outside scripture; the Westminster case; poverty the highest privilege

Loserth pp. 172.25–177.30

¶1 172.25–177.30

173.11 *The Church has no true privilege except what is founded in Scripture.*
174.1 *Corruptions of the Church.*
174.27 *A case as to privilege.*
175.21 *The Westminster privilege is a false one.*
176.19 *Divestment of all temporal possession would be the greatest privilege the Church could have.*
177.5 *Poverty is the most perfect state, therefore it is a privilege to be placed in it.*

[172] **Unde ad pacificandum discipulos et instruendum eos quale privilegium et prioritatem eligerent, dicit quod qui voluerit inter eos prior vel maior fieri in celis, oportet quod sit servus humilior atque diligencior hic in terris (ut alias ostendi modo opposito) quoad primatum vel honorem seculi. Ideo dicit Crisostomus: Fructum humilitatis posuit primatum** [173] **celestem, ut quicunque desiderat primatum celestem, sequatur hic humilitatem celestem; quicunque autem desiderant primatum in terra invenient confusionem in celo. Ergo, inquit, iam non sit inter servos Christi de primatu certamen, nec festinet unusquisque eorum quomodo alio maior appareat, sed quomodo omnibus inferior videatur. Et ista doctrina sufficeret toti ecclesie ad eleccionem privilegii vel primatus, nec est possibile quod vere pacificetur ecclesia, antequam ista regula practice sit edocta. Ex istis elicitur quod nullum est verum privilegium ecclesie, nisi de quanto fundatur, docetur vel elicitur ex scriptura. Patet sic: Omnis lex utilis sancte matri ecclesie docetur explicite vel implicite in scriptura, omne privilegium est huiusmodi ex dictis: ergo conclusio. Confirmatur ex sepe dictis: Omnis veritas est in scriptura sacra, omne privilegium est veritas quia lex, ergo conclusio. Unde Augustinus, II° De Doctrina Christiana, in fine: Quicquid homo extra scripturam sacram didicerit, si noxium est ibi dampnatur, si utile est ibi invenitur; et idem dicit epistola quarta ad Volusianum (ut alibi diffuse exposui). Sequitur ergo, si quis quidquid utile extra scripturam sacram didicerit, ibi invenitur, omne privilegium concessum in cartis vel bullis est quiddam utile (ut patet ex diffinicione), ergo omne privilegium ecclesie est in scriptura sacra; ideo cum illa sit maioris auctoritatis et accepcionis quam bulle vel carte (ut dixi alias), ille ut plurimum in clero superfluunt. Nam illis ablatis inniteretur privilegiatus ministerio ecclesie quod est per se causa privilegii, et non sic confideret in** [174] **cartis dimisso officio. Talis enim securitas**

Hence, to pacify the disciples and instruct them what privilege and priority they should choose, he says that whoever will be prior or greater among them in heaven must be a humbler and more diligent servant here on earth (as I have shown elsewhere), in the way opposite to primacy or the honour of the world.[1] Therefore Chrysostom says: "He has set heavenly primacy as the fruit of humility, [173] **so that whoever desires heavenly primacy may follow heavenly humility here; but those who desire primacy on earth will find confusion in heaven. Therefore," he says, "let there now be no contest about primacy among the servants of Christ, nor let each of them hasten after how he may appear greater than another, but after how he may seem lower than all."[2] And this doctrine would suffice the whole church for the choice of privilege or primacy; nor is it possible that the church be truly pacified before this rule has been taught in practice. From these things it is drawn out that there is no true privilege of the church except in so far as it is founded on, taught by or drawn out of scripture.[3] It is clear thus: every law useful to holy mother church is taught explicitly or implicitly in scripture; every privilege is of this kind, from what has been said; therefore the conclusion. It is confirmed from what has often been said: all truth is in sacred scripture; every privilege is a truth, because it is a law; therefore the conclusion. Hence Augustine, De doctrina christiana II, at the end: "Whatever a man has learned outside sacred scripture, if it is harmful it is condemned there; if it is useful it is found there"; and he says the same in the fourth letter to Volusianus (as I have expounded at length elsewhere).[4] It follows, then: if whatever useful thing anyone has learned outside sacred scripture is found there, [and] every privilege granted in charters or bulls is something useful (as is clear from the definition), therefore every**

confundit ecclesiam, cum telis sophisticis super equivocacione que est ypocrisis et mendacium, diabolus et membra sua concludunt ecclesie. Quis queso non decipitur hodie in adherendo parti ecclesie malignancium et colendo ipsam ut membrum ecclesie? Quis insuper non aspirat ad fastum seculi vel primatum vel privilegium, cum tamen sit sceleratissima corruptela, in tantum quod sepe incidimus in illud ve propheticum Ysaie V°, 20: Ve qui dicitis bonum malum et malum bonum. Nonne diligencia nostra ostendit quod plus appreciamus cartas et privilegia humana quam scripturam sacram et privilegia que Christus suis instituit? Et indubie ut sic cadimus a quibuscunque veris privilegiis per abusum, quia iuxta beatum Gregorium (et ponitur in decretis XI, q. III. Privilegium) privilegium debet amittere qui sua abutitur potestate. Cum ergo omne racionabile vel utile ecclesie Christi prius ab ipso conceditur et in carta vel libro suo inscribitur, patet quod scrutinio illius libri et condicioni sub qua privilegiavit debemus primo attendere. Non enim sequitur: Datus potentatus seculi concessit hoc ut privilegium date ecclesie, ergo hoc est rationabile sive verum. Ideo oportet ultra concessionem scrutari regulam per quam racio privilegii debeat iudicari. Esto, inquam, quod Petrus potentatus seculi concedat privilegium Westmonasterio sub hac forma quod quicunque quantumcunque maleficus intraverit septa sua habebit immunitatem omnimodam, sic tamen quod in prima conclusione in qua post introitum a preposito loci [175] sibi opponitur dicat verum. Casus autem videtur possibilis et honestus, cum pro mendacio et pro quocunque scelere posset uti privilegio ad hoc sibi donato, ut dicitur; ergo multo magis pro confessione humili veritatis. Pono insuper quod Petrus maleficus intrans Westmonasterium pro immunitate habenda sit primo interrogatus a preposito Westmonasterii si habebit immunitatem in dicta ecclesia et pono quod Petrus conscius sibi ex dignitate contracta de crimine dicat desperando de venia vel vere reputando se dignum morte temporali, quod non habebit immunitatem in dicta ecclesia; tunc isto casu deducto ad placitum, patet quod ex casu et aliis circumstanciis positis et ponendis utraque pars contradiccionis sequitur, ut noverunt sophiste in materia insolubilium. Et revera quilibet intrans limina ecclesie, ut foveatur in crimine, incidit culpabilius in materia insolubili cuiusmodi est peccatum, quam sequitur Petrum incidere. Unde ego nescio aliter solvere nec credo alium quemquam scire, nisi quod dictum vocatum privilegium non est privilegium, quia non est fundabile in scriptura; et ita generaliter omnis lex privata non fundabilis in scriptura non est privilegium, quia non cedit ad utilitatem ecclesie, cum (ut dicit Augustinus) quicquid utile

privilege of the church is in sacred scripture; therefore, since scripture is of greater authority and acceptance than bulls or charters (as I have said elsewhere), these are for the most part superfluous among the clergy.[5] For if they were taken away, the one privileged would lean on the ministry of the church, which is of itself the cause of the privilege, and would not so trust in [174] charters, leaving his office aside. For such security confounds the church, since with sophistical darts, upon an equivocation which is hypocrisy and a lie, the devil and his members close in upon the church.[6] Who, I ask, is not deceived today in adhering to a part of the church of the malignant and cultivating it as a member of the church? Who, moreover, does not aspire to the pomp of the world, or to primacy or privilege, although it is a most wicked corruption, insomuch that we often fall into that prophetic woe, Isaiah 5:20: "Woe to you that call good evil, and evil good"?[7] Does not our diligence show that we value charters and human privileges more than sacred scripture and the privileges which Christ instituted for his own? And undoubtedly, as such, we fall by abuse from whatever true privileges [we have], because according to blessed Gregory (and it is placed in the Decretum, C. 11 q. 3 c. Privilegium) "he ought to lose a privilege who abuses his power".[8] Since, therefore, everything reasonable or useful to the church of Christ is first granted by him and inscribed in his charter or book, it is clear that we ought first to attend to the scrutiny of that book and to the condition under which he privileged. For it does not follow: a given potentate of the world granted this as a privilege to a given church, therefore it is reasonable or true. Therefore beyond the grant one must scrutinize the rule by which the ground of the privilege ought to be judged.[9] Suppose, I say, that Peter, a potentate of the world, grants a privilege to Westminster in this form: that whoever, however much a malefactor, has entered its precincts shall have immunity of every kind; provided, however, that in the first conclusion which is put to him after his entry by the superior of the place [175] he speaks the truth.[10] Now the case seems possible and honest, since he could use the privilege given him for this for a lie and for any crime whatever, as is said; therefore much more for the humble confession of the truth. I suppose, moreover, that Peter, a malefactor entering Westminster to have immunity, is first asked by the superior of Westminster whether he will have immunity in the said church; and I suppose that Peter, conscious of the desert he has contracted by his crime, says, despairing of pardon or truly reckoning himself worthy of temporal death, that he will not have immunity in the said church. Then, this case having been carried

est ibi invenitur. Et si claudit contradiccionem quod hoc sit privilegium, multo magis omnis casus in quo ponitur dari privilegium loco, ut quicunque intraverit cum quocunque crimine, gaudeat immunitate date ecclesie; illud enim est impossibile plus elongatum ab apparencia quam precedens. Cum multi intrant sanctuarium cum illo peccato, racione cuius tenentur amittere libertatem, ymo cum principium Gregorii sit verum quod omnis et specialiter prescitus [176]privilegium tenetur amittere qui sua abutitur potestate, et omnis criminosus ut sic sua abutitur potestate, cum racione mortalis peccati inficientis abutitur bonis nature: sequitur quod omnis criminose intrans septa ecclesie tenetur ut sic privilegiis ecclesie pro illo tempore non gaudere. Et hoc est notum illis qui sciunt quod quicquid criminosus fecerit racione peccati inficientis peccat mortaliter. Fundet ergo homo racionabilitatem privilegii ex scriptura et aliter nichil valet. Illa autem privilegia que debemus magis attendere plus relucent in speculo scripture, et minus necessaria plus confuse, quia Deus qui non potuit in privilegiis et scriptis ipsa testantibus sponse sue deficere, scivit quod palea plus diverteret ad terrena quam celestia, ideo ut gradus notificacionis scripture sit nobis pro regula, expressit privilegia spiritualia de corporalibus que adducerentur confusam adiciens disciplinam. Ex istis tercio colligitur quod summum privilegium pro statu vie foret ecclesiam esse exoneratam possessione civili temporalium, currendo libere post Christum in evangelica paupertate. Patet ex duabus conclusionibus precedentibus, nam ut sic disponitur fidelis Christo similius et paracius ad conquirendum regnum celorum. Unde et hoc privilegium notatur in ecclesia expressius, alcius et crebrius carioribus Christi discipulis (ut patet Matthei X°, Luce XIV° et Iª, Thymotei VI°); ad hoc enim copiosius sequebantur bona gracie. Confirmatur primo sic: Christus posuit vicarios suos in maxima libertate et privilegio in hoc quod regulam illam iniunxit singulariter suis apostolis, ergo conclusio. Non enim licet negare quin Christus privilegiavit suum collegium, cum dedit eis leges singulares, [177]ut consilia evangelica ad maximam utilitatem sui atque ecclesie, sicut patet ex indole que inde provenerat. Ergo ex diffinicione privilegii in hoc privilegiavit suam ecclesiam. Confirmatur secundo: Ille status est perfectissimus, ut patet in VI° decretalium, cap. Exiit qui seminat, per Nicolaum III., et omne ponere viatorem in statu tam alto est proporcionaliter privilegiare ipsum, ergo conclusio. Si enim dare bona fortune que sunt abiectissima sit privilegiare datarium, multo magis dare sibi bona gracie. Item, quicunque vians exoneratus fuerit sarcina temporalium, ad propinquius, paracius atque laudabilius sequendum hynnulum

through at will, it is clear that from the case and the other circumstances posited and to be posited each part of the contradiction follows, as the sophists know in the matter of insolubles.[11] And in truth anyone who enters the threshold of the church in order to be harboured in crime falls more culpably into an insoluble matter, of which kind is sin, than it follows that Peter falls.[12] Hence I do not know how to solve it otherwise, nor do I believe that anyone else knows, except that the said so-called privilege is not a privilege, because it cannot be founded in scripture; and so, generally, every private law not foundable in scripture is not a privilege, because it does not turn to the profit of the church, since (as Augustine says) whatever is useful is found there. And if it implies a contradiction that this should be a privilege, much more every case in which a privilege is posited to be given to a place, that whoever has entered with whatever crime should enjoy immunity in a given church; for that is an impossibility further removed from appearance than the preceding.[13] Since many enter sanctuary with that sin by reason of which they are bound to lose the liberty, indeed, since the principle of Gregory is true, that everyone, and especially one foreknown, [176]"is bound to lose a privilege who abuses his power", and every criminal as such abuses his power, since by reason of the mortal sin infecting him he abuses the goods of nature: it follows that everyone entering the precincts of the church criminally is bound, as such, not to enjoy the privileges of the church for that time.[14] And this is known to those who know that whatever a criminal does, by reason of the sin infecting him he sins mortally. Let a man, therefore, found the reasonableness of a privilege on scripture, and otherwise it is worth nothing. Now those privileges to which we ought to attend more shine out more in the mirror of scripture, and the less necessary ones more indistinctly; because God, who could not fail his bride in privileges and in writings that witness to them, knew that the chaff would turn aside more to earthly than to heavenly things; therefore, so that the degree of scripture's making known might be a rule for us, he expressed the spiritual privileges, adding an indistinct teaching about the bodily ones which would be adduced.[15] From these things, thirdly, it is gathered that the highest privilege for the state of the way would be for the church to be discharged of the civil possession of temporal goods, running freely after Christ in evangelical poverty.[16] It is clear from the two preceding conclusions, for so the believer is disposed more like Christ and more ready for conquering the kingdom of heaven. Hence also this privilege is noted in the church more expressly, more highly and more

cervorum salientem in montibus, ut sic est privilegiatus uberius, sed sic fuit de apostolis renunciantibus quoad civilitatem omnibus bonis suis, ergo conclusio. Non enim negabit fidelis quin possessio talis temporalium sit pondus anime, ut docet beatus Gregorius XXXI° Moralium (sicut declaravi XII° cap. huius). Unde apostoli vere reputarunt eis magnum privilegium, quod exonerati fuerunt a ministerio cotidiano in mensis fidelium (ut patet Actorum VI°), ergo multo magis exonerare eos a statu seculari plus abiecto. In hoc enim consistit excellencia status cleri super dominos seculares (ut hic supponitur), non autem in caractere ordinis, cum stat cum illo servitus abiectissima (ut patet de Scarioth), sed in hoc quod deputati sunt ut milites plus strenui ad plus meritorie peragendum bella domini et conquirendum regnum celorum. Nam Matthei V°, 3 dicitur: Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum celorum.

often for the dearer disciples of Christ (as is clear, Matthew 10, Luke 14 and 1 Timothy 6); for upon this the goods of grace followed more copiously.[17] It is confirmed, first, thus: Christ placed his vicars in the greatest liberty and privilege in this, that he enjoined that rule singularly on his apostles; therefore the conclusion. For it is not lawful to deny that Christ privileged his college when he gave them singular laws, [177] such as the evangelical counsels, for the greatest profit of himself and of the church, as is clear from the promise which came of it. Therefore, by the definition of privilege, he privileged his church in this.[18] It is confirmed, secondly: that state is the most perfect, as is clear in the Sext, chapter Exiit qui seminat, by Nicholas III; and to place a wayfarer in so high a state is proportionally to privilege him; therefore the conclusion. For if to give the goods of fortune, which are the most abject, is to privilege the recipient, much more to give him the goods of grace.[19] Again, whatever wayfarer has been discharged of the burden of temporal goods, to follow more nearly, more readily and more laudably the young hart leaping upon the mountains, is as such more richly privileged; now so it was with the apostles, who renounced, as to civil possession, all their goods; therefore the conclusion.[20] For a believer will not deny that such possession of temporal goods is a weight on the soul, as blessed Gregory teaches, Moralia XXXI (as I declared in chapter 12 of this [work]). Hence the apostles truly reckoned it a great privilege to themselves that they were discharged of the daily ministry at the tables of the faithful (as is clear, Acts 6); therefore much more [is it a privilege] to discharge them from the secular state, which is more abject.[21] For in this consists the excellence of the state of the clergy over the secular lords (as is here supposed): not in the character of order, since the most abject servitude stands with that (as is clear of Iscariot), but in this, that they are deputed as more vigorous knights to wage more meritoriously the wars of the Lord and to conquer the kingdom of heaven. For in Matthew 5:3 it is said: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."[22]

Notes

1. A paraphrase of Matt. 20:26–27. *Prioritatem*: the glossary "priority", paired with *prior*. *(ut alias ostendi modo opposito) quoad primatum vel honorem seculi*: we take *modo opposito* with what follows: humility here is the way opposite to worldly primacy. Read the other way, it gives "as I have shown elsewhere in the opposite manner".
2. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 35 (Loserth to 172.30: "l.c., pag. CLIII C"). A margin *Crisostomus* (172.30). B's second-hand gloss at 172.9, *Primatus est fructus humilitatis*, takes up this sentence.
3. B lacks *inter* (173.4). A has two margin notes: *Honor scripture, quia omnis veritas in ea continetur* (173.13) and *Secunda conclusio* (173.16). *De quanto*: "in so far as". Side-note 173.11.

4. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* II.42 (II.42.63, PL 34:65: *quidquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi damnatur; si utile est, ibi invenitur*; Loserth: "cap. XLII, Opp. III, 1, 44"); *scripturam sacram* is Wyclif's gloss. "The fourth letter to Volusianus": Loserth refers to the letter to Volusianus without locating it. The passage is not in *Ep.* 132, 135 or 137 (PL 33); untraced. "Elsewhere" is not identified. A margin *Augustinus* (173.18).
5. B reads *si quis est, quis est, quid utile* (173.18–19). The sentence is loosely built: we take *si ... invenitur* as the major premiss, and we supply [and] before the minor. *Illa*: scripture. *Ille*: the bulls and charters. B reads *acceptacionis* (173.28). A margin *Correlarium* (173.28).
6. Loserth queries *ecclesie* at 174.4 and suggests *confundunt ecclesiam*. The print, *concludunt ecclesie*, is translated: *concludere* is used here in its physical sense, "to shut in", not its logical one. A margin *Conclusio* (174.1). Side-note 174.1.
7. *Ecclesie malignancium*: Ps. 25:5 (DR "the assembly of the malignant"). We keep "church" for *ecclesia*. Isa. 5:20: Wyclif has *bonum malum et malum bonum*, the reverse of the Vulgate's order (*malum bonum, et bonum malum*). His order is translated. B reads *Cum tamen scit* (174.8).
8. *Decretum* C.11 q.3 c.63 (Loserth: "Dec. sec. pars, causa XI, q. III, c. LXIII"; the modern form is ours). The canon is at PL 187:862; Wyclif's wording is not compared with it here. A margin *Conclusio* (174.15).
9. The codices read *condicione*; Loserth prints *condicioni* (174.20–21), translated. *Datus ... date*: "a given", the logician's placeholder. *Racio privilegii*: the ground of the privilege. A margin *De privilegiis monasteriorum et ecclesiarum* (174.22).
10. The case is set out in the manner of the *obligationes*. *In prima conclusione ... sibi opponitur*: the first proposition put to him for his answer. "Peter" is the logicians' placeholder name. Westminster is chosen because of the "case which lately befell" there (165.15, 08-c; named at 159.13, 08-a), the violation of its sanctuary in 1378. A margin *Casus* (174.27). Side-note 174.27.
11. A_1 would correct to *ex gravitate contracta* (175.6). The print's *dignitate*, which construes as "desert" (what he deserves, *dignum morte*), is translated. A and A_1 lack *casu et* (175.13). *Deducto ad placitum*: "carried through at will", the obligational formula. *Insolubilia*: the paradoxes of self-reference: if Peter's answer is true he has immunity, so it is false, and so on.
12. Loserth judges *in materia insolubili* (175.17) superfluous, a margin gloss fallen into the text, but he prints it; it is translated. B reads *peccatum incidere* (175.18). *Quam sequitur Petrum incidere*: "than Peter, by the inference, falls [into the insoluble]".
13. A margin *Conclusio* (175.23). B lacks *immunitate ... elongatum* (175.28–30). *Impossibile ... elongatum ab apparencia*: an impossibility that does not even look possible. Side-note 175.21.
14. A_1 would correct *criminose* to *criminosus* (176.4). The print is translated: the adverb, "criminally". A has the margin notes *Responsio* (176.4) and *Nota* (176.8). Gregory's principle is the canon of n. 8.
15. A and A_1 read *Non ut* (176.15). A and A_1 read *adicerentur* for *adducerentur* (176.17). *Expressit ... disciplinam*: we take *de corporalibus* with *confusam ... disciplinam*. It could instead go with *expressit*, "he expressed the spiritual privileges by means of bodily ones". *Palea*: the chaff, the worldly part of the church.
16. A has the margin notes *Tercia conclusio* (176.19) and *Responsio. Paupertas cleri* (176.22). *Currendo ... post Christum*: cf. Song 1:3. Side-note 176.19.
17. The chapters only, as printed: Matt. 10 (the sending of the twelve), Luke 14 (cf. 14:33), 1 Tim. 6 (cf. 6:8). *Carioribus ... discipulis*: a dative, "for (or to) the dearer disciples".
18. *Vicarios suos*: the apostles. *Indoles*: the promise or growth that came of it (the glossary, as at 164.1). A margin *Optimum privilegium ecclesie est paupertas cleri* (177.5).
19. Loserth prints *alto est*; the codices read *alto ut* (177.7–8). *Sext* 5.12.3, *Exiit qui seminat* (Loserth: "Lib. V. tit. XII, cap. III"; the modern form is ours). Side-note 177.5.
20. *Hynnulum cervorum salientem in montibus* joins Song 2:17 ("a young hart upon the mountains", Loserth's reference) with 2:8 ("leaping upon the mountains"), both DR. A margin *Sequela Christi* (177.11). *Quoad civilitatem*: as to civil possession.
21. Gregory, *Moralia* XXXI (Loserth: "cap. XIII, Opp. tom. I, 1006"). Loserth notes that "chapter 12 of this [work]" should rather be chapter 3 (pp. 50–54 above). The print is translated. A margin *Gregorius* (177.18). Acts 6:2. B lacks *a* (177.22).
22. *Caracter ordinis*: the sacramental character of orders, which Judas also had. B reads *belli domini et conquirendo* (177.28). *Milites* is the estate's word, "knights" (the glossary), in keeping with the battle figure of 169.15–28. Matt. 5:3 DR.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 173: *fundatur*
  - 173: *II°*
  - 174: *bonum*
  - 174: *Christus*
  - 175: *in*
  - 176: *ecclesie*
  - 176: *privilegium* (trailing R is the margin letter)
  - 176: *Iª*
  - 176: *Christus*
  - 176: *Christus*
  - 177: *per*
  - 177: *ut hic* (one scan token covers two printed words)
  - 173: *in*
  - 174: *preposito loci* (prepo- here, 152d sito loci at top of p.175; main token covers both words)
  - 176: *amittere*

- **176:** ***qui***

Part 6: Christ's privilege above Caesar's; the lords may relieve the clergy of temporal goods

Loserth pp. 178.1–182.5

¶1 178.1–178.16
178.1 *Christ, who gives poverty, is far greater than Caesar, who gives riches.*
178.31 *All privileges come from Christ directly or indirectly.*

[178]**Item, proporcionaliter ut dominus est potencior, prudencior et plus affectus sue ecclesie, tribueret eis privilegia pociora, sed iste condiciones autonomatice reperte sunt in Christo in comparacione ad Cesarem, ergo et privilegiacio proporcionaliter correspondens. Nemo ergo dicet quod Cesar plus privilegiavit ecclesiam quam dominus Jesus Christus, nec licet fingere quin Christus fuit potencior ad donandum eis temporalia, sicut et apostoli potuerunt ea copiosius recepisse, ut patet in vitis eorum. Unde Symon magus voluit dedisse Petro multam pecuniam pro privilegio apostolico (ut patet Act. VIII°), et indubie foret melius quam quantalibet pecunia vel omnia temporalia huius mundi. Nos ergo non erimus magis degeneres dicto Symone, plus appreciantes privilegium Cesaris quam privilegium domini Jesu Christi.**

Again, in proportion as a lord is more powerful, more prudent and more affectioned to his church, he would bestow on them more excellent privileges; now these conditions are found by antonomasia in Christ in comparison with Caesar; therefore also a privileging proportionally corresponding.[1] No one, therefore, will say that Caesar privileged the church more than the Lord Jesus Christ did; nor is it lawful to feign that Christ was not more powerful to give them temporal goods, as the apostles also could have received them more copiously, as is clear in their lives. Hence Simon Magus wished to give Peter much money for the apostolic privilege (as is clear, Acts 8), and undoubtedly it would be better than any amount of money or all the temporal goods of this world.[2] We, then, will not be more degenerate than the said Simon, valuing the privilege of Caesar more than the privilege of the Lord Jesus Christ.[3]

¶2 178.17–178.23

[178]**Nec valet dicere quod ista privilegia dicuntur equivoce voce et ideo non sunt comparabilia, nam Deus est melior diabolo, bona gracie sunt meliora bonis fortune, et iuxta sanctos melius est seculariter carere temporalibus quam habere. Si ergo ista tam disparia sunt conparabilia in bono analogo, a pari vel maiori bona minus disparia.**

Nor does it avail to say that these privileges are so called equivocally, in name only, and therefore are not comparable; for God is better than the devil, the goods of grace are better than the goods of fortune, and according to the saints it is better to lack temporal goods in the secular manner than to have them. If, then, these things, so disparate, are comparable in a good said analogically, from the equal or from the greater, goods less disparate [are comparable].[4]

¶3 178.24–178.30

[178]**Et preter hoc aliqua temporalia donavit Deus suis que quoad quantitatem et modum habendi sunt comparabilia dono Cesaris vel alterius domini secularis; in hoc ergo quod dicta privilegia dicuntur tam equivoce, oportet concedere quod unum infinitum excedit reliquum in perfeccione, sicut spiritus excedit naturam corpoream.**

And besides this, God gave his own some temporal goods which, as to quantity and manner of having, are comparable to the gift of Caesar or of another secular lord; in this, then, that the said privileges are called [privileges] so equivocally, one must grant that the one exceeds the other infinitely in perfection, as spirit exceeds bodily nature.[5]

¶4 178.31–182.5
179.1 *Those coming directly are the greatest.*
179.15 *Baptist, than whom none was greater, was very poor.*
179.31 *It is futile to say that the state of poverty*

[178]**Item, iuxta hic dicta in correlariis descripcionis privilegii, nemo potest dare privilegium, nisi Christus principaliter illud dederit, et cum non decet dominum dare per servum donum perfeccius quam ipse dat** [179]**singulariter per se ipsum, sequitur quod privilegium datum appropriate per Christum excedit privilegium quod ipse dedit per Constantinum, potissime cum videtur privilegia illa fuisse**

Again, according to what was said here in the corollaries of the definition of privilege, no one can give a privilege unless Christ has principally given it; and since it does not befit a lord to give through a servant a gift more perfect than he gives [179]**singularly through himself, it follows that the privilege given by Christ as his own exceeds the privilege which he gave**

was more perfect, but is so no longer.
180.1 *Poverty is nearer to the state of innocence.*
180.10 *Hence rulers may relieve the clergy of useless wealth.*
181.6 *Opinions of Gregory*
181.11 *and Augustine.*

contraria. Ergo uno existente bono aliud saperet in parte maliciam venenosam, et per consequens, non foret privilegium pocius quam fuisset, quod filiorum Zebedei unus sedisset ad dexteram Christi et alius ad sinistram in regno temporali. Confirmatur ex sepe dictis, privilegium est filium patrisfamilias domus poni in loco digniori ad premium et in loco tuciori ad evadendum periculum, nec fas est dubitare quin Christus vocavit apostolos suos ad talem locum, in quo eciam secundum quandam prerogativam fuit Baptista, dicente Christo Matthei XI°, 11: Inter natos mulierum qui ceciderant per peccatum non surrexit maior Johanne Baptista. Cum ergo hec diffinicio Christi necessario sit vera, patet quod nec Petrus nec alius citra Christum fuit maior Baptista quoad Deum, cuius maioritas non attenditur penes possessionem secularem, cum Baptista fuit citra Christum pauperrimus, sed penes gradum evangelice paupertatis que consistit in vera humiliacione et in meritoria penalitate et in ecclesie edificacione. In hoc ergo fuit Baptista positus securius ad cavendum periculum et alcius ad querendum premium. Cum ergo quicunque status sit alcior quem Deus plus acceptat, sequitur quod status in quo Christus posuit apostolos et docuit ecclesiam sit status alcior statu secularis glorie in quo positi sunt Christi vicarii et dotati per Cesarem. Nec valet dicere quod ille status fuit tunc perfeccior, nunc autem status iste est perfeccior, tum quia fructus status ostendit oppositum de intricacione et detrimento ecclesie, tum eciam quia racio fidei scripture contradicit, [180] **nam lex consiliorum est perpetua, non habens contrarium, cum ponit hominem in statu, statui utriusque innocencie propinquiori, statum autem magnitudinis secularis oportet deserere propter eius repugnanciam statui beatitudinis. Quomodo ergo non est alio statu inperfeccior, cum respicit magnitudinem temporalem quam oportet deserere, alius autem magnitudinem virtutis quam oportet semper habere? Ex istis colligitur quod domini temporales possent maxime zelando pro privilegiis ecclesie exonerare clerum suum ab occupacione temporalium que sunt preter necessaria ad faciendum opus evangelicum; nam possent sic faciendo reducere ecclesiam cleri ad perfecciorem statum ex dictis, sed cum impossibile sit hominem posse facere bonum de genere, nisi posset facere illud bene, sequitur quod domini temporales possent facere illud bene. Absit, inquam, credere quod status in quo Cesar posuit clerum non posset solvi licite propter habitudinem sacerdotum Christi ad globum temporalium. Et cum status in quo Christus posuit clerum suum dissolvi posset licite propter inperfeccionem habitudinis vite eorum ad paupertatem evangelicam et alia carismata in quibus**

through Constantine, especially since those privileges seem to have been contrary.[6] Therefore, the one being good, the other would savour in part of venomous malice; and consequently it would not be a privilege, any more than it would have been one that, of the sons of Zebedee, one should have sat at the right hand of Christ and the other at the left in a temporal kingdom.[7] It is confirmed from what has often been said: a privilege is for a son of the father of the household to be placed in a worthier place for reward and in a safer place for escaping danger; nor is it right to doubt that Christ called his apostles to such a place, in which also, by a certain prerogative, the Baptist was, as Christ says, Matthew 11:11: "Among them that are born of women, who had fallen through sin, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."[8] Since, then, this definition of Christ is necessarily true, it is clear that neither Peter nor anyone else short of Christ was greater than the Baptist with respect to God, a greatness that is not reckoned by secular possession, since the Baptist was, short of Christ, the poorest of all, but by the degree of evangelical poverty, which consists in true humbling, in meritorious hardship and in the building up of the church.[9] In this, then, the Baptist was placed more securely for avoiding danger and more highly for seeking reward. Since, then, any state is the higher which God accepts the more, it follows that the state in which Christ placed the apostles and taught the church is a state higher than the state of secular glory in which the vicars of Christ have been placed and endowed by Caesar. Nor does it avail to say that that state was more perfect then, but now this state is more perfect: both because the fruit of the state shows the opposite, from the entanglement and detriment of the church, and also because the reasoning of the faith of scripture contradicts it; [180] **for the law of the counsels is perpetual, having no contrary, since it places man in a state nearer to the state of both innocences, whereas the state of secular greatness must be deserted because of its repugnance to the state of blessedness.[10] How then is it not more imperfect than the other state, since it regards temporal greatness, which must be deserted, while the other [regards] greatness of virtue, which must always be had?[11] From these things it is gathered that the temporal lords, most of all by zeal for the privileges of the church, could discharge their clergy of the occupation of temporal goods beyond what is necessary for doing the evangelical work; for by doing so they could bring the church of the clergy back to a more perfect state, from what has been said; now since it is impossible that a man can do a good in kind unless he could do it well, it follows that the temporal lords could do it**

Christus dotavit ecclesiam, nonne foret suspectum verbum, accusans proprietarios de affeccione inordinata temporalibus, dicendo quod lex Dei et eius consilium sunt temporalia sub dispensacione cadencia, sed non ordinacio Cesaris quoad donacionem temporalium? Numquid credimus quod excommunicacio vel maledicciones interpretacio plus ligat dissolventem ordinacionem dominorum temporalium, quam excommunicacio Christi, Johannis et Pauli ligat dissolventem Christi consilium? Nonne dicit Paulus Galat. 1°, 9: Si quis aliud evangelizaverit preter illud quod evangelizatum est, anathema sit, et cum ipse [181]instruxit coapostolum Thymoteum Iª Thymotei VI°, 8: Habentes ergo alimenta et quibus tegamur hiis contenti simus? Numquid est contrarium isti contencioni aspirari inordinate ad habendum perpetuo et indissolubiliter quantumlibet seculariter dominium? Nonne dicit beatus Gregorius (ut recitavi superius, III° cap.) quod labor querendi et defendendi temporalia et dolor amittendi eadem, si superat laborem et dolorem circa bona spiritualia quesita vel perdita, indicat terrenorum affeccionem inordinate in animo presidere Nonne beatus Augustinus in libro De Vera Religione, XCII° cap., dicit idem? Ubi postquam ostenderat quid est adherere Deo et quibus profluit affluencia temporalium etc, respondet: Cum, inquit, mutabilium bonorum adest copia, non eis confidit, sed cum subtrahuntur, agnoscit utrum eum non ceperint, quia plerumque cum assunt nobis, putamus quod non ea diligimus, sed cum abesse ceperint, invenimus qui simus; hoc enim sine amore nostro aderat quod sine dolore discedit. Si ergo clerus aliquis sit mundo deditus quod plus dolet pro amissione temporalium quam virtutis, plus insistit circa adquisicionem vel defensionem eorum quam boni spiritualis, ut sic inhabilitat se ad habendum hec temporalia et per consequens dignificat se ut perdat illa. Nec est ille cui hec sunt donata qui in isto animo finaliter perseverat, quia est membrum diaboli et non pars ecclesie (ut patet in solutione VIⁱ argumenti de VI° cap. huius). Nam vera religio stat in recta dilectione beatorum, ut in libro De Vera [182] Religione XCIII.: Et hec est perfecta iusticia qua pocius pociora et minus minora diligimus. Vana ergo est religio facientis oppositum, privilegium ciresorum iniectorum puris certantibus est medicinaliter removendum.

well.[12] Far be it, I say, to believe that the state in which Caesar placed the clergy could not be lawfully dissolved because of the condition of the priests of Christ toward the mass of temporal goods. And since the state in which Christ placed his clergy could [on that view] be lawfully dissolved because of the imperfection of the condition of their life toward evangelical poverty and the other charisms with which Christ endowed the church, would not that word be suspect, accusing the proprietaries of inordinate affection for temporal goods, which says that God's law and his counsel are temporal things falling under dispensation, but not the ordinance of Caesar as to the donation of temporal goods?[13] Do we believe that excommunication, or the interpretation of a curse, binds the one who dissolves the ordinance of temporal lords more than the excommunication of Christ, of John and of Paul binds the one who dissolves the counsel of Christ? Does not Paul say, Galatians 1:9: "If any one preach besides that which hath been preached, let him be anathema"; and since he [181]instructed his fellow apostle Timothy, 1 Timothy 6:8: "Having therefore food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content"?[14] Is it not contrary to this contentment to aspire inordinately to have, perpetually and indissolubly, secular lordship of whatever amount? [15] Does not blessed Gregory say (as I recited above, chapter 3) that "the labour of seeking and defending temporal goods, and the grief of losing them, if it exceeds the labour and grief about spiritual goods sought or lost, shows that affection for earthly things presides inordinately in the mind"?[16] Does not blessed Augustine, in the book De vera religione, chapter 92, say the same? Where, after he had shown what it is to cleave to God, and to whom the abundance of temporal goods flows, etc., he answers: "When," he says, "there is plenty of changeable goods, he does not trust in them; but when they are withdrawn, he learns whether they have not taken hold of him; because for the most part, when they are with us, we think that we do not love them, but when they begin to be absent, we find out who we are; for that was present without our love which departs without grief."[17] If, then, any clergy is so given to the world that it grieves more for the loss of temporal goods than of virtue, and insists more on the acquisition or defence of them than of spiritual good, to that extent it makes itself unqualified to have these temporal goods, and consequently makes itself deserving to lose them. Nor is he who finally perseveres in this mind the one to whom these things were given, because he is a member of the devil and not part of the church (as is clear in the solution of the sixth argument of chapter 6 of this [work]).[18] For true

religion stands in the right love of blessed things, as in the book De vera
[182] religione, 93: "And this is perfect justice, by which we love the more excellent more and the lesser less." Vain, therefore, is the religion of one who does the opposite; the privilege of *ciresorum* cast upon those who strive purely is to be removed by way of remedy.[19]

Notes

1. Loserth's apparatus records *antonomastice* (178.3) beside the print's *autonomatice* (the glossary: both forms). *Eis*: the members of the church, plural by sense after *ecclesie*. Side-note 178.1.
2. Acts 8:18–19: Simon offered the apostles money for the power to give the Holy Ghost. "For the apostolic privilege" is Wyclif's description. *Vitis eorum*: the lives of the apostles.
3. *Nos ergo non erimus*: we take the future as a resolve, "we will not be". It may also be read as a rhetorical question ("shall we not, then, be ...?"), with the participle giving the condition: if we value Caesar's privilege more, we are worse than Simon, who at least valued the apostolic one above money.
4. A margin *Responsio* (178.17). At 178.23 Loserth supplies *sc. sunt comparabilia*, which we translate. *Equivoce voce*: equivocally, in name only. *In bono analogo*: in good said analogically, which spans God and devil. *A pari vel maiori*: the topics from the equal and from the greater (cf. the glossary *locus a maiori*). *Seculariter carere*: to lack civil possession. "The saints" are not identified.
5. The argument concedes the equivocation and turns it: if Christ's privilege and Caesar's share only a name, Christ's exceeds Caesar's infinitely.
6. A margin *Nota hoc argumentum* (178.31). "The corollaries of the definition" are those at 168.4–169.28 (08-d), especially the third (168.19). *Appropriate*: as his own, directly; not the canon-law sense of the glossary *appropriare*. The privilege "through Constantine" is the endowment of the church under the Donation. Side-notes 178.31, 179.1.
7. *Maliciam venenosam* may allude to the story that at Constantine's donation a voice was heard saying that poison had been poured into the church: Higden, *Polychronicon* IV.26, *Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei*, which Wyclif cites by name in *De potestate pape* c. 6 and retells in cap. 16 below. The allusion here is our reading. Matt. 20:21.
8. Matt. 11:11. Wyclif adds *qui ceciderant per peccatum*, which is not in the Vulgate (roman in the print). It excepts Christ, who is not counted among those fallen through sin. *Filium patrisfamilias domus*: a son of the household's father, that is, a member of Christ's household. *Diffinicio Christi*: Christ's determination at Matt. 11:11; 'definition' (glossary: *diffinicio*), not the *descripcio* of privilege at 178.31.
9. A and A_1 lack *possessionem penes* (179.20–21). *Citra Christum*: Christ excepted. *Cuius maioritas*: the greatness in question (the Baptist's), not God's. Side-note 179.15.
10. A margin *Responsio* (179.31). *Utriusque innocencie*: we do not settle which two states of innocence are meant. Perhaps they are the first state and the state of glory, or the innocence of Adam and that of Christ. *Racio fidei scripture*: the reasoning of the faith of scripture (not the *ex fide* formula). Side-notes 179.31, 180.1.
11. The subject is the state of secular greatness. *Alius* is the state of the counsels.
12. Loserth's apparatus has an A margin *Correlarium. Ablacio temporalium nota supra* (179.33). Loserth thinks two words, *sicut patet* (or *sicut patet ex dictis*), are missing at 180.14. A and A_1 read *possunt facere* (180.16). *Bonum de genere*: a good in kind (as at p. 164, 08-c). *Sed*, bringing the next premiss, is rendered "now". Side-note 180.10.
13. *Habitudo ... ad*: the condition of the priests in respect of temporal goods (glossary: "condition"). *Globum temporalium*: "the mass of temporal goods". the glossary *globus* "band" is a derogatory collective of persons and does not fit here, so the word is untagged. We take the second *cum* clause as the opponents' position, hence "[on that view]". *Proprietarios*: those who hold property (cf. *affeccio proprietaria*).
14. *Malediccionis interpretacio*: as printed, "the interpretation of a curse". The sense expected is the curse clauses of charters of donation (perhaps an *imprecacio*). B reads *consilium Christi* (180.32). Gal. 1:9: Wyclif's *aliud ... preter illud quod evangelizatum est* is not the Vulgate's *vobis ... praeter id quod accepistis*. His Latin is translated. 1 Tim. 6:8 DR: Wyclif reads *ergo* for *autem*.
15. *Isti contencioni*: we take it as "contentment", answering *contenti*. It could also be "contention", which construes less well.
16. Loserth corrects the codices' *12° cap.* to *III° cap.* (181.7), translated. He refers to pp. 52–54 above. The work of Gregory is not named here; the passage cited at pp. 52–54 is from the *Moralia* XXXI. A margin *Gregorius; XII. cap. recte III* (181.6). Side-note 181.6.
17. Augustine, *De vera religione* 92 (PL 34:163; Loserth: "cap. XCII ... Opp. I, pag. 781"). Loserth corrects two readings from Augustine's text, and his corrections are translated: the codices' *conficit* becomes *confidit* (181.15), and their *separent* is corrected at 181.16. A reads *ostenderit* (181.12). A has the margin notes *Amor temporalium occultus quomodo indicatur* (181.11), *Augustinus* (181.12) and *Nota* (181.15). A also has a Czech gloss, *Pomny*, "Memento" (181.12). Side-note 181.11.
18. A margin *Conclusio* (181.25). The cross-reference is to the solution of the sixth argument in chapter 6 (Loserth: pp. 136–138 above). *Inhabilitat se*: makes itself unqualified (cf. 08-c, p. 165).
19. *De vera religione* 93 (PL 34:163–64, *Et haec est perfecta justitia*). Loserth corrects the codices' *est hec* to *hec est* from Augustine (182.1), translated. B reads *religione quoque* (182.1). *Beatorum*: as printed, "blessed things". *Ciresorum*: so printed (*cire-*|*sorum*), with no note from Loserth. We could not construe it and leave it untranslated; Loserth's apparatus is silent. Conjectures, neither secure: *cesareorum* ("imperial grants", cf. *dotacio cesarea*) or *cirographorum* ("charters"). *Puris certantibus*: those who strive purely, the athletes of the spiritual contest.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):

- **178:** ∅ **(the boxed item is the folio asterisk (153c); no word there)**
- **178:** ***principaliter*** **(prin-/cipaliter; main token princjpa spans the hyphen)**
- **178:** ∅ **(tcr is the rest of cipaliter, already in pos 224)**
- **178:** ***illud***
- **179:** ***singulariter*** **(153c folio mark, S margin letter)**
- **179:** ***I*** **(leaf zoom: print has XI°, 11 (two old-style 1s); main splits them, this token is the first, pos 106 the second)**
- **179:** ***perfeccior***
- **181:** ***Iª*** **(153d folio mark; print Iª Thymotei)**
- **181:** ***Gregorius*** **(g with lower bowl, not c)**
- **181:** ***III°***
- **181:** ***assunt*** **(print spelling) [NW]**
- **178:** ***proporcionaliter***
- **178:** ***est***
- **178:** ***potencior***
- **178:** ***prudencior***
- **178:** ***sue***
- **178:** ***ecclesie***
- **178:** ***tribueret***
- **179:** ***eciam***
- **179:** ***scripture***
- **182:** ***Religione***
- **182:** ***pociora***

Chapter 9

Part 1: Privilege is chiefly in spiritual gifts; exemptions and earthly privileges

Loserth pp. 182.7–186.31

¶1 182.7–182.10
182.7 *Objection: Privilege is generally understood of worldly things.*
182.14 *If so, it is the fault of the people who use the word.*

[182]Sed contra dicta arguitur sic: Videtur enim primo quod equivocatur in nomine privilegii, cum communitas non vocat privilegium nisi excellenciam quam habet una persona super aliam quoad mundum.

But against what has been said it is argued thus. For it seems, first, that there is an equivocation in the name "privilege", since the community calls nothing a privilege except an excellence which one person has over another as regards the world.[1]

¶2 182.11–183.33
183.5 *It might as well be said that law and possession apply only to earthly goods.*
183.12 *Such is not the language of the primitive Church.*

[182]Hic dicitur quod illud assumptum indicat sic vocantes terrena diligere, et despicere vel odire celestia, quia voluntas trahit intellectum ad affectuosius cogitandum et nominandum rem cui magis infigitur: ad quem sensum dicitur Joh. III°, 31: Qui de terra est de terra loquitur. Et hinc apostoli et sancti priores reputarunt ista terrena ut stercora, sicut patet in dictis et factis eorum et exprimit Apostolus Philipp. III° cap. Ergo quod communitas sic loquitur et attendit, non nisi accusat ipsam perversam a Deo et verificat dictum Evangeliste Ia Johannis V°, 19: Totus mundus in maligno positus est et dictum Christi Matthei XII°, 34: Ex habundancia cordis os loquitur. Ideo debemus attendere qualiter secundum regulas fidei est loquendum: cum autem privilegium sonat in maioritatem prerogativam vel preeminenciam creature, manifestum est quod partes ecclesie tam militantis quam triumphantis sunt privilegiate a Deo. Ideo dicunt sancti doctores communiter quod Christus et mater sua habuerunt singularia privilegia super alios, et ita de apostolis et aliis beatis, quilibet habet dispariter [183]donum suum, ut manifestavit Apostolus. Iª Cor. XII°, 4, dicens quod divisiones graciarum sunt, Notet ergo fidelis racionem privilegii et videbit quod principaliter sit in donis spiritualibus a Deo appropriate collatis, unde, si argumentum factum moveret, diceret consequenter quod nulla est lex, possessio vel dominium nisi de bonis temporalibus, quia de illis principaliter vel precise loquitur communitas, in tantum quod statim audito de bonis, applicant ad mundi divicias; et locuto de episcopatu, rectoria vel alio nomine prelacie, statim applicant ad dotem temporalem dimissa consideracione de officio; et ita de aliis. Non sic autem in primitiva ecclesia vel scriptura sacra; ideo postponendo viciosam consuetudinem debemus loqui conformiter sanctis doctoribus. Non enim reperi rem in scriptura sacra vocatam

To this the answer is that that assumption shows that those who speak so love earthly things and despise or hate heavenly ones; for the will draws the intellect to think more affectionately of, and to name, the thing in which it is more deeply fixed. In this sense it is said, John 3:31: "He that is of the earth, of the earth he speaketh." And hence the apostles and the earlier saints reckoned these earthly things "as dung", as is clear in their words and deeds, and as the Apostle expresses, Philippians 3.[2] Therefore, that the community speaks and attends in this way only accuses it of being turned away from God, and verifies the saying of the Evangelist, 1 John 5:19: "The whole world is seated in wickedness," and the saying of Christ, Matthew 12:34: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." So we ought to attend to how one is to speak according to the rules of faith. Now since "privilege" sounds of the greatness, prerogative or pre-eminence of a creature, it is manifest that the parts of the church, both of the church militant and of the triumphant, are privileged by God.[3] So the holy doctors commonly say that Christ and his mother had singular privileges above others, and so of the apostles and the other blessed: each has, unequally, [183]his own gift, as the Apostle showed, 1 Corinthians 12:4, saying that "there are diversities of graces." Let the faithful man therefore note the meaning of privilege, and he will see that it lies principally in spiritual gifts conferred by God as proper [to each];[4] hence, if the argument made had force, it would say consequently that there is no law, possession or lordship except of temporal goods, because the community speaks principally or exclusively of those, so much so that as soon as "goods" is heard they apply it to the riches of the world; and when a bishopric, a rectory or another name of prelacy is spoken of, they at once apply it to the temporal endowment, setting aside consideration

sub nomine privilegii, sed doctores et usus ecclesie vocant eam sic communiter, ut patet de sancto Evangelista, de sancto Petro et Romana ecclesia. Et patet quod innitendo pure modo loquendi vulgari totus conventus Christi non foret privilegiatus sub aliquo gradu, nisi forte fingatur quod Scarioth fuit privilegiatus in hoc quod Deus permisit eum portare loculos, et sic introductum esset privilegium in ecclesiam cum superbia ex contencione circa maioritatem et secularem obedienciam quam Christus nitebatur in suis destruere. Non ergo concedendum est quod solus dominus temporalis privilegiavit, edificavit vel dotavit ecclesiam, cum ecclesia canit quod Christus privilegio amoris Johannem dilexit apostolum; et idem est de quolibet singulari dono Dei, ut patet ex descripcione privilegii. Unde non expressius posset quis ostendere se iuste perditurum privilegium per abusum quam negando Christi privilegia vel preponderando privilegia terrena.

of the office; and so of other things.[5] But it is not so in the primitive church or in holy scripture; so, setting the vicious custom behind us, we ought to speak in conformity with the holy doctors. For I have not found a thing called by the name "privilege" in holy scripture; but the doctors and the usage of the church commonly call it so, as is clear of the holy Evangelist, of St Peter and of the Roman church. And it is clear that, relying purely on the common way of speaking, the whole company of Christ would not be privileged in any degree, unless perhaps it is feigned that Iscariot was privileged in this, that God permitted him to carry the purse; and so privilege would have been brought into the church with pride, out of strife about greatness and secular obedience, which Christ strove to destroy in his own.[6] It is not to be granted, therefore, that the temporal lord alone privileged, built or endowed the church, since the church sings that Christ loved John the apostle with the privilege of love; and the same holds of any singular gift of God, as is clear from the definition of privilege.[7] Hence one could not show more expressly that one will justly lose privilege through abuse than by denying the privileges of Christ or by preferring earthly privileges.

¶3 184.1–186.13
184.1 *The Church ought not to insist on earthly privileges such as exemptions and endowments.*
184.6 *Exemptions are bad in kind, although they may sometimes serve a good purpose.*
184.27 *Good prelates ought not to be hampered by them.*
185.9 *Privileges of wearing mitre etc. are often a snare of the devil.*
186.15 *The Roman college may be the synagogue of Satan and not the head of the Church.*

[184]Secundo videtur quod non licet clero insistere circa privilegia terrena cuiusmodi videntur esse exempciones, prerogative, proprietates et seculares dominaciones, cum videntur repugnare privilegiis Christi que non licet amittere. Hic dicitur, primo quantum ad exempciones quod, licet videantur esse male de genere, tamen contingit subditum bene uti illis sicut et aliis actibus malis de genere; est enim contra regulas ecclesie triumphantis quod quis sit exemptus ne superior illuminet inferiorem, et ita contra regulas nature est quod subditus sit exemptus, ne ducatur vel corrigatur per superiorem in casu quo deviet vel delinquat. Unde videtur idem inpetrare oppositum et luciferine querere licenciam ad peccandum; diaboli enim exempti sunt a tali regimine et (ut ego credo) a privilegiacione, quia nulla excellencia quam habent cedit dampnatis ad bonum utile, sed econtra beati sunt summe privilegiati, in tantum quod nullum privilegium vie valet homini, nisi de quanto preparat ad querendum privilegium regni. Quia tamen contingit prepositos ecclesie esse ceciores ducendis vel inniti in visitacione fastui vel questui plus quam correccioni, ideo expedit per accidens a talibus temporalis exempcio. Non autem debet talis esse perpetua nisi cognito quod perpetuo erit prepositus deses, inscius vel avarus, quia aliter (ut recitat Lincolniensis) hoc inconveniens sequeretur quod quantumlibet bonus pastor videns

[184]Secondly, it seems that it is not lawful for the clergy to insist on earthly privileges, of which kind seem to be exemptions, prerogatives, properties and secular exercises of lordship, since they seem to be repugnant to the privileges of Christ, which it is not lawful to lose. To this the answer is, first, as to exemptions, that although they seem to be bad in kind, yet it happens that a subject uses them well, as also other acts bad in kind; for it is against the rules of the church triumphant that anyone be exempt so that a superior may not enlighten an inferior; and so it is against the rules of nature that a subject be exempt, so as not to be led or corrected by a superior in case he goes astray or offends.[8] Hence it seems the same thing to obtain the opposite and, like Lucifer, to seek licence to sin; for the devils are exempt from such rule and (as I believe) from privileging, since no excellence which they have turns to a useful good for the damned; but on the contrary the blessed are supremely privileged, so much so that no privilege of the way avails a man except in so far as it prepares him to seek the privilege of the kingdom.[9] Since, nevertheless, it happens that the superiors of the church are blinder than those they are to lead, or in visitation rely on pomp or gain more than on correction, therefore a temporary exemption from such men is expedient by accident. But such [an exemption] ought not to be perpetual, unless it is known

exemptum strangulare oves, pro quibus reddet racionem in die iudicii, non audebit propter exempcionem pape exagitare vel exterrere lupos mordentes tam nequiter oves suas. Hoc autem non potest dici privilegium sed rete diabolicum. Unde privilegium foret eximi a iurisdiccione talis pape, si fuerit qui [185] propter pecuniam et casum particularem, in minori parte eciam ob defectum sui contingentem, statuerit exempcionem talem ut legem perpetuam. Nam diabolus et membra sua seducendo populum ab observancia legis Christi videntur inducere exempcionem huiusmodi, ne inferior fruatur suffragio sui prepositi, ut innuit Augustinus libro secundo De Ordine. Et quantum ad alia insignia perquisita de portando mitram, crucem et baculum ac ordinando clericos extensius vel striccius, cum aliis vocatis privilegiis istis similibus, cum ut plurimum sapiunt fastum et non commodum, sunt sepe non privilegia sed diabolica sagena quibus pisces natantes in mari huius seculi capiuntur; et sic dicendum videtur de privilegiis terrenis seculariter impetratis. Unde Augustinus in libro De Agone Christiano, cap. IV: Gaudet piscis quando hamum non videns escam devorat, sed piscator cum eum ceperit, torquentur eius viscera primo, deinde ab omni leticia sua per ipsam escam de qua letatus est trahitur ad consumacionem. Sic sunt omnes qui de bonis temporalibus beatos se putant unde bonis nichil nocet ablacio temporalium, cum ipsa non diligunt. Unde inter omnes cautelas diaboli mundana preeminencia est prima sagena diaboli; de illa enim primo temptavit Christum. Nam Matthei IV°, 8, 9, dicitur quod ostendit sibi omnia regna mundi dicens: Hec omnia tibi dabo, si cadens adoraveris me. Et revera propter minus privilegium adoramus sepius membra sua, cum tamen profitemur in baptismo quod abrenunciamus sathane et omnibus pompis eius. Talis itaque finalis preponderancia secularis privilegii est signum infallibile membri diaboli, et sic [186] videtur mihi quod contendentes superbe circa talia privilegia nisi redeant humiliter ad unitatem subiecti invicem, non sunt de sancta matre ecclesia, dicente decreto Pelagii pape XXIV, q. I. Pudenda: Ecclesia, inquit, una est, ut patet in canticis, et illa est que fide formata per orbem diffunditur; quod beati Augustini testimonio comprobemus. Audite quid in quodam opere suo preclarissimus doctor dicat ecclesie: Ait enim quod, cum nullo modo recte potest dici ecclesia in qua scisma est, restat ut, quoniam nulla esse ecclesia non potest, ea sit quam in sedis apostolice per successiones episcoporum radice constitutam nullorum hominum malicia eciamsi nota excludi non possit.

that the superior will perpetually be slothful, ignorant or avaricious; because otherwise (as Lincoln relates) this ill consequence would follow: that a pastor, however good, seeing the exempt [party] strangling the sheep for which he will render account on the day of judgement, will not dare, because of the exemption of the pope, to harry or frighten off the wolves that bite his sheep so wickedly.[10] And this cannot be called a privilege, but a devilish net. Hence it would be a privilege to be exempted from the jurisdiction of such a pope, if there should be one who, [185] for money and for a particular case, in the lesser part also on account of a defect of his own that befalls, should establish such an exemption as a perpetual law.[11] For the devil and his members, by seducing the people from the observance of the law of Christ, seem to bring in an exemption of this kind, so that the inferior may not enjoy the aid of his superior, as Augustine hints in the second book De ordine.[12] And as to the other insignia acquired, of carrying mitre, cross and staff, and of ordaining clerics more widely or more narrowly, with other so-called privileges like these: since for the most part they savour of pomp and not of profit, they are often not privileges but a devilish dragnet, in which the fish swimming in the sea of this world are caught; and so it seems one must say of earthly privileges secularly obtained.[13] Hence Augustine in the book De agone christiano, chapter 4: "The fish rejoices when, not seeing the hook, it devours the bait; but when the fisherman has caught it, first its entrails are wrenched, then from all its gladness it is drawn to its destruction by the very bait in which it rejoiced." So are all who think themselves blessed from temporal goods. Hence the taking away of temporal goods does the good no harm at all, since they do not love them.[14] Hence among all the wiles of the devil, worldly pre-eminence is the devil's first dragnet; for with it he first tempted Christ. For in Matthew 4:8–9 it is said that "he shewed him all the kingdoms of the world, saying: 'All these will I give thee, if falling down thou wilt adore me.'" And truly, for a lesser privilege we often adore his members, although we profess in baptism that we renounce Satan and all his pomps.[15] Such a final preponderance of secular privilege is therefore an infallible sign of a member of the devil; and so [186] it seems to me that those who contend proudly about such privileges, unless they return humbly to unity, subject to one another, are not of holy mother church, as the decree of Pope Pelagius says, C. 24 q. 1 [c. 33] Pudenda: "The church," he says, "is one, as is clear in the Canticles, and it is that which is spread throughout the world by formed faith; which let us prove by the testimony of blessed Augustine. Hear what the most

illustrious doctor says of the church in a certain work of his. For he says that, since that in which there is schism can in no way rightly be called a church, it remains, since it cannot be that there is no church, that it is that which is established in the root of the apostolic see through the successions of bishops, [and which] the malice of no men [can extinguish], even if [that malice] is notorious and cannot be shut out."[16]

¶4 186.14–186.31

[186] Ex isto notandum, primo quomodo iste papa allegat venerabiliter Augustinum: quod divisi a Christo per invidiam extrudentem caritatem non sunt membra ecclesie. Patet secundo quod, si collegium Romanum sit sic divisum scismate, tunc ipsum non est caput vel pars ecclesie, quia deficit unio apostolica. Unde dicit quod, si talis episcopus consecrat alium, non consecracio sed execracio debet dici. Et tercio notari potest quomodo crescente superbia et cupiditate primatus de loco ecclesie, potest fieri synagoga sathane, cum nemo potest esse Christi vel Petri vicarius, nisi sequatur eos in moribus, ut patet XL[a] distinccione: Non est facile. Et patet quod licet clero insistere circa privilegia terrena, de quanto promovent ad eterna; quod oportet exemplo sanctorum et fide scripture pensari, nullomodo amittendo privilegia que Christus dedit propter aliquod bonum mundi.

From this one must note, first, how reverently this pope alleges Augustine: that those divided from Christ by envy, which thrusts out charity, are not members of the church. It is clear, secondly, that if the Roman college is so divided by schism, then it is not head or part of the church, because apostolic union is lacking. Hence he says that if such a bishop consecrates another, it ought to be called not a consecration but an execration.[17] And thirdly it can be noted how, as pride and greed for primacy grow, a synagogue of Satan can be made out of the place of the church, since no one can be vicar of Christ or of Peter unless he follows them in manners, as is clear in Distinction 40, Non est facile.[18] And it is clear that it is lawful for the clergy to insist on earthly privileges in so far as they promote [men] to eternal things; which must be weighed by the example of the saints and by the faith of scripture, in no way losing, for any good of the world, the privileges which Christ gave.[19]

Notes

1. A margin *Prima obieccio*; A lacks *sic*, B *primo* (182.7). *Communitas*: common usage, the community of speakers (again at 182.17, 183.7). The objection: "privilege" in Wyclif's argument (cap. 8) means something other than what people mean by it, so the comparison of Christ's privilege with Caesar's is equivocal. Side-note 182.7.
2. A margin *Responsio* (182.11). John 3:31: Wyclif quotes only *Qui de terra est de terra loquitur*, leaving out the Vulgate's middle clause *de terra est*; the DR is adapted to his Latin. Philippians 3 (v. 8, *arbitror ut stercora*): Wyclif gives the chapter only. *Rem cui magis infigitur*: the thing in which the will is more deeply fixed. Side-note 182.14.
3. *Accusat ipsam perversam a Deo*: accuses the community as turned away from God. *Sonat in*: "sounds of", i.e. signifies. *Maioritatem*: greatness (glossary: *majoritas*), as in the strife "about greatness" at 183.24. B reads *attendat* (182.19).
4. A margin *Privilegium debet esse in donis spiritualibus* (183.5). *Appropriate collatis*: conferred as proper to each (cf. 08-f, *appropriate* "as his own"), not the canon-law sense of the glossary *appropriare*. *Racionem privilegii*: the meaning (account) of privilege.
5. *Si argumentum factum moveret*: if the argument made had force; the argument from common usage proves too much, since the same usage restricts "law", "possession" and "lordship" to temporal goods. *Precise*: exclusively. *Rectoria*: a rectory, the benefice. Side-note 183.5.
6. A margin *Conclusio* (183.29) belongs to the next sentence. B lacks *quod* (183.19) and *sub aliquo — privilegiatus* (183.20–22), and reads *suis defervere* (183.26). John 12:6 (Judas "having the purse"). *Ut patet de sancto Evangelista …*: John, Peter and the Roman church are those commonly said to be privileged; John's "privilege of love" follows at 183.30. *Secularem obedienciam*: obedience paid to worldly rank. Side-note 183.12.
7. "The church sings": the invitatory of Matins of St John the Evangelist, *Adoremus regem apostolorum qui privilegio amoris Johannem dilexit apostolum* (CAO 1013). *Descripcione privilegii*: the definition of privilege given in cap. 8 (08-d).
8. A margins *Secunda obieccio* (184.1) and *Responsio: Nota contra exempciones continue infra* (184.6). *Male de genere*: bad in kind (cf. *bonum de genere*, 08-f). *Ne superior illuminet inferiorem*: the order of the church triumphant by which the higher enlightens the lower; Wyclif names no source. *Proprietates*: properties, holdings owned. Side-notes 184.1, 184.6.
9. *Idem inpetrare oppositum*: we take *oppositum* as the opposite of being led and corrected, i.e. the exemption itself: to obtain it is the same as to seek licence to sin. *Luciferine*: like Lucifer, who would not be subject. *Privilegiacione*: the act of privileging (as 08-f *privilegiacio*). *Privilegium vie / regni*: the privilege of the way against that of the kingdom (cf. the glossary *via / patria*).

10. B lacks *Quia tamen — exempcio* (184.22–24). *Temporalis exempcio*: a temporary exemption, against *perpetua*, not a "temporal" one. "Lincoln" (A margin *Lincolniensis*, 184.26) is Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln; Loserth gives no reference: Grosseteste's *Sermo* at Lyon, 1250 (Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum* II, 1690, p. 255: pastors see their sheep *a lupis ... strangulari*, and *per exemptorum privilegia sic obstruuntur pastorum ora*), recited in sense. *Inconveniens*: the glossary CONTEXTUAL (an absurdity in argument; ill consequences in affairs). Here it is the harm that follows in the church's government, hence 'ill consequence'. *Exemptum*: the exempt person or house. B lacks *potest* (184.31). Side-note 184.27.
11. *In minori parte eciam ob defectum sui contingentem*: obscure. We take it as a further aggravation of the pope's act (made for money, for one case, and in part because of a failing of his own); *sui* may instead refer to the case. *Talis pape*: a pope who sells perpetual exemptions.
12. Augustine, *De ordine* II; Loserth's reference reads "cap. XVIII (?) vid. Opp. I", with the page uncertain. *Suffragio*: aid (glossary: *suffragium*), not the church's suffrages.
13. A margin *Augustinus* (185.15). *Ordinando clericos extensius vel striccius*: privileges of conferring orders beyond or short of the ordinary bounds. *Sagena*: a dragnet. Side-note 185.9.
14. Augustine, *De agone christiano* 4 (Loserth: "Opp. VI, 245"). A has an erasure at *de agone* (185.16); A_1 is corrected to *torquet* (185.18). The passage is cap. 7 (PL 40:295), not 4: Augustine has *Sic sunt omnes qui de bonis temporalibus beatos se putant* (roman in the print), and *unde ... diligunt* paraphrases his next sentence, *Et ideo bonis nihil nocent; quia hoc eis auferunt quod non diligunt* (*bonis*: the good).
15. A margin *Mundana preeminencia est sagena diaboli* (185.21). Matthew 4:8–9: v. 8 is abridged and v. 9 quoted; the print italicises both. The baptismal renunciation of Satan "and all his pomps": the rite asks *Abrenuntias Satanae? ... Et omnibus operibus ejus? ... Et omnibus pompis ejus?* (Gelasian Sacramentary, PL 74:1106B); Wyclif leaves out the works. *Membra sua*: the devil's members.
16. A and A_1 margin *Membrum diaboli* (185.32); A margin *Conclusio* (186.2). Decretum C. 24 q. 1 c. 33 *Pudenda* (Pelagius; the modern form is ours; Loserth: "a few words having been altered"). "The Canticles": cf. Song 6:8 "One is my dove". The canon is Friedberg I, 979–80 (*Pudenda ... non consecratus, sed execratus episcopus*); the work of Augustine quoted inside it is unnamed and untraced. *Fide formata*: Wyclif's compression; the canon has *in apostolica ... radice fundata ... fidem universo orbe propagatam*. The last clause is truncated: the canon reads *nulla hominum malitia, etiamsi nota et excludi non possit, sed pro temporum ratione toleranda iudicetur, extinguere* [valeat], so *excludi non possit* describes the malice, and we supply the canon's verb, "extinguish" (our supply). The print, as Wyclif quotes it, can also be construed without it: 'that which, established in the root of the apostolic see through the successions of bishops, cannot be shut out by the malice of any men, even if [that malice] is notorious', taking *quam ... excludi non possit* loosely, with *malicia* as agent.
17. *Iste papa*: Pelagius. *Divisi ... caritatem*: Wyclif's summary of the canon, not a quotation. *Collegium Romanum*: the college of cardinals, written as the Schism of 1378 opened. *Dicit*: the canon; the canon has *Iure ergo execratus tantum, non consecratus poterit dici* (Friedberg I, 980). Side-note 186.15.
18. "Synagogue of Satan": Revelation 2:9. *Non est facile*: Decretum D. 40 c. 2 (our identification; Loserth gives no reference; PL 187:213C–214B). *In moribus*: in manners, in way of life.
19. This closes the answer to the second objection (184.1). *De quanto*: in so far as. *Fide scripture* has no *ex* and is not the the glossary formula. *Propter aliquod bonum mundi* goes with *amittendo*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 182: *CAP. IX.*
  - 182: *quem*
  - 182: *III°*
  - 182: *III°*
  - 183: *donum* (154a folio mark, A margin letter)
  - 183: *Iª*
  - 183: *dominium* (and is the English side-note)
  - 183: *introductum*
  - 184: *Christi*
  - 184: *illis*
  - 184: *aliis* [NW]
  - 184: *exemptus* (print: quis sit exemptus, ne superior; missing from main scan)
  - 185: *Christi* (5 is the line number)
  - 186: *Christo* (15 is the line number)
  - 186: *Christi*
  - 186: *XLª*
  - 184: *cum* (clear m)
  - 185: *propter* (154b folio mark glued)
  - 186: *talia* (154c folio mark glued)

Part 2: Endowment as alms under condition; to be freed from it is a privilege

Loserth pp. 186.32–190.16

¶1 186.32–187.15
187.1 *The Church ought not to have left the state (of poverty) appointed by Christ.*
187.18 *Silvester may have acted from pious motives.*
187.29 *The clergy should gladly leave laymen to minister to the poor*

[186]**Sed tercio obicitur, cum privilegia quibus Christus dotavit ecclesiam sunt perfecciora quam terrena privilegia** [187]**succedencia, sicut et status vivencium secundum illa privilegia est statu moderno perfeccior atque ad servandum facilior, videtur quod non licuit a privilegiis illis et statu recedere; nam nulli persone licet magis bonum sibi in eleccione postponere: ecclesia, sponsa Christi est persona, cum sit virgo ex cap. VI°, ergo non licet sibi privilegia Christi et statum evangelice paupertatis relinquere. Confirmatur primo per decretum De Consecracione, dist. V^a^, Non mediocriter, ubi dicitur quod graviter peccant qui eligunt minus bonum sibi maiori bono postposito. Confirmatur secundo ex dictis libro V°, cap., ubi docetur quod oportet viantem semper meliorando procedere. Et tercio confirmatur ex hoc quod consilia Christi sunt perpetua et sponse sue indispensabilia.**

But thirdly it is objected: since the privileges with which Christ endowed the church are more perfect than the earthly privileges [187] **that succeeded them, as also the state of those living according to those privileges is more perfect than the modern state, and easier to keep, it seems that it was not lawful to depart from those privileges and that state; for it is lawful for no person, in choosing, to set the greater good behind [the lesser] for himself; the church, the bride of Christ, is a person, since she is a virgin, from chapter 6; therefore it is not lawful for her to abandon the privileges of Christ and the state of evangelical poverty.**[1] **It is confirmed, first, by the decree De consecratione, D. 5 [c. 24] Non mediocriter, where it is said that they sin gravely who choose the lesser good for themselves, setting the greater good behind. It is confirmed, secondly, from what is said in book 5, chapter [ ], where it is taught that one on the road must always proceed by growing better. And thirdly it is confirmed from this, that the counsels of Christ are perpetual and not to be dispensed for his bride.**[2]

¶2 187.16–188.13
188.1 *and devote themselves to preaching.*

[187]**Hic videtur mihi quod unum concluditur ex assumpto necessario, cum omnis christianus debet sequi Christum in moribus quantum sufficit, unde videtur mihi quod beatus Silvester potest dici ex pietate suscepisse elemosinas Cesaris corporales ad exonerandum eum, ad excitandum eius devocionem et procurandum tenerius pro fidelibus quam faceret populus laycalis; quod, cum stat cum paupertate evangelica, patet quod clerus non debet exinde inniti proprietati vel fastui, sed ad sui tedium secundum partes plus abiectas ministrare pauperibus de collatis elemosinis. Unde tales elemosine non possunt donari in perpetuam elemosinam quomodocunque clerus vixerit, sed sub condicione saltem tacita quod clerus sit vere sequax apostolorum in vita et opere. Et ita credo quod oportet ut reputet sibi omne tediosum ministrare pauperibus et fore gaudiosum, dando operam contemplacioni** [188]**et predicacioni, quod fideles layci accipiant illud onus (ut alias exemplificavi de Augustino et aliis sanctis). Unde quia fragilitas humana prona est ad relinquendum primam caritatem de elemosinis, superbiendo, se ipsam nimis laute pascendo et pastoris officium relinquendo, ideo apostoli et sancciores ecclesie talia reliquerunt. Unde mirum est si collacio rei temporalis sit clero privilegium; ymmo apostolis petentibus illam a Christo audivisset responsum superius: Nescitis quod petatis. Nonne docet experiencia quod dotacio talis subicit dotatos mundane sollicitudini, servicio et exaccioni, et per consequens distrahit ab amore Christi et ministerio sacerdotali?**

Here it seems to me that one [thing] is inferred from the assumption necessarily, since every Christian ought to follow Christ in manners as far as suffices.[3] **Hence it seems to me that blessed Silvester can be said to have received the bodily alms of Caesar out of piety: to unburden him, to stir up his devotion, and to provide more tenderly for the faithful than the lay people would; and since this stands with evangelical poverty, it is clear that the clergy ought not on that account to rely on property or pomp, but, to its own weariness, to minister to the poor from the alms conferred, in the more abject parts [of the service].**[4] **Hence such alms cannot be given as perpetual alms however the clergy may have lived, but under the condition, at least tacit, that the clergy be truly a follower of the apostles in life and work. And so I believe that it must count all ministering to the poor wearisome to itself, and count it joyful, while it gives its labour to contemplation** [188] **and preaching, that faithful laymen take up that burden (as I have shown elsewhere by the example of Augustine and other saints).**[5] **Hence, because human frailty is prone to leave its first charity over alms, by growing proud, by feeding itself too sumptuously and by leaving the office of shepherd, therefore the apostles and the holier [members] of the church left such things. Hence it is a wonder if the conferring of a temporal thing is a privilege to the clergy; indeed, had the apostles asked it of Christ, it would have heard the answer given above: "You know not what you ask."**[6] **Does not experience teach that such an**

¶3 188.14–190.12
189.9 *The removal of endowment may be a restoration of primitive privilege,*
189.17 *worth much more, than the right of gallows etc.*
189.25 *The apostles were poor by choice.*
190.13 *It is said that, if this be true, all temporal privileges are abolished.*

[188] **Quomodo ergo non foret privilegium ab incitamento huiusmodi liberari, unde decretum recitat XI[a], q. I[a], ex epistola beati Petri ad Clementem scriptum sub hac forma: Te quidem oportet irreprehensibiliter vivere et summo studio niti, ut omnes vite huius occupaciones abicias, ne fideiussor existas nec advocatus licium fias neve in ulla alia occupacione prorsus inveniaris mundani negocii occasione perplexus. Neque enim iudicem neque cognitorem secularium negociorum hodie te vult ordinare Christus, ne prefocatus presentibus hominum curis non possis verbo Dei vacare. Hec vero opera que tibi minime congruere dicimus exibeant sibi invicem vacantes laici, et te nemo occupet ab hiis studiis per que salus hominibus datur. Quomodo ergo licet nobis ab ista regula apostolica recedere quibus relictum** [189] **est a Deo ecclesiam gentilium ad perfectam legem Christi convertere? Non enim cadit auctoritas vel racio dispensandi; unde verisimile est quod radix tocius perturbacionis in seculo est cleri declinacio a lege Christi ad vitam et tradiciones civiles. Christus autem semper reliquit in una parte ecclesie sue vel alia aliquos fideles qui mundum deserant, et in illis forte abiectis primatibus stat fides et continuacio sancte matris ecclesie. Et patet quod sepe non est privilegium vocata dotacio cleri in temporalibus, et per consequens auferendo a clero ista non oportet quod auferantur ab eo privilegia, sed pocius amoto prohibente sit ecclesia apostolica restituta ad vera privilegia primitiva; quod ego credo dominos temporales in casu debere facere sub pena dampnacionis gravissime. Numquid credimus esse magnum privilegium episcopo vel abbati quod habeant furcas et puteum, in quibus dampnati regulariter trucidentur, et sic de carcere, de aliis mundanis privilegiis sive insigniis? Ymmo non foret privilegium prelato quod haberet efficaciam, ut quicquid tetigerit statim convertatur in aurum, quia tunc periret aer deferens inspirandus, periret vescibile et tegumentum corpori temperatum. Unde in detestacionem huius philargirie legitur beatum Evangelistam convertisse frondes silvestres in aurum et litoria saxa in gemmas. Iste sanctus statim potuit fuisse aput mundum ditissimus et secundum gloriam mundanam preclarissimus, dominatissimus et famosissimus, si non repugnasset perfeccioni apostolice et privilegio concesso a Christo; aliter enim peccasset graviter omittendo. Nam habens in potestate tam** [190] **faciliter proficiendi sibi et aliis, glorificando endowment subjects those endowed to worldly care, service and exaction, and consequently draws them away from the love of Christ and from the priestly ministry?**

How then would it not be a privilege to be freed from an incitement of this kind? Hence the decree, C. 11 q. 1 [c. 29], recites from the letter of blessed Peter to Clement, written in this form: "It behoves you indeed to live irreproachably and to strive with the utmost zeal to cast off all the occupations of this life, that you be not a surety, nor become an advocate in lawsuits, nor be found at all entangled in any other occupation by occasion of worldly business. For Christ does not wish to ordain you today a judge or an examiner of secular business, lest, choked by the present cares of men, you be unable to be free for the word of God. But these works, which we say do not at all befit you, let laymen who are free for them perform for one another; and let no one occupy you away from those studies through which salvation is given to men."[7] How then is it lawful for us to depart from this apostolic rule, we to whom it has been left [189] **by God to convert the church of the gentiles to the perfect law of Christ? For there is no room for authority or reason for dispensing; hence it is likely that the root of all the disturbance in the world is the clergy's turning aside from the law of Christ to civil life and traditions. But Christ has always left, in one part of his church or another, some faithful who desert the world; and in them perhaps, who have cast primacies aside, stand the faith and the continuance of holy mother church.[8] And it is clear that the so-called endowment of the clergy in temporal goods is often not a privilege; and consequently, in taking these things from the clergy, it is not necessary that privileges be taken from it, but rather that, the hindrance being removed, the apostolic church be restored to the true primitive privileges; which I believe the temporal lords are bound in the case to do, under pain of most grievous damnation.[9] Do we believe it a great privilege for a bishop or an abbot that they have gallows and pit, in which the condemned are regularly put to death, and so of the prison and of other worldly privileges or insignia? Indeed, it would not be a privilege for a prelate to have the power that whatever he touched should at once be turned into gold; for then the air that carries [breath], which must be breathed in, would perish, and food and covering fitted to the body would perish.[10] Hence, in detestation of this love of money, it is read that the blessed Evangelist turned branches of the wood into gold and stones of the shore into gems. That saint could at once have been, in the world's**

ecclesiam plus quam Cesar, non haberet excusacionem de negligenti desidia, sed scitur demonstracione certissima quod omne spirituale privilegium superat quodcunque corporale privilegium in infinitum, et sic non est privilegium clerum stipari seculari milicia, vesci in auro, uti fibula vel habere secundum mundanam gloriam splendencia ornamenta. Omnia enim ista gentes exquirunt (ut patet I° Machabeorum IX° et XI°), Christus autem et eius discipuli cum habere possent facillime hec omnia, si non repugnarent sue perfeccioni, quia repugnant, ideo omnia ista penitus respuerunt.

eyes, the richest and, according to worldly glory, the most illustrious, the most lordly and the most famous, had it not been repugnant to apostolic perfection and to the privilege granted by Christ; for otherwise he would have sinned gravely by omitting it.[11] For one having it in his power so [190]easily to profit himself and others, glorifying the church more than Caesar, would have no excuse for negligent sloth; but it is known by most certain demonstration that every spiritual privilege surpasses any bodily privilege infinitely; and so it is not a privilege for the clergy to be thronged about by secular knighthood, to feed in gold, to wear a buckle, or to have shining ornaments according to worldly glory.[12] For all these things the heathens seek (as is clear, 1 Maccabees 10 and 11); but Christ and his disciples, although they could most easily have had all these things if they were not repugnant to their perfection, because they are repugnant, therefore utterly rejected all these things.[13]

¶4 190.13–190.16

[190]Sed quarto arguitur sequi ex dictis: quod nullum sit corporale privilegium, ymmo quod nedum licet secularibus sed debent sub pena excommunicacionis auferre bona a clericis quibus putantes se benefacere erraverunt.

But fourthly it is argued that it follows from what has been said that there is no bodily privilege; indeed, that it is not only lawful for seculars but they are bound, under pain of excommunication, to take goods away from the clerics to whom, thinking they did them good, they erred [in giving].[14]

Notes

1. A margin *Tercia obieccio* (186.33). *Statu moderno*: the present state of the endowed clergy. *Ex cap. VI°*: this work's chapter 6: *ecclesia est virgo, cum sit sponsa virginis Jesu Christi* (117, 06-a; again 133, 06-e); cf. 2 Corinthians 11:2, "a chaste virgin to Christ". Side-note 187.1.
2. Decretum, De cons. D. 5 c. 24 (the modern form is ours; Jerome; Friedberg I, 1418). Loserth prints the canon as *Non mediocriter errat qui magno bono prefert mediocre bonum*: Wyclif's *graviter peccant qui eligunt minus bonum ...* is his own restatement, translated. *Libro V°, cap.*: the chapter number is blank in the print, and the book is not identified. *Viantem*: the one on the road (glossary: *viantes*). *Indispensabilia*: not open to dispensation.
3. A margin *Responsio* (187.16). Loserth prints *unum*; A_1 reads *verum*, A and B *um* (Loserth: "verum?"). The print is translated, "one [thing]"; with *verum* it would be "something true". *Necessario* may also go with *assumpto*: "from the necessary assumption". Wyclif grants part of the objection's conclusion.
4. Silvester and Caesar: Constantine's endowment of the church under Pope Silvester (as in 08-f). *Ad exonerandum eum*: to unburden Caesar of his wealth. *Secundum partes plus abiectas*: in the more menial parts of the service of the poor. Side-note 187.18.
5. *Reputet sibi omne tediosum ... et fore gaudiosum ... quod*: we take two complements: the clergy is to count ministering to the poor irksome, and to count it joyful that faithful laymen take over that burden. "Elsewhere": the place in Wyclif's works is not traced. Side-notes 187.29, 188.1.
6. *Relinquendum primam caritatem*: Revelation 2:4, "thou hast left thy first charity". A and A_1 read *audivissent* (188.9), "they would have heard"; the print's singular is translated, with the clergy understood as subject ("it"). Matthew 20:22: Wyclif has *quod* for the Vulgate's *quid*, with the same sense. "Above": the request of the sons of Zebedee, 179 (08-f).
7. Decretum C. 11 q. 1 c. 29 (the modern form is ours; Loserth's rubric *De secularibus negociis episcopus cognoscere non debet*). The canon is from Clement's letter to James (Friedberg I, 634), but within it Peter speaks to Clement (c. 30, *tibi, o Clemens*), so Wyclif's ascription to Peter is defensible; translated. Loserth corrects the codices' *ne vel* from the decree (188.20); his correction is translated. *Perplexus*: entangled, not the moral-theology sense of the glossary *perplexus*. A margins *Nota decretum super hoc quod clerus non debet se implicare mundo* (188.16) and *De ablacione temporalium et cleri paupertate* (188.28).
8. *Non enim cadit*: there is no room for. *Abiectis primatibus*: we take *primatibus* from *primatus*, "primacy", in an ablative absolute: those who have cast primacies aside. It may be from *primas*: "the primates being cast off". A margin *Conclusio* (189.6); A_1 is corrected to *deserunt* (189.7).
9. A and A_1 lack *amoto* (189.12). *In casu*: in the case stated (where the endowment hinders). Side-note 189.9.

10. ***Furcas et puteum*: the franchise of gallows and pit (the drowning-pit) held by lords of high justice. *Aer deferens inspirandus*: construed loosely, "the air that carries [breath]"; the phrase is compressed. A_1 reads *vestimentum* (189.23). B reads *Quod* (189.17). The golden touch is Midas's, unnamed. Side-note 189.17.**
11. B margin, another hand: *Evangelista frondem convertit in aurum* (189.26). The story of John the Evangelist turning branches and stones into gold and gems is Isidore's, *De ortu et obitu patrum* 72 (PL 83, 151C: *mutavit in aurum silvestres frondium virgas littoreaque saxa in gemmas*), repeated in the *Legenda aurea* (c. 9). *Philargirie*: love of money (Greek *philargyria*). A and A_1 lack *et secundum — dominatissimus* (189.28–29). *Repugnasset*: the understood subject is that wealth. Side-note 189.25.
12. A and A_1 read *in finitum* (190.5). B lacks *seculari* (190.6). Loserth suggests *vestiri*, "to be clothed", for *vesci*; the print's *vesci in auro* is translated, and construes: cf. 1 Maccabees 11:58, "leave to drink in gold".
13. The golden buckle is at 1 Maccabees 10:89 and 11:58 (DR "buckle of gold"); Wyclif's *IX°* is a misnumbering for X. *Omnia enim ista gentes exquirunt*: Matthew 6:32, "for after all these things do the heathens seek" (Vulgate *inquirunt*). B reads *possint* and *repugnat*; A_1 is corrected to *sed quia* (190.10–11).
14. A margin *Quarta obieccio* (190.13). *Quibus putantes se benefacere erraverunt*: the seculars erred in the clerics to whom they thought they did good, that is, in endowing them. *Debent*: are bound. Side-note 190.13.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **187: *privilegia***
  - **187: *V^{a}***
  - **187: *tenerius* (tene-/rius; main token holds the whole word (154d folio mark glued))**
  - **187: *Et***
  - **188: *et* (print begins p.188: placioni et predicacioni; main donari is spurious)**
  - **188: *predicacioni***
  - **188: *quod***
  - **188: *incita-* (first half of incita-/mento; F is the margin letter) [NW]**
  - **188: *XI^{a}* (15 is the line number)**
  - **188: *I^{a}***
  - **189: *est* (154d folio mark, F margin letter)**
  - **189: *Christi***
  - **190: *faciliter***
  - **190: *proficiendi***
  - **190: *I°* (cap-height I, not old-style 1)**
  - **190: *Christus***
  - **190: *ymmo***
  - **186: *privilegia* (pri- here, 154d vilegia on next page; main token holds whole word)**
  - **187: *illa***
  - **188: *fideles***
  - **188: *illud***
  - **190: *et***
  - **190: *ecclesiam* (155a folio mark follows)**

Part 3: The oldest privilege is poverty; ignorance does not excuse the endowers; the fifth objection

Loserth pp. 190.17–194.25

¶1 190.17–194.12
190.27 *But we allow such privileges as help the clergy in their duties.*
191.5 *It is wrong to take away ancient privileges;*
191.17 *and the oldest and greatest privilege is poverty granted by Christ.*
192.1 *If this wrong has been committed (by*

[190] **Hic dicitur quod prima pars est falsa, sed secunda est mihi vera in casu; nam cum omne privilegium sit ad commodum privilegiati, patet quod multis dominis temporalibus et aliis assunt terrena privilegia ad exercicium virtutis. Hoc autem contingit communius laicis quam clericis, quia officium dispensandi temporalia et dominanter cohercendi subiectos est eis pertinencius, et clerici declinantes ad mundum communiter peccant gravius. Conceditur tamen quod ministracio temporalium, ne clerus dispergatur ad**

To this the answer is that the first part is false, but the second is, to my mind, true in a case; for since every privilege is for the benefit of the one privileged, it is clear that many temporal lords and others have earthly privileges for the exercise of virtue.[1] And this happens more commonly to laymen than to clerics, because the office of dispensing temporal goods and of coercing subjects as a lord does belongs more fittingly to them, and clerics who decline to the world commonly sin more gravely. Yet

endowment) it should be set right.
192.20 *It is wrong for the clergy to receive endowments as for the laity to give them.*
193.1 *Ignorance is not always an excuse.*
193.31 *It is argued that endowment is consistent*
194.2 *with evangelical poverty; and, since it brings some good, must be a gain to the Church.*
194.13 *The first assumption is doubtful,*

inhonestis mediis mendicandum, foret in casu clero in privilegium, sicut contigit III Regum XVII° quod Helias privilegialiter fuit pastus per corvum. Et breviter ministracio temporalium non est clero in privilegium, nisi de quanto promovet ad sequendum Christum in moribus et impetrandum privilegium [191] **amoris sui; quod contigit, cum Christus accepit elemosinas a laicis et sanctis feminis. Et secundum istam condicionem dotata fuit ecclesia non ad tardandum vel ad retrahendum eam a perfeccione primeva. Unde excommunicatissime peccant sive clerici sive laici qui hoc privilegium antiquum ecclesie scienter auferunt vel minuunt, et hinc XXV, q. II, sic loquitur Leo papa: Privilegia ecclesiarum et monasteriorum sanctorum patrum auctoritate instituta nulla possunt improbitate convelli, nulla novitate mutari. In quo opere auxiliante Christo fideliter exequendo necesse est sedis Romane pontifices perseverantem exhibere famulatum. Dispensacio enim nobis credita est et ad nostrum reatum tendit, si paternarum regule sanccionum nobis consencientibus vel negligentibus violentur. Talia sunt multa decreta: quod non licet antiquioribus privilegiis novis subsequentibus derogare. Cum ergo antiquissima et validissima privilegia, instituta a Christo, steterunt in paupertate altissima, sequitur quod non licet cuiquam privilegium illud subtrahere. Cum ergo privilegium illud stat in habendo cuncta exproprietarie in communi, sic quod sibi repugnat dominacio civilis et conversacio secularis, videtur quod hoc non licuit sine gravi periculo introducere in clerum. Unde XXV^a^ q. I, canon sic loquitur: Que ad perpetuam generaliter sunt ordinata utilitatem, nulla commutacione varientur, nec ad privatum commodum trahantur que ad bonum sunt commune prefixa. Ex istis colligitur, cum nec dominus secularis debuit nec potuit dare clero in privilegium dominacionem** [192] **secularem, stante illo ordine, nec licuit clero illam accipere, patet quod error, si ex ignorancia in illud processerit, debet utrimque celeriter emendari. Patet prima pars ex hoc quod non licet deteriorare proximum, auferendo ab eo privilegium a Deo datum, ad perficiendum in suis limitibus precipuis tantum statum, sed necessario foret deterioracio, quia deieccio status cleri ad laycos, habere dominacionem huiusmodi. Ideo non licuit seculari hoc facere. Unde tercio decretalium, Nec clerici vel monachi, capitulo Relatum, precipit papa quod monachi incorrigibiles vivendo seculariter alios corrumpentes eiciantur aliis religiose viventibus introductis, ubi tamquam per se manifestum supponitur quod secularis conversacio sit clericali inferior; nec dubium quin repugnat statui et perfeccioni cleri quod sic per affeccionem et occupacionem temporalium degradetur; ideo propter**

it is granted that the ministering of temporal goods, lest the clergy be scattered to beg by dishonest means, would in a case be to the clergy as a privilege, as happened, 1 Kings 17, when Elijah was fed by privilege through the raven.[2] And in brief, the ministering of temporal goods is not to the clergy as a privilege except in so far as it promotes [it] to follow Christ in manners and to obtain the privilege [191] **of his love; which happened when Christ accepted alms from laymen and holy women. And under this condition the church was endowed: not so as to slow it or draw it back from its first perfection. Hence they sin most excommunicably, whether clerics or laymen, who knowingly take away or diminish this ancient privilege of the church; and hence, C. 25 q. 2 [c. 2], Pope Leo speaks thus: "The privileges of churches and monasteries, instituted by the authority of the holy fathers, can be torn up by no wickedness, changed by no novelty. In which work, to be faithfully carried out with Christ's help, the pontiffs of the Roman see must show persevering service. For the dispensation has been entrusted to us, and it tends to our guilt if the rules of the fathers' sanctions are violated with our consent or through our neglect."[3] Many decrees are such: that it is not lawful to derogate from older privileges by newer ones following after. Since, then, the most ancient and most valid privileges, instituted by Christ, stood in the highest poverty, it follows that it is not lawful for anyone to withdraw that privilege. Since, then, that privilege stands in having all things in common, without property, so that civil exercise of lordship and secular manner of life are repugnant to it, it seems that this could not lawfully be introduced into the clergy without grave peril. Hence, C. 25 q. 1 [c. 3], the canon speaks thus: "Things that have been ordained generally for perpetual utility are to be varied by no exchange, nor are things fixed for the common good to be drawn to private advantage."[4] From these it is gathered: since a secular lord neither ought nor was able to give the clergy, as a privilege, secular** [192] **exercise of lordship while that order stands, nor was it lawful for the clergy to accept it, it is clear that the error, if it proceeded into this from ignorance, ought to be quickly amended on both sides.[5] The first part is clear from this, that it is not lawful to make one's neighbour worse by taking from him a privilege given by God for perfecting so great a state within its chief limits; now there would necessarily be a making worse, because to have an exercise of lordship of this kind is a casting down of the state of the clergy to the laity. Therefore it was not lawful for a secular to do this.[6] Hence in the third [book] of the Decretals, Ne clerici vel monachi, chapter**

repugnanciam non potest fieri talis dotacio stante ordine. Non enim est privilegium peiorare. Et ex eodem patet quod non licet clero a perfeccione primitiva deficere, sicut non licet laico sponsam Christi sic inficere. Si enim non licet laico auferre suas elemosinas que sunt bona abiectissima, multo minus liceret auferre elemosinas a Deo institutas que sunt bona et privilegia Dei potissima. Quomodo ergo liceret seculari ordinacionem Dei inficiendo corrigere cui non licet iuxta falsigrafos suam culpam quam commisit ex ignorancia emendare? Numquid tam affectata ignorancia excusat dominum secularem: Si enim secularis cui minus repugnat mundialitas ex tali inclinacione ad seculum, non obstante quod putat in hoc prestare Deo obsequium, reddit eum [193]dampnabilem, quanto magis necessitando personam cleri cui plus repugnat conversacio secularis? Revera si talis ignorancia omnino excusat, per idem excusaret quemlibet viciosum; nam, ut patet primo Ethicorum, sicut omnis homo appetit naturaliter esse felix, sic appetit media que credit ducere ad hunc finem, ut voluptuosus ponit felicitatem in cibariis delicatis, luxuriosus in actibus venereis, avarus in mundi diviciis, superbus in mundanis honoribus, et sic de aliis in quibus ignorans amplius delectatur. Sed quis diceret ignoranciam talem simpliciter excusare? Sic ergo posito quod Cesar ex ignorancia crediderit se prestare Deo obsequium in dando clero Christi mundi gloriam, sicut est accusabilis ex eleccione fatua et amore prepostero affectando talia sibi ipsi, sic est plus accusabilis retardando proditorie et cum mundano toxico precipuos milites exercitus christiani. Aliter enim foret elemosina privilegiare clerum eciam religiosum, ut sit voluptuosissime, delectabilissime et splendidissime cibatus, uxoratus et in omni mundi gloria pre omnibus secularibus predotatus. Sed quid privilegio tali insanius? Unde sola fabrica, cum super fallaciam equivocacionis privilegii decipit totum mundum, quia cum dominus temporalis potuit meritorie concedere hec privilegia, sicut clerus ea accipere, et potuit utrimque esse dampnabilis fastus et ignorancia: ideo neutram partem assero, nec quod succedentes abutuntur privilegio, sed veritatem condicionalem ut fidem christianam defendendo relinquens prepositis veritatem de inesse ex operibus iudicandam. Quinto arguitur per hoc quod iuxta sepe dicta paupertas evangelica et omnino spiritualia insignia que Christus concessit sue ecclesie stant cum cesarea [194]dotacione, et ex hinc aliquod bonum ecclesie eveniet (ut patet in proximo argumento): ergo melius est quod ecclesia sic dotetur, et per consequens, Cesar dotavit ecclesiam supra Christum. Maior videtur ex hoc quod beatus Silvester et alii sancti episcopi et domini seculares non approbassent dotacionem huiusmodi, si fuisset ad deterioracionem ecclesie, sed

Relatum, the pope commands that incorrigible monks, living secularly and corrupting others, be expelled, others who live religiously being brought in; where it is supposed as self-evident that the secular manner of life is inferior to the clerical. Nor is there doubt that it is repugnant to the state and perfection of the clergy that it be thus degraded through affection for and occupation with temporal goods; therefore, because of the repugnance, such an endowment cannot be made while the order stands. For it is not a privilege to make worse.[7] And from the same it is clear that it is not lawful for the clergy to fall away from the primitive perfection, as it is not lawful for a layman so to infect the bride of Christ. For if it is not lawful for a layman to take away his alms, which are the most abject goods, much less would it be lawful to take away the alms instituted by God, which are the chief goods and privileges of God. How then would it be lawful for a secular to correct the ordinance of God by infecting it, when, according to the false writers, it is not lawful for him to amend his own fault which he committed in ignorance?[8] Does so affected an ignorance excuse the secular lord? For if, in a secular, to whom mundanity is less repugnant, [the ignorance that comes] from such an inclination to the world, notwithstanding that he thinks he does a service to God in this, renders him [193]damnable, how much more, when he constrains the person of the cleric, to whom the secular manner of life is more repugnant?[9] Truly, if such ignorance excuses altogether, by the same token it would excuse any vicious man; for, as is clear in the first [book] of the Ethics, as every man naturally desires to be happy, so he desires the means which he believes lead to that end: as the voluptuary places happiness in delicate foods, the lecher in venereal acts, the avaricious in the riches of the world, the proud in worldly honours, and so of the others in which the ignorant man takes the more delight. But who would say that such ignorance excuses without qualification?[10] So then, supposing that Caesar out of ignorance believed that he was doing a service to God in giving the clergy of Christ the glory of the world: as he is accusable for a foolish choice and a preposterous love, in desiring such things for himself, so he is more accusable for treacherously holding back, and with worldly poison, the chief soldiers of the Christian army.[11] For otherwise it would be alms to privilege the clergy, even the religious, so that it be fed most voluptuously, delightfully and splendidly, married, and endowed beforehand with all the glory of the world above all seculars. But what is more insane than such a privilege? Hence [it is] mere contrivance, since it deceives the whole world on the fallacy of equivocation in "privilege". For

curia Romana instetisset olim pro privilegiis antiquis ecclesie et propter facilitatem fuissent olim restituta, cum tam dotantes quam dotati statim annuerent expropriacioni, dato quod esset meritoria.

since a temporal lord could meritoriously grant these privileges, as the clergy [could] accept them, and pride and ignorance could be damnable on both sides, therefore I assert neither part, nor that the successors abuse the privilege; but [I assert] the conditional truth, as in defending the Christian faith, leaving to the superiors the truth as a matter of fact, to be judged from works.[12] Fifthly, it is argued by appeal to this: that, according to what has often been said, evangelical poverty and the wholly spiritual insignia which Christ granted to his church stand with the caesarean [194] endowment, and from this some good will come to the church (as is clear in the last argument); therefore it is better that the church be so endowed, and consequently Caesar endowed the church above Christ.[13] The major seems [clear] from this, that blessed Silvester and other holy bishops and secular lords would not have approved an endowment of this kind if it had been to the worsening of the church; but [then] the Roman curia would long ago have pressed for the ancient privileges of the church, and because of the ease [of it] they would long ago have been restored, since both the endowers and the endowed would at once have assented to the renunciation of property, granted that it were meritorious.[14]

¶2 194.13–194.25

[194]Hic dicitur negando primam consequenciam, nisi forte assumptum sit impossibile. Nam videtur multis quod laureola martirii qua milites Christi plus strenui decertarunt in floribus ecclesie, convertendo tam expedite tantum populum, non stetissent simul subiecto et tempore cum dotacione cesarea, nec tam abiecta paupertas, calcato mundo, submisso clero Christi consilio, voluntarie paciendo, nec tanta aspiracio ad bona patrie contempta confidencia in bonis fortune vel bonis nature, et per consequens non fuisset tanta status securitas sequendo Christum per compendium arte vite que ducit ad celum. Nam omnia ista quatuor cum suis correlativis videntur esse dotacioni terrene contraria.

To this the answer is by denying the first inference, unless perhaps the assumption is impossible.[15] For it seems to many that the aureole of martyrdom, with which the more vigorous soldiers of Christ strove in the flowering of the church, converting so great a people so readily, would not have stood together in subject and in time with caesarean endowment; nor so abject a poverty, the world trodden down, the clergy submitted to Christ's counsel, suffering voluntarily; nor so great an aspiration to the goods of the homeland, confidence in goods of fortune or goods of nature being despised; and consequently there would not have been so great a security of state in following Christ by the short way of the strait life that leads to heaven. For all these four, with their correlatives, seem to be contrary to earthly endowment.[16]

Notes

1. A margins *Ablacio temporalium quomodo est limitanda* (190.18) and *Responsio* (190.21). "The first part": that there is no bodily privilege; "the second": that seculars are bound to take the goods away (190.14–16). *Assunt*: belong to, are present to.
2. 1 Kings 17:6 (Vulgate 3 Kings): DR "the ravens brought him bread and flesh"; Wyclif has the singular *per corvum*. *Ad inhonestis mediis mendicandum*: to beg by dishonest means. *Dominanter*: as a lord, by lordly power. Side-note 190.27.
3. Decretum C. 25 q. 2 c. 2, Leo to Marcian, *Ep.* 52 (Friedberg I, 1011–12; the modern form is ours). A reads *sanctorum paternum* (191.9). *Excommunicatissime*: "most excommunicably", Wyclif's superlative: in the way that most incurs excommunication. Side-note 191.5.

4. A reads *cunta*, A_1 corrected to *cuncta* (191.22). Decretum C. 25 q. 1 c. 3, Leo to Anatolius, *Ep.* 51 (Friedberg I, 1007–08; the modern form is ours). A margin *Non licuit clero recipere dominacionem nec licuit dominis* (191.30). Side-note 191.17.
5. The period's main verb is *patet*; the *cum* clause holds both premisses (the lord could not give, the clergy could not accept). *Stante illo ordine*: while the order Christ set for his clergy stands. A margin *Conclusio* (192.2). Side-note 192.1.
6. B reads *in suis militibus* (192.6) for *limitibus*; the print is translated. *Deieccio status cleri ad laycos*: the degrading of the clergy to the lay state. *Sed*, bringing the minor premiss, is rendered "now".
7. Decretals of Gregory IX, X 3.50.7 *Relatum*, under the title *Ne clerici vel monachi* (Alexander III to the bishop of London; Friedberg II, 659–60; the modern form is ours; Loserth: "a few words altered"); Wyclif's "inferior" state is his inference. Side-note 192.20.
8. *Suas elemosinas*: alms he has once given. *Inficiendo corrigere*: to "correct" by infecting. *Falsigrafos*: "the false writers", Wyclif's opponents, unnamed; on their view not even ignorance allows the secular to undo the endowment.
9. The *si enim* sentence is an anacoluthon: *secularis* hangs in the nominative and the subject of *reddit* is understood (the ignorance, or the inclination); we supply it in brackets. "Thinks he does a service to God": cf. John 16:2. *Mundialitas*: rendered "mundanity", to keep it apart from *secularitas* (glossary: "worldliness"). *Necessitando*: constraining the cleric by the endowment. Side-note 193.1.
10. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* I (Loserth: "Cap. II, III"). *Ignorans*: the man ignorant of the true end.
11. Loserth corrects the codices' *mundana toxica* to *mundano toxico* (193.16–17); his correction is translated. *Milites*: soldiers, the Pauline figure (glossary: *milites Christi*), not the knightly estate. *Retardando*: holding back from their warfare.
12. *Sola fabrica*: the sentence has no main verb; we construe "[it is] mere contrivance", the case for endowment as a privilege resting on the equivocation in "privilege". The reading is doubtful. A margin *Protestacio: hoc verbum extinctum est* (193.22): Wyclif's protestation follows (*neutram partem assero*). *Uxoratus*: provided with a wife. *Veritatem condicionalem*: the conditional truth (if endowment harms the church, it is unlawful), as against the truth *de inesse*, whether particular endowers and endowed in fact sinned.
13. A margin *Quinta obieccio* (193.31). *Proximo argumento*: we take it as the last (fourth) argument and its answer, which granted that the ministering of temporal goods can be a privilege; *proximo* could also mean the next. *Supra Christum*: more than Christ did. Side-notes 193.31, 194.2.
14. *Maior*: the major premiss. *Sed curia Romana instetisset*: the counterfactual: had endowment harmed the church, the curia would have pressed for the old privileges. *Expropriacioni*: the giving up of property. *Dato quod esset meritoria*: granting that it would have been meritorious.
15. A margin *Responsio* (194.12). "The first inference": from "poverty stands with endowment and some good comes of it" to "it is better that the church be so endowed". *Nisi forte assumptum sit impossibile*: Wyclif denies the inference, while hinting that the assumption itself (that the two stand together) is impossible. Side-note 194.13.
16. A margin *Nota quattuor* (194.14). A_1 reads *calcata* (194.18). Loserth expands the codices' *correl'* (194.24); his expansion is translated. *Laureola*: the aureole, the martyr's special crown (the glossary). *Subiecto et tempore*: in the same subject and at the same time. *Arte vite que ducit ad celum*: cf. Matthew 7:14, "strait is the way that leadeth to life"; Wyclif speaks of the strait life, and of heaven. A margin *Conclusio* (194.33) falls outside this chunk.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 190: *assunt* [NW]
  - 190: *Et*
  - 191: *amoris* (H 155ª is folio mark and margin letter)
  - 191: *improbitate* (10 is the line number)
  - 192: *secularem*
  - 192: *stante*
  - 192: *ignorancia*
  - 192: *capitulo* (capi-/tulo hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 192: *Christi*
  - 193: *dampnabilem* (K 155ᶜ is margin letter and folio mark)
  - 194: *dotacione*
  - 194: ∅ ('as' is the English side-note (as-/sumption); box word Hic already present)
  - 191: *dominacionem* (domina- here, cionem at top of p.192; main token holds whole word)
  - 192: *ordine*
  - 192: *accipere*
  - 192: *patet*
  - 192: *quod*
  - 192: *Deo*
  - 192: *obsequium*
  - 193: *cesarea*
  - 194: *ex*

- **192: ∅ (second half of capi-tulo; neighbour 74 already capitulo) [DELX]**

Part 4: The saints' example settles nothing; the vineyard turned into a garden of herbs

Loserth pp. 194.26–198.24

¶1 194.26–195.22
194.26 *Even if we grant it, the gain is less than the loss.*
195.1 *The example of Silvester and other Saints is insufficient.*
195.16 *Our only safe model in all things is Christ.*
195.27 *If we follow saints in possessing properly, we must follow them in our use of it.*

[194]**Sed da quod ista fuissent compossibilia cum dotacione ecclesie et da minorem principalis argumenti, adhuc non sequitur conclusio, cum stat cum toto isto quod ecclesia perdat perfeccionem aliunde maiorem quam fuit perfeccio ex acquisicione temporalium perquisita; quod ego credo nedum fuisse verum sed necessarium, supposita declinacione a religione quam Christus instituit. Et videtur mihi stultum fore omnino excusare beatum Silvestrum et Cesarem a peccato** [195]**sic quod unus fuisset omnino inmunis ab affeccione inordinata ad temporalia, et ut sic aliquantulum venialiter nocens sibi, et occasione male accepta plene superbiendi, plus nocens suo generi succedenti. Potuit enim renuisse, sicut beatus Evangelista et ceteri apostoli qui possent in tanta quiete assumpsisse sibi et successoribus suis tantam copiam temporalium quam prudencius reliquerunt. Nec repugnat isti quod sancti canonizantur in ecclesia et beatificantur in celo, cum possunt hic penitere et in purgatorio emendari. Quis, inquam, sanctus a sancto sanctorum exclusive usque ad novissimum sanctum non peccavit eciam mortaliter? Ideo (ut sepe dixi) cecitas magna foret nobis superstitibus allegare tales argucias: Iste sanctus sic fecit, ergo nobis licet sic faciendo quodcunque opus consimile approbando defendere et augere. Hoc enim privilegium specialiter reservatum est Christo qui non potuit peccare, ut nitamur sequi ipsum in omnibus quantum sufficimus et nullum alium nisi de quanto ipsum sequitur; sed propter formidinem mentiendi neutram partem assero, vel quod sancti meruerunt in dicta dotacione vel quod demeruerunt.**

But grant that these had been compossible with the endowment of the church, and grant the minor of the principal argument: still the conclusion does not follow, since it stands with all this that the church should lose, from elsewhere, a perfection greater than was the perfection gained from the acquisition of temporal goods; which I believe to have been not only true but necessary, supposing the declining from the religion which Christ instituted.[1] And it seems to me that it would be altogether foolish to excuse blessed Silvester and Caesar from sin [195]**in such a way that the one had been altogether immune from inordinate affection toward temporal goods; and as such [he was] somewhat, venially, harming himself, and, through the occasion, ill taken, of growing fully proud, harming more his line succeeding him.[2] For he could have refused, as did the blessed Evangelist and the other apostles, who could, in so great quiet, have taken for themselves and their successors so great an abundance of temporal goods, which they more prudently left. Nor is it repugnant to this that saints are canonized in the church and beatified in heaven, since they can repent here and be amended in purgatory. Who, I say, among the saints, from the Holy of holies (exclusive) down to the last saint, has not sinned, even mortally?[3] Therefore (as I have often said) it would be great blindness for us survivors to allege such quibbles: "This saint did thus; therefore it is lawful for us, by doing thus, to defend and increase any like work by approving it." For this privilege is specially reserved to Christ, who could not sin: that we strive to follow him in all things as far as we are able, and no other except in so far as he follows him. But for misgiving of lying I assert neither part, either that the saints merited in the said endowment or that they demerited.[4]**

¶2 195.23–198.24
196.14 *They despised the world.*
196.28 *We should show by our works that we do so.*
197.2 *How the Church is God's vineyard.*
197.27 *The spring time of the early Church*

[195]**Sed scio quod prior status fuit perfeccior, et scio quod donacio si fuit privilegium fuit facta a Christo, et scio quod nos debemus uti hiis temporalibus sicut illi usi sunt, quia aliter excidimus a privilegio per abusum. Si ergo volumus sequi sanctos confessores, arguamus per locum a sufficienti similitudine sequendo eos in affeccione et usu temporalium concessorum, et conformiter videtur probabile in republica de Cesare et ceteris mundi principibus quod laborarunt**

But I know that the former state was more perfect; and I know that the donation, if it was a privilege, was made by Christ; and I know that we ought to use these temporal goods as they used them, because otherwise we fall from the privilege through abuse.[5] If, then, we wish to follow the holy confessors, let us argue by the topic from sufficient likeness, following them in affection for and use of the temporal goods granted;

198.17 *has passed into winter,*

peccato superbie, volentes in republica solempnitate sacerdotes [196] suos excellere et nomen suum in mundo extollere. Et sic potuerunt melius fecisse defendendo religionem quam Christus instituit. Christus enim ne sponsa sua adulteretur cum mundo, prohibuit sibi communicacionem cum mundo et iniunxit contemptum sue glorie, et hec fides scripture docuit sanctos pro amore sponsi zelotis vincere istum mundum; Iª Joh. II°, 15 precipit Johannes dileccione speciali privilegiatus a Christo: Nolite diligere mundum neque que in mundo sunt; et magister noster Christus dicit Iª Joh. III°, 13: Nolite mirari si odit vos mundus et Joh. XVI°, 33: Confidite, quia ego vici mundum, et: Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister eius. Hec cum quotlibet eis similibus fecerunt sanctos mundum cum condicionibus suis contempnere et sponso qui hec fecit et docuit moribus adherere, cum ex testimonio suo Matthei VI°, 24: Non possumus Deo servire et mammone. Si ergo servamus usum et ritum ecclesie per accidens introductum in dicendo divinum servicium et conversando secundum tradiciones hominum, ne parva declinacio tracta in consequenciam inducat maiorem defectum, quanto magis debemus striccius servare usum et mandatum dominicum de incommunicanter odiendo mundum? Revera declinacio ad oppositum posset paulative inducere clerum nostrum, ut vivat secularius quam laici colentes seculum, et sic olim vinea domini transiret in ortum olerum; et probando si blaspheme excusaciones nostre sint vere de non diligendo seculum, sed ad roborandum amorem Dei, capiendo licitum eius usum, utamur regula tacta in fine proximi capituli, videndo si dicta nostra operibus compensamus. [197] Constat quidem ex testimonio scripture Ysaie V°, 1, 2, quomodo ecclesia Dei est vinea, dum stillat a botris plenis vino sapiencie doctrinam fidei scripture ad nutriendam vitam fidelium, ut patet ex processu Cantici canticorum, quod si ab isto officio declinat ad seculum, tunc soror nostra parvula, non habens ubera, versa est in ortum olerum. Olera enim (ut tangit Augustinus super Psalmum XXXVI^{um}) virescunt in hyeme, in estate autem propter defectum radicum marcescunt; et cum secundum naturales caules sunt herbe nimis melancolice, generantes humorem terrestrem, propter quod a bestiis melancolicis ut bobus, leporibus et similibus adeo sunt amate, signanter signant mundo deditos qui virescunt in yeme peregrinacionis, refrigescente caritate multorum, sed in estate diei novissime propter defectum radicacionis in Christo ex ardore solis iusticie evanescunt; sed tunc fideles in caritate fundati quorum vita abscondita est cum Christo, cum pastor eorum apparuerit, evirescunt. Canticorum II°, 11, scribitur: Jam enim yemps transiit, ymber abiit et recessit, flores apparuerunt in terra nostra, tempus putacionis

and correspondingly it seems probable, in the commonwealth, of Caesar and the other princes of the world, that they laboured under the sin of pride, wishing that their priests should excel in the commonwealth in pomp, [196] and to extol their own name in the world.[6] And so they could have done better by defending the religion which Christ instituted. For Christ, lest his bride commit adultery with the world, forbade her communion with the world and enjoined contempt of its glory; and this faith of scripture taught the saints, as zealots for love of the bridegroom, to conquer this world.[7] In 1 John 2:15 John, privileged by Christ with a special love, commands: "Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world"; and our master Christ says, 1 John 3:13: "Wonder not if the world hate you"; and John 16:33: "Have confidence, for I have overcome the world"; and: "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master."[8] These, with any number like them, made the saints despise the world with its conditions and cleave in their manners to the bridegroom who did and taught these things, since, on his own testimony, Matthew 6:24: "We cannot serve God and mammon."[9] If, then, we keep the usage and rite of the church introduced by accident, in saying the divine service and in living according to the traditions of men, lest a small declining, drawn into precedent, bring in a greater defect, how much more strictly ought we to keep the usage and commandment of the Lord about hating the world without communion with it?[10] Truly, the declining to the opposite could little by little lead our clergy to live more secularly than laymen who cultivate the world; and so the vineyard of the Lord would one day pass into a garden of herbs. And in proving whether our blasphemous excuses are true, that we do not love the world but, taking its lawful use, [use it] to strengthen the love of God, let us use the rule touched at the end of the last chapter, seeing whether we make our words good with works.[11] [197] It is evident indeed from the testimony of scripture, Isaiah 5:1–2, how the church of God is a vineyard while, from clusters full of the wine of wisdom, it drips the doctrine of the faith of scripture to nourish the life of the faithful, as is clear from the course of the Song of Songs; [and] that if it declines from this office to the world, then "our little sister, not having breasts", is turned into a garden of herbs.[12] For herbs (as Augustine touches on Psalm 36) grow green in winter, but in summer wither for want of roots; and since, according to the natural philosophers, cabbages are exceedingly melancholic herbs, generating an earthy humour, for which reason they are so loved by melancholic beasts such as oxen, hares and the like, they markedly signify those given to the world, who grow

advenit, vox turturis audita est in terra nostra, ficus protulit grossos suos, vinee florentes dederunt odorem suum. Quamvis autem illud epitalamium verificatum est ad literam pro tempore incarnacionis sponsi ecclesie, tamen pertinenter et vere dici potest pro estate diei iudicii. Primo enim tempore processit tempus vernum ecclesie, quando apparuit gracia et caritas solis iusticie, fugato frigore brumali ab ecclesia, instructa a sponso ponere animam [198]pro amicis; tunc enim yemps transiit et ymber tribulacionis abiit, mollificans fideles, ut patet de Petro et ceteris fugientibus a sponso, qui postea usque ad mortem permanserant, quia Canticorum VIII° scribitur: Aque multe non potuerunt extinguere caritatem. Sermones Christi erant flores, fructus virtutum prenostici, et quando misit discipulos ad metendum fructus et evellendum actus superfluos (ut notat Christus Johannis IV°), tunc advenit tempus putacionis. Nonne fuit Baptista turtur qui Johannis III°, 29, dicitur gaudere propter vocem sponsi; ipse enim fuit vox clamantis in deserto, simul cantans penitenciam et gaudium sicut turtur; tunc enim cetus apostolorum protulit rudimenta fidei sicut ficus, et discipuli christiani florentes virtutibus ut palmites vitis vere dederunt adoramenta sancte matri ecclesie, IIª Corinthiorum II° 15, scribitur: Christi bonus odor sumus Deo. Sed sole occidente ab affeccionibus generata melancolia propter esum olerum yemps rediit, faciens refrigescere caritatem multorum; et iterum oportet ut fiat nova appropinquacio ad perpendiculare, quodque fiat directe post diem iudicii solsticium sempiternum (ut patet Apocalypsis ultimo), tunc enim invariabiliter coincident radius incidens et reflexus.

green in the winter of pilgrimage, as the charity of many grows cold, but in the summer of the last day vanish for want of rootedness in Christ, from the heat of the sun of justice; but then the faithful, founded in charity, whose life is hid with Christ, when their shepherd shall appear, grow green again.[13] In Song of Songs 2:11–13 it is written: "For winter is now past, the rain is over and gone. The flowers have appeared in our land, the time of pruning is come: the voice of the turtle is heard in our land: the fig tree hath put forth her green figs: the vines in flower yield their sweet smell." And although that marriage song was verified to the letter for the time of the incarnation of the bridegroom of the church, yet it can pertinently and truly be said of the summer of the day of judgment. For in the first time came the springtime of the church, when the grace and charity of the sun of justice appeared, the wintry cold having been driven from the church, which was taught by the bridegroom to lay down its life [198]for its friends;[14] for then winter was past and the rain of tribulation, which softened the faithful, was gone, as is clear of Peter and the others fleeing from the bridegroom, who afterwards stood firm unto death; because in Song of Songs 8:7 it is written: "Many waters cannot quench charity." The sermons of Christ were the flowers, foretelling the fruit of the virtues; and when he sent the disciples to reap the fruits and to pluck out superfluous acts (as Christ notes, John 4), then the time of pruning came. Was not the Baptist the turtle, who in John 3:29 is said to rejoice because of the bridegroom's voice? For he was "the voice of one crying in the wilderness", singing at once penance and joy, like the turtle. For then the company of the apostles put forth the rudiments of the faith like the fig, and the Christian disciples, flowering with virtues like the branches of the true vine, gave sweet savours to holy mother church; in 2 Corinthians 2:15 it is written: "We are the good odour of Christ unto God."[15] But as the sun set from the affections, melancholy being generated through the eating of herbs, winter returned, making the charity of many grow cold; and there must again be a new approach to the perpendicular, and [it must be] that directly after the day of judgment there be an everlasting solstice (as is clear in the last [chapter] of Revelation); for then the incident and the reflected ray will coincide without variation.[16]

Notes

1. Wyclif answers the fifth argument (193.31–194.12, 09-c). ***Ista***: the four goods of the early church just listed (194.14–25), granted for argument's sake to be compossible with endowment; "the minor of the principal argument": that some good came to the church from the endowment (194.1). ***Aliunde***: on another side, by a loss elsewhere. ***Perquisita***: obtained. ***Supposita declinacione***: given that the clergy declined from Christ's religion. A margin ***Conclusio*** (194.33). Side-note 194.26.

2. ***Sic quod unus fuisset … immunis***: what it would be foolish to hold; we take *unus* as Silvester, who received the gift. The *et ut sic … nocens* clauses we read as Wyclif's own estimate: Silvester harmed himself venially, and his successors (*suo generi succedenti*) more, by the occasion of pride. They could also be read as part of the excuse that is rejected; the sense is then that it is foolish to make his harm only venial. The construal is doubtful. Side-note 195.1.
3. "The blessed Evangelist": John, it seems (cf. *Johannes … privilegiatus*, 196.7). B reads *beatificentur* (195.9), the subjunctive; no change of sense. *A sancto sanctorum exclusive*: from Christ, the Holy of holies, who is excluded, to the last saint.
4. A margin *Argucia* (195.13), at the quibble "this saint did thus"; A margin *Dotantes et dotaciones recipientes si et quomodo peccaverunt* ("whether and how those who endowed and those who received endowments sinned", 195.21). *Quantum sufficimus*: as far as we are able. *Neutram partem assero* repeats the protestation at 193.24 (09-c). Side-note 195.16.
5. B reads *quod peior status* (195.23), "that the former state was worse", against the sense of the whole passage; the print is translated. A margin *Sciencia trium* ("knowledge of three things", 195.23), at Wyclif's three *scio*. B omits *uti* (195.25). *Si fuit privilegium fuit facta a Christo*: if the gift was a privilege, its true giver was Christ.
6. A and A_1 omit *de Cesare* (195.30), and B adds *et ceteris* after it; the print is translated. The codices abbreviate *solempni'*, which Loserth expands to *solempnitate* (195.32–33); his expansion is translated, "in pomp". *Per locum a sufficienti similitudine*: the topic from likeness (glossary: *locus a simili*), with the likeness required to be sufficient; Wyclif sets against it the devil's topic *ab insufficiente similitudine* (204.10, 09-f). *Sacerdotes suos excellere*: accusative and infinitive, "that their priests should excel". Side-note 195.27.
7. *Zelotis* stands in the dative or ablative plural, with nothing to govern it; we take it with *sanctos*, "the saints, as zealots for the bridegroom's love". The case is a doubt. *Sibi* (*prohibuit sibi*): the bride.
8. 1 John 2:15; John as the disciple whom Jesus loved. Wyclif ascribes 1 John 3:13 to "our master Christ"; in the Vulgate the words are John's in the epistle, with *fratres*, which Wyclif omits. Loserth's foot (196.7, 196.11; the OCR is rough) records that A and B cite "Joh. III" (the Gospel), corrected in A_1 to "I Joh. III", and that the codices give "Joh. XVII" for John 16:33. Wyclif adds *quia* to John 16:33 ("for"). The last quotation is Matthew 10:25 (DR "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master"); Wyclif gives no reference.
9. At 196.13 the codices read *Hec requiritur cum* (A_1 *requiritur*); Loserth deletes *requiritur* as superfluous, perhaps an error of the archetype; his text is translated. B omits *sanctos* (196.14). Matthew 6:24: Wyclif's *Non possumus*, "we cannot"; the Vulgate has *Non potestis* (DR "You cannot serve God and mammon"). Side-note 196.14.
10. *Per accidens introductum*: brought in by circumstance, not by Christ. *Tracta in consequenciam*: drawn into precedent, the canonists' phrase for an act that comes to bind later acts; B omits *tracta* (196.21). *Incommunicanter*: so as to have no communion with it. *Divinum servicium*: the liturgy (glossary: *servicium*: untagged in this sense).
11. "Garden of herbs": *hortus olerum*, 1 Kings 21:2 (Vulgate 3 Kings), Naboth's vineyard, which Ahab wished to turn into one; the figure governs what follows. *Olim*: of the future, "one day". *Blaspheme*: adjective with *excusaciones*. *Sed ad roborandum … usum*: the content of the excuse: that we take the lawful use of the world only to strengthen the love of God. "The rule touched at the end of the last chapter": the test at the end of ch. 8 (08-f), that grief and labour over temporal goods beyond grief over spiritual ones shows disordered love. A margin *Conclusio* (196.24). Side-note 196.28.
12. Isaiah 5:1–2, the vineyard of the beloved; A cites *Is. IV.* Song of Songs 8:8 (Loserth's reference): Wyclif's *soror nostra parvula, non habens ubera*, where the Vulgate has *Soror nostra parva, et ubera non habet* (DR "Our sister is little, and hath no breasts"). A margin *Quomodo ecclesia dicitur vinea et quomodo convertitur in ortum olerum* (197.1). Side-note 197.2.
13. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 36, sermo 1 (PL 36:357–58, *sicut olera prati cito cadent*; Loserth: Opp. IV, 1). The cabbage as a melancholic herb is not Augustine's; the natural philosophers meant are not identified. "The charity of many grows cold": Matthew 24:12; "whose life is hid with Christ": Colossians 3:3, where 3:4 has "When Christ shall appear"; Wyclif says "their shepherd". A and A_1 read *apparuit* (197.19); A *malencolice* (197.11). A margins *Augustinus*, *Olus* (197.7); B, in a second hand, *Olerum proprietates*. A_1's margin reads: *Olus est herba melancolica que signat mundo deditos, et ideo Theotunici pre aliis gentibus comedunt olus, quia plus sunt mundo et avaricie dediti*: "cabbage is a melancholic herb that signifies those given to the world, and so the Germans eat cabbage more than other nations, because they are more given to the world and to avarice." It shows an early reader taking Wyclif's figure literally and turning it on a nation.
14. Song of Songs 2:11–13 in the Douay–Rheims; Wyclif agrees with the Vulgate. *Epitalamium*: the Song as a marriage song. "To lay down its life for its friends": John 15:13. *Instructa* agrees with *ecclesia*: the church was taught to lay down its life. Side-note 197.27.
15. Song of Songs 8:7. *Permanserant*, pluperfect: who afterwards stood firm. "As Christ notes, John 4": the sowing and reaping of John 4:35–38; the "plucking out of superfluous acts" is Wyclif's gloss. John 3:29; "the voice of one crying in the wilderness": John 1:23. *Adoramenta* we take as *odoramenta*, "sweet savours", which the next quotation (*odor*) requires. A and A_1 omit *Deo* in 2 Corinthians 2:15 (198.17); the print agrees with the Vulgate.
16. *Sole occidente ab affeccionibus*: we take it that the sun of justice set from men's affections, and that melancholy, bred by eating the herbs of the world, then brought back winter; *ab affeccionibus* could instead go with *generata*, "melancholy bred by the affections". A reads *malencolica* (198.18). The codices read *quosque* (198.21); Loserth's *quodque* is translated. *Appropinquacio ad perpendiculare*: the sun's approach to the vertical, its summer height; at the perpendicular the incident and reflected rays coincide. "The last chapter of Revelation": Revelation 22:5, where there is no more night. Side-note 198.17.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 195: *sic* (155^{d} is the folio mark)
  - 195: *assumpsisse*
  - 195: *Christo* (side-note things follows)
  - 195: *ergo*
  - 195: *Cesare* (capital C)
  - 196: *sue* (156^{a} is the folio mark)

- **196: *I[a]***
- **196: *II°***
- **196: *I[a]***
- **196: *III°***
- **196: *24* (print: Matthei VI°, 24)**
- **196: *declinacio* (20 is the line number)**
- **197: *1* (old-style arabic 1, short like the following 2 (Ysaie V°, 1, 2))**
- **197: *vinea* (italic v)**
- **197: *II°* (Canticorum II°, 11)**
- **197: *et* (margin 1 is the argument numeral)**
- **197: *pro***
- **198: *tribulacionis* (tri-/bulacionis hyphenated; main token holds whole word; 156[b] O are folio mark and margin letter)**
- **198: ∅ (bulacionis is the tail of tribulacionis held whole at pos 8; no separate word) [NW]**
- **198: *Christi***
- **198: *clamantis* (6 is the argument numeral)**
- **198: *II[a]***
- **198: *II°* ('into' is the English side-note)**
- **195: *fuisset***
- **195: *sacerdotes***

Part 5: Naboth's vineyard and St Thomas; the sixth objection, on the foreknown and privilege; the three pairs of Matthew 24

Loserth pp. 198.25–202.29

¶1 198.25–199.10
199.9 *Example of St. Thomas.*
199.20
6. It is objected that on our showing privileges could be held only in grace.

[198]**Sicut ergo Naboth noluit vel vendere regi vineam hereditariam, ut transferatur in ortum olerum (ut patet III, Regum XXI°, cap. I°), sic clerus pure accipiens Christum, vitem veram in porcionem hereditariam, non venderet illud privilegium paternum, sic quod ortus deliciarum in ortum olerum transferatur. Sed heu Jesabel, hoc est, effeminati et lubrici, voluptati dediti, dominantes satrapis primevum privilegium subverterunt; ideo caveant de malediccione et pena minata Achab et Jesabel. Istam moralitatem tangit venerabilis** [199]**Beda super epistolam Jacobi. Insuper, si vitis noluit deserere vinum suum quo dii letificantur et homines, ut imperet ceteris lignis silve (ut patet Iudicum IX° et expositum est IV° cap. libri VI[i]), quanto magis clerus non desereret primevum privilegium quod Christus instituit propter libidinem civiliter dominandi; ita solutio sathane regis superbie post mille annos (de quibus Apocalypsis XX°) retardat quod ecclesia non sit ad privilegium primevum restituta. Et ista causa rectificavit gloriosum martirium sancti Thome, cum de eo canit ecclesia:**

As, then, Naboth would not even sell the king his inherited vineyard, that it be turned into a garden of herbs (as is clear, 1 Kings 21), so the clergy, receiving Christ purely, the true vine, as its portion of inheritance, would not sell that paternal privilege so that the garden of delights should be turned into a garden of herbs.[1] But alas, Jezebel, that is, the effeminate and slippery, given to pleasure, lording it over satraps, have overthrown the primeval privilege; therefore let them beware of the curse and the punishment threatened to Ahab and Jezebel. This moral sense the venerable [199]**Bede touches on the Epistle of James.[2] Moreover, if the vine would not desert its wine, by which gods and men are gladdened, to rule over the other trees of the forest (as is clear, Judges 9:13, and has been expounded in chapter 4 of book 6), how much more would the clergy not desert the primeval privilege which Christ instituted, for lust of lording it civilly? So the loosing of Satan, the king of pride, after a thousand years (of which Revelation 20 [speaks]), delays the church's being restored to its primeval privilege.[3] And this cause made right the glorious martyrdom of Saint Thomas, since the church sings of him:[4]**

¶2 199.11–199.11

[199]**Nec in agnos sustinet**

He suffers not, against the lambs,

¶3 199.12–199.12

[199] **Lupos desevire**

the wolves to rage,

¶4 199.13–199.13

[199] **Nec in ortum olerum**

nor into a garden of herbs

¶5 199.14–199.27

[199] **Vineam transire. Nec credo quod est causa verior vel alia qua fuit martir nisi resistendo lupis sevientibus in agnos gregis dominici et impediendo ne vinea inebrians transferatur in ortum olerum; herba quidem melancolica preservat ab ebrietate ex amissione temporalium gignens vecordiam. Sexto arguitur contra dicta per hoc quod iuxta predicta nichil sonat in privilegium hominis, nisi de quanto sapit graciam vel virtutem; sed hoc nullus preter Christum potest concedere, ergo nec privilegium, et sic nullus prescitus haberet privilegium, ymmo sciencia cum inflat et omnia bona citra virtutes non forent privilegia abutenti, que videntur legibus et modo loquendi vulgari contraria.**

the vineyard to pass. Nor do I believe that there is a truer cause, or any other, for which he was a martyr, than resisting the wolves raging against the lambs of the Lord's flock, and preventing the inebriating vineyard from being turned into a garden of herbs; the melancholic herb indeed preserves from drunkenness, begetting faint-heartedness from the loss of temporal goods.[5] Sixthly, it is argued by appeal to this, against what has been said: that according to what was said before nothing counts as a privilege of man except in so far as it savours of grace or virtue; now no one except Christ can grant this; therefore no one [can grant] a privilege either; and so no foreknown [man] would have a privilege; indeed, knowledge, since it puffs up, and all goods short of the virtues, would not be privileges to one who abuses them: which seem contrary to the laws and to the common way of speaking.[6]

¶6 199.28–202.29
200.4 *The predestinate holds privilege in a more excellent way,*
200.10 *yet a privilege may be of some avail to the foreknown.*
200.21 *Privileges that are abused should be changed in form.*
201.4 *We cannot recognise the members of the Church.*
201.10 *Hence the rule that we are to love our enemies.*
201.20 *Exposition of Matthew XXIV,*
201.29 *Those in the field are the clergy;*
202.8 *those at the mill, the laity engaged in active life;*
202.21 *those in the bed, those who are tree from active duties.*

[199] **Hic dicitur quod prima consequencia non procedit, cum prescitus habet privilegium, dum est in gracia.** [200] **Ideo signanter additur in descripcione privilegii quod est bonum concessum ecclesie vel persone. Datur enim quandoque temporale privilegium persone prescite que non est membrum ecclesie, verumptamen predestinatus habet excellenciori modo privilegium, quia ad maiorem utilitatem, scilicet ad beatitudinem, percipit donum Dei (ut patet in fine capituli VI[i]). Prodest autem privilegium prescito quoad commodum temporale et quoad mitigacionem pene perpetue, sed manifestum videtur ex fide quod nulli prescito est privilegium bonum quod habet, dum est iniustus, quia ut sic abutitur dato ad sui incommodum; abutitur, inquam, quia debet uti dato in caritate honorando Deum et merendo sibi ac sancte matri ecclesie, et facit omnino oppositum deteriorando se ipsum. Ideo patet ex diffinicione privilegii quod peccatum facit prius privilegium desinere esse privilegium, quod quidam vocant mortificacionem privilegii. Et sic verum dicit beatus Gregorius (ut recitatur XI[a], q. III): Privilegium omnino meretur amittere qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate. Et patet (ut ostendit glosa) quod non exinde debet sancta ecclesia privari privilegio, sed in privilegio innovari. Nam privilegium foret clericum in casu privari bonis fortune tam sibi quam ecclesie; privilegium eciam foret in casu ecclesie quod heretici sibi molesti subtrahantur morte**

To this the answer is that the first inference does not hold, since a foreknown [man] has a privilege while he is in grace. [200] **Therefore it is markedly added in the definition of privilege that it is a good granted to the church or to a person.[7] For a temporal privilege is sometimes given to a foreknown person who is not a member of the church; yet the predestinate has privilege in a more excellent way, because he receives the gift of God to a greater utility, namely to blessedness (as is clear at the end of chapter 6). And a privilege profits the foreknown as to temporal advantage and as to the mitigation of everlasting punishment; but it seems manifest, as faith teaches, that to no foreknown [man] is the good that he has a privilege while he is unjust, because as such he abuses what is given, to his own disadvantage: abuses, I say, because he ought to use what is given in charity, honouring God and meriting for himself and for holy mother church, and he does altogether the opposite, making himself worse. Therefore it is clear from the definition of privilege that sin makes the former privilege cease to be a privilege, which some call the mortification of the privilege.[8] And so blessed Gregory says truly (as is recited at C. 11 q. 3): "He deserves altogether to lose his privilege who abuses the power permitted to him." And it is clear (as the gloss shows) that holy church ought not on that account to be deprived of privilege,**

civili ecclesiastica, naturali vel violenta. Et hec racio quare oportet consulere regulas scripture sacre in dando privilegia positiva vel privativa ecclesie. Nunquam enim debet quis punire personam in ecclesia, nisi sub intento privilegiandi ecclesiam; quod quia Apostolus fecit inconsulta scriptura (ut patet Act. IX°), ideo blasphemavit; et sepe contingit hodie quod seculares putantes se privilegiare [201] ecclesiam perturbant et retardant eam, fortificando inimicos ecclesie et specialiter in concedendo elemosinas perpetuas, cum necesse est discolos subintrare in tales elemosinas, propter necessitatem ignorancie quam oportet nos hinc habere de membris ecclesie. Ideo dicit decretum sub auctoritate Gregorii XXIII[a] q. IV: Hec autem, quod sicut habitacio ecclesie militantis est inter celum et terram, sic utrarumque parcium cives recipit, sed in finali iudicio discernentur. Et hec racio quare regula Christi precipit benefaciendo diligere tam amicos quam eciam inimicos (ut patet Luce VI°, 27, et ad Romanos VIII°). Omnis, inquit, iniquus bonorum est inimicus. Omnis enim amicus huius seculi inimicus est Dei, inimicus autem Dei bonitatis et iusticie est inimicus. Racionabile itaque et securum est diligere inimicos, quia necesse est dilecionem illam premiari in retribucione finali; odium autem extra caritatem necesse est sequi demeritum. Et hec racio quare Christus voluit hic filios suos atque diaboli esse permixtim nobis absconditos. Nam Matthei XXIV°, 40, loquens de die iudicii dicit confuse: In illa die erunt duo in agro uno, unus assumetur et alter relinquetur, due erunt molentes in una mola, una assumetur et altera relinquetur, duo in lecto uno, unus assumetur et alter relinquetur. Illud autem exponit Augustinus super Psalmum XXXVI[um] de tribus statibus ecclesie militantis, qui sunt pastores, laboratores et ociatores. Pastores sunt prepositi ovibus Christi, quia instar floris campi et suorum agricultorum debent evellere, destruere, edificare et plantare, ut patet Jeremie I° et Ia Cor. III°, 6, dicit Apostolus: Ego plantavi, Apollo [202] rigavit, sed Deus incrementum dedit, et sequitur: Dei adiutores sumus, Dei agricultura estis. Illud autem genus pastorum dividitur in duas personas quorum filius Dei assumetur ad beatitudinem et filius diaboli relinquetur ad dampnacionem. Ista autem logica est rectissima sed confusa, quia ignoramus quot et qui descendent ad inferos vel ascendent. Secundum iugum, signans infirmiores activam vitam ducentes, signanter exprimitur per terminos feminini generis; molaris inferior est terra quam colimus, recipiens undique constanter secundum variacionem anguli incidentalis et reflexionis influenciam celestium radiorum. Molaris autem superior qui pigre circumducitur est spera celestium; cui activi molentes preparant terre nascencia

but to be renewed in privilege.[9] For it would be a privilege for a cleric, in a case, to be deprived of the goods of fortune, as much for himself as for the church; it would also be a privilege for the church, in a case, that heretics troublesome to it be withdrawn by death, civil [or] ecclesiastical, natural or violent.[10] And this is the reason why it is necessary to consult the rules of holy scripture in giving privileges, positive or privative, to the church. For no one ought ever to punish a person in the church except with the intent of privileging the church; and because the Apostle did this without consulting scripture (as is clear, Acts 9), therefore he blasphemed. And it often happens today that seculars, thinking that they privilege [201] the church, disturb it and hold it back, strengthening the enemies of the church, and especially in granting perpetual alms, since it is inevitable that froward men creep into such alms, because of the necessary ignorance which we must have, here, about the members of the church.[11] Therefore the decree says, under the authority of Gregory, C. 23 q. 4: "And this" [holds]: that as "the dwelling of the church militant is between heaven and earth, so it receives citizens of both parts; but at the final judgment they will be separated."[12] And this is the reason why the rule of Christ commands us, by doing good, to love friends and enemies alike (as is clear, Luke 6:27, and Romans 8). "Every unjust man," he says, "is the enemy of the good." For every friend of this world is the enemy of God; now the enemy of God is the enemy of goodness and justice.[13] It is therefore reasonable and safe to love enemies, because that love must necessarily be rewarded in the final retribution; but demerit must necessarily follow hatred outside charity. And this is the reason why Christ willed his sons and the devil's to be mingled here, hidden from us. For in Matthew 24:40, speaking of the day of judgment, he says indistinctly: "In that day two shall be in one field: one shall be taken and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding at one mill: one shall be taken and the other shall be left. Two in one bed: one shall be taken and the other shall be left."[14] And Augustine expounds this, on Psalm 36, of three states of the church militant, which are pastors, labourers and men of leisure. The pastors are those set over the sheep of Christ, because, after the likeness of the flower of the field and its husbandmen, they must root up, destroy, build and plant, as is clear, Jeremiah 1:10; and in 1 Corinthians 3:6 the Apostle says: "I have planted, Apollo [202] watered: but God gave the increase"; and there follows: "We are God's coadjutors: you are God's husbandry."[15] And that kind of pastors is divided into two persons, of whom the son of God will be taken to blessedness and

et alia mixta inanimata sive artificialia sive naturalia de quibus est negociacio activorum. Celum enim sua circulacione ministrat illis tempus et auram ac unicuique sui generis complementum; cum autem gracia hominis celum circumducitur, signanter dicitur activus molere in pistrino. Tercium vero iugum est quiescencium ab istis duobus officiis, sive sint clerici contemplantes, sive promiscui deprecantes, sive seculares domini imperantes omnes enim tales quiescunt in lecto (ut patet Canticorum III°), et sunt ambo iuga, ut primum secundum predestinacionem et prescienciam ac finalem perseveranciam et finalem inpenitenciam bipertiti, cum ibunt hii in supplicium eternum, iusti autem in vitam eternam (ut dicitur Matthei XXV°, 46).

the son of the devil left to damnation. And this logic is most right but indistinct, because we are ignorant how many and which will descend to hell or ascend. The second yoke, signifying the weaker, who lead the active life, is markedly expressed by terms of the feminine gender. The lower millstone is the earth which we till, receiving constantly on every side, according to the variation of the angle of incidence and of reflection, the influence of the heavenly rays. And the upper millstone, which is slowly turned round, is the sphere of the heavens, against which the active grinders prepare what the earth brings forth, and the other inanimate mixed bodies, whether artificial or natural, in which the trade of the active consists. For the heaven by its circling ministers to them time and air, and to each the completion of its kind; and since the heaven is turned round for the sake of man, the active man is markedly said to grind in the mill.[16] And the third yoke is that of those who rest from these two offices, whether they be contemplative clerics, or people of every kind who pray, or secular lords who command; for all such rest in the bed (as is clear, Song of Songs 3:1); and both [these] yokes, like the first, are divided in two according to predestination and foreknowledge, final perseverance and final impenitence, since "these shall go into everlasting punishment: but the just, into life everlasting" (as is said, Matthew 25:46).[17]

Notes

1. 1 Kings 21:2 (Vulgate 3 Kings): Ahab asks for Naboth's vineyard "that I may make me a garden of herbs". The print gives *III, Regum XXI°, cap. I°*; A reads *Reg. 21 cap.*, B *12 cap.* (198.27). *Noluit vel vendere*: would not even sell. *Ortus deliciarum*: the garden of delights, the vineyard set against the garden of herbs.
2. *Jesabel* is taken collectively: the plural verb *subverterunt*, and the gloss "the effeminate and slippery". *Dominantes satrapis*: dative, "lording it over satraps" (glossary: *satrapa*, the officials of the church courts); it could also be instrumental, "ruling through satraps". The threats to Ahab and Jezebel: 1 Kings 21. Bede on James 1:10–11 (PL 93:13A; Loserth: Opp. V, p. 676): *Naboth vir justus mori maluit, quam vineam patrum suorum in hortum olerum transferre*; Jezebel and Ahab are Wyclif's application. A margin *Beda* (199.1).
3. Judges 9:13: the Vulgate has *quod laetificat Deum et homines* (DR "that cheereth God and men"); Wyclif's *quo dii letificantur et homines*, "by which gods and men are gladdened", is translated. "Chapter 4 of book 6" is a cross-reference not identified here. The loosing of Satan: Revelation 20. A and A_1 read *itaque solucio* (199.6); the print is translated.
4. *Rectificavit*: made right, that is, this cause made Thomas Becket's death a true martyrdom. The four lines that follow are, Loserth notes, the antiphon of the second nocturn of the feast of St Thomas, archbishop, in the Sarum Breviary (Procter and Wordsworth I, col. ccli). Loserth sets them as four lines (199.11–14), and so the working transcription has four paragraphs; together: "He suffers not the wolves to rage against the lambs, nor the vineyard to pass into a garden of herbs." A margin *Conclusio* (199.11), which Loserth corrects to *obieccio*. Side-note 199.9.
5. *Herba ... melancolica*: the cabbage of 197.11 (09-d). We read the clause as setting the sober herb against the inebriating vine: the garden of herbs keeps the clergy from the drunkenness of the vine and, by the loss of temporal goods, breeds faint-heartedness. *Ex amissione temporalium* could instead go with *preservat*. The construal is doubtful. A reads *malencolica* (199.18).
6. A margin *Sexta conclusio* (199.20); Loserth's side-note makes it the sixth objection. *Sonat in privilegium*: amounts to, counts as, a privilege. *Prescitus*: the glossary "the foreknown", the term explained at its first occurrence in the work. "Knowledge puffeth up": 1 Corinthians 8:1. *Que videntur*: these consequences. Side-note 199.20.
7. A margin *Responsio* (199.28). *Descripcio*: the definition of privilege given earlier in the treatise, "a good granted to the church or to a person"; *signanter*, "markedly", that is, with purpose. Side-note 200.4.
8. *Mortificacio privilegii*: the "death" of a privilege when it is abused. This is not the glossary *mortificacio* "amortization" (land put into mortmain); rendered "mortification" and left untagged. "The end of chapter 6": 06-g, 138, the justice founded in predestination beyond the natural justice the foreknown also has (substance, not words). *Ex fide*: the glossary "as faith teaches". *Ex diffinicione privilegii*: the glossary *diffinicio* 'definition'; the same definition is called *descripcio* at 200.1. A margin *Correlarium* (200.21). Side-note 200.10.
9. Gregory, quoted "as is recited at C. 11 q. 3"; Loserth gives no reference; the canon is C. 11 q. 3 c. 63 (PL 187:862). "The gloss": presumably the ordinary gloss on that canon, not independently checked (same row). A and A_1 read *sed privilegio* without *in* (200.22), "but renewed by privilege"; the print is translated. Side-note 200.21.

10. ***Morte civili ecclesiastica, naturali vel violenta***: we take civil and ecclesiastical death (loss of standing in the commonwealth or in the church) as one pair and natural or violent death as the other, which A's margin *Duplex mors* (200.27) supports; a list of four kinds is also possible.
11. "The Apostle": Paul, persecuting before his conversion, Acts 9; "he blasphemed": cf. 1 Timothy 1:13, "who before was a blasphemer". ***Elemosinas perpetuas***: alms given for ever, that is, endowments, against the temporary alms of 203.17 (09-f). ***Hinc***: here, in this life. A margin *Conclusio* (200.29). Side-note 201.4.
12. Loserth: Decretum, C. 23 q. 4 c. 15 (*Decr.* II, causa XXIII, q. IV, c. XV; the modern form is ours). Loserth gives the same canon for the Augustine passage at 203.6–10 (09-f); we have not reconciled the two references; the canon is ***Hec autem vita***, ascribed to Gregory (Friedberg I, c. 903). ***Hec autem, quod ...*** has no main verb as Wyclif quotes it; we construe what he wrote and supply "[holds]".
13. Loserth notes that the quoted words occur neither in Luke nor in Romans (201.12). The command is Luke 6:27, "Love your enemies. Do good to them that hate you." The second sentence echoes James 4:4, "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of this world becometh an enemy of God". The speaker of ***inquit*** is Gratian: the words are his dictum after C. 23 q. 4 c. 15 (***Omnis enim iniquus bonorum est inimicus ...***, PL 187:1178C–1179A), and the reference to Paul is Gratian's. Side-note 201.10.
14. Wyclif joins Matthew 24:40–41 with Luke 17:34 (the bed; Loserth refers it to Luke 17:35). His Latin is translated: ***In illa die*** where Matthew has *Tunc* and Luke ***In illa nocte***; "one field" and "one mill", where Matthew has neither ***uno*** nor ***una***. B reads ***permixtum*** (201.19–20); A ***loquens de Dei iudicii*** (201.21). ***Confuse***: indistinctly, without saying which (the glossary). Side-note 201.20.
15. Augustine, ***Enarrationes in Psalmos*** 36, sermo 1 (PL 36:356–57, the field, the mill and the bed; Loserth: Opp. IV, 1, p. 258); ***instar floris campi*** and Jer. 1:10 are Wyclif's additions. ***Ociatores***: men of leisure, who become the third yoke (202.20). ***Instar floris campi et suorum agricultorum***: we take the flower of the field as Christ (Song of Songs 2:1, "I am the flower of the field") and its husbandmen as the apostles; A_1 adds ***id est apostolorum*** after ***agricultorum*** (201.29). Jeremiah 1:10 is abridged to four of its six verbs. 1 Corinthians 3:6, 9. A margin ***Augustinus*** (201.26). Side-note 201.29.
16. ***Iugum***: a yoke, a pair, Wyclif's word for each of the three pairs. A and B read ***exprimit*** (202.9). The feminine terms: ***due ... molentes***. ***Spera***: ***sphaera*** (Loserth, 202.14). ***Cui activi molentes preparant***: we take ***cui*** as the upper stone against which the grain is ground; "for which" is also possible. ***Influenciam***: "influence" (kept apart from ***influxus***, the glossary). A first wrote ***circumciditur***, corrected to ***circumducitur*** (202.19). ***Pistrinum***: the mill. Side-note 202.8.
17. ***Promiscui deprecantes***: people of every kind who pray. ***Sunt ambo iuga, ut primum ... bipertiti***: the masculine ***bipertiti*** agrees with the persons, not with ***iuga***; we construe "both yokes, like the first, are divided in two". Song of Songs 3:1, "In my bed by night I sought him". Matthew 25:46 in the Douay–Rheims. Side-note 202.21.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 198: ***vineam*** (P is the alinea letter)
  - 198: ***I°*** (cap. I°))
  - 199: ***Beda*** (156ᵇ is the folio mark)
  - 199: ***gloriosum***
  - 199: ***privilegium***
  - 200: ∅ (print has nothing between Ideo and signanter; the inserted run is text from the end of p.199)
  - 200: ***VIⁱ*** (superscript i after VI)
  - 200: ***XIª***
  - 200: ***Nam***
  - 200: ***foret***
  - 201: ***quam*** (5 is the line number)
  - 201: ***oportet***
  - 201: ***nos hinc*** (main token covers two printed words)
  - 201: ***habere***
  - 201: ***et iusticie*** (main token covers two printed words)
  - 201: ***est*** (15 is the line number)
  - 201: ***edificare*** (f clear) [NW]
  - 201: ∅ (print has 'Jeremie I° et' once; main already has I° (225) and et (226))
  - 201: ***I°***
  - 202: ∅ ('the' is the English side-note (those at the mill))
  - 202: ***signans***
  - 202: ***ducentes*** (glued 'ac' is the English side-note (ac-tive life))
  - 202: ***signanter*** [NW]
  - 202: ***influenciam*** [NW]
  - 202: ***iugum***
  - 199: ***est***
  - 200: ***Ideo***

- **200:** ***privilegiare***
- **201:** ***XXIV°, 40,*** **(print has verse 40 after chapter (old-style 4)) [-VERSE]**

Part 6: The hidden judgment; the sure way of temporal alms; the answer to the sixth objection

Loserth pp. 202.30–204.26

¶1 202.30–204.26
203.12 *A christian is bound: to take the sure way.*
203.17 *Giving temporal alms is sure; giving perpetual alms uncertain,*
203.23 *since it leads to quarrels,*
203.27 *and induces unfit men to take clerical office.*
204.16 *To sum up: rulers have the power of giving privileges so far as they are confirmed by God.*

[202] **Et raciones omnium istorum sunt nobis abscondite, (ut dictum est.... capitulo). Nam secretum divine ordinacionis dies nostre mortis et dies finalis divisionis ideo sunt a mortalibus occultati, ut nec presumamus** [203] **nec despiciamus, sed timentes senciamus humiliter et amemus generaliter; et quoad duo sequencia, ut vigilemus a peccato continue et obviam sponso cum oleo et lumine sollicitissime nos paremus. Et ista ignorancia est racionalis et salubris. Ideo pertinenter dicit canon sub auctoritate Augustini XXIII[a], q. IV: Quantus arrogancie tumor est, quanta humilitatis et lenitatis oblivio quantaque arrogancie iactancia, ut quis se credat posse facere quod nec apostolis concessit dominus, ut zizannia videlicet a frumento posse se putet discernere. Ex istis formari potest talis racio: Quilibet christianus debet in ambiguis viam perplexam abicere et viam securam eligere, sed omnis dominus secularis dotans vel privilegians ecclesiam est christianus cui talis duplex via exponitur, ergo debet eligere viam certam: sed certum est quod dare elemosinas temporales est via certa, dare autem elemosinas perpetuas est via ambigua, ergo prima via facilior et cercior est eligenda, neglecta alia. Quis queso presumeret viam eligere per quam verisimiliter credere posset Deum offendere? Quis insuper dubitat quin ex perpetuacione elemosinarum fundantur lites et bella per que subtrahitur religio christiana, originantur utrimque superbia et cetera vicia, in tantum quod elemosinarius insurgit saltem contencione cauterizante contra elemosinantem, et (quod est pessimum) surrepentibus multis discolis loco veri cleri cui donata sunt temporalia, aspiratur ad statum propter temporale lucrum, contempto vero officio? Omnia autem ista vel extinguerentur vel mitigarentur data elemosina temporaliter probabiliter egenis qui fideliter peragerent incumbens ministerium, et non data cece ad securandum** [204] **discolos futuros quos datarius ignorat. Hoc enim plus consonat legi Christi qui nec suscepit nec docuit elemosinas tales fieri, sed pocius oppositum. Nec dubium quin temporalis elemosina de decimis, de oblacionibus et sponte oblatis sufficeret ad numerum tanti cleri quanto eget ecclesia. Non ergo ex veteri testamento vel novo fundari potest tanta et talis dotacio. Unde sophisma diaboli procedens nunc ex equivocis, nunc per locum ab insufficiente similitudine conturbat ecclesiam dicentem Canticorum VI°, 11°, Anima mea**

And the reasons of all these are hidden from us (as was said in chapter [ ]).[1] For the secret of the divine ordinance, the day of our death and the day of the final division are hidden from mortals for this reason: that we neither presume [203] **nor despise, but, fearing, think humbly and love generally; and, as to the two that follow, that we watch continually against sin and most carefully make ourselves ready to meet the bridegroom with oil and light. And this ignorance is reasonable and wholesome.[2] Therefore the canon says pertinently, under the authority of Augustine, C. 23 q. 4: "How great is the swelling of arrogance, how great the forgetfulness of humility and gentleness, and how great the boasting of arrogance, that anyone should believe he can do what the Lord did not grant even to the apostles, namely should think that he can distinguish the cockle from the wheat."[3] From these such an argument can be formed: Every Christian ought in doubtful things to reject the perplexed way and choose the safe way; now every secular lord who endows or privileges the church is a Christian to whom such a double way is set forth; therefore he ought to choose the certain way. Now it is certain that to give temporal alms is a certain way, but to give perpetual alms is a doubtful way; therefore the first way, easier and more certain, is to be chosen, the other being set aside.[4] Who, I ask, would presume to choose a way by which he could in all likelihood believe that he would offend God? Who, moreover, doubts that from the perpetuation of alms there are founded lawsuits and wars, through which the Christian religion is withdrawn; that pride and the other vices arise on both sides, so far that the almsman rises up, at least with a searing contention, against the almsgiver; and (what is worst) that, many froward men creeping in in place of the true clergy to whom the temporal goods were given, men aspire to the state for temporal gain, the true office being despised?[5] But all these things would either be extinguished or mitigated if alms were given for a time to those in probable need, who would faithfully carry out the ministry incumbent on them, and not given blindly to secure** [204] **future froward men whom the giver does not know.[6] For this accords more with the law of Christ, who neither received nor taught that such alms be made, but rather**

turbata est propter currus Aminadab. Nunc enim ecclesiastici procedunt currati cum multitudine cliencium quasi reges et reputant privilegium quod ceci et inhabiles et ignari preficiantur in altis statibus quoad mundum (de qua materia patet alibi). Sed redeundo ad difficultatem dicitur quod potentatuum seculi est privilegia terrena (quantum in eis est) concedere, et Dei virtute et gracia confirmare sine quibus non recipit privilegium ultimum complementum. Unde si hoc moveret, tunc nullus sacerdos posset conficere vel dare sacramenta, nullus fidelis posset facere opera meritoria, nec aliquis homo preter Christum dare alteri quevis dona. Omnia enim ista implicant graciam Dei, ideo non fiunt, nisi Deus approbando preveniat et det graciam; quod solus Deus potest facere.

the opposite. Nor is there doubt that temporal alms from tithes, from oblations and from things freely offered would suffice for the number of so great a clergy as the church needs. Therefore so great and such an endowment cannot be founded on the old testament or the new. Hence the devil's sophism, proceeding now from equivocals, now by the topic from insufficient likeness, troubles the church, which says, Song of Songs 6:11: "My soul is troubled for the chariots of Aminadab."[7] For now churchmen go forth in chariots with a multitude of retainers, like kings, and count it a privilege that the blind, the unqualified and the ignorant are set over high states as regards the world (on which matter it is clear elsewhere).[8] But returning to the difficulty, the answer is that it belongs to the potentates of the world to grant earthly privileges (as far as in them lies), and to God to confirm them by power and grace, without which a privilege does not receive its final completion. Hence if this moved [us], then no priest could consecrate or give the sacraments, no faithful man could do meritorious works, nor could any man except Christ give another any gifts whatever. For all these imply the grace of God; therefore they are not done unless God, approving, goes before and gives grace; which God alone can do.[9]

Notes

1. The chapter number is wanting in the codices, which leave a gap (Loserth, 202.31); the English leaves the gap. *Istorum*: the divisions of each yoke into the saved and the damned (202.1–29, 09-e). B reads *Nam decretum* (202.31) for *Nam secretum*, "the decree of the divine ordinance"; the print is translated.
2. *Nec presumamus nec despiciamus*: that we neither presume [on our own salvation] nor despise [others]; *despiciamus* is translated as printed, though the usual pair is presumption and despair. *Senciamus humiliter*: cf. Romans 11:20, "Be not highminded, but fear". *Quoad duo sequencia*: the day of death and the day of the final division call for watchfulness. The oil and the light: the wise virgins (Matthew 25). The codices read *solitissime* (203.4); Loserth's *sollicitissime* is translated.
3. Loserth: Decretum, *Decr.* II, causa XXII, q. IV, c. XV; the text above reads XXIII[a], and Loserth's "XXII" is evidently a misprint for C. 23 (the modern form is ours). But the passage is c. 14 (*Boni a malis numquam in hac vita penitus possunt separari*; PL 187:1178; Friedberg I, 904–05), inscribed Augustine, *De baptismo* IV.12, who quotes Cyprian, *Ep.* 55; c. 15 is the Gregory passage at 201.6–9 (09-e). The cockle and the wheat: Matthew 13:24–30.
4. A margin *Racio* (203.12), and *Nota contra perpetuacionem elemosine* (203.17). The first *sed* brings the minor premiss ("now"), the second a new premiss ("now"). *Elemosinas temporales*: alms given for a time, against alms given in perpetuity. Side-notes 203.12, 203.17.
5. B reads *contenciose* (203.20). *Contencione cauterizante*: with a contention that burns like a cautery. *Aspiratur*, impersonal: men aspire. *Elemosinarius ... elemosinantem*: the almsman, who receives, against the almsgiver, who gives (the glossary). Side-notes 203.23, 203.27.
6. *Data elemosina temporaliter probabiliter egenis*: ablative absolute with conditional force; we take *probabiliter* with *egenis*, "to those in probable need", as far as the giver can judge, set against *cece*, "blindly", below. *Datarius*: the giver.
7. Song of Songs 6:11: the Vulgate has *anima mea conturbavit me propter quadrigas Aminadab* (DR "my soul troubled me for the chariots of Aminadab"); Wyclif's *anima mea turbata est propter currus Aminadab* is translated. Loserth refers it to Song of Songs 6:11 (*propter quadrigas*, 204.11). *Per locum ab insufficiente similitudine*: the counterpart of the topic *a sufficienti similitudine* (195.27, 09-d).
8. *Ecclesiastici*: the glossary CONTEXTUAL; here the clergy, rendered "churchmen". *Currati*: riding in chariots, answering Aminadab's chariots. B reads *altis stautibus* (204.15). "Elsewhere": not identified.
9. *Potentatuum seculi est ... et Dei ... confirmare*: we take *Dei* as a second genitive of what belongs to someone, "and [it belongs] to God to confirm"; it could also be read "and to confirm them by God's power and grace". Side-note 204.16 supports the first. *Si hoc moveret*: if this argument (the sixth, 199.20, 09-e) were sound. *Conficere*: to consecrate the eucharist. *Preveniat*: goes before, as prevenient grace (glossary: *gracia preveniens*). A margin *Nota de privilegio Westermonasterii* (204.28) falls after this chunk.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **203: *nec* (157ª is the folio mark)**
  - **203: *putet* (italic)**
  - **203: *offendere***
  - **204: *Christi***
  - **204: *preficiantur* [NW]**
  - **204: *eis***
  - **203: *XXIIIª,* [-MARK]**

Chapter 10

Part 1: The Westminster privilege: the charters of Edgar and Edward

Loserth pp. 204.28–206.26

¶1 204.28–206.10
205.3 *Westminster privileges granted by Edgar,*
206.12 *and St. Edward.*

[204]**Istis premissis descendendum est specialiter ad privilegium Westmonasterii super quo versatur contencio. Supponatur itaque in primis (ut patet ex vera copia ministrata) quod dictum Westmonasterium habeat** [205]**privilegium concessum ab Edgaro et sancto Edwardo confessore, concessum (inquam) sibi et ecclesie sub hac forma: Cognoscat, inquit Edgarus, magnitudo seu utilitas vestra quam discernimus et in perpetuum mansurum iubemus atque constituimus ut pro reverencia reliquiarum gloriosissimi apostoli Petri et quiete monachorum ibidem Deo famulancium, honor et laus eidem ecclesie habeatur, ut quisquis fugitivorum pro quolibet scelere ad prefatam basilicam sancti Petri fugiens precinctum eius intraverit sive pedes vel pedester, sive eques vel equester, sive de curia regali sive de civitate seu villa, seu cuiuscunque condicionis sit, quocunque delicto facinoris contra nos vel succesores reges Anglie vel contra alium quemlibet fidelem sancte ecclesie foris factus sit, relaxetur et liberetur et vitam atque membra absque ulla contradiccione optineat. Preterea interminamur divina auctoritate et nostra, ut neque nos neque successores nostri neque ullus episcopus nec quicunque alius de iudiciaria potestate in ipsam sanctam basilicam vel in manentes in ipsa vel in homines qui cum sua substancia vel rebus ad ipsam tradere vel devovere se voluerint, nisi per voluntatem abbatis et suorum monachorum, ullam unquam habeant potestatem, sed sit hec mater ecclesia libera et absoluta ab omni invasione vel inquietudine omnium hominum cuiuscunque ordinis vel potestatis. Obsecramus eciam omnes successores nostros reges et** [206]**principes per sanctam et individuam trinitatem et per adventum iusti iudicis, ut quoniam ex munificencia antecessorum nostrorum ipse locus videtur esse dicatus, nullus episcoporum vel abbatum aut eorum ordinatores vel quelibet persona possit quoquo ordine de loco ipso aliquid auferre aut aliquam potestatem sibi in ipso monasterio usurpare vel aliquid quasi per commutacionis titulum absque voluntate ipsius congregacionis vel nostrum permissum minuere presumat.**

These things premised, we must come down specifically to the privilege of Westminster, over which the contention turns.[1] Let it be supposed, then, in the first place (as is clear from a true copy supplied [to me]) that the said Westminster has a [205]**privilege granted by Edgar and by Saint Edward the Confessor, granted (I say) to it and to the church in this form:[2] "Let your greatness or usefulness know," says Edgar, "what we decide, and command and establish to abide for ever: that, for reverence of the relics of the most glorious apostle Peter and for the quiet of the monks serving God there, honour and praise be paid to that church; so that whoever of the fugitives, for any crime whatever, fleeing to the aforesaid basilica of Saint Peter, has entered its precinct, whether a foot-soldier or on foot, whether a horseman or on horseback, whether from the royal court or from a city or township, or of whatever condition he be, by whatever offence of crime he has committed forfeiture against us or the kings of England our successors, or against any other faithful man of holy church, let him be released and set free and keep life and limbs without any gainsaying.[3] Moreover we forbid under threat, by divine authority and our own, that neither we nor our successors nor any bishop nor anyone else of judicial power should ever have any power over that holy basilica, or over those dwelling in it, or over the men who wish to deliver or devote themselves to it with their substance or goods, except by the will of the abbot and his monks; but let this mother church be free and quit of all invasion or disturbance by all men of whatever order or power. We also beseech all our successors, kings and** [206]**princes, by the holy and undivided Trinity and by the coming of the just judge, that, since that place is seen to have been dedicated by the munificence of our predecessors, none of the bishops or abbots or their ordainers, or any person whatever, may in any manner take anything away from that place, or usurp any power for himself in that monastery, or presume to diminish anything as if by title of exchange, without the will of the congregation itself or our permission."[4]**

¶2 206.11–206.11

[206] **In carta vero sancti Edwardi sic scribitur:**

And in the charter of Saint Edward it is written thus:

¶3 206.12–206.26

[206] **Sit hic sancta mater ecclesia peculiaris patroni nostri et domini et magni apostoliter beati Petri libera et absoluta ab omni invasione et inquietudine omnium hominum cuiuscunque ordinis vel potestatis esse videantur. Et in alia carta eiusdem sancti sic scribitur: Preterea in perpetuum confirmo ut quisquis fugitivorum de quocunque loco pro quacunque causa cuiuscunque condicionis sit ipsum sanctum locum vel precinctum eius fugiens intraverit membrorum suorum ac vite inpunitatem consequatur cum omnimoda libertate, nec aliquis aliud quidlibet ab ecclesia illa vel a terris ad eam pertinentibus per vim aut consuetudinem exigat. Hec sunt verba magis pregnancia pro libertate dicti monasterii que omnia sunt per bullas Nicolai III. postmodum confirmata.**

"Let this holy mother church of our special patron and lord, the great apostle blessed Peter, be free and quit of all invasion and disturbance by all men, of whatever order or power they may appear to be." And in another charter of the same saint it is written thus: "Moreover I confirm in perpetuity that whoever of the fugitives, from whatever place, for whatever cause, of whatever condition he be, fleeing, has entered that holy place or its precinct, shall obtain impunity of his limbs and life with every kind of liberty; and let no one exact anything else whatever from that church or from the lands belonging to it by force or by custom."[5] These are the most telling words for the liberty of the said monastery, all of which were afterwards confirmed by bulls of Nicholas III.[6]

Notes

1. *Super quo versatur contencio*: the dispute is over the abbey's privilege of sanctuary after its violation on 11 August 1378 (Loserth, Introduction, pp. x–xi); two men were killed there, Hauley and a servant of the church. A has in the margin *Nota de privilegio Westermonasterii* (204.28). *Vera copia ministrata*: a true copy supplied [to Wyclif]. Side-notes 205.3, 206.12.
2. Edgar's charter: Loserth refers to Kemble, *Codex diplomaticus aevi Saxonici* II, 366, which "gives the exact words of the greater part of this charter", and corrects the codices from it. His corrections are translated: *villa* (codd. *villa cuiuscunque*, 205.12–13), *facinoris* (codd. *facinoriter*, 205.13), *ad ipsam* (wanting in the codices, 205.22). Charter readings he records without adopting them: *decernimus* (205.4), *et pro quiete* (205.7), *eiusdem ecclesie habeatur id est ut* (205.8), *beati apostoli Petri* (205.10), *esse videantur* after *vel potestatis* (205.27), *quemadmodum ex munificencia* (206.1–2). The print is translated.
3. *Cognoscat ... quam discernimus*: *quam* agrees with nothing; we take it as introducing the object, "what we decide" (the charter has *decernimus*, Loserth). *Magnitudo seu utilitas vestra*: forms of address. *Pedes vel pedester ... eques vel equester*: the charter's doubling, noun and adjective (foot-soldier / on foot), is kept. *Foris factus sit*: the participle of *forisfacere* (the glossary): has made himself liable to forfeiture by crime.
4. *Mater ecclesia*: Westminster as a mother church; neither the *matrix ecclesia* of the glossary nor the church as *mater nostra*, and so untagged. *Eorum ordinatores*: literally "their ordainers"; perhaps those who appoint them. *Absque voluntate ... vel nostrum permissum*: the accusative after *absque* is as printed; the sense is "without ... our permission". *Quoquo ordine*: in any manner (not "order").
5. Edward's charter: Loserth refers to Kemble, *Cod. dipl.* IV, no. 825, p. 181 (compare pp. 173 ff.); the "other charter" to IV, p. 186. Loserth's corrections are translated: *magni apostoli ... beati Petri* from Edward's charter (codd. *etc. beati*, 206.13), *videantur* from Kemble p. 186 (codd. *videatur*, 206.16), *consuetudinem* (codd. *consuetum*). B lacks *sit* (206.12). At 206.20 Loserth notes that Edward's diploma reads here *immunis sit omnino ac plenam libertatem consequatur*. *Esse videantur* hangs loosely on *omnium hominum*: "of whatever order or power they may appear to be".
6. Loserth points to a bull of Nicholas III inserted in this diploma (Kemble, *Cod. dipl.* IV, p. 183) and to the *Monasticon Anglicanum* (Dodsworth and Dugdale, London 1655); he says he has not seen bulls confirming the diploma. The bull inserted there is addressed by *Nicholaus episcopus* to King Edward (Kemble IV, 183–84; its *nulli omnino personae nisi regi subdantur* is quoted at 230), so the pope is Nicholas II (1059–61); the text's *Nicolai III* is an error. *Verba magis pregnancia*: the most telling (literally "pregnant") words.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **204: *CAP. X.***
  - **206: *inquietudine* (3 is the argument numeral; no s)**
  - **205: *eciam***
  - **205: *nostros***

Part 2: The argument from mercy for the privilege; the twofold remission of debt

Loserth pp. 207.1–211.31

¶1 207.1–210.10

207.1 *It is argued that these grants may reasonably be made: 1. because all that tends to mercy is lawful;*
207.16
2. by the parable of the wicked servant, which shows that debt should be forgiven;
207.31
3. by the Sabbathical year of the old Law.
208.5 *Christ also teaches us to be merciful;*
209.3 *and we are to follow the New Testament rather than the Old.*
209.18 *The duty of forgiveness does nothing to support a mischievous privilege.*
210.5 *Otherwise all offences ought to be forgiven: out of sanctuary as well as in.*
210.17 *Remission is of two kinds: a) of the spiritual debt: and this must be left to God;*
210.25 *b) of the material debt; which a man may forgive yet leave to be exacted by the law.*

[207] **Quod autem hec possunt racionabiliter concedi, sic ostenditur: Omnia que possunt sonare in pietatem ac misericordiam, que homo potest de facto concedere, possunt racionabiliter concedi. Sed huiusmodi sunt omnia in dictis privilegiis annotata, ergo conclusio. Maior patet racione meriti quod non potest esse nisi racionabile, et minor patet ex hoc quod omne delictum commissum in hominem nedum potest sed debet remittere, et per consequens, tam rex quam totum regnum potest remittere iniusticiam quamlibet fugitivi. Confirmatur de debito de quo minime videretur; nam Matthei VI°, 12, docet Christus nos orare, ut Deus dimittat nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris, ubi docemur non dimitti nobis a Deo, nisi dimiserimus ex corde debita nostris confratribus. Secundo confirmatur ex parabola Salvatoris Matthei XVIII° de servo suffocante unum de conservis suis, postquam longe maiora debita a suo domino sunt dimissa. Serve nequam, inquit, omne debitum dimisi tibi, quoniam rogasti me, nonne ergo oportuit te misereri conservi tui, sicut ego tui misertus sum? Et iratus dominus eius tradidit eum tortoribus, quoadusque redderet universum debitum. Sic, inquit, et pater meus celestis faciet vobis, si non remiseritis unusquisque fratri suo de cordibus vestris. Unde eodem capitulo docet Petrum in persona ecclesie quod usque septuagies septies, hoc est, quociens in ipsum peccaverit, dimitteret debitum fratri sue. Frater enim non incurrit culpabiliter debitum nisi excedendo decalogum mandatorum. Tercio confirmatur ex lege veteri, nam Levitici XXV° datur lex de anno septimo, quod tunc sabbatizabunt et anno quinquagesimo redibunt ad possessiones suas,** [208] **eritque remissio plena debiti cuiuscunque. Nolite, inquit, affligere contribules vestros, sed timeat unusquisque Deum suum. Et breviter utrumque testamentum testatur creberrime misericordiam faciendam. Unde Matthei V°, 7, quando Christus tradidit legem suam, hortatus est ad misericordiam sub obtentu misericordie consequende. Beati, inquit, misericordes, quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur. Unde ad exprimendum quod misericordia in novo testamento debet excellere dicit discipulis Matthei IX°, 13: Euntes discite quid est: Misericordiam volo et non sacrificium. Et super talibus fundat se beatus Gregorius, exponens illud Matthei XXII°, 2, Simile factum est regnum celorum homini regi qui fecit nupcias filio suo, et ponitur in canone XXIII[a], q. IV: Cum in lege scriptum sit, diliges amicum tuum et odio habebis inimicum tuum, accepta tunc licencia, cum iustum fuerit ut Dei suosque adversarios quanta possent virtute comprimerent, eosque in ore gladii ferirent quod in novo procul**

And that these things can reasonably be granted is shown thus: All things that can tend to piety and mercy, which a man can in fact grant, can reasonably be granted. Now of this kind are all the things noted in the said privileges; therefore the conclusion.[1] The major is clear by reason of merit, which cannot be other than reasonable; and the minor is clear from this, that every offence committed against a man [the man] not only can but ought to remit, and consequently both the king and the whole kingdom can remit any injustice whatever of the fugitive.[2] It is confirmed of debt, where it would least seem [to hold]; for in Matthew 6:12 Christ teaches us to pray that God "forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors", where we are taught that [debts] are not forgiven us by God unless we have forgiven from the heart their debts to our brethren. Secondly it is confirmed from the Saviour's parable in Matthew 18 of the servant throttling one of his fellow servants after far greater debts had been forgiven [him] by his lord: "Thou wicked servant," he says, "I forgave thee all the debt, because thou besoughtest me: shouldst not thou then have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had compassion on thee? And his lord being angry, delivered him to the torturers until he paid all the debt. So also," he says, "shall my heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."[3] Hence in the same chapter he teaches Peter, in the person of the church, that he should forgive his brother the debt up to seventy times seven times, that is, as often as he sins against him. For a brother does not culpably incur a debt except by transgressing the decalogue of the commandments.[4] Thirdly it is confirmed from the old law; for in Leviticus 25 the law is given of the seventh year, that then they shall keep sabbath, and in the fiftieth year "they shall return to their possessions", [208] **and there shall be full remission of every debt. "Do not," he says, "afflict your countrymen: but let every one fear his God."[5] And in brief both testaments testify very often that mercy is to be done. Hence in Matthew 5:7, when Christ delivered his law, he exhorted to mercy under the prospect of obtaining mercy: "Blessed," he says, "are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." Hence, to express that mercy ought to excel in the new testament, he says to the disciples, Matthew 9:13: "Go and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice."[6] And on such [texts] blessed Gregory grounds himself, expounding that of Matthew 22:2, "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a king who made a marriage for his son"; and it is set in the canon, C. 23 q. 4: "Since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love**

dubio testamento compescitur cum per semetipsam veritas predicet dicens: Diligite inimicos vestros, benefacite hiis qui oderunt vos. Et post exponens illud evangelii: Thauri mei et altilia occisa sunt, venite ad nupcias. Quid, inquit, per thauros nisi veteris testamenti patres signantur. Nam dum ex permissione legis acceperant, quatinus adversarios suos odii retribucione percuterent, ut ita dicam, quid aliud quam thauri erant, qui inimicos suos cornu virtutis corporee feriebant? Quid enim per altilia nisi patres novi testamenti figurantur qui dum graciam interne pinguedinis percipiunt a terrenis [209] desideriis innitentes, quasi contemplacionis penna sese ad sublimia sublevant? Ex istis videtur hunc sanctum intendere quod in magnis nupciis sancte matris ecclesie membra eius rudia pascenda sunt exemplo patrum testamenti veteris tamquam carnibus thaurinis qui contra infideles usi sunt ex mandato domini feritate; modo vero adveniente Christo mitissimo pascendi sunt laucius evacuatis grossis carnibus veteris testamenti, in secundo ferculo novi testamenti porrectis eis altilibus; quod fit, dum ad exemplum Christi et suorum discipulorum ob amorem sui paciuntur iniurias. Et utinam ista leccio esset per nos sacerdotes tam sermone quam opere efficaciter in populo predicata. Tunc enim non foret tanta sanguinis effusio nec tanta conturbans ecclesiam Christi per membra diaboli a lege Christi declinacio. Accipio itaque istam sentenciam tamquam catholicam et tocius ecclesie directivam et dico ulterius quod ipsa nedum non confirmat sed infirmat privilegium supradictum, quia (ut patet ex dicta sentencia et fide scripture) non est privilegium, nisi de quanto sonat in misericordiam privilegiantis et privilegiati et omnino in honorem Dei et utilitatem sancte matris ecclesie; quod cum capit instanciam de isto, ideo interimit se ipsum. Unde ista condicio debet subintelligi de natura privilegii in opere cuiuscunque privilegiantis ecclesiam, cum Deus non potest privilegiare aliquam partem ecclesie, condicione ista penitus pretermissa, quia tunc foret sibi ipsi et sponse sue contrarius. Ideo necesse est privilegiantes ecclesiam cavere precipue ne ex ignorancia scripture et cecitate seculi officiant matri sue cui debent proficere. Non enim solum debent attendere ad illud quod posset sonare in misericordiam et edificacionem ecclesie, sed ad illud quod verisimiliter [210] secundum legem scripture sonaret in caritatem et utilitatem ecclesie, quia cum omnia facta sceleratissima possent occasione misericordie Dei sonare ad profectum ecclesie, patronus ecclesie indifferenter omnia talia ordinaret. Sic ergo conceditur quod tam rex quam regnum nostrum nedum potest sed debet de lege caritatis (que est ius communissimum contra quod non fit dispensacio) remittere omnes iniurias fratris sui, nedum hospitati

thy friend, and hate thy enemy, licence then being received, when it was just that they should crush the adversaries of God and their own with what strength they could, and strike them with the edge of the sword; which in the new testament is without doubt restrained, since the Truth through itself preaches, saying: Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you."[7] And afterwards, expounding that of the gospel, "My beeves and fatlings are killed: come ye to the marriage": "What," he says, "is signified by the bulls but the fathers of the old testament? For since by the permission of the law they had received [leave] to strike their adversaries with the requital of hatred, what else were they, so to speak, but bulls, who struck their enemies with the horn of bodily strength? For what is figured by the fatlings but the fathers of the new testament, who, while they receive the grace of inward fatness, bearing up from earthly [209] desires, raise themselves to the heights as on the wing of contemplation?"[8] From these it seems that this saint maintains that at the great wedding of holy mother church her untaught members are to be fed with the example of the fathers of the old testament, as with bulls' flesh, [fathers] who by the Lord's command used fierceness against unbelievers; but now, Christ the most gentle having come, they are to be fed more sumptuously, the coarse meats of the old testament being cleared away and the fatlings set before them in the second course, of the new testament; which happens when, after the example of Christ and his disciples, they suffer injuries for love of him.[9] And would that this lesson were effectually preached among the people by us priests, in word as much as in deed! For then there would not be so great a shedding of blood, nor so great a turning aside from the law of Christ through members of the devil, troubling the church of Christ. I accept, therefore, this teaching as catholic and as directive of the whole church; and I say further that it not only does not confirm but weakens the privilege mentioned above, for (as is clear from the said teaching and from the faith of scripture) there is no privilege except in so far as it tends to the mercy of the one who privileges and of the one privileged, and altogether to the honour of God and the profit of holy mother church; and since it [the privilege] meets an objection on this point, it therefore destroys itself.[10] Hence this condition must be understood [as belonging] to the nature of a privilege in the act of anyone whatever who privileges the church, since God cannot privilege any part of the church with this condition wholly left out, for then he would be contrary to himself and to his bride. Therefore it is necessary that those who privilege the church take special care lest, from ignorance of

infra basilicam sed ubicunque terrarum fuerit, sub divo, in celo vel purgatorio.

scripture and the blindness of the world, they harm their mother, whom they ought to profit. For they must not attend only to what could tend to the mercy and edification of the church, but to what, [210] according to the law of scripture, would in all likelihood tend to the charity and profit of the church; for since all the most wicked deeds could, by occasion of God's mercy, tend to the church's advancement, the patron of the church would [then] ordain all such things indifferently.[11] So therefore it is granted that both the king and our kingdom not only can but ought, by the law of charity (which is the most common law, against which no dispensation is made), to remit all the injuries of his brother, not only of one lodged within the basilica but wherever on earth he may be: in the open air, in heaven or in purgatory.[12]

¶2 210.11–211.3

211.4 *Forgiveness does not bar a request for punishment;*

[210] Nam cum remittere iniuriam sit caritatem ignoscere ipsam quoad dampnacionem vel vindictam, volendo iniuriantem transire impunem de quanto placuerit domino capitali, patet quod omnis christianus debet cedendo Christo remittere (quantum in ipso est) omnem fratris iniuriam. Nam ut sic meritorie defert Deo qui Deuteronomii XXXII°, 35, dicit: Mea est ulcio et ego retribuam. Et sic est duplex remissio, scilicet debiti spiritualis quo quilibet christianus debet prodesse in vita caritatis cuilibet membro ecclesie; et illud debitum incurrit quilibet peccator (in quantum huiusmodi), cum ex lege caritatis et communione sanctorum iniuriatur Deo et toti ecclesie, ut patet XXIII^{a} q. IV. Hec autem, et recitatur proximo capitulo. Talem autem remissionem debet quilibet peccator habere quoad omnem iniuriam fratris sui, cum debet humiliter iudicium puniendi Deo relinquere. Secunda autem est remissio debiti corporalis, quam ut quis fecerit, cedit iuri illud debitum repetendi. Et qui non concipit istam duplicem remissionem debiti, est valde indispositus ad concipiendum materiam privilegiorum ecclesie vel [211] scripturas. Sic enim loquuntur tractantes materiam de indulgenciis quod Deus remittit culpam et expetit penam. Ideo impetratur absolucio tam a pena quam culpa.

For since to remit an injury is to pardon it [in] charity as regards condemnation or vengeance, willing that the one who did the injury pass unpunished in so far as it shall please the chief lord, it is clear that every Christian ought, yielding to Christ, to remit (as far as in him lies) every injury of his brother.[13] For in this way he meritoriously defers to God, who says, Deuteronomy 32:35: "Revenge is mine, and I will repay."[14] And so there is a twofold remission: namely, of the spiritual debt, by which every Christian ought to profit every member of the church in the life of charity; and that debt every sinner (in so far as he is such) incurs, since by the law of charity and the communion of saints he does injury to God and to the whole church, as is clear in C. 23 q. 4, *Hec autem*, which is also recited in the preceding chapter.[15] And such remission every sinner ought to have as regards every injury of his brother, since he ought humbly to leave the judgment of punishing to God. And the second is the remission of the bodily debt: when anyone has made it, he yields the right of reclaiming that debt. And he who does not grasp this twofold remission of debt is very unfit to grasp the matter of the church's privileges, or the [211] scriptures. For so those who treat the matter of indulgences speak: that God remits the guilt and exacts the penalty. Therefore absolution is obtained both from penalty and from guilt.[16]

¶3 211.4–211.31

[211] Ex istis patet quod stat hominem meritorie et plene remittere fratri debitum et tamen eum impetere excommunicare et quandocunque meritorie occidere pro eodem. Nam capio Petrum qui licite repetit in foro contencioso debitum a suo debitore, Paulum rite excommunicantem suum debitorem, et Linum

From these it is clear that it is consistent for a man meritoriously and fully to remit a debt to his brother and yet to sue him, excommunicate [him] and even, on occasion, meritoriously kill [him] for the same. For I take Peter, who lawfully reclaims a debt from his debtor in the contentious court; Paul, duly excommunicating his debtor; and Linus, meritoriously

meritorie persequentem suum debitorem usque ad mortem, ut puta, decapitacionem, suspensionem vel aliam mortem corporalem: patet possibilitas casus ex hoc quod aliter leges ecclesie de contencione, excommunicacione et occisione hominum forent heretice, quia legi caritatis contrarie. Stat ergo hominem meritorie exequi legem talem et cum de necessitate salutis tenetur iniuriam et debitum spirituale remittere, patet conclusio. Ymmo cum licet excommunicare accessorie, et per accidens sic persequi hominem pro debito corporali, videtur quod stat illud remittere et tamen ad salutem anime debitoris ex caritate fraterna quolibet istorum trium modorum eum persequi et torquere. Nemo enim meritorie sic persequitur principaliter propter debitum corporale, sed propter spirituale debitum et iniuriam factam Deo, remittendoque eum divino iudicio diligit ipsum in domino. Cum quo stat quod ex revelacione vel lege divina moveatur licite ad taliter cruciandum, sive ex sola detencione debiti committatur Dei iniuria, sive alia superveniens sit commixta; utrobique enim excommunicatur vel occiditur confuse pro omnibus, sicut Deus dampnat prescitum pro peccatis singulis que commisit.

pursuing his debtor even to death, for example beheading, hanging or some other bodily death: the possibility of the case is clear from this, that otherwise the laws of the church on litigation, excommunication and the killing of men would be heretical, as contrary to the law of charity.[17] It is consistent, therefore, for a man meritoriously to carry out such a law; and since, of necessity for salvation, he is bound to remit the injury and the spiritual debt, the conclusion is clear. Indeed, since it is lawful to excommunicate accessorily, and incidentally thus to pursue a man for a bodily debt, it seems that it is consistent to remit it and yet, for the salvation of the debtor's soul, out of brotherly charity, to pursue and torment him in any one of these three ways.[18] For no one meritoriously pursues in this way principally for the bodily debt, but for the spiritual debt and the injury done to God; and by remitting him to the divine judgment he loves him in the Lord. With which it is consistent that he be moved lawfully, by revelation or by divine law, to torment [him] in such a way, whether the injury to God is committed by the mere withholding of the debt, or another [injury] supervening is mixed with it; for in either case he is excommunicated or killed indistinctly for all [of them], just as God damns the foreknown man for each of the sins that he committed.[19]

Notes

1. The argument for the privilege (A in the margin *Racio*, 207.1; side-note 207.1). *Sonare in*: tend to. *Sed* brings the minor premiss ("now"). The three confirmations that follow (Matthew 6, Matthew 18, Leviticus 25) are the "first", "second" and "third" answered in 10-c.
2. *Omne delictum ... nedum potest sed debet remittere*: the subject of *potest ... debet* is unexpressed; we supply "the man", the one offended (the *homo* of the major). *Racione meriti*: because granting what tends to mercy is meritorious.
3. Matthew 18:32–35. Wyclif lacks the Vulgate's *et* before *te* and before *ego* (*nonne ergo oportuit et te ... sicut et ego*), so DR's "also" in verse 33 is dropped. *Quoniam rogasti me* is Loserth's correction from Matthew 18:32 (codd. *quando rogasti*, 207.20); AA_1 read *dimiseritis* for *remiseritis* (207.24). *Suffocante*: throttling (cf. Matthew 18:28). Side-note 207.16.
4. Matthew 18:21–22, paraphrased. *In persona ecclesie*: Peter stands for the church. *Excedendo decalogum*: only by transgressing the ten commandments does a brother incur a debt culpably.
5. Wyclif summarises Leviticus 25, the sabbath of the seventh year and the return to possessions in the fiftieth (Loserth cites 25:13, 17). *Eritque remissio plena debiti cuiuscunque* is not in Leviticus 25; compare the year of remission, Deuteronomy 15:2 ("He to whom any thing is owing from his friend or neighbour or brother, cannot demand it again"). Leviticus 25:17 is quoted as the Vulgate, without its last clause. Side-note 207.31.
6. Matthew 5:7 as the Vulgate. Matthew 9:13: Wyclif lacks *autem* (DR "then"); in Matthew the words answer the Pharisees (9:11), not the disciples. *Sub obtentu misericordie consequende*: under the prospect of obtaining mercy. Side-note 208.5.
7. Gregory, Homily 38 on the Gospels (on Matthew 22:2), as in the Decretum, C. 23 q. 4 c. 16 (Loserth: "Homil. XXXVIII in Matth.", "Decr. II. pars, causa XXIII, q. 4, cap. XVI"; the modern form is ours). Loserth notes that Gratian has *in ore gladii* (as the Maurist edition records), Gregory's homily *iure gladii*, "by right of the sword"; Friedberg prints *iure* with the Correctors' note that the original has *iure* (Friedberg I; PL 76, Hom. 38); Wyclif's *in ore gladii* is translated ("with the edge", literally "the mouth", "of the sword"). As Wyclif gives it the period has no main verb: *accepta ... licencia* is an ablative absolute and *cum iustum fuerit* its clause; we construe what is written ("licence then being received"), the sense being that licence was then given. "Thou shalt love thy friend": the Vulgate (Matthew 5:43) has *proximum*, DR "neighbour". Matthew 5:44 is quoted only as far as "hate you".
8. Matthew 22:4, without the Vulgate's *et omnia parata* (DR "and all things are ready"). *Terrenis* is Loserth's correction from Gregory (codd. *eternis*, 208.31). *Terrenis desideriis innitentes*: "leaning on earthly desires" would contradict the figure; we render "bearing up from earthly desires", as a bird pushes off from the ground; Gregory has *a terrenis desideriis enitentes* (PL 76), Gratian *innitentes*: Wyclif follows Gratian's verb. B reads *promissione* for *permissione* (208.26). *Altilia*: fatlings, fattened fowl, hence the wing.
9. *Intendere*: "maintain" (the glossary). *Membra rudia*: the untaught, the beginners. *Laucius*: *lautius*, more sumptuously. *Ob amorem sui*: we take *sui* as Christ, "for love of him". Side-note 209.3.

10. A in the margin *Responsio* (209.18); side-note 209.18. *Sentencia*: CONTEXTUAL (the glossary): here the position taught, Gregory's, so 'teaching', not a judicial sentence. *Nedum non confirmat sed infirmat*: the play confirm / weaken. *Ex dicta sentencia et fide scripture*: *ex* governs both. *Quod cum capit instanciam de isto*: *instancia* in the logicians' sense, a counter-case or objection (the glossary); we take the subject to be the privilege itself, *privilegium supradictum*, the subject of the whole period: since it admits an objection on this point (it does not tend to mercy), it undoes itself; the next sentence (*Unde ista condicio ... de natura privilegii*) continues with the privilege. It could also be the argument for the privilege.
11. *Officiant ... proficere*: harm ... profit, Wyclif's play. The last clause is a reductio: if what *could* tend to the church's profit sufficed, every crime would qualify, since God's mercy can turn any to good; so a privilege must be judged by what in all likelihood does so "according to the law of scripture".
12. *Ius communissimum*: *ius* here is "law", the law of charity (glossary: *ius*). *Nedum hospitati infra basilicam*: not only the brother sheltered in the sanctuary. *Sub divo, in celo vel purgatorio*: wherever the brother is, under the open sky (out of sanctuary) or, after death, in heaven or purgatory. A in the margin *Conclusio* (210.5); side-note 210.5.
13. A in the margin *Quid est remittere iniuriam* (210.11). *Caritatem ignoscere ipsam*: *caritatem* is the print (plate n0247, 210.11; no variant). It does not construe. "In" is our supply, giving the sense of *caritative* (our emendation would be *caritative* or *caritate*). B reads *concedendo* for *cedendo* (210.15). *Domino capitali*: God as chief lord (the glossary).
14. Deuteronomy 32:35: Wyclif quotes only the opening words (Vulgate *Mea est ultio, et ego retribuam in tempore*; DR "Revenge is mine, and I will repay them in due time"); compare Romans 12:19, "Revenge is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord".
15. A in the margin *Duplex remissio* (210.17); B, second hand, *Remissio duplex*; side-note 210.17. *Debiti spiritualis quo*: the debt of charity owed to every member. "C. 23 q. 4, *Hec autem*": Wyclif cites the canon by its opening words. Loserth's foot reference at 210.23 reads "Cap. XV.". That is the canon number, C. 23 q. 4 c. 15, *Hec autem* (the modern form is ours). If it means *De ecclesia* cap. 15 instead, it would conflict with *proximo capitulo*. *Et recitatur*: "which is also recited"; *proximo capitulo* is the nearest chapter, cap. 9, where the canon is quoted (09-e, 201; C. 23 q. 4 c. 15, *Hec autem uita*).
16. *Remissio debiti corporalis ... cedit iuri ... repetendi*: he gives up the right to reclaim; side-note 210.25. *Indispositus*: unfit (the glossary). *Absolucio tam a pena quam culpa*: the indulgence formula *a pena et a culpa*; Loserth's apparatus records an added *a culpa* (211.3). *Ideo*: since God remits the guilt but requires the penalty, absolution is sought from both.
17. A in the margin *Conclusio. Nota quomodo mali ex caritate sunt persequendi* (211.3) and *Casus* (211.7); side-note 211.4. *Stat*: "it is consistent", the logicians' *stat* (can hold together). AA_1 read *quomodocunque* (211.6), "in whatever way", for *quandocunque*; the print is translated. *Quandocunque*: medieval "at some time, on occasion" (= *aliquando*); "at any time" is possible but overstates the thesis. Peter, Paul and Linus as names for the case: Loserth compares Wyclif, *De civili dominio*, p. 39. *Suspensio*: here "hanging", a bodily death, not the canonical penalty (glossary: *suspencio*).
18. *Patet conclusio*: the conclusion stated at 211.4. *Accessorie ... per accidens*: excommunication and pursuit for a bodily debt are lawful only as accessory, not as the principal end. A in the margin *Conclusio* (211.17). *Quolibet istorum trium modorum*: suit, excommunication, killing.
19. *Remittendo eum divino iudicio*: the same verb *remittere*, here "remitting him to the divine judgment". *Confuse*: "indistinctly" (the glossary): for all the injuries taken together, not one by one, as God damns the foreknown for each of his sins. *Sive ex sola detencione debiti ...*: whether the withholding of the debt alone already injures God, or another sin is added to it.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 207: *Serve* (italic)
  - 208: *eritque*
  - 208: *sacrificium* (sacri-/ficium hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 209: *magnis*
  - 209: *infirmat*
  - 210: *regnum*
  - 210: *impunem*
  - 211: *accessorie* [NW]

Part 3: The answers from the Lord's prayer, the parable and the jubilee; the clergy as ravens

Loserth pp. 212.1–216.26

¶1 212.1–212.19
212.1 *but we must not punish if we cannot do it in love.*
212.21 *In the Lord's prayer "debts" means "sins".*

[212]Ex istis patet tercio, cum erga omnem punitum oportet punientem servare caritatis amorem ac difficile vel impossibile est viantem caritative persequi fratrem suum contencione, excommunicacione vel occisione in visceribus caritatis, lex Christi est certissima qui, inquit, aufert que tua sunt, ne repetas, Luce VI°, 30 (quod alias diffuse exposui); Benedicite persequentibus vos, benedicite et nolite maledicere, ad Rom. XII°, 14, et si

From these it is clear, thirdly (since toward everyone who is punished the one punishing must keep the love of charity, and it is difficult or impossible for one on the road charitably to pursue his brother by litigation, excommunication or killing in the bowels of charity), [that] the law of Christ is most certain: "of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again", Luke 6:30 (which I have expounded at length

quis te percusserit ad maxillam dexteram, prebe ei et alteram Matthei V°, 39. Ille autem qui nescit erga inimicum quem cruciat servare regulas caritatis, non licet declinare ab istis consiliis. Unde Archidiaconus super XXXIII, q. V. Excomunicatorum, dicit quod non licet quemquam occidere nisi ex dileccione occisi preponderante dileccionem cuiuslibet temporalis, multo magis hoc astrueret purus theologus. Unde desidia predicacionis illius veritatis catholice fuit causa occisionis duplicis multi populi; remittat Deus episcopis qui ipsam dominis intrepide predicarent.

elsewhere); "Bless them that persecute you: bless, and curse not", Romans 12:14; and "if one strike thee on thy right cheek, turn to him also the other", Matthew 5:39.[1] And he who does not know how to keep the rules of charity toward the enemy whom he torments may not turn aside from these counsels. Hence the Archdeacon, on C. 33 q. 5, *Excommunicatorum*, says that it is not lawful to kill anyone except out of love for the one killed outweighing the love of any temporal thing; much more would a pure theologian assert this.[2] Hence sloth in preaching that catholic truth has been the cause of the double killing of much people; may God forgive the bishops, who should have preached it fearlessly to the lords.[3]

¶2 212.20–214.3
213.11 *Money debts may be claimed from those who can pay.*
214.4 *As to the Sabbatical year we ought to be more merciful than the Fathers of O. T.,*
214.23 *our clergy especially;*
214.32 *but it is not so.*

[212]Ex istis patet solucio ad primum obiectum de quinta peticione oracionis dominice; nam secundum Augustinum, libro II°, De Sermone Domini in monte c° X°, peticio intelligitur de spirituali debito (ut alias diffuse exposui): Debitum, inquit, peccatum dici manifestum est. Non ergo quisquis hic urgetur pecuniam debitori dimittere, sed quecunque alius in eum peccaverit, quia tunc non reciperet a volente dare debitum, nec peteret a potente avaro qui inops animo inexcusabiliter detinet alienum. Et tum conclusio Augustini est: Si modeste ac leniter omnimodo quis egerit, ut [213] sibi restituatur a tali, non tam intendens fructum pecunie, quam ut hominem corrigat cui indubie perniciosum est detinere, cum habeat unde reddat; non solum non peccabit sed proderit plurimum eciam debitori; aliter enim dum alienam pecuniam lucrum vult facere, dampnum fidei pacietur. Cum ergo sensus pretensus huius privilegii excludit hanc elemosinam, cum protegit indifferenter potentem et nolentem aliena reddere quam eciam inpotentem, manifestum est quod ponit obstaculum regulis caritatis. Per hec patet responsio ad secundum, cum dictum Christi intelligitur de debito culpe cuius satisfactoriam solucionem omnis christianus tenetur humiliter iudici supremo remittere. Si enim intelligeretur de corporali debito, tunc omnes religiosi possessionati et clerici tenerentur ex privilegio Christi quo amplius obligantur eius consiliis et preceptis, remittere et non repetere omne eis debitum corporale; et tamen dicitur quod sine misericordia exigunt eciam ab inpotentibus tale debitum per exacciones seculares et ecclesiasticas censuras ardencius quam domini seculares. Non ergo est eis privilegium fovere hostes ecclesie, ne sibi satisfaciant, cum tamen sufficiant, quia (ut alias dixi) Deus non potest licenciare hominem, ut servet debitum sine hoc quod satisfaciat saltem Deo, quia nisi satisfaciat restitucione vel meritoria

From these the solution to the first objection, about the fifth petition of the Lord's prayer, is clear; for according to Augustine, ***On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount***, book 2, chapter 10, "the petition is understood of the spiritual debt" (as I have expounded at length elsewhere): "That debt", he says, "is called sin is manifest. No one, therefore, is here pressed to forgive money to a debtor, but whatever another has sinned against him"; for then he would not receive the debt from one willing to pay it, nor seek it from a miser who is able [to pay], who, needy in spirit, inexcusably keeps back what is another's.[4] And then Augustine's conclusion is: "If anyone acts in every way modestly and gently that it be [213]restored to him by such a man, not so much aiming at the fruit of the money as to correct the man, for whom it is without doubt ruinous to keep it back when he has the means to repay, he will not only not sin but will greatly profit even the debtor; for otherwise, while he wishes to make another's money his gain, he will suffer the loss of faith."[5] Since, therefore, the pretended sense of this privilege excludes this alms, since it protects without distinction the man who is able and unwilling to return what is another's as well as the man who is unable, it is manifest that it puts an obstacle to the rules of charity.[6] By these the answer to the second is clear, since Christ's saying is understood of the debt of guilt, whose satisfactory payment every Christian is bound humbly to remit to the supreme judge. For if it were understood of bodily debt, then all the possessioner religious and the clerics would be bound, by the privilege of Christ by which they are the more bound to his counsels and precepts, to remit and not to reclaim every bodily debt owed them; and yet it is said that without mercy they exact such debt even from those unable [to pay], by secular exactions and ecclesiastical censures, more ardently than

punicione, est dampnandus. Deus autem non potest licenciare hominem ad peccandum; hoc autem foret privilegium tali ecclesie quod haberet a suis patronis seculares divicias ad ministrandum fugitivis impotentibus se iuvare, et (quantum facultas suppetit) pro ipsis restituere, quia hoc sonaret utrimque in opus misericordie, non autem defensio cuiuscunque fugitivi quantumlibet excomunicati, [214]quantumcunque defensio cadat fugitivo ad dampnum anime et iniuriatis ad detrimentum, nec non ad perturbacionem regni atque ecclesie.

the secular lords.[7] It is not, therefore, a privilege for them to shelter the enemies of the church so that they do not satisfy them, although they are able; for (as I have said elsewhere) God cannot license a man to keep back a debt without his making satisfaction at least to God, because unless he makes satisfaction by restitution or by meritorious punishment, he is to be damned.[8] Now God cannot license a man to sin. But this would be a privilege for such a church: that it should have from its patrons secular riches to minister to fugitives unable to help themselves, and (as far as its means allow) to make restitution for them, because this would tend on both sides to a work of mercy; but not the defence of any fugitive whatever, however excommunicated, [214]however much the defence falls out to the fugitive's loss of soul and to the detriment of those he has injured, and also to the disturbance of the kingdom and of the church.[9]

¶3 214.4–214.22

[214]Ad tercium dicitur quod tam sabbatizacio pro anno septimo quam remissio pro anno iubileo fuit valde racionabilis pro tempore suo, nunc autem pro tempore legis gracie quando colimus octonarium, debemus habere amorem fertiliorem: sicut enim septenarius numerus virginitatis habet solum unitatem pro parte aliquota, octonarius autem habet unum, duo et quattuor que septem constituunt, sic patres veteris testamenti erant in caritate plus steriles quam patres sub lege gracie qui colunt ex integro septenarium; qui signat unici Dei cultum et preter hoc unionem Christi et ecclesie que est unitas septenario superaddita in numerum priorem, redundans quoad partes aliquotas. Et sic debemus nos tempore legis gracie habere diffusiorem amorem et ampliorem continenciam, quam habuerunt patres veteris testamenti, quia nedum habemus contribules, sed fratres germanos singulos christianos, cum omnes nati sumus spiritualiter de eodem patre Christo et eadem matre ecclesia.

To the third the answer is that both the sabbath-keeping for the seventh year and the remission for the jubilee year were very reasonable for their time; but now, for the time of the law of grace, when we keep the eighth, we must have a more fruitful love. For as the number seven, [the number] of virginity, has only unity as an aliquot part, while the eight has one, two and four, which make up seven, so the fathers of the old testament were more barren in charity than the fathers under the law of grace, who keep the seven in its entirety; which signifies the worship of the one God and, besides this, the union of Christ and the church, which is a unity added to the seven into a prior number, overflowing as regards its aliquot parts.[10] And so we, in the time of the law of grace, ought to have a more widespread love and a larger continence than the fathers of the old testament had; for we have not only countrymen, but every single Christian as a full brother, since we are all born spiritually of the same father, Christ, and the same mother, the church.[11]

¶4 214.23–215.10
215.3 *Even the regular clergy disherits many men in perpetuity.*

[214]Et rogo innitentem isti evidencie notare, primo quomodo nos sacerdotes Christi debemus esse magis misericordes et magis religiosi quam sacerdotes veteris testamenti. Notet secundo quomodo non licuit sacerdotibus Aaronitis acquirere sibi redditus vel seculare dominium, sed in partem dominii forent de porcione sibi limitata a domino contentati (ut patet Ezechielis XLIV°, 28); alie autem tribus impetrantes possessiones a suis contribulibus non exheredarent eos perpetuo, sed in anno iubileo restituerent diutissime impetrata. Et notet tercio per iuxtaposicionem [215]conversacionis cleri nostri

And I ask the one who relies on this evidence to note, first, how we priests of Christ ought to be more merciful and more religious than the priests of the old testament. Let him note, secondly, how it was not lawful for the Aaronite priests to acquire for themselves revenues or secular lordship, but for their share of lordship they were to be content with the portion assigned them by the Lord (as is clear from Ezekiel 44:28); and the other tribes, obtaining possessions from their countrymen, were not to disinherit them in perpetuity, but in the jubilee year were to restore what had been obtained, however long before.[12] And let him note,

eciam religiosi, si sit proporcionalis correspondencia utrobique. Dicitur enim quod clerus eciam vocatus religiosus exheredat multos de fratribus eciam pro suo perpetuo, vocantes hoc perquisitum Christi patrimonium, cum tamen Christus omnino exproprietarie pendebat nudus in cruce, scisso velo templi, ad denotandum Judeis et gentibus quod spiritualis hereditas est simpliciter appetenda et terrena possessio contempnenda (ut expositum est... cap. libri sexti).

thirdly, by setting beside [these] the [215]manner of life of our clergy, the religious too, whether there is a proportional correspondence on both sides. For it is said that the clergy, even the so-called religious, disinherit many of their brethren, even in perpetuity for themselves, calling this acquisition Christ's patrimony; although Christ hung naked on the cross wholly without property, the veil of the temple being rent, to signify to Jews and gentiles that the spiritual inheritance is to be sought without qualification and earthly possession despised (as has been expounded in chapter [ ] of the sixth book).[13]

¶5 215.11–216.11
216.12 *Danger of riches.*

[215]Tunc enim essemus altilia de puro frumento, pasta ad exemplariter nutriendum filios, ut fecerunt sancti patres, vice quorum fungimur saltem in nomine, ut congregemus pecunias, non ut sanemus animas. Modo autem pervertimur in corvos perfidos, pastos de cadavere extra navem ecclesie, et tamquam aves rapacissime in altum ascendimus, non ad pericula et commoda spiritualia ecclesie speculandum sed lumina habemus acutissima, membra velocissima et rostra retentissima ad predandum; et cum beatus Gregorius, pastor precipuus, dicit XXI° Moralium, cap. IV°, satis asperum verbum atque terrificum: Festina, inquit, consolacio bonorum est consideratus finis malorum. Dum enim ex eorum interitu malum conspiciunt quod evadunt, bene existimant quidquid adversum in hac vita paciuntur. Eant ergo nunc reprobi et delectacionum suarum desideria compleant: in finis sui dampnacione sensuri sunt, quia mortem male viventes amaverunt. Transitorio autem verbere affligantur electi ut a pravitate flagella corrigant quos paterna pietas ad hereditatem servat. Modo etenim flagellatur iustus, [216]et verbere discipline corrigitur, quia ad eterne hereditatis patrimonium preparatur. In suis autem voluptatibus relaxatur iniustus, et quanto eis temporalia bona suppetunt, tanto eterna denegantur. Vituli, inquit, qui mactandi sunt in liberioribus pastibus relinquuntur; non quin stat vere divitem, in temporalibus affluentem, regnum celorum acquirere, sed tunc oportet Deum miraculose agere quod aput homines est impossibile, convertendo mundo divitem ab affeccione temporalium et carnalium voluptate, et omnino in extremis suis finire in evangelica paupertate (ut patet Luce XIV°).

For then we should be fatlings of pure wheat, fed so as to nourish the children by example, as the holy fathers did, in whose stead we act, at least in name, to gather money, not to heal souls.[14] But now we are perverted into faithless ravens, fed on carrion outside the ship of the church, and like most rapacious birds we mount on high, not to watch for the dangers and spiritual advantages of the church; but we have the sharpest eyes, the swiftest limbs and the most retentive beaks for preying. And this while blessed Gregory, the chief shepherd, says in *Moralia* 21, chapter 4, a word harsh and terrifying enough: "A swift consolation of the good," he says, "is the end of the wicked, considered. For when from their destruction they see the evil that they escape, they think well of whatever adversity they suffer in this life. Let the reprobate go now, then, and fulfil the desires of their delights: in the damnation of their end they will feel that, living ill, they loved death. But let the elect be afflicted with a passing stroke, so that the scourges may correct from wickedness those whom fatherly kindness keeps for the inheritance. For now the just man is scourged, [216]and corrected by the stroke of discipline, because he is being prepared for the patrimony of the eternal inheritance. But the unjust man is let loose in his pleasures, and the more temporal goods are at hand for them, the more the eternal are denied. The calves," he says, "that are to be slaughtered are left in freer pastures."[15] Not that it is impossible for a man truly rich, abounding in temporal things, to acquire the kingdom of heaven; but then God must act miraculously [to do] what with men is impossible, converting the rich man from the world, from affection for temporal things and from carnal pleasure, and [making him] in his last days end altogether in evangelical poverty (as is clear from Luke 14).[16]

¶6 216.12–216.26

[216]Unde quia probabile est paucos mundi divites sic facere, ideo argumentum topicum est quod multi tales moriuntur in peccato finalis inpenitencie. Ideo dicit Gregorius (ubi supra): Negantur electis in hac vita bona terrena, quia et egris quibus spes vivendi est nequaquam a medico cuncta que appetunt conceduntur. Dantur autem reprobis bona que in hac vita appetunt, quia desperatis egris omne quod desiderant non negatur. Attendamus ergo ad doctrinam Christi in opere et sermone et videbimus quod filios suos carissimos non sic dotat, et tum nos faciendo elemosinas debemus capere exemplum a Christo. Et patet quod dicte raciones super pietate milvina pretense non concludunt nec rectificant sed excludunt privilegia supradicta.

Hence, because it is probable that few of the world's rich men do so, it is therefore a topical argument that many such die in the sin of final impenitence. Therefore Gregory says (in the place cited above): "Earthly goods are denied to the elect in this life, because to the sick, too, who have hope of living, by no means is everything they crave granted by the physician. But to the reprobate are given the goods they crave in this life, because to the sick who are despaired of, nothing that they desire is denied."[17] Let us attend, then, to the doctrine of Christ in deed and word, and we shall see that he does not so endow his dearest sons; and then we, in giving alms, ought to take example from Christ. And it is clear that the said arguments, alleged on the score of a kite's piety, do not infer nor justify but exclude the privileges mentioned above.[18]

Notes

1. ***Patet tercio***: the third conclusion drawn (after 210.5 and 211.4); A in the margin ***Conclusio*** (212.1); side-note 212.1. The ***cum*** clause is causal; what is clear is that the law of Christ is most certain. ***Viantem***: the glossary ***viantes***. Luke 6:30 and Romans 12:14 are quoted as the Vulgate; at Matthew 5:39 Wyclif has ***ad maxillam dexteram, prebe ei*** (Vulgate ***in dexteram maxillam tuam, praebe illi***; B ***in maxilla dextera***, 212.9), with DR's sense. "Elsewhere": not identified.
2. "The Archdeacon": the canonists' name for Guido de Baysio, author of the ***Rosarium*** on the Decretum (so Loserth's index); the passage itself, in the ***Rosarium*** on C. 23 q. 5 c. 47, is not available to us in a checkable text. ***Excomunicatorum*** is Loserth's correction (codd. ***Excommunicantes***, 212.13). The canon is C. 23 q. 5 c. 47 (Urban II to Godfrey of Lucca; Friedberg I; PL 187), not C. 33 as printed. AA$_1$ read ***preponderantem*** (212.15). ***Purus theologus***: a theologian pure and simple, as against a canonist.
3. ***Occisionis duplicis***: perhaps the killing of body and of soul, of the slain and of the slayers; the text does not say. ***Predicarent***: what they ought to have done, "who should have preached". The bloodshed meant is presumably that at Westminster (10-a, August 1378), where two men died, Hauley and a church servant named Richard; the link to this phrase remains an inference.
4. Augustine, ***De sermone Domini in monte*** II, cited by Wyclif as chapter 10: the place is II.8.28 (PL 34:1281–82), which Wyclif condenses; Loserth: Opp. III, pt. 2, pp. 214, 211. A in the margin ***Triplex solucio*** (212.20), ***Augustinus*** (212.22), ***Dimittere debita quid est?*** (212.24); side-note 212.21. ***Primum obiectum***: the first confirmation, from Matthew 6:12 (10-b, 207.10). ***Non ergo quisquis ... urgetur***: "no one is pressed". The print's italics close the quotation at ***peccaverit***; ***quia tunc ... alienum*** is Wyclif's own gloss. ***Potente avaro qui inops animo***: a miser who can pay and is poor only in spirit. "Elsewhere": not identified.
5. ***Omnimodo*** is Loserth's correction from Augustine (codd. ***omnino quis***, 212.30). A reads ***intendes***, A$_1$ ***intendendo*** (213.1). AA$_1$ lack ***aliter enim ... pacietur*** (213.5); the print is translated. ***Dampnum fidei pacietur***: we take the subject to be the debtor who keeps another's money as his gain.
6. ***Hanc elemosinam***: the correction of the debtor, which is a spiritual alms. ***Sensus pretensus***: the sense claimed for the privilege. Side-note 213.11.
7. ***Ad secundum***: the parable of Matthew 18 (10-b, 207.16). ***Satisfactoriam solucionem ... remittere***: to leave its satisfying payment to God the judge. ***Religiosi possessionati***: the endowed orders (the glossary). ***Ex privilegio Christi***: Christ's own "privilege", his counsels and precepts; Wyclif turns the word against the privilege. A in the margin ***Conclusio*** (213.21).
8. ***Ne sibi satisfaciant, cum tamen sufficiant***: we take the fugitives as the subject, "so that they do not satisfy them [their creditors], though they can"; ***sibi*** could instead be the monks. "As I have said elsewhere": not identified.
9. ***Deus autem***: Loserth suggests ***Deus enim*** (213.27); the print is translated, ***autem*** bringing a new premiss ("now"). ***Utrimque***: for fugitive and creditor alike.
10. A in the margin, on the sabbatical and jubilee years, that they were valid in their time and are not now (214.4); side-note 214.4. ***Octonarium***: the eight, set against the seven of the old law. ***Pars aliquota***: an exact divisor; seven has only one, eight has one, two and four, whose sum is seven. ***Qui signat***: the antecedent may be the seven or the eight. ***In numerum priorem***: so the print (plate n0251; no variant). The added unity makes the eight. "Prior" may look to the eighth day as also the first, the Lord's day. The English keeps "prior".
11. ***Continenciam*** is Loserth's emendation (codd. ***continuum***, 214.18); "continence" may here mean capacity, what love holds. A reads ***contribulos*** (214.20). ***Contribules***: "countrymen", as DR at Leviticus 25:17. ***Fratres germanos***: full brothers, of one father and one mother.
12. A in the margin ***Status cleri. Nota tria*** (214.23); B, second hand, ***Nota pro sacerdotibus***; side-note 214.23. ***Innitentem isti evidencie***: the one who leans on this evidence (the Levitical argument). Ezekiel 44:28 is cited, not quoted: "they shall have no inheritance, I am their inheritance: neither shall you give them any possession in Israel". ***Diutissime impetrata***: things obtained, however long held.
13. ***Vocatus***: "so-called" (the glossary). ***Pro suo perpetuo***: as their own for ever. ***Perquisitum***: an acquisition, property gained otherwise than by inheritance, set against the disinherited. B reads ***ex proprietate*** for ***exproprietarie*** (215.6). The veil: Matthew 27:51. The chapter number is wanting in the codices, which leave a gap (Loserth, 215.9–10); "the sixth book" is the sixth

of Wyclif's *Summa*, *De veritate sacre scripture*, presumably c. 23, where the rent veil, Christ crucified naked and the clergy's greed for temporal goods come together (ed. Buddensieg II, 212). Side-notes 214.32, 215.3.

14. *Tunc enim*: then, if the correspondence held. *Altilia de puro frumento*: the fatlings of Gregory's figure (10-b, 208–09), fattened on pure wheat. *Vice quorum fungimur ... ut congregemus pecunias*: we hold their place in name only, and for money. The ravens outside the ship: the raven of the ark, "which went forth and did not return" (Genesis 8:7). *Speculandum*: to keep watch, as the watchman does.

15. Gregory, *Moralia* 21.4, as Wyclif cites it; Loserth: Opp. I, p. 681. Loserth records Gregory's readings *leve existimant* (Wyclif *bene*, 215.25), *quidquid adversi* (Wyclif *adversum*), *Nunc etenim* (Wyclif *Modo etenim*, 215.31), *quia tanto ei temporalia bona suppetunt, quanto aeterna denegantur* (216.3) and *in liberis* (216.5); Wyclif's text is translated. *Et cum ... dicit*: the *cum* clause has no main clause; we take it with what precedes ("and this while Gregory says"). A in the margin *Gregorius* (215.20) and *Nota de tribulacione bonorum et prosperitate malorum in hac vita* (215.22). *Reprobi* "the reprobate" and *electi* "the elect" are Gregory's words, not *presciti* and *predestinati*.

16. *Quod aput homines est impossibile*: compare Luke 18:27, "The things that are impossible with men are possible with God". *Convertendo mundo divitem*: *mundo* is taken as "from the world"; it may stand for *mundi*, "the world's rich man" (cf. *mundi divites*, 216.12). "Luke 14": perhaps 14:33, "every one of you that doth not renounce all that he possesseth cannot be my disciple".

17. *Argumentum topicum*: a probable, not a demonstrative, argument (the glossary): probable because few rich men are so converted. Gregory, *Moralia* 21.4, the same place. A in the margin *Gregorius* (216.15); B in the margin *Bona terrena quare electis negantur*; side-note 216.12.

18. AA_1 read *videamus* (216.21), "let us see"; the print is translated. *Pietate milvina*: the kite's piety, a bird of prey's show of mercy; B, second hand, in the margin *Pietas Milvina* (216.24). *Raciones ... pretense*: the arguments for the privilege (10-b, 207.1 ff.), alleged on the ground of mercy. *Non concludunt*: do not infer [the privileges] (glossary: *concludere*). A in the margin *Prima racio* (216.27) opens the next chunk.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 212: *patet*
  - 212: *ac* (158^{b} is the folio mark)
  - 212: *certissima* (5 is the line number)
  - 212: *II°* (libro II°)
  - 213: *quod* (158^{c} is the folio mark)
  - 214: *iubileo* [NW]
  - 215: *Christi* (5 is the line number)
  - 215: *Christus*
  - 216: *facere* (tall ascender = f)
  - 212: *ut* (30 is the line number glued)
  - 215: *flagellatur*

Part 4: Objections to the privilege: a harbour for enemies and criminals

Loserth pp. 216.27–220.25

¶1 216.27–217.8

216.27 *This privilege would allow a hostile army to be harboured.*

217.22 *Such a danger is not purely fanciful.*

[216]Ideo restat iam quarto obicere contra illa. Videtur primo: Si tenor privilegiorum debet sic intelligi nude ad litteram, tunc posito quod exercitus inimicorum invadat Angliam, debet in illo loco habere refugium, sic quod post recreacionem posset animosius predari provinciam. Nam quelibet persona talis exercitus est [217]aliquis homo de aliquo loco veniens, pedester vel equester, intrans illum locum ex causa aliqua, sed omnis talis iuxta tenorem verborum privilegii habebit in loco illo immunitatem omnimodam, ergo quelibet persona talis exercitus virtute privilegii, quam diu voluerit, quiescet ibi pacifice; si enim in aliquo casu capit instanciam, oportet nuda verba abicere et sapere sanam sentenciam.

Therefore it remains now, fourthly, to object against those [arguments]. It seems, first: if the tenor of the privileges must be understood thus, barely, according to the letter, then, supposing that an army of enemies invades England, it must have refuge in that place, so that after refreshment it could plunder the province more boldly. For every person of such an army is [217]some man coming from some place, on foot or on horseback, entering that place for some cause; now every such man, according to the tenor of the words of the privilege, will have in that place immunity of every kind; therefore every person of such an army, by virtue of the privilege, will rest there in peace as long as he wishes. For if

¶2 217.9–218.13
218.1 *To give such a privilege is beyond the King's power;*
218.24 *since such a refuge for criminals would ruin the realm;*

[217]**Hic dixit mihi quidam ingeniosus legista quod quelibet persona talis exercitus gaudebit hoc privilegio, cum non oportet propter tales casus inpossibiles limitare vel restringere privilegia regum. Illud autem capit calumpniam multiplicem aput quemlibet mentis compotem. Nam nec rex potuit concedere tale privilegium nec clerus debuit ipsum ut privilegium sibi admittere, cum non potest regno nostro vel parti eius esse privilegium fovere destructores regni et tocius ecclesie Anglicane, sicut non est privilegium alicui se ipsum deteriorando destruere. Ideo quicunque impetraverit vel defenderit hoc ut privilegium regno nostro, tamquam infidelis Deo et regno degenerat. Nec valet dicere quod talis comitiva non possit consurgere et regnum nostrum invadere, cum in tribus conquestibus scilicet Britonum, Saxonum et Normanorum hoc contigit, ymmo tales depopulatores tempore regis Edwardi secundi surrexerant et cardinales in comitatu Dunelmie spoliarunt, et in nobili regno Francie, in Lumbardia et in aliis regnis potentibus tales comitive depopulantes nostris temporibus surrexerunt: ymmo diebus istis regna nunquam vel raro sunt sine talibus vel corporaliter vel spiritualiter confederatis ad destruccionem eorum, cum talis corruptela sub pallio privilegii posset per se regnum perdere.** [218]**Item, rex non potest quicquam rite concedere quod vergeret ad enervacionem regni sui vel iniuriam sui populi, sed utrumque contingeret datis verbis recitati privilegii, secundum nudum verbalem conceptum. Ergo non subiacet potestati regis privilegium tale concedere. Maior patet ex dictis de privilegio, cum nichil sit privilegium, nisi quod directe vergit ad utilitatem sancte matris ecclesie; destruccio autem regni nostri et iniuria facta suo populo non potest directe vergere ad honorem Dei et utilitatem sancte matris ecclesie, ergo non subiacet potestati regis alicuius privilegium tale concedere; Deus enim non potest in contradiccionem.**

in any case it admits an objection, the bare words must be cast aside and sound teaching understood.[1]

Here a certain ingenious lawyer told me that every person of such an army will enjoy this privilege, since there is no need, on account of such impossible cases, to limit or restrict the privileges of kings.[2] **But that incurs manifold challenge with anyone in his right mind. For neither could the king grant such a privilege, nor ought the clergy to admit it as a privilege for themselves, since it cannot be a privilege for our kingdom, or for a part of it, to shelter the destroyers of the kingdom and of the whole English church, just as it is no privilege for anyone to destroy himself by making himself worse. Therefore whoever has obtained or defended this as a privilege for our kingdom degenerates, as one faithless to God and to the kingdom. Nor does it avail to say that such a company could not rise up and invade our kingdom, since this happened in three conquests, namely of the Britons, the Saxons and the Normans; indeed, such depopulators had risen in the time of King Edward the Second and despoiled cardinals in the county of Durham; and in the noble kingdom of France, in Lombardy and in other powerful kingdoms such depopulating companies have risen in our times: indeed, in these days kingdoms are never or rarely without such men, confederated bodily or spiritually for their destruction, since such corruption under the cloak of privilege could of itself destroy a kingdom.**[3] [218]**Again, the king cannot rightly grant anything that would tend to the enervation of his kingdom or to the injury of his people; now both would happen, given the words of the privilege recited, according to their bare verbal conception. Therefore it does not lie within the king's power to grant such a privilege. The major is clear from what has been said of privilege, since nothing is a privilege except what tends directly to the benefit of holy mother church; now the destruction of our kingdom and injury done to its people cannot tend directly to the honour of God and the benefit of holy mother church; therefore it does not lie within the power of any king to grant such a privilege; for God cannot [do] what is contradictory.**[4]

¶3 218.14–219.22
219.14 *and cause injustice to individuals.*
219.29 *Difficult case for the supporters of the privilege.*

[218]**Et confirmacio est quod officium regis terreni in quantum huiusmodi) est ecclesiam sanctam defendere, inimicos eius rigide cohercere et cunctis sed specialiter suis legiis iusticiam observare (ut patet libro III° cap°. Minor autem sic ostenditur: Nichil plus enervaret regnum quam tutela facinorosorum sine correpcione legitima. Unde**

And the confirmation is that the office of an earthly king, as such, is to defend holy church, rigidly to coerce its enemies, and to keep justice for all, but especially for his lieges (as is clear in book 3, chapter [ ]).[5] **Now the minor is shown thus: nothing would more enervate a kingdom than the protection of criminals without lawful correction. Hence it is written,**

Ecclesiastici X°, 8, scribitur: Regnum de gente in gentem transfertur propter iniusticias, iniurias, contumelias et diversos dolos; sed nichil plus cederet ad fomentum istorum quattuor quam concedere cuilibet libertatem quod, quidquid facinoris perpetraverit, fugiendo ad tam patentem locum non erit ab aliquo castigatus; ergo hoc evidenter minaretur ruinam regno. Si enim hoc privilegium esset per totam Angliam concessum, quomodo staret regnum? Rex enim non haberet potestatem ad cohercendum civiliter homines legios suos, et tunc non foret univoce rex eorum vel populi qui sue non subiacet potestati. Nec est racio quare rex posset concedere libertatem tanto loco, [219] quin per idem et patrie, et sic alius rex alii patrie, et sic quousque tota Anglia fuerit libertata. Si enim totalis exempcio extingueret totam regiam potestatem, particularis exempcio extingueret partem eius, cum de tanto non haberet rex potestatem loci vel persone incolentis ad castigandum ipsam, quantumcunque in regem vel regnum deliquerit, et sic non foret rex tocius Anglie, cum locus exemptus foret in regno, sed non de regno. Non enim haberet rex tantam potestatem ad subiugandum incolas talis loci sicut habet potestatem ad puniendum gentem Francie, cum tantum eximuntur a cohercione regia sicut incole Almanie vel omnino aliene provincie. Et quantum ad iniuriam populi, patet quod vendicatur libertas, ut quantumcunque sceleste quis iniuriatus fuerit proximo, homicidio, furto, mechia, prevaricando in omnem speciem mandatorum decalogi, fugiat ad illum locum et precluditur iniuriato iusticie complementum, cum nec tenetur per se vel procuratorem ibi vel alibi stare iuri, et tamen rex Anglie in coronacione sua iuratus est religione laudabili quod non negabit sed concedet iusticiam cuicunque.

Ecclesiasticus 10:8: "A kingdom is translated from one people to another, because of injustices, wrongs, injuries and divers deceits"; now nothing would contribute more to the fostering of these four than to grant anyone the liberty that, whatever crime he has perpetrated, by fleeing to so open a place he will not be chastised by anyone; therefore this would evidently threaten ruin to the kingdom.[6] For if this privilege were granted throughout all England, how would the kingdom stand? For the king would not have power to coerce his liege men by civil [process], and then he would not be univocally king of them, or of a people that is not subject to his power. Nor is there a reason why the king could grant liberty to so great a place [219] but that by the same token [he could grant it] also to a homeland, and so another king to another homeland, and so on until the whole of England were set at liberty. For if total exemption would extinguish the whole royal power, partial exemption would extinguish a part of it, since to that extent the king would not have power over the place, or over the person dwelling in it, to chastise it, however much it had offended against king or kingdom; and so he would not be king of all England, since the exempt place would be in the kingdom but not of the kingdom.[7] For the king would not have as much power to subjugate the inhabitants of such a place as he has power to punish the people of France, since they are exempted from royal coercion as much as the inhabitants of Germany or of a wholly foreign province. And as regards the injury of the people, it is clear that a liberty is claimed such that, however wickedly anyone has injured his neighbour, by homicide, theft, adultery, transgressing against every kind of the commandments of the decalogue, he may flee to that place, and the fulfilment of justice is shut off from the injured man, since [the fugitive] is not bound, in person or by proctor, there or elsewhere, to stand to law; and yet the king of England at his coronation is sworn, by a laudable religious bond, that he will not deny but will grant justice to anyone whatever.[8]

¶4 219.23–219.28

[219] O si totum regnum esset sic privilegiatum quoad omne factum scelestum et undique proclamatum licitum mendacium, qualem nidum haberet diabolus in Anglia ad protegendum in delictis verbi et operis populum tenebrarum? Revera in baratro non habet tale privilegium.

O, if the whole kingdom were thus privileged as to every wicked deed, and lying everywhere proclaimed lawful, what a nest would the devil have in England for protecting the people of darkness in offences of word and deed? Truly, in the abyss he has no such privilege.[9]

¶5 219.29–220.25

[219] Unde quesivi ab adversariis duos casus: Primo, si predans, furans vel mutuans quantumlibet magnum thesaurum ab alia ecclesia et

Hence I put two cases to [my] adversaries. First, whether one who plunders, steals or borrows a treasure however great from another

illuc fugiens cum thesauro habebit ad sensum expositum omnimodam libertatem. Et dictum est mihi quod sic; tum quia verba privilegii a quibus non licet recedere generaliter [220] illud sonant, tum eciam quia aliter foret nimis suspectum, negando laycis complementum iusticie et faciendo clero iusticiam. Sed tunc sequitur, primo quod rex qui potuit concedere ut sceleratissimi homines in perpetuum iniuste detineant reliquias et quecunque bona immunis ecclesie posset concedere ut iusti auferant temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente. Nam per se notum est quod ille qui potest concedere magis elongatum a communi iure potest concedere consonancius iuri Dei. Et iterum notum est quod maius peccatum foret iniuste, pertinaciter et obstinate detinere rem alienam, quam foret iniusta ablacio, quia pro primo est homo excommunicandus tamquam hereticus, et pro secundo non, nisi affuerit contumax obstinacia, ut noverant legiste. Ideo non dubium, si rex potest concedere privilegium ut quilibet regni sui habeat libertatem ad perpetuo detinendum iniuste ablata de sancta matre ecclesia, multo magis potest concedere licenciam, ut iusti auferant elemosinas suas quibus fraudantes regnum et sanctam matrem ecclesiam abutuntur. Unde inconsonum factum est et sibi ipsi contrarium tam ferventer defendere illud tamquam privilegium catholicum et solicite laborare, quando raciones deficiunt, ad dampnandum aliud tamquam hereticum.

church, and flees thither with the treasure, will have, on the sense expounded, liberty of every kind. And I was told that he would: both because the words of the privilege, from which it is not lawful to depart, [220] say that generally, and also because otherwise it would be too suspect, denying the laity the fulfilment of justice and doing justice to the clergy.[10] But then it follows, first, that the king, who could grant that the most wicked men should unjustly keep back in perpetuity the relics and any goods whatever of an immune church, could grant that the just should take away temporal goods from a delinquent church. For it is known of itself that he who can grant what is further removed from common law can grant what is more consonant with the law of God. And again it is known that it would be a greater sin unjustly, pertinaciously and obstinately to keep back another's property than an unjust taking away would be; because for the first a man is to be excommunicated as a heretic, and for the second not, unless contumacious obstinacy is present, as the lawyers knew.[11] Therefore there is no doubt: if the king can grant a privilege that anyone in his kingdom may have liberty perpetually to keep back what has been unjustly taken from holy mother church, much more can he grant licence that the just may take away their alms, which those who defraud the kingdom and holy mother church abuse. Hence it has been an inconsistent thing, and contrary to itself, to defend that so fervently as a catholic privilege, and anxiously to labour, when reasons fail, to condemn the other as heretical.[12]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Prima racio* (216.27); side-note 216.27. *Quarto obicere contra illa*: after the arguments for the privilege (10-b) and the answers to them (10-c), the fourth step is to argue against it; *illa* is taken as those arguments, though it may be the privileges. The minor echoes the words of the privilege itself ("whoever comes, from whatever place, on foot or on horseback ..."). *Si ... capit instanciam*: if the privilege admits an objection (an exception) in any one case, its bare letter cannot be the rule. *Sapere sanam sentenciam*: to understand (literally "savour") the sound teaching, as against the bare words.
2. A in the margin *Responsio quedam* (217.9); A writes *hoc hoc* (217.10). *Legista*: a civil lawyer, as against a canonist. *Limitare* has here its plain sense, "limit", beside *restringere*; the the glossary sense "assign" does not fit, and the word is untagged. *Capit calumpniam*: is open to challenge.
3. The robbery of the cardinals in the county of Durham: Loserth refers to Walsingham I, p. 151 (217.25); the event is the robbery of the two cardinals and of Louis de Beaumont, bishop-elect of Durham, near Darlington in 1317 by Gilbert de Middleton and Walter de Selby. B lacks *secundi* (217.26); Loserth would read *surrexerunt* for *surrexerant* (217.26), which does not change the sense. *Comitive depopulantes*: the free companies of France and Lombardy. *Vel corporaliter vel spiritualiter confederatis*: destroyers of the body (armed bands) or of the spirit; the second presumably aims at the clergy who shelter them. B *privilegio* (217.33). Side-note 217.22.
4. A in the margin *Secunda racio* (218.1) and *Nota de privilegiis ut supra* (218.5); side-note 218.1. *Maior* is Loserth's correction: the codices have the abbreviation for *assumptum*, which he reads as *maior* against *Minor autem* at 218.18 (218.6). B lacks *quod* (218.7). *Ex dictis de privilegio*: the definition of privilege argued earlier (cap. 8–9). *Deus enim non potest in contradiccionem*: not even God can make a thing both privilege and destruction; *a fortiori* not the king.
5. *Confirmacio*: a further proof of the major. A in the margin *Officium regis* (218.14). *Legiis*: the king's lieges, his sworn subjects. The chapter number is wanting in the print; which work's "book 3" is meant is not identified.
6. Ecclesiasticus 10:8 (Vulgate numbering): Wyclif has *de gente* and lists the four without the conjunctions (Vulgate *a gente ... propter iniustitias, et iniurias, et contumelias, et diversos dolos*); the sense is DR's. A in the margin *Contra privilegia locorum* (218.22); side-note 218.24. *Tam patentem locum*: a place so open (to all comers).

7. ***Univoce***: he would be their king only in an equivocal sense, in name. ***Patria***: here the earthly sense (the glossary): a whole district or country, against the single place of sanctuary. ***Quin per idem et patrie***: "but that he could by the same token [grant it] to a homeland". ***In regno, sed non de regno***: inside the kingdom, but not part of it.
8. ***Non ... tantam potestatem ... sicut***: the comparison is printed so; the sense is that the king would have no more hold on the sanctuary than on France or Germany. Side-note 219.14. ***Stare iuri***: to answer at law; ***ius*** is "law" here. ***Prevaricando in omnem speciem mandatorum***: transgressing every kind of commandment. The coronation oath (1308 form) asks the king to cause justice to be rendered "rightly, impartially, and wisely"; Wyclif's ***non negabit*** is nearer Magna Carta (1297) c. 29, "we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right".
9. A in the margin ***Casus*** (219.23). ***Et undique proclamatum licitum mendacium***: taken as a second thing the kingdom would be privileged in, lying (the ***delicta verbi***) proclaimed lawful; it could also be read "and [were] proclaimed everywhere a lawful lie". ***Baratrum***: the pit of hell.
10. A in the margin ***Prima questio*** (219.27); side-note 219.29. B reads ***si predicans*** (219.29–30) and ***omnimoda libertate*** (219.32–33); the print is translated. ***Ad sensum expositum***: on the sense the defenders give the privilege, the bare letter. ***Aliter foret nimis suspectum***: if the refuge covered those who rob laymen but not those who rob churches, the privilege would look partial, denying justice to the laity while doing it to the clergy.
11. A in the margin ***Bona racio*** (220.3). ***Immunis ecclesie***: a church enjoying immunity, as the sanctuary does. ***Magis elongatum a communi iure***: the privilege, further removed from common law than the grant Wyclif proposes. A_1 corrects to ***noverunt*** (220.15); the print is translated. ***Ius*** is "law" throughout.
12. ***Elemosinas suas***: the alms the just themselves gave, the endowments. ***Aliud***: the opposite thesis, that the just may take temporal goods from a delinquent church, which Wyclif's opponents condemn as heretical; the sixth of his conclusions condemned by Gregory XI in May 1377 (***Fasciculi zizaniorum***, p. 248; Walsingham, ***Hist. Angl.*** i. 354). A in the margin ***Conclusio*** (220.27) opens the next chunk.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 216: ***primo*** (glued 'army to' is the English side-note)
  - 217: ***aliquis*** (K 158^{d} are margin letter and folio mark)
  - 217: ***legista*** [NW]
  - 217: ***impetraverit*** (im-/petraverit hyphenated; main token holds whole word)
  - 218: ***legiis*** [NW]
  - 218: ***III°***
  - 219: ***cohercione*** [NW]
  - 220: ∅ (print has sus-/pectum; main already holds suspectum whole at pos 8)
  - 220: ***consonancius*** [NW]
  - 220: ***legiste*** [NW]
  - 219: ***quin*** (alinea L and 159b folio mark glued)
  - 219: ***idem***
  - 217: ***quod*** (159^{a} is the folio mark, dropped) [-MARK]

Part 5: The king cannot license wrong; excommunicate fugitives; scripture and canon law against the privilege

Loserth pp. 220.26–224.13

¶1 220.26–221.16
220.26 *We maintain that the king cannot give a privilege to rob or detain wrongfully.*
221.17 *Another case.*

[220] **Ego autem dico consonancius pro privilegiis sancte matris ecclesie quod rex non potest cuiquam concedere libertatem ad violente auferendum et multo evidencius ad iniuste detinendum aliquod bonum de quocunque membro ecclesie, nisi prius peccaverit hoc merendo. Nec est hic sophisma: Rex concedit malefico libertatem, ut non puniatur et ut maneat in perpetuum inaccusatus de crimine, sed non concedit sibi licenciam ad peccandum vel cuiquam iniuriandum; nam licenciare** [221] **ad formaliter atque notorie antecedens ad quamcunque iniuriam est licenciare ad ipsam iniuriam; ut si Deus dat mihi licenciam ad frangendum caput presbyteri, et hoc non potest fieri sine facinore, tunc Deus dat mihi licenciam ad facinus perpetrandum. Correspondenter, notato scelerato fugitivo quiescente**

But I say, more consonantly with the privileges of holy mother church, that the king cannot grant anyone liberty violently to take away, and much more evidently [none] unjustly to keep back, any good from any member of the church whatever, unless [that member] has first sinned, deserving this.[1] Nor does the sophism [hold] here: "The king grants the evildoer liberty not to be punished and to remain for ever unaccused of the crime, but he does not grant him licence to sin or to injure anyone"; for to license [221] **to what is formally and notoriously antecedent to any injury whatever is to license to the injury itself: as, if God gives me licence to break the head of a presbyter, and this cannot be done without crime, then God gives me licence to perpetrate a crime.[2] Correspondingly, when**

in dicto monasterio cum rapina pro suo perpetuo, queratur ab eo vel defendente hoc privilegium, a quo habet licenciam sic pausandi. Si dicatur quod non habet, tunc licitum est collacionem tam illicitam removere. Si dicatur quod a rege habet illam licenciam, sequitur cum veris quod rex licenciat ad antecedens formaliter ad peccatum, et longe coloracius dici poterit quod rex legitime licenciat ad auferendum temporalia, sed nullo modo ad faciendum iniuriam cuicunque, nam ablacio fieri potest legitime sed non talis detencio.

a wicked fugitive is noted resting in the said monastery with his plunder as his own for ever, let it be asked of him, or of the one defending this privilege, from whom he has licence so to rest. If it is said that he has none, then it is lawful to remove so unlawful a bestowal. If it is said that he has that licence from the king, it follows, together with truths, that the king licenses to what is formally antecedent to sin; and it could be said with far more colour that the king lawfully licenses the taking away of temporal goods, but in no way the doing of injury to anyone; for a taking away can be done lawfully, but not such a keeping back.[3]

¶2 221.17–224.13
222.4 *At least the criminals ought to be excommunicated and after forty days imprisoned.*
223.5 *3rd chief argument: Such privileges have no foundation in Scripture.*
223.24 *Exceptions made in Canon Law to right of sanctuary:*
224.1
1. a public thief,
224.3
2. a waster of fields,
224.6
3. an escaped slave,
224.9
4. a wilful homicide.

[221]Secundo quesivi, si fugitivus huiusmodi possit excommunicari, dum fuerit in loco illo pro facinore exterius perpetrato, vel si excomunicatus extra locum et fugiens ad ipsum ne virtute brevis regii capiatur ad carcerem, habebit in dicto monasterio libertatem? Et dictum est mihi quod non, quia leges humane non derogant legibus et iuri ecclesie, et specialiter ut inobedientissimis excommunicandis apponatur anime medicina; aliter enim liceret excludere et privilegiare spiritualiter infirmum, ut sordescat in crimine nec accipiat correccionem ab homine; quod cum sit contra legem correpcionis fraterne, Matthei XVIII°, 15, Si peccaverit in te frater tuus etc, manifestum videtur quod talis defensio non habet privilegium sed pravilegium Antichristi. Ymmo cum talis sit plene et non minus excommunicatus a Deo, non obstante quod sentencia non sit lata ab homine, sequitur [222]iuxta fidem scripture et leges ecclesie quod non est communicandum cum tali, nisi forte ut convertatur, ne inficiat gregem Christi. Ex quotlibet talibus evidenciis dicitur quod licet talem fugitivum excommunicare et post quadraginta dies excommunicacionis carceri mancipare. Sed dato isto sequitur, cum licet excommunicare pro quocunque facinore, quod fugitivus talis facinorosus sit statim excommunicandus et consequenter post quadraginta dies incarcerandus, et cum non habebit post excommunicacionem maiorem favorem quam ethnicus et publicanus, videtur quod sit de monasterio extrahendus et in carcere publico cum aliis excommunicatis tamquam alienus a filiis ecclesie detrudendus. Unde cum in dubiis via securior est tenenda, et vel est, dubium vel probabile quod fovens taliter criminosum erit particeps criminis ex consensu vel culpabilis, negando coreccionis suffragium, quod foret verum privilegium, oppositum hinc privilegio, videtur, cum cursus legis communis sit via securior, quod illa sit pocius sustinenda. Quomodo rogo tenderet ad profectum persone pro querenda beatitudine indifferenter omnes facinorosos, diabolicos et

Secondly I asked whether such a fugitive can be excommunicated while he is in that place, for a crime perpetrated outside; or whether one excommunicated outside the place, and fleeing to it so as not to be taken to prison by virtue of the king's writ, will have liberty in the said monastery. And I was told no; because human laws do not derogate from the laws and right of the church, and especially [not from the law] that the medicine of the soul be applied to the most disobedient, who are to be excommunicated; for otherwise it would be lawful to shut off and privilege the spiritually sick man, so that he grows filthy in crime and receives no correction from man.[4] And since that is against the law of fraternal correction, Matthew 18:15, "If thy brother shall offend against thee", etc., it seems manifest that such a defence has not a privilege but a "pravilege" of Antichrist.[5] Indeed, since such a man is fully, and no less, excommunicated by God, notwithstanding that sentence has not been passed by man, it follows, [222]according to the faith of scripture and the laws of the church, that one is not to communicate with such a man, unless perhaps so that he may be converted, lest he infect the flock of Christ.[6] From any number of such evidences the answer is that it is lawful to excommunicate such a fugitive and, after forty days of excommunication, to commit him to prison. But, granted this, it follows, since it is lawful to excommunicate for any crime whatever, that such a criminal fugitive is to be excommunicated at once and consequently, after forty days, imprisoned; and since after excommunication he will have no greater favour than "a heathen and a publican", it seems that he is to be dragged out of the monastery and thrust into the public prison with other excommunicates, as a stranger to the sons of the church. Hence, since in doubtful matters the safer way is to be held, and it is either doubtful or probable that one who shelters a criminal in this way will be a partaker in the crime by consent, or guilty by denying the aid of

inimicos ecclesie in domo sua protegere et medicinam correpcionis et censuras ecclesie quibus sanarentur ab eis precludere? Revera nec hoc nec participacio rapine sonat religiosis ad commodum. Nam Hely non propter fomentum malicie filiorum sed propter remissionem correpcionis filiorum punitus fuit morte et privatus summo sacerdocio in sua posteritate, ut patet I° Regum, II° et IV° capitulis, et III° Regum II°. Hoc ergo posset sonare in privilegium dicti loci quod fugitivos inpotentes, de quibus foret spes conversionis ad frugem melioris vite, in vite necessariis et pecuniis debitis de regis elemosinis misericorditer relevarent et predas latronum [223]illatas fideliter restituerent. Hoc enim esset elemosina et sic privilegium cedens undique ad utilitatem parcium, ad honorem Dei et profectum ecclesie (ut sepe superius inculcavi). Tercio principaliter arguitur ex hoc quod omne bonum utile est fundabile in scriptura iuxta conclusionem secundam capituli VIII[i], sed non est fundabile in scriptura nec in lege ecclesie quod locum vel personam sic generaliter privilegiare liceat. Ergo non est bonum utile ecclesie et sic non privilegium alicui sic facere. Minor patet ex hoc quod in veteri testamento cautum est de civitatibus refugii, ut dictum est capitulo VII°; nullibi autem signatum est refugium pro sceleratis, sed limitatum est ut pro occisione casuali preter propositum habeat occisor refugium, ut patet Levitici XXV°, Deuteronomii XIX° et Josue XX°. In novo autem testamento non signatur tale refugium, sed precipitur Matthei XVIII°, 17, quod talis sceleratus sit sicut ethnicus et publicanus. Unde ergo nobis autoritas ad hostes Dei ac sancte ecclesie taliter protegendum, specialiter cum legalis correccio sive punicio foret plus misericors atque iusta, tempore autem legis gracie obligamur ad misericordiam ampliorem? Quantum autem ad iura canonica, videtur mihi quod specificantur quinque casus in quibus malefici a defensione ecclesie excluduntur; tres autem casus exprimuntur III° Decretalium, De Immunitate Ecclesiarum, capitulo Inter alia, sub hac forma: Hoc verum est, scilicet quod fugientes ad ecclesiam habebunt [224]immunitatem nisi publicus latro fuerit vel nocturnus populator agrorum qui, dum itinera frequentata vel publicas stratas obsidet aggressionis insidiis, ab ecclesia extrahi potest, inpunitate non prestita secundum canonicas sancciones. Si vero servus fuerit qui confugerit ad ecclesiam, postquam de inpunitate sua dominus eius clericis iuramentum prestiterit, ad servicium domini sui redire compellatur eciam invitus, alioquin a domino poterit occupari. Ecce tres casus in quibus licet fugitivum invitum extrahere, et libro V°, De Homicidio, ponitur pro lege illud Exodi XXI°, 14, Si quis per industriam occiderit, ab altari meo evellas eum, ut moriatur.

correction (which would be the true privilege, opposed on this side to the [pretended] privilege), it seems, since the course of the common law is the safer way, that it is rather to be upheld.[7] How, I ask, would it tend to the profit of a person [vowed] to seeking blessedness to protect in his house, without distinction, all criminals, devilish men and enemies of the church, and to shut off from them the medicine of correction and the censures of the church by which they might be healed? Truly, neither this nor a share in plunder tends to the advantage of the religious. For Eli was punished with death, and deprived of the high priesthood in his posterity, not for fostering the malice of his sons but for remitting the correction of his sons, as is clear from 1 Samuel, chapters 2 and 4, and 1 Kings 2.[8] This, then, could tend to the privilege of the said place: that out of the king's alms they should mercifully relieve impotent fugitives, of whom there was hope of conversion to the fruit of a better life, in the necessaries of life and in money owed, and faithfully restore the plunder of thieves [223]brought in. For this would be alms, and so a privilege turning on all sides to the benefit of the parties, to the honour of God and the profit of the church (as I have often inculcated above).[9] Thirdly, as a principal [argument], it is argued from this: that every useful good is groundable in scripture, according to the second conclusion of chapter 8; now it is not groundable in scripture, nor in the law of the church, that it is lawful to privilege a place or a person so generally; therefore it is not a useful good of the church, and so it is no privilege for anyone to do so. The minor is clear from this: that in the old testament provision was made concerning cities of refuge, as was said in chapter 7; but nowhere was a refuge designated for the wicked; but it was assigned that for accidental killing, beyond intention, the killer should have refuge, as is clear from Leviticus 25, Deuteronomy 19 and Joshua 20.[10] And in the new testament no such refuge is designated; but it is commanded, Matthew 18:17, that such a wicked man be "as the heathen and publican". Whence, then, have we authority to protect thus the enemies of God and of holy church, especially since legal correction or punishment would be more merciful and just, and in the time of the law of grace we are bound to a larger mercy?[11] And as regards the canon laws, it seems to me that five cases are specified in which evildoers are excluded from the defence of the church; and three cases are expressed in the third [book] of the Decretals, *De immunitate ecclesiarum*, chapter *Inter alia*, in this form: "This is true", namely that those fleeing to a church will have [224]immunity, "unless he be a public thief or a nocturnal waster of fields who, while he besets

frequented routes or public highways with ambushes of assault, can be drawn out of the church, impunity not being afforded, according to the canonical sanctions. But if it be a slave who has fled to the church, after his lord has given the clerics an oath concerning his impunity, let him be compelled to return to his lord's service even unwilling; otherwise he may be seized by his lord."[12] Behold three cases in which it is lawful to drag out a fugitive against his will; and in book 5, *De homicidio*, that [text] of Exodus 21:14 is laid down for law: "If a man kill on set purpose, thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die."[13]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Conclusio* (220.27); side-note 220.26. *Ego autem dico*: Wyclif's own conclusion against the defenders' (10-d, 220.20 ff.). *Consonancius pro privilegiis*: more in keeping with the church's true privileges. *Nisi prius peccaverit hoc merendo*: the subject is taken to be the member of the church who is deprived.
2. *Nec est hic sophisma*: literally "nor is there here the sophism"; we take it that the defenders' distinction between liberty from punishment and licence to sin does not hold, as the *nam* clause shows; it could instead mean that Wyclif's own argument is no sophism. *Antecedens*: what entails the injury (glossary: *antecedens*). *Caput* is here the literal head.
3. AA_1 read *cubacionem* (221.10), "lying [there]", which suits *pausandi*; the print *collacionem* construes ("bestowal", of the liberty) and is translated. *Cum veris*: together with true premisses. *Coloracius*: "with more colour", on a more plausible ground (glossary: *color*). B reads *sed non est talis detencio* (221.16), with the same sense.
4. A in the margin *Secunda questio* (221.17) and *Responsio* (221.22); side-note 221.17. *Brevis regii*: Loserth glosses *breve* as *mandatum* (221.20); the writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, issued on the bishop's letters against one obstinate forty days in excommunication (Bracton f. 426b–427). *Et specialiter ut ... apponatur*: the *ut* clause has no governing word; we supply "[not from the law]". *Excludere*: to shut [him] off from correction.
5. Matthew 18:15, printed as verse 1: Wyclif omits the Vulgate's *autem* (*Si autem peccaverit*); DR is given without its "But". B in the margin *Matth. VIII* (221.28). *Pravilegium*: a pun on *privilegium* and *pravus*, "depraved"; we keep it as "pravilege".
6. *Sentencia* is here a judicial sentence, of excommunication; the the glossary "teaching" does not fit, and the word is untagged. *Non est communicandum*: one is not to hold communion with him, as with an excommunicate.
7. *Dicitur* is taken as the answer to the second question; side-note 222.4. The forty days: Bracton f. 426b. *Ethnicus et publicanus*: Matthew 18:17. In the long period, *illa* is taken as the common law (*cursus legis communis*); *quod foret verum privilegium, oppositum hinc privilegio*: correction would be the true privilege, set against the pretended one.
8. *Persone pro querenda beatitudine*: a religious, whose profession is the seeking of blessedness. Eli: 1 Samuel 2–4, especially 3:13, "because he knew that his sons did wickedly, and did not chastise them"; Abiathar's deposition, "the word of the Lord ... concerning the house of Heli", 1 Kings 2:27 (Wyclif's "1 Kings" and "3 Kings").
9. *De regis elemosinis*: the king's endowment of the house is itself alms, to be spent on such fugitives. *Utilitatem parcium*: the parties, fugitive and those he wronged.
10. A in the margin *Tercia racio* (223.5); side-note 223.5. The second conclusion of chapter 8: Loserth, above p. 173 (223.7); AA_1 read *cap. XVIII*. B lacks *quod locum* (223.8). For *cautum* Loserth suggests *tantum*, "only" (223.12); the print is translated. Chapter 7: A *XVI*, B *VI* (223.12–13); Loserth, above p. 147 (223.16). *Levitici XXV°* (AA_1 *XV*, 223.15–16): the cities of refuge are given at Numbers 35 (35:11, "for the refuge of fugitives, who have shed blood against their will"); Leviticus 25:32–34 treats the Levites' cities.
11. Matthew 18:17, as DR. *Tempore autem legis gracie*: *autem* continues the *cum* clause ("and").
12. A in the margin *Nota qui malefici a defensione ecclesie excluduntur*, B *Nota quinque casus (in) quibus a sanctuario extrahitur fugitivus* (223.24); side-notes 223.24–224.6. The decretal: X 3.49.6, *Inter alia* (our modern form of Loserth's reference, 223.27). Loserth notes that *scilicet quod fugientes ad ecclesiam habebunt immunitatem* are Wyclif's words, not the decretal's (*mutatis verbis*); we keep them outside the quotation. *Frequentata* is Loserth's correction from the decretal (codd. *frequentat*, 224.2).
13. *De homicidio*: *X* 5.12.1 (Friedberg II, ~791), which quotes Exodus 21:14. Exodus 21:14: Wyclif omits *proximum suum, et per insidias* (Loserth, 224.12) and has *evellas* for the Vulgate's *evelles*; DR is given for the rest. Side-note 224.9 counts this as the fourth case.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **220: *Ego***
  - **220: *consonancius* [NW]**
  - **221: *ad* (N 159^c are margin letter and folio mark)**
  - **221: *formaliter***
  - **221: *tuus* (italic)**
  - **222: *licet* (O is the alinea letter)**

- 222: ***I°*** **(I° Regum)**
- 222: ***II°***
- 222: ***III°***
- 223: ***arguitur***
- 223: ***VIII^{i}*** **(superscript i after VIII)**
- 223: ***III°***
- 224: ***immunitatem*** **('1. a public thief,' is the English side-note)**
- 224: ***iuramentum*** **(italic)**
- 223: ***illatas*** **(alinea O and 159d folio mark glued)**
- 223: ***habebunt*** **(asterisk mark follows)**

Part 6: The fifth case and the gloss; why offenders forfeit sanctuary; the twofold privilege

Loserth pp. 224.14–227.18

¶1 224.14–226.11

224.14 *The 5th exception applies to the Westminster case.*
225.5 *The Church should have regard to the crime, not to the place where it was committed.*
226.3 *The civil law withdraws from sanctuary those guilty of homicide, adultery and rape.*
226.12 *All offenders are so far unfit to be shielded by the Church; a) because he who has broken a law cannot claim the benefit of it;*
226.21 *b) Christ's law is an adversary to the sinner;*
226.30 *c) in remaining wicked the refugee abuses the privilege and so forfeits it.*

[224]**Et ut videtur mihi, quintus casus exprimitur in III° Decretalium, in fine tituli De Immunitate Ecclesie, cum inquit: In eo in quo delinquit puniri quis debeat, et frustra legis auxilium invocet qui committit in legem: mandamus quatenus nuncietis publice tales non debere gaudere immunitatis privilegio quo faciunt se indignos. Et ipsos indignos prius exprimit sub hiis verbis: Nonnulli inpunitatem suorum excessuum per defensionem ecclesie obtinere sperantes, homicidia et mutulaciones membrorum in ipsis ecclesiis vel earum cimiteriis committere non verentur, qui nisi per ecclesiam ad quam confugiunt crederent se defendi, nullatenus fuerant commissuri. Unde glosa dicit quod omnes leges que videntur istis contrarie, ut XVII^{a}, q. IV^{a} et cetere leges, sonantes in presidium maleficorum in sanctuario, intelliguntur de dignis tali presidio. Hugucius, inquit, male dixit,** [225]**concordando decretales et decreta, quod dicta decretalis intelligitur de illis qui fugientes ad ecclesiam non deliquerunt in ea vel cimiterio eius sed alibi. Talibus, inquit Hugucius, ab ecclesia prestatur immunitas. Sed revera cum ecclesia, sponsa Christi, sit undique ligata vinculis caritatis, infinitum plus respiceret ad delictum in quodlibet membrum eius quam ad sedacionem loci corporei. Et quia basilica infinitum minus diligitur quam membrum ecclesie, patet quod ubicunque terrarum quis peccat mortaliter, ecclesia debet plus ad peccatum respicere quam ad locum. Nam locus est impertinens offense ecclesie que non debet personas vel signa inanimata sic accipere, nisi forte locus sit per accidens principium noscendi et augendi gravedinem culpe. Quicunque, inquam, plus offenderunt in Deum, plus offendunt in totam sanctam matrem ecclesiam et quodlibet eius membrum ex vi communionis sanctorum et communicacionis membrorum diaboli, cum caput in quod primo delinquitur sit ubique. Ideo bene dicit glossa, III° Decretalium, quod**

And as it seems to me, the fifth case is expressed in the third [book] of the Decretals, at the end of the title *De immunitate ecclesie*, where it says: "In that in which one offends he ought to be punished, and he invokes the help of the law in vain who offends against the law: we command that you announce publicly that such men ought not to enjoy the privilege of immunity of which they make themselves unworthy." And it first expresses who are unworthy, in these words: "Some, hoping to obtain impunity for their excesses through the defence of the church, are not afraid to commit homicides and mutilations of limbs in the churches themselves or in their cemeteries, who, unless they believed they would be defended by the church to which they flee, would by no means have committed them."[1] Hence the gloss says that all the laws that seem contrary to these, as C. 17 q. 4 and the other laws that tend to the protection of evildoers in sanctuary, are understood of those worthy of such protection. "Huguccio," it says, "spoke ill, [225]**in harmonizing the decretals and the decrees, [in saying] that the said decretal is understood of those who, fleeing to the church, did not offend in it or in its cemetery, but elsewhere. To such, says Huguccio, immunity is afforded by the church."[2] But truly, since the church, the bride of Christ, is bound on all sides with the bonds of charity, it would have regard infinitely more to an offence against any member of it than to the siting of a bodily place. And because a basilica is loved infinitely less than a member of the church, it is clear that wherever on earth anyone sins mortally, the church ought to have more regard to the sin than to the place. For the place is irrelevant to an offence against the church, which ought not so to respect persons or inanimate signs, unless perhaps the place is accidentally a principle for knowing and increasing the gravity of the guilt.[3] Whoever, I say, have**

illi qui in quamcunque ecclesiam deliquerint sunt ut sic indigni habere immunitatem cuiuscunque ecclesie: Illi, inquit, non habent immunitatem ab ecclesia, quia reddiderunt se indignos eius presidio, etsi fuerint stulti in culpa, sint sapientes in pena, ut dicit beatus Gregorius, sicut recitatur XXXVIII[a] distinctione: Qui ea. Unde non est racio (sicut tangit predicta glossa) quare in istis quinque casibus excluduntur malefactores ab immunitate ecclesie, nisi quia ecclesia in istis casibus sensibilibus percipit indignitatem talium ex peccato notorio quam indignitatem [226] aliorum qui aput Deum sunt magis indigni eo quod gravius peccaverunt. Unde leges civiles quas iura canonica non reprobant alios maleficos exprimunt ut homicidas, adulteros et raptores virginum quos collacio tercia docet extrahere; et idem indubie est de quocunque peccante mortaliter, quia omnis talis ut sic est inimicus Dei et sancte matris ecclesie, ut patet XXIII[a] q. IV[a] (sicut recitavi superius in fine proximi capituli). Nam distancia loci non impedit quin peccans offendat in Deum et subtrahat ab ecclesia spirituale suffragium.

offended more against God offend more against the whole of holy mother church and each member of it, by force of the communion of saints and of the communication of the members of the devil, since the head against which the offence is first committed is everywhere.[4] Therefore the gloss on the third [book] of the Decretals says well that those who have offended against any church whatever are, as such, unworthy to have the immunity of any church whatever: "They," it says, "do not have immunity from the church, because they have rendered themselves unworthy of its protection; though they have been foolish in guilt, let them be wise in punishment, as blessed Gregory says, as is recited in distinction 38, *Qui ea*." Hence there is no reason (as the aforesaid gloss touches on) why in these five cases evildoers are excluded from the immunity of the church, except that the church in these perceptible cases perceives [more] the unworthiness of such men from notorious sin than the unworthiness [226] of others who before God are more unworthy because they have sinned more gravely.[5] Hence the civil laws, which the canon laws do not reprove, express other evildoers, such as homicides, adulterers and ravishers of virgins, whom the third collation teaches [us] to drag out; and the same without doubt holds of anyone who sins mortally, because every such man, as such, is an enemy of God and of holy mother church, as is clear from C. 23 q. 4 (as I recited above at the end of the preceding chapter). For distance of place does not prevent the sinner from offending against God and withdrawing spiritual aid from the church.[6]

¶2 226.12–226.29

[226] Ideo ubicunque sub divo quis magis offenderit, de tanto redditur magis inhabilis ad percipiendum defensionem ecclesie. Quod probatur tripliciter primo per hoc quod secundum regulam iuris per se notam frustra invocat legis auxilium qui offendit in legem, sed talis manens facinorosus offendit in legem ecclesie et totam sanctam matrem ecclesiam, ergo frustra invocat suffragium legum ecclesie, cum ex culpa sua per decretum sponsi ad ipsum redditur tam indignus. Item, secundum sentenciam Christi Matthei V°, 25, necesse est legem Christi esse adversariam peccatori et accusantem eum quamdiu sorduerit in peccato: Esto, inquit, consenciens adversario tuo cito, dum es in via cum illo. Cum ergo lex Christi mitissima non excusat sed accusat, non protegit sed prodit, omnes tales dum manserint primo legifero inimici, sequitur quod omnes leges ancillantes Christo non debent procurare defensionem hostis ecclesie in peccato.

Therefore, wherever in the open air anyone has offended more, by so much is he rendered more unqualified to receive the defence of the church. This is proved in three ways: first, by this, that according to the rule of law, known of itself, "he invokes the help of the law in vain who offends against the law"; now such a man, remaining a criminal, offends against the law of the church and against the whole of holy mother church; therefore he invokes in vain the aid of the laws of the church, since by his own fault, by the decree of the bridegroom, he is rendered so unworthy of it.[7] Again, according to the teaching of Christ, Matthew 5:25, the law of Christ must be adverse to the sinner and accuse him as long as he lies filthy in sin: "Be at agreement," he says, "with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him." Since, therefore, the most gentle law of Christ does not excuse but accuses, does not protect but betrays, all such men while they remain enemies to the first lawgiver, it follows that all the

laws that serve Christ ought not to procure the defence of an enemy of the church in his sin.[8]

¶3 226.30–227.18

227.1 *The privilege is twofold: to the inhabitants of the place and to the fugitive, who forfeits it, if he is ungrateful.*

[226]Item, secundum beatum Gregorium (ut sepe repecii) privilegium omnino debet amittere qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate, sed omnis manens facinorosus intra locum refugii propter securitatem privilegii sibi permissa abutitur potestate, ergo debet ut sic carere loci suffragio. [227]Est enim ad propositum dare duplex genus privilegii, scilicet privilegium quod residet in incolis loci talis et privilegium quod individuatur in persona fugitivi, cum quilibet talis dignus habere privilegii prioris suffragium, habet in se singulare privilegium a privilegio ecclesie exemplatum cuius proteccionem est dignus amittere dum ingratus fuerit matri sue. Et hic rogo primo professores iuris canonici considerare quomodo dictum vocatum privilegium nedum non fundatur in iure suo, sed manifeste repugnat eidem, cum lex ecclesie dicit quod in nullo dictorum quinque casuum fugitivus ad ecclesiam habebit refugium, sed privilegium pretensum dicit quod in quolibet eorum habebit refugium, et cum iste sensus videtur tam patenter repugnare iuri canonico, legi scripture et legi consciencie, verecundum et periculosum esset vocatum privilegium tam dampnabile et hereticum tam instanter defendere, veris privilegiis ecclesie pretermissis.

Again, according to blessed Gregory (as I have often repeated), "he ought wholly to lose his privilege who abuses the power permitted him"; now everyone who remains a criminal within the place of refuge, because of the security of the privilege, abuses the power permitted him; therefore he ought, as such, to lack the aid of the place.[9] [227]For it is to the purpose to posit a twofold kind of privilege: namely, the privilege that resides in the inhabitants of such a place, and the privilege that is individuated in the person of the fugitive; since each such [fugitive], worthy to have the aid of the former privilege, has in himself a singular privilege copied from the privilege of the church, whose protection he deserves to lose while he is ungrateful to his mother.[10] And here I ask, first, the professors of canon law to consider how the said so-called privilege is not only not founded in their own law but manifestly conflicts with it: since the law of the church says that in none of the said five cases will the fugitive to a church have refuge, but the pretended privilege says that in each of them he will have refuge. And since this sense seems so patently to conflict with canon law, the law of scripture and the law of conscience, it would be shameful and perilous to defend so urgently a so-called privilege so damnable and heretical, the true privileges of the church being passed over.[11]

Notes

1. Side-note 224.14. The decretal at the end of the title: X 3.49.10 (our modern form of Loserth's *ib. cap. X*, 224.15). Loserth supplies an *et* from the decretal (224.23). Its opening words are a maxim of the law (*frustra legis auxilium invocet qui committit in legem*, Friedberg II, 658; also *X* 1.6.23, 5.19.14, 5.39.45), which Wyclif calls a *regula iuris* at 226.13. *Quo faciunt se indignos*: "of which they make themselves unworthy". *Nullatenus fuerant commissuri*: "would by no means have committed them".
2. C. 17 q. 4 c. 9 (Loserth, 224.28), *Reum ad ecclesiam fugientem nemo abstrahere audeat* (Friedberg I, ~818). The gloss: Loserth compares the gloss on X 3.49.10 (225.1, 225.20). Huguccio, the Bolognese canonist; Loserth refers to Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter* V, 425. The first *inquit* is the gloss's, the second Huguccio's; where the gloss's report ends is not marked, and we close it at *immunitas*.
3. A in the margin *Nota hic* (225.5); side-note 225.5. *Sedacionem loci corporei*: taken as the "siting" (settled seat) of a bodily place, against the person offended; the word is doubtful. *Basilica*: the church building, against the church as its members. *Personas ... accipere*: to respect persons. *Per accidens principium noscendi*: the place may show, and so aggravate, the guilt, but does not make it.
4. A in the margin *Conclusio* (225.15). *Communicacionis membrorum diaboli*: the counterpart of the communion of saints; whoever offends one member offends the whole, and shares in the communion of the devil's members. *Caput*: Christ, against whom every offence is first committed.
5. The gloss on X 3.49.10 again. Gregory (*Moralia*) as recited in D. 38 c. 10, *Qui ea* (Loserth, 225.26; Friedberg I, 144: *Quicumque stultus est in culpa, sapiens erit in pena*); the end of the gloss's words is not marked, and we close at *Qui ea*. *Percipit ... quam*: Loserth would understand *plus percipit* (225.30); translated with "[more]". *Sensibilibus*: cases perceptible to the church, as against those known only to God.
6. *Collacio tercia*: the third collation of the *Authenticum*: Nov. 17 c. 7 (Coll. III tit. 4), *neque homicidis neque adulteris neque virginum raptoribus*, who are to be dragged out; Loserth: see above p. 144 ff. (226.5). A in the margin *Nota* (226.3); side-note 226.3. C. 23 q. 4: Loserth, above p. 201 (226.8). *Spirituale suffragium*: rendered "aid" (glossary: *suffragium legis*); it may mean the sinner's share in the church's suffrages, which he withdraws.

7. ***Sub divo*: the the glossary's "in the open air"; here simply "anywhere under heaven". *Inhabilis*: unqualified. *Regulam iuris*: the maxim of 224.15. *Ad ipsum*: unworthy of the aid (*suffragium*). *Sponsi*: Christ, the bridegroom. Side-note 226.12 (its a), b), c) follow Wyclif's *primo*, *item*, *item*).**
8. **Matthew 5:25, as the Vulgate (Wyclif *cum illo* for *cum eo*); DR. Side-note 226.21. *Primo legifero*: Christ, the first lawgiver. *Leges ancillantes Christo*: the laws, civil and canon, that serve Christ's law.**
9. **The maxim, "he deserves to lose his privilege who abuses the power permitted him", ascribed to Gregory and cited by Wyclif before (*ut sepe repecii*); its place in the Decretum is C. 11 q. 3 c. 63 (PL 187:862). B reads *contra locum* for *intra locum* (226.32–33); the print is translated. Side-note 226.30.**
10. **A and B in the margin *Duplex privilegium* (227.1); side-note 227.1. *Dare*: to posit, in argument. *Exemplatum*: copied, derived from it as from an exemplar. *Est dignus amittere*: "deserves to lose". *Ingratus* is here a person ungrateful to someone, his mother the church: "ungrateful" (the glossary).**
11. **A in the margin *Nota* (227.8). *Rogo primo*: no second request follows before the chapter ends. *Lex ecclesie dicit*: the five cases above (223.24–224.25). *Iure suo*: their own law, the canon law. B reads *vires* (227.18), apparently for *veris*; the print is translated. *Instanter*: urgently.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **224: *fine***
  - **224: *Ecclesie* (italic; 15 is the line number)**
  - **224: *XVII*ª**
  - **224: *IV*ª**
  - **225: *quod* (Q 160ª are margin letter and folio mark)**
  - **225: *III°* (20 is the line number)**
  - **226: *aliorum***
  - **226: ∅ ('law' is the English side-note (The civil law))**
  - **226: *IV*ª**
  - **226: *tripliciter* (one unhyphenated printed word; main splits it tripli | citer (pos 101))**
  - **226: ∅ (citer is the tail of tripliciter (pos 100); no separate word)**
  - **226: *primo***
  - **226: *per* (a is the margin letter)**
  - **226: *Christi***
  - **226: *Christi* (25 is the line number)**
  - **226: *facinorosus* (f with crossbar, tall) [NW]**
  - **227: *individuatur***
  - **227: *quilibet***
  - **227: *privilegii***
  - **227: *prioris* (5 is the line number) [NW]**
  - **226: *V°, 25,* (print has verse 25 at line end; following b is an alinea letter) [-VERSE]**

Chapter 11

Part 1: How the Westminster privilege is to be read: its interpreter, its ends, and no privilege against the common law

Loserth pp. 227.20–232.33

¶1 227.20–232.33
227.20 *The real use of the privilege.*
228.2 *The interpretation of it lies with the King,*
228.12 *who is to be guided by sound theology.*
229.5 *We must consider the purposes of the Charter,*
229.10 *which are: a) respect to the relics of St. Peter,*
229.15 *b) quiet for the monks,*
229.17 *c) honour to the Church in which the King Is Specially prayed for.*
229.23 *Monks of the royal foundation are bound to obey the King; so must be their guests or fugitives.*
229.31 *Crime cannot free from the duty of obedience.*
230.7 *Forgiveness is good so far as it tends to true mercy,*
230.12 *and a special privilege of forgiveness should be left to Westminster,*
230.23 *out of regard for the royal grant.*
230.28 *No privilege may be contrary to common law.*
231.10 *Hence fugitives are not made altogether free of debt or of punishment,*
231.17 *since this would be mischievous.*
232.3 *It is contrary to charily to encourage a man not to pay his debts.*

[227] **Cum elemosina tantorum principum non debet omnino extingui propter sinistram interpretacionem abutencium, sicut nec veritas scripture sacre frustrari debet a suo lumine propter hereticos qui sinistrum sensum occasione male accepta ex ipsa eliciunt, videndum est ad quem sensum dictum privilegium debet concipi, ut remaneat tam re quam nomine privilegium utrobique. Igitur inprimis, cum illius sit interpretari leges ac privilegia cuius est condere (ut patet XXV^a^ q. I, Ideo permittente, et V° Decretalium, De Sentencia** [228] **Excomunicacionis, Inter alia), rex autem Anglie debet concedere et condere leges tales privatas de suo regali dominio ad edificacionem ecclesie: ideo capiendum est tamquam per se notum quod regis est illas leges privatas ac elemosinas interpretari et in rectitudine sua defendere. Romanus autem pontifex super isto consultus, et sacerdos suus legius requisitus de interpretacione sensus catholici, tenentur de lege evangelii quantum sciunt humiliter declarare; quibus non est parendum nisi de quanto sentenciam suam fundaverint in scriptura sacra. Unde secundo oportet supponere quod sacram theologiam necesse sit omnem talem scienciam principaliter regulare; patet ex hoc quod illa sola principaliter docet viam qua celeste coniugium honoratur, sed iuxta hunc finem regulandum est omne factum viatoris legitimum; ergo conclusio. Et ista est sentencia XX^a^ dist. De quibus, ubi Innocencius papa docet quinque gradus procedendi in dubiis discernendis, primo in quantum recurrendum est ad scripture auctoritatem quam episcopi et specialiter papa usque ad sanguinem tenentur defendere, ut patet XXV^a^, q. I. Sunt quidam. Secundo si ex scriptura sacra in lingua latina solucio dubii non clare eluceat, recurratur ad scripta greca, ut vel sic divina sentencia habeatur. Tercio si nec sic lux veritatis appareat, ad ecclesiasticas historias catholicas congregatas a sanctis doctoribus, mitte manum. Quarto si nec illis eluceat difficultas que queritur, sanctorum exempla perspicaciter recordare, exempla enim vite sanctorum debent esse nobis speculum conversandi.** [229] **Quinto si omnibus istis inspectis questionis qualitas non lucescat, per decretum seniorum provincie ad hoc congregatorum mediante Dei assistencia qui non potest suis deficere, decidatur. Tercio suppono: Cum dictum privilegium non**

Since the alms of such great princes ought not to be wholly extinguished because of the perverse interpretation of those who abuse it, just as the truth of holy scripture ought not to be cheated of its light because of heretics who, taking occasion amiss, draw a perverse sense out of it, we must see in what sense the said privilege ought to be conceived, so that it may remain a privilege on both counts, in fact as well as in name.[1] First, then: it belongs to him whose it is to make laws and privileges to interpret them (as is clear from C. 25 q. 1, *Ideo permittente*, and from the fifth [book] of the Decretals, *De sentencia* [228] *excommunicacionis*, *Inter alia*); now the king of England must grant and make such private laws out of his royal lordship for the edification of the church: therefore it must be taken as known of itself that it belongs to the king to interpret those private laws and alms and to defend them in their rightness.[2] And the Roman pontiff, consulted on this, and his liege priest, asked for the interpretation of the catholic sense, are bound by the gospel law to declare humbly as much as they know; and they are not to be obeyed except in so far as they have founded their teaching in holy scripture.[3] Hence, second, it must be supposed that holy theology must principally regulate every such science. This is clear from the fact that it alone principally teaches the way by which the heavenly marriage is honoured; now every lawful deed of a wayfarer is to be regulated according to this end; therefore the conclusion. And this is the teaching of distinction 20, *De quibus*, where Pope Innocent teaches five degrees of proceeding in deciding doubts. First, in so far as recourse must be had to the authority of scripture, which bishops, and especially the pope, are bound to defend even to [shedding their] blood, as is clear from C. 25 q. 1, *Sunt quidam*. Second, if the solution of the doubt does not shine out clearly from holy scripture in the Latin tongue, let recourse be had to the Greek writings, so that at least in this way the divine teaching may be had. Third, if not even so does the light of truth appear, put your hand to the catholic ecclesiastical histories gathered by the holy doctors. Fourth, if the difficulty that is enquired into does not come clear even by them, call keenly to mind the examples of

fundatur in iure canonico vel civili, sed specialiter in legibus regni nostri et cartis illius ecclesie superius recitatis, quod notetur forma et finis gracia cuius hec privilegia sunt concessa (finis enim ex secundo Phisycorum mensurat omnia media ad eundem), in privilegiis autem regis Edgari triplex finis exprimitur, scilicet reverencia Dei in reliquiis sui apostoli, quies monachorum ibi degencium et honor sanctitatis illius peculiaris basilice in qua degant speciales oratores pro rege et regno de quorum elemosinis ad hoc specialiter sustentantur. Unde in bulla Nicolai III sic habetur: Monachi ibidem nulli omnino persone subdantur nisi regi. Ex quo videtur quod incole illius loci, non solum quia legii homines regis, nec solum quia speciales eius elemosinarii sed ex mandato pape regi suo specialiter sunt subiecti; nam secundum beatum Gregorium multiplicitas beneficiorum auget obligacionem beneficiati ad suum datarium. Ex quo videtur, cum monachi illius loci regi tam singulariter sunt subiecti, nec hospites vel fugitivi sui debent esse plus exempti vel privilegiati quam monachi a quibus emanat privilegium, videtur quod omnes profugi, de quanto sunt in illo loco, regi Anglie quadam preeminencia sunt subiecti ex hoc quod ab eo ibi recipiunt beneficium singulare; nec consonat fidei religionis Christi quod monachus, si per possibile occiderit hominem in dicto loco, erit post liberior et plus percipiens de fructu privilegii, quam quando fuit immunis quoad Deum et [230] hominem magis capax. Nec videtur racionabile quin, supposita capacitate in monacho vel quocunque famulo illius loci, habebit fructum privilegii post delictum eciam pocius quam unus extraneus; aliter enim omnis contumaciter ibi quiescens in crimine ut sic indisponeret se ad habendum privilegium supradictum. Istis premissis videtur mihi (ut alias) quod, licet per totam Angliam indulgeri debet omnimoda remissio, de quanto sonat in misericordiam et non ultra, tamen pro loco Westmonasterii servari debet generalis talis remissio virtute singularis privilegii pie concessi a regibus illi loco. Prima pars patet ex hoc quod privilegia cum (in quantum huiusmodi) sonant per se bonum, sunt racionabiliter amplexanda; nam melius esset quod tota ecclesia haberet privilegium, hoc est, legem ad sui commodum quam quod aliqua pars ecclesie a privilegio vero deficiat, quia de tanto peccat vel punitur de quanto deficit a plenis privilegiis beatorum. Et patet quod nullum est privilegium, nisi de quanto sonat in elemosinam vel opus misericordie, quia non est privilegium, nisi de quanto misericorditer datur a Deo, vergens homini ad profectum. Et secunda pars patet ex hoc quod oportet concessionem regis habere specialem efficaciam ibi diligencius observandam, nam aliter foret frustra. Et ex istis patet quod nullum privilegium est iuri communi contrarium,

the saints; for the examples of the saints' life ought to be to us a mirror of how to live. [229] Fifth, if, when all these have been examined, the nature of the question does not grow clear, let it be decided by decree of the elders of the province gathered for this, with the help of God, who cannot fail his own.[4]

Third, I suppose this. Since the said privilege is not founded in canon or civil law, but specially in the laws of our kingdom and in the charters of that church recited above, note should be taken of the form, and of the end for the sake of which these privileges were granted (for the end, as the second [book] of the *Physics* teaches, measures all the means to it); now in the privileges of King Edgar a threefold end is expressed: namely, reverence for God in the relics of his apostle; the quiet of the monks living there; and the honour of the holiness of that peculiar basilica, in which there live special bedesmen for the king and kingdom, who are maintained specially for this out of their alms.[5] Hence in the bull of Nicholas III it is contained thus: "Let the monks there be subject to no person at all except the king."[6] From which it seems that the inhabitants of that place are specially subject to their king, not only because [they are] the king's liege men, nor only because [they are] his special almsmen, but by the pope's command; for according to blessed Gregory the multiplicity of benefits increases the obligation of the one benefited to his giver.[7] From which it seems (since the monks of that place are so singularly subject to the king, and their guests or fugitives ought not to be more exempt or privileged than the monks from whom the privilege flows), it seems, [I say,] that all refugees, in so far as they are in that place, are subject to the king of England with a certain pre-eminence, from the fact that they receive from him there a singular benefit. Nor does it accord with the faith of the religion of Christ that a monk, if (to suppose what is possible) he should kill a man in the said place, would afterwards be freer and receive more of the fruit of the privilege than when he was guiltless before God and [230] man and more capable [of it]. Nor does it seem reasonable [to deny] that, supposing capacity in a monk or in any servant of that place, he will have the fruit of the privilege after an offence even rather than an outsider; for otherwise everyone resting there obstinately in crime would, as such, make himself unfit to have the aforesaid privilege.[8]

These things premised, it seems to me (as elsewhere) that, although throughout all England remission of every kind ought to be granted, in so far as it tends to mercy and no further, yet for the place of Westminster

nam si foret, tunc esset contra iusticiam et per consequens lex iniqua et non privilegium. Unde videtur mihi omnino insipidum dictum quorundam dicencium quod non esset privilegium nisi foret iuri communi contrarium. Nam licita variacio ritus pro loco et tempore non est contrarium veritati et per consequens nulli legi. Ideo oportet privilegiantes omnino attendere, [231] ne subtrahant iusticiam vel inferant iniuriam alicui. Unde XXV^{a} q. II, Quod vero, dicit Gregorius: Absit hoc a me ut statuta maiorum cum sacerdotibus meis in qualibet ecclesia infringam, quia mihi iniuriam facio, si fratrum meorum iura perturbo. Et indubie idem foret iudicium de quolibet viatore, quod si privilegiando precludit cuicunque iusticiam, dampnificat tam se quam privilegiandum; quod non licet vel Deo facere. Ex istis secundo sequitur quod fugitivi privilegiati in Westmonasterio non ex hinc libertantur, ut non satisfaciant debitori vel quod ibidem maneant pro suo perpetuo sine pena correccionis salubris, sed aliquam defensionem singularem habent ibidem que sonat eis in commodum et non in dampnum vel iniuriam alicui. Prima pars patet, tum quia hoc non sequitur ex tenore verborum privilegii, tum eciam quia hoc non foret libertas vel privilegium sed pravissima corruptela. Nam mandatum apostoli et sic Dei est Rom. XIII° 8: Nemini quidquam debeatis nisi ut invicem diligatis. Quomodo ergo licet creature licenciare aliquem, ut remaneat in debito fratris, non satisfaciens, eciam quoad Deum? Tales itaque hereses si pullulaverint eciam per dominos regni nostri, tenentur prelati destruere. Unde XXV^{a}, q. I, Omne quod, sic scribitur: Iniustum iudicium et diffinicio iniusta regio metu vel iussu a iudicibus ordinata non valeat, nequaquam enim quod contra evangelicam vel propheticam vel apostolicam doctrinam constitucionemve eorum sive sanctorum patrum actum fuerit, stabit. Unde istam doctrinam dicitur Romanos [232] pontifices debere usque ad animam et sanguinem confirmare (ut capitulo proximo precedente). Quomodo ergo stant simul: nulli liceat quidquam debere alteri extra caritativam dilecionem, et tamen fugitivus licenciatur in dicto loco perpetuo debere tam debitum corporale quam spirituale sine hoc quod rependat satisfaccionem. Revera in istam blasphemiam usurpatam Deus non potest, cum non licenciat hominem ad aliquid pro quo dampnat. Secunda autem pars conclusionis patet ex hoc quod oportet aliquod privilegium ex concessione regis dari talibus fugitivis ex conclusione proxima. Et ista sentencia notabiliter docetur XXV^{a}, q. I. Ideo permittente domino, ubi dicitur quod quandocunque Romana ecclesia concedit privilegium, exprimit vel subintelligit, nisi aliter decreverit ordinandum. Unde, inquit, in nonnullis capitulis conciliorum, cum aliquid observandum decernitur, statim

such a general remission ought to be kept, by virtue of the singular privilege piously granted to that place by the kings.[9] The first part is clear from this, that privileges, since (as such) they tend of themselves to good, are reasonably to be embraced; for it would be better that the whole church should have privilege, that is, law for its own advantage, than that any part of the church should fall short of true privilege, since it sins or is punished by so much as it falls short of the full privileges of the blessed. And it is clear that there is no privilege except in so far as it tends to alms or a work of mercy, since there is no privilege except in so far as it is mercifully given by God, turning to a man's profit. And the second part is clear from this, that the king's grant must have a special efficacy, to be observed there more diligently; for otherwise it would be in vain. And from these it is clear that no privilege is contrary to the common law; for if it were, then it would be against justice, and consequently an unjust law and not a privilege. Hence the saying of some, who say that it would not be a privilege unless it were contrary to the common law, seems to me wholly foolish. For a lawful variation of rite for place and time is not contrary to truth, and consequently not to any law.[10] Therefore those who privilege must take every care [231] not to withdraw justice from anyone or inflict injury on anyone. Hence in C. 25 q. 2, *Quod vero*, Gregory says: "Far be this from me, that I should break the statutes of our forebears with my priests in any church; for I do myself injury if I disturb the rights of my brothers." And without doubt the judgment would be the same of any wayfarer: that if by privileging he shuts anyone off from justice, he harms both himself and the one to be privileged; which it is not lawful even for God to do.[11]

From these, second, it follows that the fugitives privileged in Westminster are not thereby set free so as not to satisfy [their creditor], or so as to remain there in perpetuity without the penalty of wholesome correction; but they have there some singular defence, which tends to their advantage and not to the harm or injury of anyone.[12] The first part is clear, both because this does not follow from the tenor of the words of the privilege, and also because this would not be liberty or privilege but the most depraved corruption. For the command of the apostle, and so of God, is Romans 13:8: "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another." How, then, is it lawful for a creature to license anyone to remain in debt to his brother, not making satisfaction, even as regards God? Such heresies, therefore, if they should sprout even through the lords of our kingdom, the prelates are bound to destroy.[13] Hence in C. 25 q. 1, *Omne quod*, it

subinfertur, nisi auctoritas Romane ecclesie aliter fieri imperaverit vel salvo semper in omnibus iure Romane ecclesie vel salva in omnibus apostolica auctoritate. Cum ergo alia privilegia ab apostolico aliquibus conceduntur, et si contra generalem legem aliquid sonare videantur, non tamen contra ipsam aliquid concedere intelliguntur. Privilegia, inquit, dicuntur quasi privata legia; et concludit finaliter: Valet ergo Romana ecclesia extra generalia decreta quedam speciali beneficio indulgere, considerata tamen racionis equitate, ut mater iusticie in nullo ab ea dissentire inveniatur, ut videlicet privilegia que ob religionis vel necessitatis vel exhibiti obsequii graciam conceduntur, neminem relevando ita divitem faciant, ut multorum detrimenta non circumspiciendo in paupertatis miseriam nonnullos deiciant.

is written thus: "An unjust judgment and an unjust definition, ordained by judges through a king's fear or command, shall not be valid; for in no way shall anything stand that has been done against the evangelical or prophetic or apostolic doctrine, or their constitution, or [that] of the holy fathers." Hence it is said that the Roman [232] **pontiffs ought to confirm this doctrine even to [the giving of] life and blood (as in the chapter immediately preceding).[14] How, then, do these stand together: that it is lawful for no one to owe anything to another beyond the love of charity, and yet a fugitive is licensed in the said place to owe perpetually both a bodily and a spiritual debt without paying back satisfaction? Truly God cannot [consent] to this usurped blasphemy, since he does not license a man to anything for which he damns [him].[15] And the second part of the conclusion is clear from this, that some privilege must be given to such fugitives from the king's grant, by the preceding conclusion.**

And this teaching is notably taught in C. 25 q. 1, *Ideo permittente domino*, where it is said that whenever the Roman church grants a privilege, it expresses or understands [the clause] "unless it should decree that it be ordered otherwise". "Hence," it says, "in some chapters of the councils, when something is decreed to be observed, there is at once added: 'unless the authority of the Roman church should command it to be done otherwise', or 'saving always in all things the right of the Roman church', or 'saving in all things the apostolic authority'. When, therefore, other privileges are granted to some by the apostolic [pontiff], even if they seem to say something against the general law, yet they are not understood to grant anything against it." "Privileges," it says, "are so called as being private laws (*privata legia*)"; and it concludes finally: "The Roman church, therefore, has power to grant certain things by special favour outside the general decrees, yet with regard had to the equity of reason, so that the mother of justice may be found in nothing to dissent from it: that is, so that privileges, which are granted for the sake of religion, or of necessity, or of service rendered, may not, by relieving someone, make him so rich that, through failing to look to the losses of many, they cast some into the misery of poverty."[16]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Cap. XI* (227.20). *Elemosina tantorum principum*: the royal grants to Westminster discussed in cap. 10, treated as alms. *Occasione male accepta*: occasion taken amiss, as of the heretics' misuse of scripture. *Utrobique*: in both respects, *re* and *nomine*. *Cum illius sit ... rex autem ... ideo*: one sentence in the Latin, a *cum* clause holding both premisses; the English sets out the syllogism (major; "now" for the minor, *autem*; "therefore", *ideo*) rather than keep "since ... and [since]".

2. Side-note 228.2. Loserth (227.28): C. 25 q. 1 c. 16 and X 5.39.31 (our modern form of his references); the words Wyclif uses are Gratian's dictum after c. 16, §§1–4 (Friedberg I, 1011–12). B reads *concedere* for *condere* (227.28); the print is translated. *Autem* brings the second premiss (the king makes these laws), hence "[since]". *Leges privatas*: private laws, the etymology of *privilegium* quoted at the end of this paragraph.
3. *Sacerdos suus legius*: the king's liege priest, i.e. a priest of his realm bound to him in allegiance; *suus* refers to the king, not the pope. B omits *suus* (228.7) and reads *humiliter declinare* (228.9); the print is translated. Side-note 228.12.
4. A in the margin *Nota quomodo est dubium discernendum* (228.17); B in the margin *Ad quem quis debet recurrere pro dubiis discrete decidendis* (228.25). The manuscripts read *dist. XXI*; Loserth prints *XX* (228.17). Loserth: Wyclif draws the five degrees, "with some words changed", from D. 20 c. 3 and C. 25 q. 1 c. 6; the five degrees are the canon's own words as Gratian prints it (ascribed to Innocent I; Friedberg I, 66), Wyclif adding *in lingua latina*. B corrects *mitte* to *mittere* (228.27). *Recordare*: imperative.
5. Side-notes 229.5–229.17 (their a), b), c) follow Wyclif's threefold end). A in the margin *Conclusio. Nota quomodo sunt privilegia intelligenda* (229.18). Aristotle, *Physics* II.3 (Loserth, 229.9). *Apostoli*: St Peter, Westminster's patron (side-note 229.10). *Peculiaris basilice*: that "peculiar" church, taken as Westminster's standing as a royal foundation exempt from the bishop; it may mean only "special". *De quorum elemosinis*: the alms of the king and realm.
6. B in the margin *Bulla Nicolai III* (229.16). The words are from the privilege of Nicholas II (1059–61) to Edward the Confessor, inserted in Edward's (spurious) charter to Westminster (Kemble, *Codex diplomaticus* IV, no. 825, pp. 183–4; Sawyer 1041); Wyclif's and the margin's "III" is an error, which Loserth's reference at 206.26 repeats.
7. The saying ascribed to Gregory (gifts increase the account owed for them) is *Hom. in Ev.* 9.1, *Cum enim augentur dona, rationes etiam crescunt donorum* (PL 76:1106), paraphrased; Loserth does not locate it. *Datarium*: the giver.
8. *Videtur ... videtur*: Wyclif restarts the sentence after the *cum* clause; we keep the repetition. A reads *preminencia* (229.28); B omits *per* in *per possibile* (229.31). *Immunis quoad Deum et hominem*: guiltless before God and man (cf. 239 on *immunitas*). *Nec ... quin*: a double negative, "it is reasonable that". *Aliter*: if the privilege did not depend on capacity, i.e. on worthiness. Side-note 229.31.
9. A in the margin *Prima conclusio* (230.7). The conclusion has two parts (*remissio* in all England only as mercy allows; a general remission kept at Westminster), proved in turn below. *Sonat in*: tends to (as 10-f). *Ut alias*: as elsewhere, perhaps *De civ. dom.*; not identified.
10. A and A_1 read *ex hoc cum privilegia* (230.12), A *sonant* (230.20); the print is translated. A in the margin *Correlarium* (230.19, 230.25); B in the margin *Privilegium non est communi iuri contrarium* (230.26). *Ius commune*: the general law (of the church), not the English common law. The view rejected (a privilege is by definition against the common law) is the canonists'; Gratian (D. 3 c. 3) gives only Isidore's *privilegia sunt leges privatorum*, and the gloss that sets privilege against *ius commune* is not traced.
11. Loserth: C. 25 q. 2 c. 10 (231.2). *Cum sacerdotibus meis*: Friedberg reads *consacerdotibus meis*, "my fellow priests"; *cum sacerdotibus*, Wyclif's reading, is that of the old editions (Friedberg I, 1014). *Vel Deo*: "even for God", since God cannot do injustice.
12. A in the margin *Secunda conclusio* (231.10); side-note 231.10. *Debitori*: the print has "debtor"; the sense requires the one to whom the debt is owed, and we translate "[their creditor]". Whether *debitor* here is Wyclif's slip or a loose use we leave open. *Pro suo perpetuo*: literally "for their perpetuity", i.e. for life.
13. Romans 13:8, as the Vulgate; DR. The manuscripts read *Rom. XII*; Loserth corrects (231.20). *Eciam quoad Deum*: the debt is owed to God as well as to the brother. B in the margin *Est hic manifeste elicibile quod non licet contra apostolum dispensare* (231.28), an early reader taking the point as a limit on dispensation.
14. Loserth: C. 25 q. 1 c. 8 (231.25); *Omne quod inreprehensibile est* is the canon's incipit, and Wyclif quotes its § 1 (Friedberg I, 1009). *Eorum*: of the evangelists, prophets and apostles. *Capitulo proximo precedente*: probably the preceding canon of the same *quaestio* (*Sunt quidam*, c. 6, cited at 228.20), though it could mean cap. 10 of this treatise.
15. A and A_1 read *extra caritatem* (232.4); the print is translated. *Deus non potest*: Loserth notes that a verb seems to be wanting (232.8); we supply "[consent]". Side-note 232.3.
16. C. 25 q. 1 c. 16, *Ideo permittente*, here quoted at length as Gratian's text, with *inquit* for its author. B omits from *vel salva* to *conceduntur* (232.19); A reads *que vel* (232.30). The manuscripts read *pauperis*; Loserth corrects to *paupertatis* from the Decretum (232.33). *Mater iusticie*: the Roman church; *ab ea*: from equity. *Privata legia*: the etymology of *privilegium*, kept in Latin.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 227: *CAP. XI.*
  - 228: *XX*ª
  - 228: *XXV*ª (italic)
  - 229: *Cum* (B 3 are the alinea letter and argument numeral)
  - 229: *iure*
  - 229: *superius* [NW]
  - 229: *Edgari* (letterspaced)
  - 229: *scilicet* (glued 'the' is the English side-note)
  - 229: *apostoli* [NW]
  - 229: *rege* (15 is the line number)
  - 229: *legii*
  - 229: *singulare* (30 is the line number)
  - 229: *Christi*

- **230:** ***per*** **(C is the alinea letter)**
- **230:** ***Angliam***
- **230:** ***attendere*** **(atten-/dere hyphenated; main token holds whole word)**
- **231:** ***XXV***^{a} **(25 is the line number)**
- **232:** ∅ **(print has sangui-/nem; main already holds sanguinem whole at pos 6)**
- **232:** ***licenciatur*** **[NW]**
- **232:** ***XXV***^{a}
- **232:** ***legia*** **(italic; print legia;) [NW]**

Part 2: Three corollaries: privilege implies reason; punishment as the fugitive's privilege; no courts or fairs in holy places

Loserth pp. 233.1–237.33

¶1 233.1–237.33

233.1 *All privileges must be reasonable and not injurious,*
233.11 *and this condition must always be understood, however the words of the privilege run,*
233.26 *By virtue of this very privilege many fugitives should be punished;*
234.1 *since it would be to their advantage.*
234.7 *If the King had a wrong purpose his mistake should be corrected.*
234.14 *Not to punish the wicked is to support them.*
234.24 *The monks cannot have quiet, if they are disturbed by sin.*
235.4 *Redress cannot be had within the Sanctuary; a) because it is not a proper court of justice;*
235.10 *b) to hold trials there would disturb the monks;*
235.13 *c) to use a church as a court of law is to violate it.*
236.10 *Whoever sins mortally in a Church steals its protection.*
236.26 *Church dignitaries should not allow fairs etc. to be held in Churchyards;*
237.8 *nor the King's court to sit in the house of the Lord.*

[233]**Ex istis patet triplex correlarium: primum declaracio et confirmacio descripcionis supradicti privilegii; secundo patet, cum actus privilegiandi regum terre exemplari debet a privilegiacione sancte Romane ecclesie, quam oportet subintelligere condicionem sicut oportet et Deum a quo est omnis privilegiacio exemplata: necesse est reges terre subintelligere racionabilitatem privilegii, sic quod non sonet in alicuius iniuriam; quod si ignoranter fecerit, error perceptus debet statim ex mandato Christi et eius pura licencia revocari. Et patet tercio stultum esse ex nudis verbis privilegii aliqua vocata privilegia que sunt manifesti errores concludere, quia (ut patet V° Ethicorum cap. ultimo De Epykeya) necesse est in talibus subintelligere condicionem captam a fine; aliter enim preter triplex inconveniens (deductum in proximo capitulo) sequeretur manifesta blasphemia, ut puta, rex Anglie concedit cuilibet tali fugitivo omnimodam libertatem, sed libertas a peccato est maxima, sine qua non est aliqua vera libertas, ergo rex concedit cuilibet tali ipsum esse liberum a peccato. Quod cum sonat blasphemiam, manifestum est quod hec non fuit regis intencio sed quod haberent quodcunque terrenum privilegium tam in bonis nature quam in bonis fortune quod sue subiacet potestati. Ex istis tercio colligitur quod virtute dicti privilegii multi fugitivi ad dictum locum debent in casu acute puniri, bonis alienis que occupant privari et aliis medicinis tam corporalibus quam spiritualibus ad salutem anime sue tendentibus expurgari. Patet ex hoc quod ibi virtute privilegii habebunt quod** [234]**nocius vergit ad sui commodum, sed hoc foret in casu huiusmodi medicina; ergo conclusio. Unde movet ad hoc privilegiacio regis, finis, gracia cuius privilegium conceditur illi loco, et utilitas quam caritative rex debet intendere fugitivo. Si enim rex erranter intenderit finem illi oppositum, tunc si ab illo errore purgatus non fuerit, pena sua ex quacunque malicia que directe exinde sequitur, aggravatur, et nedum hoc sed peccatum regum dominorum et prelatorum superstitum,**

From these a threefold corollary is clear. First, the declaration and confirmation of the definition of the aforesaid privilege.[1] It is clear, second (since the act of privileging by the kings of the earth must be copied from the privileging of the holy Roman church, which must tacitly understand a condition, as God too must, from whom all privileging is copied), that the kings of the earth must tacitly understand the reasonableness of the privilege, so that it may not tend to anyone's injury; and if [a king] has done so in ignorance, the error, once perceived, must at once be revoked, by Christ's command and by his pure licence.[2] And it is clear, third, that it is foolish to infer from the bare words of a privilege some so-called privileges which are manifest errors; because (as is clear from the fifth [book] of the *Ethics*, last chapter, on *epieikeia*) in such things one must tacitly understand a condition taken from the end. For otherwise, besides the threefold absurdity (drawn out in the preceding chapter), a manifest blasphemy would follow: for example, the king of England grants to every such fugitive liberty of every kind; now freedom from sin is the greatest, without which there is no true liberty at all; therefore the king grants to every such man that he be free from sin.[3] Since this tends to blasphemy, it is manifest that this was not the king's intention, but that they should have whatever earthly privilege lies within his power, both in goods of nature and in goods of fortune.

From these, third, it is gathered that by virtue of the said privilege many fugitives to the said place ought in [such a] case to be sharply punished, deprived of the goods of others that they occupy, and purged by other medicines, both bodily and spiritual, tending to the health of their souls. This is clear from the fact that there, by virtue of the privilege, they will have what [234]**rather turns to their advantage; now in such a case this would be medicine; therefore the conclusion.[4] Hence three things move to**

237.15 *As to the fugitives it is not a privilege to them to be encouraged in their sin.*

qui correpcionem illam quam debent ex accidia pretermittunt. Nam LXXXIII[a] distinccione sic scribitur: Error cui non resistitur approbatur, et veritas cum minime defensatur opprimitur. Negligere quippe, cum possis perturbare perversos, non est aliud quam fovere. Nec caret scrupulo societatis occulte qui manifesto facinori desinit obviare. Et utinam nostri domini, nostri prelati et nostri scolastici attenderent illud dictum; nam totus labor scolasticus debet tendere ad hunc finem propter zelum ad dominum veritatis in quem offenditur. Et ad idem sonat quies monachorum ibi degencium; cum enim omnis nociva perturbacio trahit originem a peccato, patet quod monachi non quietarentur sed turbarentur ex favore et assistencia peccatorum. Et si dicitur quod est eis lucrum, cum fugitivi condividunt temporalia que apportant, superadditur accusans gravacio quod tam sancti viri, tam alienati a mundo, sint socii furum, communicantes cum excommunicatis, impedientibus suam contemplacionem et quietem in domino, quia Isaie IX°, 5, scribitur: Omnis violenta predacio cum tumultu. Ymmo cum loci sanctitas [235]precipue trahitur ab inhabitantibus illum locum, patet quod talis monachorum infeccio derogat sanctitati et reverencie loci quam rex privilegians intendebat. Nec valet dicere (ut audivi quosdam fingere) quod infra locum haberent iniuriati contra profugos respondentes ibidem iusticie complementum. Primo quia ritus regni laudabilis in habendo forum contenciosum in loco prophano non debet in domum oracionis vel locum sanctum propter tale maleficium transmutari. Secundo quia monachis pro quorum quiete rex tam tenere procuravit inferretur dampnum anime, quia inquietacio a contemplacione distrahens cuius oppositum privilegians intendebat. Tercio quia contra ius divinum et ius ecclesie est violare sponsam Christi vel locum eius. Unde VI° Decretalium, De immunitate ecclesie, cap. Decet, postquam ostenditur ex scriptura quod multipliciter decet sanctitas domum Dei, sic infertur: Nullus in locis eisdem in quibus cum pace ac quiete vota convenit celebrari, sedicionem excitet, conclamacionem moveat, impetumve committat; cessent in illis universitatum et societatum quelibet consilia, concertaciones et publica parliamenta; cessent vana et multo forcius feda et prophana colloquia, cessent confabulaciones quelibet, sed postremo quecunque alia que divinum possent turbare officium aut oculos divine maiestatis offendere sint ab ipsis prorsus extranea, ne ubi peccatorum est venia postulanda, ibi peccandi detur occasio aut deprehendantur peccata committi. cessent in ecclesiis earumque cimiteriis negociaciones et precipue nundinarum ac fori cuiuscunque [236]tumultus. Omnis in eis secularium iudiciorum strepitus conquiescat. Nulla inibi causa per laycos criminalis maxime

this: the king's privileging; the end for the sake of which the privilege is granted to that place; and the benefit which the king, in charity, ought to intend for the fugitive. For if the king in error intended an end opposed to that, then, if he has not been purged of that error, his punishment is aggravated by whatever malice follows directly from it; and not only this, but [so is] the sin of the surviving kings, lords and prelates who out of sloth omit the correction they owe.[5] For in distinction 83 it is written thus: "An error that is not resisted is approved, and truth, when it is not defended, is crushed. For to neglect to disturb the perverse, when you can, is nothing other than to foster them. Nor is he free from the scruple of a hidden fellowship who ceases to oppose a manifest crime." And would that our lords, our prelates and our schoolmen attended to that saying! For the whole labour of the schools ought to tend to this end, out of zeal for the Lord of truth, against whom offence is given.[6]

And the quiet of the monks living there tends to the same. For since every hurtful disturbance draws its origin from sin, it is clear that the monks would not be quieted but disturbed by favour to and support of sinners. And if it is said that it is gain for them, since the fugitives share out the temporal goods they bring, an accusing aggravation is added: that men so holy, so estranged from the world, should be companions of thieves, communicating with the excommunicate, who hinder their contemplation and quiet in the Lord; for in Isaiah 9:5 it is written: "Every violent taking of spoils [is] with tumult." Indeed, since the holiness of a place [235]is drawn chiefly from those who dwell in it, it is clear that such an infection of the monks detracts from the holiness and reverence of the place which the privileging king intended.[7]

Nor does it avail to say (as I have heard some feign) that within the place those injured would have the full measure of justice against the refugees, who would answer [at law] there.[8] First, because the praiseworthy usage of the kingdom, of holding the contentious court in a profane place, ought not, for such wrongdoing, to be transferred into the house of prayer or a holy place. Second, because harm of soul would be inflicted on the monks, for whose quiet the king provided so tenderly, since [there would be] disquiet drawing them away from contemplation, the opposite of which the privileger intended. Third, because it is against divine law and the law of the church to violate the bride of Christ or her place. Hence in the Sext, *De immunitate ecclesiarum*, chapter *Decet*, after it is shown from scripture that holiness becomes the house of God in many

agitetur; sint loca eadem a laicorum congregacionibus aliena. Hec ibi. Quomodo queso foret ecclesia fomentum criminum? vel quoscunque in ipsam committentes defenderet? Unde super verbo Sedicionem dicit glossa quod committens furtum in ecclesia non habebit inmunitatem in ea et hoc tenet Hostiensis, et bene, cum frustra invocat loci suffragium qui fedat eundem. Cum ergo quicunque offendit in uno factus est omnium reus, manifestum est quod omnis peccans mortaliter intra ecclesiam furatur spirituale suffragium, quo Deus plus offenditur quam pro furto temporalium, ymmo cum omnis occupans temporalia in mortali, deficit a iure utendi quocunque, pro tunc manifestum est quod furatur bona ecclesie in qua pausat. Si ergo ille sit prevaricator precepti decimi: quicunque iniuste cupierit aliena, multo magis ille est prevaricator decalogi qui fraudulenter et iniuste detinet aliena. Si ergo non licet alicui dispensare cum aliquo preceptorum domini, manifestum videtur quod non subiacet potestati humane privilegiare locum vel hominem, ut liceat sibi vivere contra mandatum dominicum. Et hic mirantur nonnulli, cum sit ad privilegium locis sanctis quod eximantur a quocunque tumultu secularis negocii, quomodo superiores prepositi ecclesie, scilicet episcopi, priores et abbates nedum permittunt sed vendicant ut privilegium et pertinaciter defendunt, quod in ecclesiis suis ac cimiteriis suis sint nundine et secularia negocia que nunquam sine dolo et crimine multiplici exercentur. Cum autem non est possibile ut duo contraria sint simul privilegium eidem ecclesie, manifestum est quod vel oportet negare privilegium iuris divini ac iuris canonici de exempcione [237] ecclesie a tumultu negocii secularis vel concedere hoc esse privilegium impediens bonos mores. Et credo quod nostri ecclesiastici isti sentencie annuerent, si non essent lucro temporalium excecati, cuius probacio foret, si princeps tolleret questum, renunciaretur privilegium; sed sceleratissimum videtur atque sacrilegum pro pecuniis vendere divinum privilegium. Et per idem tollitur quod leges Anglie non mutarentur pretextu erroris in hoc privilegio, introducendo bancum regis, eius iudicem vel placitum seculare in domum domini; tunc enim foret novissimus error peior priore, cum error ignorancie factus in Deum augeretur supplecius per supinum contemptum; nam unum peccatum illaqueando profundius trahit ad aliud. Quoad terciam personam, scilicet fugientes, patet quod privilegians intendit commodum fugitivi, quia aliter non esset sibi elemosina vel opus misericordie sed omnino contrarium, si intenderet dampnificare proximum. Quod autem esset in casu fugitivo privilegium sic puniri, patet supponendo aliquos occasione male accepta ex securitate talis refugii iniuriari proximis et sic

ways, it is inferred thus: "Let no one, in the same places in which it is fitting that vows be celebrated with peace and quiet, stir up sedition, raise an outcry, or commit violence; let there cease in them all councils of corporations and societies, disputes and public parliaments; let vain talk cease, and much more foul and profane talk; let all chatter cease; but, finally, let whatever else could disturb the divine office or offend the eyes of the divine majesty be wholly foreign to them, lest where pardon for sins is to be asked, there occasion of sinning be given, or sins be found committed. Let there cease in churches and their cemeteries trading, and especially the tumult of fairs and of any market [236]. Let all the din of secular judgments be quiet in them. Let no cause, especially a criminal one, be pleaded there by laymen; let the same places be strangers to gatherings of laymen." Thus far there.[9] How, I ask, could the church be a fomenter of crimes, or defend any who offend against it? Hence on the word *Sedicionem* the gloss says that one who commits theft in a church shall not have immunity in it; and Hostiensis holds this, and rightly, since he invokes the aid of a place in vain who defiles it.[10]

Since, then, whoever offends in one point is become guilty of all, it is manifest that everyone who sins mortally within a church steals [its] spiritual aid, by which God is offended more than by a theft of temporal goods. Indeed, since everyone who occupies temporal goods in mortal [sin] falls short of the right of using anything, it is then manifest that he steals the goods of the church in which he rests.[11] If, then, he is a transgressor of the tenth commandment who unjustly covets the goods of others, much more is he a transgressor of the decalogue who fraudulently and unjustly withholds the goods of others. If, then, it is not lawful for anyone to dispense with any of the Lord's commandments, it seems manifest that it is not within human power to privilege a place or a man so that it may be lawful for him to live against the Lord's command.[12]

And here some wonder how, since it is a privilege for holy places that they be exempted from every tumult of secular business, the higher superiors of the church, namely bishops, priors and abbots, not only permit but claim as a privilege, and obstinately defend, that in their churches and their cemeteries there be fairs and secular business, which are never carried on without fraud and manifold crime. Now, since it is not possible that two contraries be at once a privilege to the same church, it is manifest that one must either deny the privilege of divine law and canon law concerning the exemption [237] of the church from the tumult of secular

dampnificare animas proprias per peccatum. Suppono secundo quod maius opus misericordie foret impedire occidentem sic animam propriam quam occidere volentem nudum corpus. Et ex istis tercio sic arguitur: Omne maius bonum opus misericordie est pocius inpendendum, sed maius bonum opus misericordie est subtrahere bonum a tali in casu signato et castigare freneticos ad salutem eorum perpetuam, quam egentem solum in bonis corporalibus taliter relevare; ergo illam elemosinam potens pocius debet inpendere. Supposito ergo casu de fugitivis, sic alibi nocentibus, patet conclusio.

business, or grant that this is a privilege that hinders good morals.[13] And I believe that our clergy would assent to this teaching if they were not blinded by the gain of temporal goods; the proof of which would be [this]: if the prince took away the profit, the privilege would be renounced. But it seems most wicked and sacrilegious to sell a divine privilege for money.[14] And by the same token [that reply] is disposed of, so that the laws of England should not be changed, on the pretext of an error in this privilege, by bringing the King's Bench, its judge, or secular pleading into the house of the Lord; for then "the last error would be worse than the first", since an error of ignorance committed against God would be more fully increased by supine contempt; for one sin, ensnaring, draws [a man] more deeply to another.[15]

As to the third person, namely those who flee, it is clear that the privileger intends the advantage of the fugitive; for otherwise it would not be alms or a work of mercy to him, but wholly the contrary, if he intended to harm his neighbour. Now, that in [such a] case it would be a privilege to a fugitive to be so punished is clear, supposing that some, taking occasion amiss from the security of such a refuge, injure their neighbours and so harm their own souls by sin.[16] I suppose, second, that it would be a greater work of mercy to hinder one who thus kills his own soul than one who wishes to kill a bare body. And from these, third, it is argued thus: every greater good work of mercy is rather to be bestowed; now it is a greater good work of mercy to withdraw a good from such a man in the case specified, and to chastise the frenzied for their everlasting health, than in this way to relieve one who is needy only in bodily goods; therefore one who is able ought rather to bestow that alms. Supposing, then, the case of fugitives who have thus done harm elsewhere, the conclusion is clear.[17]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Triplex correlarium* (233.1); side-note 233.1. A and A_1 read *supradicte*, agreeing with *descripcionis* ("the aforesaid definition", 233.2); the print, with *supradicti* agreeing with *privilegii*, is translated, and the sense is the same: the definition of privilege given in cap. 8 and at the end of 11-a.
2. *Quam oportet subintelligere condicionem*: the Roman church must understand a tacit condition (the clause *nisi aliter decreverit*, 232.13 ff.); *exemplata* agrees with *privilegiacio*: every privileging is copied from God's. B reads *nobilitatem privilegii* (233.8); the print is translated. *Fecerit*: the subject is a king (singular after *reges*).
3. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* V, the chapter on equity (*epieikeia*), Loserth's V c. 14 (233.13). B reads *quadruplex* (233.16), apparently for *triplex*. *Inconveniens* is CONTEXTUAL; here the absurd consequences of the bare-words reading, drawn out in cap. 10 (where is not identified here). A in the margin *Nota* (233.17).
4. A in the margin *Tercia conclusio* (233.26); side-notes 233.26, 234.1. *Ex istis tercio*: the third corollary of 233.1, stated as a conclusion. *In casu*: in the case specified (237.15 ff.), of fugitives who have done harm.
5. A and B in the margin *Triplex mocio* (234.2): three things move to this conclusion. *Regum dominorum et prelatorum superstitum*: the kings, lords and prelates who survive the king and fail to correct his error. Side-note 234.7.
6. D. 83 c. 3 (Loserth, 234.11). B reads *opprimit* (234.13). A in the margin *LXXXIII, q. Nota, Nota*; B in the margin, second hand, *Error cui non resistitur approbatur* (234.11). Side-note 234.14.

7. Isaiah 9:5 (Vulgate numbering); DR. The manuscripts read *violencia*, as the Clementine Vulgate (*violentia praedatio*); Loserth "corrects" to *violenta* from Isaiah (234.30), and his text is translated, which DR's "violent taking of spoils" also gives. A and A_1 read *dicitur quod cum eis lucrum fugitivi* (234.25). *Peccatorum*: of sinners (or of sins). *Impedientibus*: the excommunicate, who hinder the monks. Side-note 234.24.
8. A and B in the margin *Responsio ficta* (235.4); side-note 235.4 (its a), b), c) follow Wyclif's *primo*, *secundo*, *tercio*). *Respondentes*: the refugees, answering suits there. *Iusticie complementum*: the full measure of justice.
9. *Liber Sextus* 3.23.2, *Decet domum Domini* (Loserth: *Sexti decret.* lib. III, tit. XXIII, cap. II, 235.15; our modern form); the canon (Gregory X at Lyons II; Friedberg II, 1061) cites no verse: *decet … sanctitas* echoes Psalm 92:5 (Vulgate *domum tuam decet sanctitudo*), and its *in nomine Iesu* passages allude to Phil. 2:10 and Acts 4:12; for Wyclif's *congregacionibus* Friedberg reads *cognitionibus*. The manuscripts read *infereretur* (235.11). Loserth notes the canon reads *concilia, conciones* where Wyclif has *consilia, concertaciones* (235.20–21); Wyclif's words are translated. A and A_1 read *peccata quieta* (235.28). A in the margin *Nota pro immunitate ecclesiarum* (235.15) and *Nota contra nundinas et secularia negocia in locis sacris*; B in the margin *Que prohibentur fieri in ecclesiis et earum cimiteriis* (235.29).
10. The gloss on *Sedicionem* in the same canon, and Hostiensis (Henry of Segusio) holding the same: neither identified by Loserth. Hostiensis: *Summa aurea* III, *De immunitate ecclesiae*, *Quid si committit furtum in ecclesia, nunquid defendetur? Non videtur … frustra legis auxilium invocat* (though he then reports Goffredus *contra*); the gloss is untraced. The maxim is that of 224.15 (*frustra legis auxilium invocat*). B in the margin, second hand, *Furtum in ecclesia* (236.11).
11. James 2:10, unmarked by Wyclif; DR "is become guilty of all". *Spirituale suffragium*: the church's spiritual aid (as 226.11). *In mortali*: in mortal sin. The forfeiture of all right of use by mortal sin is Wyclif's doctrine of lordship founded in grace. Side-note 236.10.
12. B reads *sit privilegiator* for *sit prevaricator* (236.17); the print is translated. *Precepti decimi*: the commandment against coveting (Exod. 20:17), counted as the tenth.
13. A in the margin *Conclusio* (236.31); side-note 236.26. *Superiores prepositi*: the higher superiors, named as bishops, priors and abbots. *Hoc*: holding fairs and business in churches. *Autem* brings the premiss that two contraries cannot both be privileges.
14. *Ecclesiastici* is CONTEXTUAL; here the clergy who claim fairs as a privilege. *Sentencia*: the teaching just stated.
15. *Per idem tollitur quod*: taken as "[that reply] is disposed of" (the *responsio ficta* of 235.4), with *quod* "so that"; the alternative is "by the same token it is settled that the laws of England should not be changed", which gives the same sense. Matthew 27:64, unmarked; DR, with Wyclif's *foret* ("would be") for the Vulgate's *erit*. *Supinum contemptum*: after the canonists' *ignorantia supina*, negligent ignorance. *Bancum regis*: the King's Bench. Side-note 237.8.
16. B omits *scilicet* (237.15) and reads *quod rex privilegians* (237.16); A reads *privilegii refugii* (237.21); the print is translated. A in the margin *Conclusio* (237.17) and *Nota contra pretensam immunitatem ecclesiarum* (237.24). Side-note 237.15. *Terciam personam*: the third party, after the king and the monks.
17. A in the margin *Tercio racio* (237.26). B reads *Maius opus* without *bonum* (237.27–28); A and A_1 read *supposito casu* without *ergo* (237.32). *Subtrahere bonum*: to withdraw a good (the goods he occupies). *Freneticos*: the frenzied, the image taken up from Augustine in 11-c. *Alibi*: outside the sanctuary.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 234: *et* (161 is the folio mark)
  - 234: *LXXXIIIª*
  - 234: *violenta* (italic; c is the alinea letter) [NW]
  - 235: ∅ (G is the alinea letter; Nec is pos 21)
  - 235: *iniuriati* [NW]
  - 235: *forum* (f)
  - 237: ∅ (print has nothing between ecclesie and a; the inserted run is the end of p.236)
  - 235: *precipue* (161c folio mark glued)

Part 3: Correction as medicine; what immunity is; the first objection answered

Loserth pp. 238.1–242.18

¶1 238.1–238.27

238.1 *Christ chastises those whom he loves.*

[238] Confirmatur primo ex hoc quod Christus medicus sapientissimus et clementissimus ita facit cum suis discipulis quos plus amat (ut declarat beatus Gregorius XXI° Moralium, et recitatum est proximo capitulo). Unde Apoc. III°, 19, dicit is medicus: Ego quos amo arguo et castigo, et Hebr. XII°, 16, 19, dicitur: Flagellat autem Deus omnem filium quem recipit. Secundo confirmatur ex testimonio Augustini posito in decretis XXIIIª q. IV. Ipsa pietas, ubi sic scribitur: Molestus

This is confirmed, first, from the fact that Christ, the wisest and most merciful physician, does so with his disciples, whom he loves more (as blessed Gregory declares in the twenty-first [book] of the *Moralia*, and as was recited in the preceding chapter). Hence in Apocalypse 3:19 this physician says: "Such as I love, I rebuke and chastise"; and in Hebrews 12:6 it is said: "And God scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."[1]

est medicus furenti frenetico et pater indisciplinato filio: ille ligando iste cedendo, sed ambo diligendo. Si autem illos negligant et perire permittant, ista falsa mansuetudo foret crudelitas, V^a, q. IV^a. Non vos, et Non omnis. Et ponit post exemplum quomodo existentibus pluribus amicis in domo certissime ruitura, si nollent credere narracioni periculi, flagellaremus vel invite extraheremus aliquem, licet credamus quod aliquis se stulte precipitet. Multo magis in maiori periculo spirituali. Unde XXIII°, q. IV^a. Quid faciet, dicitur quod ad hoc datur ecclesie medicina, ut inter freneticos atque litargicos eciam contempnentes non debet desistere sic quod perseveret diligencia caritatis, ligando freneticum et litargicum stimulando. Quotlibet tales sunt leges que idem sentenciant. Si ergo tantum sit peccatum in omittentibus habentibus potestatem, manifestius et inexcusabilius est peccatum in speculatore qui ommittendo proderit veritatem.

Second, it is confirmed from the testimony of Augustine set down in the Decretum, C. 23 q. 4, *Ipsa pietas*, where it is written thus: "The physician is troublesome to the raving frenzied man, and the father to the undisciplined son: the one by binding, the other by beating, but both by loving." But if they should neglect them and let them perish, this false gentleness would be cruelty: C. 5 q. 5, *Non vos* and *Non omnis*.[2] And afterwards he gives an example: how, if several friends were in a house most certainly about to fall, and they would not believe the report of the danger, we would beat someone or drag him out against his will, even though we believe that someone may foolishly throw himself down. Much more in a greater, spiritual danger.[3] Hence in C. 23 q. 4, *Quid faciet*, it is said that medicine is given to the church for this: that among the frenzied and the lethargic, even those who scorn [it], it ought not to desist, so that the diligence of charity may persevere, binding the frenzied and goading the lethargic. Any number of such laws pronounce the same. If, then, the sin is so great in those having power who omit [this], more manifest and more inexcusable is the sin in the watchman who by omitting betrays the truth.[4]

¶2 238.28–239.31
239.6 *To sum up: The fugitives should have all liberty that is good tor themselves and for others.*

[238] Cum ergo (ut tactum est superius) non stat duo contraria esse simul privilegia eidem, et secundum idem patet cum casu limitato, foret privilegium fugitivo [239] ligari et pungi, non foret tunc idem privilegium in facultatibus et pena relaxari, quia revera omnis taliter cupidus fastus et questus est furens freneticus et soporatus litargicus ex fumo temporalium inficiencium cerebrum racionis. Et patet per modum epilogi quomodo oportet privilegium sic interpretari quod fugitivi ad locum sic privilegiatum pro quocunque commisso habeant libertatem vel immunitatem omnimodam secundum regulas caritatis et misericordie a rege et regno cum paribus eis dandam, sic quod omne dandum sonet tam eis quam dantibus bonum utile. De diversitate vero inter crimen, facinus atque flagicium dictum est XXV° cap., libri VI^i quomodo facinus sonat in proximi iniuriam; de quiditate autem privilegii dictum est superius, VIII° cap. huius libri; et cum oportet ut intelligatur libertas a peccato (ut loquitur Apostolus Rom. VI°, 22); patet quod immunitas pertinenter est indignitas criminis ad tormentum (ut loquitur scriptura Jeremie XXV° et Ecclesiasticus VII° cap.). Communiter autem intelligitur de mundicia a facinore quod in Anglia dicitur felonia, et est quedam species libertatis quam quidam vocant franchisiam et sumitur nunc extensius et nunc striccius. Unde immunis dicitur ab in et munium tributum, quasi liber a reddicione

Since, then (as was touched on above), it cannot be that two contraries are at once privileges to the same [person] and in the same respect, it is clear that, since in the case specified it would be a privilege to the fugitive [239] to be bound and goaded, it would not then likewise be a privilege [to him] to be released in his goods and his penalty; because truly everyone so greedy of pomp and gain is a raving frenzied man and a drowsy lethargic, from the fumes of temporal goods infecting the brain of reason.[5] And it is clear, by way of epilogue, how the privilege must be so interpreted that fugitives to the place thus privileged, for whatever offence, have liberty or immunity of every kind according to the rules of charity and mercy, to be given them by the king and kingdom together with the peers, so that everything to be given tends to a useful good both for them and for the givers.[6] As for the difference between crime, misdeed and outrage, it has been said in chapter 25 of book 6 how a misdeed tends to the injury of one's neighbour; and of the quiddity of privilege it was said above, in chapter 8 of this book; and since [by liberty] freedom from sin must be understood (as the Apostle speaks, Romans 6:22), it is clear that immunity, properly speaking, is the crime's not deserving torment (as scripture speaks in Jeremiah 25 and Ecclesiasticus 7).[7] But commonly it is understood of cleanness from a misdeed, which in England is called

tributi, ut est expers vel alienus a reatu et vere loquendo solum insons, dum non est dignus sic puniri. Dicitur inmunis sic quod immunitas opponatur reatui, ad quem sensum ex nullo humano privilegio sequitur in criminoso immunitas aput Deum, sed ex privilegiacione sequitur irreatus pene quoad principem libertantem.

felony; and it is a certain species of liberty which some call franchise, and it is taken now more widely and now more narrowly. Hence ***immunis*** is said from ***in*** and ***munium***, "tribute", as though free from the rendering of tribute; so [one is immune] as he is without part in, or a stranger to, guilt, and, truly speaking, only the guiltless, so long as he does not deserve to be so punished. One is called immune in such a way that immunity is opposed to guilt; in which sense no human privilege yields immunity before God in a criminal; but from privileging there follows freedom from liability to penalty as regards the prince who grants the liberty.[8]

¶3 239.32–240.22
240.1 *Objections: 1. It is said that the law would express these limitations, if they were intended.*
240.12 *Answer: It does in a way express them.*

[239] Contra dicta obicitur primo per hoc quod, si quilibet criminosus sit indignus habere suffragium ecclesie, tunc [240] lex illud exprimeret, sed facit oppositum cum servum eciam existentem in gracia docet extrahere et alios criminosos docet libertate gaudere. Hic dicitur quod plus peccans est de racione plus elongatus a suffragio ecclesie, licet ecclesia ex ignorancia gravedinis peccati vel ex percepcione planiori iniurie vel alia causa culpabili hoc dispariter prosequatur. Nam si secundum iura humana et ecclesiastica licitum racionabile atque legitimum est extrahere servum atque libertum de ecclesia pro debito operis impendendo domino temporali (ut patet capitulo De hiis qui ad ecclesiam fugiunt, le. fi.), si omnis indebitatus proximo in pecunia vel quocunque debet servicium satisfaccionis sub pena dampnacionis domino dominorum, ergo multo magis licet eum extrahere de ecclesia, si exhinc pauset inobediens ad reddendum servicium regi regum. Minor patet ex hoc quod omnis homo est magis servus Deo, plus debitor et prius quam aliquis servus est debitor domino temporali. Unde Apostolus Ephes. VI°, 5°, docet servos obedire dominis carnalibus cum timore et tremore, sicut Christo, servientes sicut domino non hominibus.

Against what has been said it is objected, by appeal to this, first: that if every criminal is unworthy to have the aid of the church, then [240] the law would express it; but it does the opposite, since it teaches that even a servant who is in grace be dragged out, and teaches that other criminals enjoy liberty.[9] To this the answer is that one who sins more is, in principle, further removed from the aid of the church, although the church, from ignorance of the gravity of the sin, or from a plainer perception of the injury, or from some other culpable cause, pursues this unequally.[10] For if, according to human and ecclesiastical laws, it is lawful, reasonable and legitimate to drag a servant or a freedman out of a church for the debt of work to be rendered to a temporal lord (as is clear from the chapter ***De hiis qui ad ecclesiam fugiunt***, the last law), [and] if everyone indebted to his neighbour in money or anything else owes the service of satisfaction, under pain of damnation, to the lord of lords, then much more is it lawful to drag him out of a church if from there he rests disobedient to rendering service to the king of kings.[11] The minor is clear from this, that every man is more a servant to God, more a debtor and earlier [a debtor], than any servant is a debtor to a temporal lord. Hence the Apostle, Ephesians 6:5[–7], teaches servants to obey their carnal lords with fear and trembling, as to Christ, serving as to the Lord and not to men.[12]

¶4 240.23–242.3
241.1 *The Church should help the injured, not those who do wrong.*
241.15 *A man is more bound to revenge an injury to God than to himself.*
241.25 *Augustine teaches the duty of punishing the wicked.*

[240] Confirmatur primo per hoc quod, sicut homo tenetur plus Deum diligere quam se ipsum, sic tenetur plus odire Dei iniuriam, unde XXIII[a], q. IV sic scribitur: Si ea de quibus vehementer Deus offenditur, insequi vel ulcisci deferimus, ad irascendum utique divinitatis pacienciam provocamus. Secundo confirmatur ex hoc quod secundum leges humanas lesis et non [241] ledentibus debent privilegia ecclesie suffragari (ut patet collacione tercia) sed omnis profugus, iniuste detinens alienum debitum pretextu profugii ad

This is confirmed, first, by this: that as a man is bound to love God more than himself, so he is bound to hate more an injury to God. Hence in C. 23 q. 4 it is written thus: "If we put off pursuing or avenging the things by which God is vehemently offended, we surely provoke the patience of the divinity to anger."[13] Second, it is confirmed from this: that according to human laws the privileges of the church ought to aid the injured and not [241] those who injure (as is clear from the third collation); now every refugee who, on the pretext of refuge at any church, unjustly withholds

242.5 *The performance of this duty would do much to set the Church right.*

quamcunque ecclesiam iniuriatur Deo et omnibus sanctis leditque se ipsum et quemlibet proximum mortalis peccati comparticipem. Ergo non est iustum ut sic ledens gaudeat taliter immunitate ecclesie. Et ad idem vadunt quotlibet iuris principia, ut III° Decretalium, De rerum permutacione, cap°. Cum universorum: Deceptis et non decipientibus iura subveniunt; aliter enim ordinarentur leges ad fovendum iniurias. Sed Isaie X°, 1, dicitur: Ve qui condunt leges iniquas; non enim est lex humana vel divina nisi ad continuandum iusticias et expurgandum iniurias. Tercio confirmatur ex hoc quod homo est obligacior ad vindicandum iniuriam Dei quam propriam, cum suam debet remittere, nisi de quanto sapit divinam iniuriam, sicut patet de Christo, de Moyse et ceteris Christi membris, que omnia debent exponere se pro capite; sed omne ad cuius complecionem est obligacior debet magis attendere: ergo debet magis attendere vindicacionem divine iniurie; unde omnes facientes oppositum sunt culpabiliter se ipsos amantes (ut loquitur Apostolus, II°, Thymothei Et istam sentenciam docet Augustinus, libro primo ad Cresconium grammaticum ut recitatur in decretis, XXXIII^{a}, q. IV^{ta}): Quisquis christianus iniquum non persequitur, Christi est inimicus. Verum dicis, si non hoc in illo persequitur quod Christo est inimicum. Neque enim dominus in servo, pater in filio, maritus [242] in coniuge, cum sint utrique christiani, non debent persequi nisi vicia christiane contraria veritati; que si non persequuntur, rei negligencie merito tenebuntur.

a debt owed to another, injures God and all the saints, and harms himself and every neighbour who shares in [his] mortal sin. Therefore it is not just that one who so injures should thus enjoy the immunity of the church.[14] And any number of principles of law go to the same, as in the third [book] of the Decretals, *De rerum permutacione*, chapter *Cum universorum*: "The laws come to the aid of the deceived and not of the deceivers"; for otherwise laws would be ordained to foster injuries. But in Isaiah 10:1 it is said: "Woe to them that make wicked laws"; for there is no law, human or divine, except to maintain justice and purge away injuries.[15] Third, it is confirmed from this: that a man is more obliged to avenge an injury to God than his own, since he ought to remit his own except in so far as it savours of an injury to God, as is clear in Christ, in Moses and in the other members of Christ, all of whom ought to expose themselves for the head; now he ought to attend more to everything to whose fulfilment he is more obliged; therefore he ought to attend more to the avenging of an injury to God. Hence all who do the opposite are culpably lovers of themselves (as the Apostle speaks, 2 Timothy [3:2]).[16] And Augustine teaches this teaching in the first book *To Cresconius the Grammarian*, as it is recited in the Decretum, C. 23 q. 4: "Whoever, being a Christian, does not pursue the wicked is an enemy of Christ. You say truly, if he does not pursue in him what is hostile to Christ. For neither the master in the servant, nor the father in the son, nor the husband in [242] the wife, since both are Christians, ought to pursue anything but the vices contrary to Christian truth; and if they do not pursue these, they will rightly be held guilty of negligence."[17]

¶5 242.5–242.18

[242] Et ista sentencia rectificaret multum ecclesiam, quia desidia et deformitas correpcionis perturbant ecclesiam, cum multi non correptores, sed corruptores zelo vindicte amant peccatum et odiunt personam, querunt pecuniam, non correpti iusticiam, et ideo correpciones propter ordinem preposterum non habent efficaciam. Conceditur ergo assumptum in obiecto, cum oportet Deum dignificare fugitivum per graciam, et post redditur dignior ad habendum matris sue suffragium; nec possunt aliqua iura exprimere huius oppositum. Racionabile autem est servum fugientem a servicio debito domino suo extrahere, cum ut sic delinquit in Deum; quod autem homines illud maioribus peccatis preponderant, accusant proprietarie se amantes.

And this teaching would set the church greatly to rights; because sloth in correction, and its deformity, disturb the church, since many, not correctors but corrupters, out of zeal for vengeance love the sin and hate the person, seek money, not the justice of the one corrected; and therefore corrections, because of their inverted order, have no efficacy.[18] The assumption in the objection is therefore granted, since God must make the fugitive worthy through grace, and afterwards he is rendered more worthy to have the aid of his mother; nor can any laws express the opposite of this. And it is reasonable to drag out a servant fleeing from the service owed to his lord, since as such he offends against God; but in that men weigh this more heavily than greater sins, they accuse [themselves] as men who love themselves as owners.[19]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Confirmacio triplex* (238.1); side-note 238.1. Gregory, *Moralia* XXI.4.8 (PL 76:193A–B); Loserth's "Cap. IV" (238.4) does not say whether it refers to the *Moralia* or to this treatise. Apocalypse 3:19, as the Vulgate; DR. Hebrews 12:6: Wyclif adds *Deus* to the Vulgate's *flagellat autem omnem filium*; DR "and he scourgeth" with "God" added.
2. C. 23 q. 4 c. 24, *Ipsa pietas* (Loserth, 238.9; Augustine to Boniface; Friedberg I, 909–10). A in the margin *Augustinus* (238.8). A and A_1 read *nec ligant* (238.12). *V^a, q. IV^a*: so the print, following the manuscripts (*V q. vel IV*, 238.13); the canons are C. 5 q. 5 cc. 1–2 (Friedberg I, 549), as Loserth's own reference has it, and the English gives that. *Furenti frenetico*: the raving madman; *freneticus* and *litargicus* are the two diseases of Augustine's figure (the frenzied, the lethargic).
3. *Ponit*: Augustine, in the same text (Loserth, 238.14). *Licet credamus quod aliquis se stulte precipitet*: "even though we believe someone may foolishly throw himself down", i.e. even at that risk; Augustine has no *flagellaremus*: the beating is Wyclif's addition (c. 24 §§4–5). B in the margin, second hand, *Correccio est medicina* (238.23).
4. C. 23 q. 4 c. 25, *Quid faciet* (Loserth, 238.19). *Ut ... non debet*: *ut* with the indicative; *debet* has the church as subject. *Proderit*: the sense requires "betrays" (*prodit*), which we translate; the print's *proderit* ("will profit") does not take *veritatem*. *Speculator*: the watchman of Ezek. 3:17.
5. *Secundum idem*: the clause of the principle of contradiction, "in the same respect". *Patet [quod] cum ... foret ... non foret*: taken as "it is clear that, since ... would be ..., it would not ..."; *cum casu limitato* may instead be ablative absolute, "the case being limited". *In facultatibus et pena relaxari*: to be spared in his property and his punishment. *Pungi*: goaded, as the lethargic is *stimulandus*.
6. Side-note 239.6. A in the margin *Epilogus. Nec omnia valent pro correccione peccancium* (239.6). B reads *omnino dandum* (239.11). *Cum paribus*: taken as the peers of the realm, joined to king and realm; *eis* goes with *dandam*. B reads *et se portatus* (239.4); the print is translated.
7. *Libri VI^i*: which work Wyclif counts as book 6, and its cap. 25, are not identified. Romans 6:22, alluded to (*liberati a peccato*). Jeremiah 25 and Ecclesiasticus 7 are cited for *immunis* in the sense "unpunished"; the verses (Jer. 25:29; Ecclus. 7:8) are our identification. *Indignitas criminis ad tormentum*: literally "the unworthiness of the crime to torment"; rendered as its not deserving it. B in the margin *Immunitas quid sit, nota* (239.18).
8. B reads *quedam franchisia* (239.22–23) and *et buium* (239.24). *Munium*: Wyclif's form of *munia*, duties, glossed *tributum*; the derivation is the grammarians' (cf. Isidore, *Etym.* X.141, *immunis, qui non facit munia*, PL 82:382A, and XV.2.10, *munia, id est tributa debita*, 82:537C; the form *ab in et munium* is not Isidore's). *Ut est expers*: the clause is loose; taken as describing who is properly immune. *Irreatus pene*: a non-classical abstract, "non-liability to penalty". *Libertantem*: who grants the liberty (franchise).
9. Loserth (239.32): *Contra. Prima obieccio*; side-note 240.1. *Suffragium ecclesie*: the aid of the church, i.e. sanctuary. *Servum ... extrahere*: the law that a fugitive servant be returned (see n. 11). *Sed*: the minor of the objection.
10. A in the margin *Responsio* (240.3); side-note 240.12. B reads *in iure*, apparently for *de racione*; A *culpali* for *culpabili* (240.6); the print is translated. *De racione*: in principle, by the nature of the case. *Hoc ... prosequatur*: the church applies this exclusion unequally.
11. *De hiis qui ad ecclesiam fugiunt, le. fi.*: *le. fi.* is the civilians' *lex finalis*, the last law of a title; the title matches the Code's *De his qui ad ecclesias confugiunt* (Cod. 1.12), an identification not independently checked against the Code. Loserth cites X 3.49.6 and quotes it: a fugitive servant, once his lord has sworn to spare him, is compelled to return to his service (240.11). B reads *quocunque alio* (240.13).
12. Ephesians 6:5–7, paraphrased: Wyclif joins verse 5 (*cum timore et tremore ... sicut Christo*) to verse 7 (*sicut Domino et non hominibus*); DR. *Servus*: "servant" throughout, as DR, though the law in question is of slaves. *Prius*: earlier, i.e. by a prior debt.
13. C. 23 q. 4 c. 50 (Loserth's *causa XXIII, cap. L*, without the *quaestio*, 240.25). A and A_1 omit *Unde* (240.25). *Deferimus*: for *differimus*, "put off".
14. *Collacione tercia*: the third collation of the *Authenticum*, as at 226.5; the novel is Nov. 17 (*Authenticum* coll. III, tit. 4), c. 7: protection of temples is given by the law not to wrongdoers but to the injured. *Suffragari*: the the glossary's "to aid by intercession" is shortened to "to aid", since here privileges aid, not prayers. B reads *ledit se* (241.4). *Comparticipem*: agrees with *proximum*: the neighbour who shares the sin; side-note 241.1.
15. X 3.19.8, *Cum universorum* (Loserth, 241.8; our modern form). Isaiah 10:1, as the Vulgate; DR. B reads *qui comedunt* (241.12). *Continuandum iusticias*: to maintain just dealing.
16. B reads *debent remittere* (241.17). Side-note 241.15. *Que omnia*: the members. 2 Timothy 3:2 (*erunt homines se ipsos amantes*): Wyclif's chapter numeral is wanting in the print, and the parenthesis runs on to the Augustine reference; our identification. A in the margin *Nota* (241.24).
17. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium* I, as in C. 23 q. 4 c. 52 (Loserth, 241.26). The print reads *XXXIII^a* (C. 33); the English gives C. 23, Loserth's own reference. A and B read *Cresconicum*, A_1 *Crescencium* (241.25). Friedberg prints *iniquum persequitur*, without *non*, but notes that *non persequitur* was the older reading, removed by the Roman Correctores from Augustine's original: Wyclif's *non* is the medieval vulgate, translated (Friedberg I, 927–28). The manuscripts read *utique*; Loserth prints *utrique* (242.1). *Neque ... non debent ... nisi*: the double negative is taken as not cancelling. *Persequi*: "pursue", also "persecute", Cresconius' charge. A in the margin *Augustinus*, *Correpcio* (241.27); side-note 241.25.
18. Side-note 242.5. *Correptores ... corruptores*: Wyclif's wordplay, kept as "correctors ... corrupters". B reads *ze vindicte* (242.7–8). *Amant peccatum et odiunt personam*: the reverse of the rule to hate the sin and love the person. *Ordinem preposterum*: the inverted order.
19. B reads *digni*; A corrects to *dignior* (242.13). *Assumptum in obiecto*: that a servant in grace is dragged out (240.1). B reads *accusat* (242.18), "[this] accuses them"; the print's *accusant* is translated with "[themselves]". *Proprietarie se amantes*: loving themselves as owners, i.e. with proprietary self-love.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 238: *Christus*
  - 238: *suis* (1 is the argument numeral) [NW]

- **238:** ***III°***
- **238:** ***amo*** **(the 5 after it is the line number) [NW]**
- **238:** ***V[a]***
- **238:** ***IV[a]***
- **238:** ***IV[a]***
- **239:** ***ligari*** **(H 162[a] in margin is alinea letter + folio mark)**
- **239:** ***VI[i]*** **(small superscript i after VI, as Edwardi III[i])**
- **240:** ***gaudere***
- **240:** ***XXIII[a]***
- **241:** ***ledentibus*** **(K 162[c] in margin is alinea + folio mark)**
- **241:** ***suffragari***
- **241:** ***ut*** **(opening paren is punctuation)**
- **241:** ***III°***
- **241:** ***1*** **(old-style arabic 1 (verse number), x-height)**
- **241:** ***Augustinus***
- **241:** ***ut*** **(opening paren is punctuation)**
- **241:** ***IV[ta]*** **(superscript ta)**
- **242:** ***odiunt*** **[NW]**
- **242:** ***servicio*** **(5 after it is the line number) [NW]**
- **239:** ***suffragium***
- **240:** ***exprimeret***
- **240:** ***oppositum***
- **241:** ***privilegia***
- **241:** ***XXXIII[a],*** **[-MARK]**

Part 4: The second objection: who deserves refuge; debtors, the forty days and Westminster; the third objection begun

Loserth pp. 242.19–246.25

¶1 242.19–243.10
242.19 *Objection: 2. It cannot be known who are fit to be protected by the privilege.*
242.24 *Answer: We must judge by acts, as in almsgiving.*
243.14 *Debtors should not be protected, except those who cannot pay through misfortune.*
243.22 *The privilege was not intended for debtors.*

[242]**Secundo obicitur per hoc quod iuxta istam senten- ciam excluderetur libertas privilegii, eo quod nemo sciret qui essent digni aut indigni, qui puniendi aut qui dimittendi, aut qualis vel quanta debet esse remissio. In ampliacione ergo privilegii est via securior Hic dicitur negando assumptum et consequenciam sequentem; nam locus potest ex effectu probabiliter COgnoscere qui fugitivi sunt fructuose penitentes, et solum tales prius criminosi debent ex lege Dei et iuris ecclesie habere in illa refugium. Nam fugientes illuc cum ere alieno et negantes restitucionem quantumcunque habundant ostendunt se incapaces refugii, et sic de cunctis facinorosis qui non disponunt se quantum sufficiunt ad emendam. Et si obicitur quod** [243]**ex talibus signis sensibilibus non fit demonstracio, cum potest esse sensus illusio vel aliunde decepcio, dicitur quod obieccio est inutilis, cum non requiritur talis infallibilis noticia ad elemosinas faciendas. Tunc enim periret omnis correccio et omnis sentenciacio secundum leges humanas et omnis elemosina, cum perinde homo dubitaret, si ille cui faceret elemosinam sit diabolus incorporatus vel membrum eius;**

Second, it is objected, by appeal to this: that according to this teaching the liberty of the privilege would be excluded, since no one would know who were worthy or unworthy, who were to be punished or who released, or of what kind or how great the remission ought to be. In the enlarging of the privilege, therefore, lies the safer way.[1] To this the answer is by denying the assumption and the inference that follows; for the place can know with probability, from the effect, which fugitives are fruitfully penitent, and only such, though formerly criminals, ought by God's law and the law of the church to have refuge in it. For those who flee there with another's money and refuse restitution, however much they abound, show themselves incapable of refuge; and so of all those guilty of misdeed who do not dispose themselves to amendment as far as they are able.[2] And if it is objected that [243]**from such perceptible signs no demonstration is made, since there can be illusion of the sense or deception from elsewhere, the answer is that the objection is useless, since such infallible knowledge is not required for giving alms. For then all correction, and**

cuius defensio foret contra voluntatem Dei, cedens ad perturbacionem ecclesie.

all pronouncing of sentence according to human laws, and all almsgiving would perish, since a man would equally doubt whether the one to whom he gave alms were a devil incarnate or a member of the devil; and the defence of such a one would be against the will of God, tending to the disturbance of the church.[3]

¶2 243.11–245.25
244.16 *The period of immunity should be limited, as in other Churches, to 40 days.*
244.25 *Two points in which Westminster exceeds other Churches.*
245.7 *Coroner's office as to fugitives in sanctuary,*
245.13 *Liberties given to the fugitive.*
245.26 *Third principal argument against us. a) All law is privilege.*
245.30 *b) Secular lords cannot appoint Church privileges, which rest with God.*

[243]Unde cum dilatacio talis non foret ampliacio privilegii sed perversio privilegii, pars securior foret tenenda, innitendo iuri communi in cuius execucione exclusa est undequaque iniuria. Ulterius, si queratur de limitibus remissionis talium profugorum, videtur mihi quod pium esset, quoad debitum pecuniarum, docto quod fugitivi sine suo demerito sint casualiter impotentes, ut ex naufragio, incendio vel rapina, quod a suis creditoribus et specialiter a mundi divitibus et clericis dimittantur liberi, vel totaliter vel in parte; egenis autem creditoribus satisfaciant suo laboricio paulative. Unde mirum est pluribus quomodo extortus fuit sensus privilegii ad debitum pecuniarum, cum ante XXV^{um} annum Edwardi III^{i} non esset pro tali debito ad ecclesiam fugiendum, privilegiantes autem per multos annos ante illud tempus non intenderant, sicut nec poterant, ut nullus debitor illuc fugiens teneatur satisfacere creditori. Nam XI^{a} q. III^{a} ex auctoritate beati Isidori sic habetur: Qui consentit peccantibus et defendit aliquem delinquentem maledictus erit aput Deum et homines et corripietur increpacione severissima. Hinc eciam quidam sanctissimus [244]pater ait: Si quis peccantem defenderit, acrius quam ille qui peccavit coherceatur. Hinc eciam alius pater ait: Si quis alterius errori consenserit, sciat se cum illo simili modo culpabilem iudicandum. Sufficit ergo prepositis peccatum proprium etsi non cumulent alienum. Insuper aliud mirum est quomodo extortus est sensus nephandus ex dicto privilegio quod licet sceleratissimis cubare ibidem in suo crimine sine correpcione penali pro tota suo periodo, cum nec verba privilegii illud annuerint. Nam potissime extorqueretur de isto verbo quod habeant ibidem omnimodam libertatem. Sed revera ex istis verbis patenter infertur oppositum, cum libertas ad pausandum in peccatis non foret libertas, eo quod tunc spiritus infernales forent liberrimi. Et si queratur quantam libertatem habebunt ibidem, dicitur quod magna libertas est concessa a regibus ecclesie Anglicane, ultra hoc quod habent regna alia vel exprimunt iura canonica, scilicet quod quilibet fugitivus ad quamcunque ecclesiam in Anglia pro qualibet felonia habeat ibidem tempus quadraginta dierum instar Ninivitarum et penitencium in Quadragesima quibus tot tempora penitencie sunt concessa. Pro illo tamen loco excedit illud privilegium in duobus: primo in hoc quod,

Hence, since such an extension would be not an enlarging of the privilege but a perversion of the privilege, the safer part should be held, relying on the common law, in whose execution injury is excluded on every side. Further, if it is asked about the limits of the remission of such refugees, it seems to me that it would be pious, as regards a debt of money, once it is shown that the fugitives are by mischance unable [to pay] without demerit of their own, as from shipwreck, fire or robbery, that they be released free by their creditors, and especially by the rich of the world and by clerics, either wholly or in part; and to needy creditors they should make satisfaction by their labour, little by little.[4] Hence many wonder how the sense of the privilege was wrested to a debt of money, since before the twenty-fifth year of Edward III there was no fleeing to a church for such a debt; and those who privileged, for many years before that time, had not intended, as neither could they, that no debtor fleeing there should be bound to satisfy his creditor.[5] For in C. 11 q. 3, on the authority of blessed Isidore, it is had thus: "He who consents to sinners and defends anyone offending will be cursed before God and men, and will be rebuked with the severest reproof." Hence also a certain most holy [244]father says: "If anyone defends a sinner, let him be coerced more sharply than he who sinned." Hence also another father says: "If anyone consents to another's error, let him know that he is to be judged culpable in like manner with him." Their own sin, therefore, is enough for superiors, even if they do not heap up another's.[6] Moreover, it is another marvel how a wicked sense has been wrested from the said privilege: that the most criminal may lie there in their crime, without penal correction, for their whole term, since not even the words of the privilege granted that. For it would be wrested above all from this word: that they have there liberty of every kind. But in truth the opposite is plainly inferred from these words, since a liberty to rest in sins would not be liberty, because then the infernal spirits would be the most free. And if it is asked how much liberty they will have there, the answer is that a great liberty has been granted by the kings to the English church, beyond what other kingdoms have or the canon laws express: namely, that every fugitive to any church in England

ubi in aliis locis restringitur situs ad basilicam Vel paucos passus extra ecclesiam, ibi possunt secure quiescere per totum precinctum Westmonasterii, ubi eciam in aliis ecclesiis limitatur causa fuge ad feloniam, ibi extenditur ad quodcunque facinus vel delictum, cum quo stat regni prosperitas et integritas regalie. Si autem placeret regi et suo consilio concedere fugitivis illius loci libertatem maiorem, gauderem et assidue procurarem, sed (si non fallor) ex debito sensu verborum privilegii non potest homo convincere ampliorem. [245]Et si arguitur quod privilegium de immunitate ecclesie Anglicane repugnat iuribus canonicis supradictis, dicitur quod non, quia omnes ille leges sunt locales, obligantes tantum eos qui ipsas acceptant, tam in materia quam in forma. Anglia autem quia prius habuit consuetudinem misericordius libertantem ecclesiam, ideo dimissa martirizacione sui populi venit coronarius ad fugitivum, querens causam sui aufugii; quod si pro alio delicto quam felonia aufugerit, libertas ecclesie non ad eum. Si autem pro felonia, dum tamen non repugnat provido statui regni, licet sibi per quadraginta dies libere ibi quiescere et in fine unum ex tribus eligere, vel per stratam regiam tamquam exulans exire provinciam, vel publice exire, stando tamquam indigena iuri regni, vel tercio remanere infra basilicam sine hoc quod ultra de cibariis provincie sustentetur. Et (ut mihi videtur) privilegium illud foret misericordius et racionabilius quam privilegium notans casus in quibus salvandi in Anglia extracti sunt alibi et occisi. Ideo laudemus nostros principes, non vendicantes alieno iure, quod consuetudo Anglie non permittit; nam Angliam non obligant aliena privilegia alleganda, sed sufficit nobis fructus ulterioris privilegii, nec est aliqua lex fundabilis pro ambobus.

for any felony has a period of forty days there, like the Ninevites and the penitents in Lent, to whom so long a time of penance has been granted.[7] For that place, however, the privilege exceeds this in two things: first in this, that whereas in other places the site is restricted to the basilica or a few paces outside the church, there they can rest secure through the whole precinct of Westminster; [second, that] whereas in other churches also the cause of flight is limited to felony, there it is extended to any misdeed or offence whatever with which the prosperity of the kingdom and the integrity of the regality can stand. If, however, it should please the king and his council to grant the fugitives of that place a greater liberty, I would rejoice and would assiduously procure it; but (if I am not mistaken) no one can prove a more ample one from the due sense of the words of the privilege.[8] [245]And if it is argued that the privilege of immunity of the English church conflicts with the canon laws mentioned above, the answer is that it does not, because all those laws are local, binding only those who accept them, both in matter and in form. But England, because it earlier had a custom that gave the church liberty more mercifully: therefore, the martyring of its people being set aside, the coroner comes to the fugitive, asking the cause of his flight; and if he has fled for another offence than felony, the liberty of the church [does] not [extend] to him. But if for felony, provided only that it does not conflict with the provident state of the kingdom, he may rest freely there for forty days and at the end choose one of three [things]: either to leave the province by the king's highway as one going into exile; or to come out publicly, standing to the law of the kingdom as a native; or, third, to remain within the basilica, without being further sustained from the victuals of the province.[9] And (as it seems to me) that privilege would be more merciful and more reasonable than the privilege which marks out cases in which men who were to be saved in England have been dragged out elsewhere and killed. Therefore let us praise our princes, who do not lay claim by a foreign law, which the custom of England does not permit; for foreign privileges that may be alleged do not bind England, but the fruit of the further privilege suffices us, nor is there any law that can be founded for both.[10]

¶3 245.26–245.33

[245]Tercio principaliter arguitur contra dicta de descripcione privilegii: videtur enim primo quod omnis lex sit privilegium, cum omnis lex individua sit lex privata, concessa ad utilitatem ecclesie vel persone. Videtur secundo quod non subiacet potestati dominorum

Third, it is argued principally against what was said about the definition of privilege: for it seems, first, that every law is a privilege, since every individual law is a private law, granted for the benefit of the church or of a person. It seems, second, that it does not lie within the power of temporal

temporalium statuere ecclesiam in privilegiis que Christus instituit, quia illa erant dona gracie que solius Dei est concedere.

lords to establish the church in the privileges which Christ instituted, because those were gifts of grace which it is God's alone to grant.[11]

¶4 246.1–246.25
246.1 *c) All weakness or sin is a privilege since it brings good to the Church. Answer: a) Such use of the word privilege is an equivocation.*

[246] Tercio videtur quod omnis infirmitas vel peccatum sit privilegium, quia cedit ad utilitatem sancte matris ecclesie. Hic dicitur negando assumptum, quia lex communissima non est privilegium, nisi equivocando in predicacione secundum essenciam vocetur omne quod obiective terminat utilitatem privatam, vel privilegiat melioratum privilegium, sicut Deus dicitur gaudium et premium beatorum. Loquendo autem formaliter de privilegio, patet supra dicta descripcio in iure canonico; nam XXV^a^, q. I, Ideo permittente domino, exprimitur supradictum genus privilegii sub hiis verbis: Privilegia enim dicuntur quasi privata legia, eo quod privatam legem singulis generent. Quam diffinicionem Gregorius innuens ait: Si hoc neque consuetudine generali neque privilegio speciali vendicas, restat te usurpare quod fecisti. Et patet ex iure canonico genus privilegii supradictum. Superaddidi eciam differenciam pro explanacione maiori quod est concessa a principe ad utilitatem ecclesie vel persone, et potest ista differencia pertinenter capi de iure canonico XIX^a^, q. II, Due sunt, ubi distinguens inter legem publicam et privatam dicit quod lex privata est que instinctu spiritus sancti in corde scribitur, sicut de quibusdam loquitur Apostolus: Qui habent legem Dei scriptam in cordibus suis.

Third, it seems that every infirmity or sin is a privilege, because it tends to the benefit of holy mother church. To this the answer is by denying the assumption, because the most common law is not a privilege, unless, by equivocating in predication according to essence, everything that objectively terminates a private benefit should be called [a privilege], or [whatever] privileges the one bettered [by it], as God is called the joy and reward of the blessed.[12] But speaking formally of privilege, the definition given above is clear in canon law; for in C. 25 q. 1, *Ideo permittente domino*, the genus of privilege stated above is expressed in these words: "For privileges are so called as being private laws, because they produce a private law for individuals." Hinting at this definition Gregory says: "If you claim this neither by general custom nor by special privilege, it remains that you have usurped what you did."[13] And the genus of privilege stated above is clear from canon law. I also added, for fuller explanation, the difference: that it is granted by a prince for the benefit of the church or of a person; and this difference can pertinently be taken from canon law, C. 19 q. 2, *Due sunt*, where, distinguishing between public and private law, it says that private law is that which is written in the heart by the prompting of the Holy Spirit, as the Apostle speaks of some: "Who have the law of God written in their hearts."[14]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Contra. Secunda obieccio* (242.19); side-note 242.19. *Istam sentenciam*: the teaching of 11-c, that the privilege is to be interpreted by the rules of charity, so that the unrepentant criminal is unworthy of the church's aid. *In ampliacione ... securior*: the objector's conclusion: better to enlarge the privilege than to restrict it.
2. A in the margin *Responsio* and *Nota, qui fugitivi debent gaudere de immunitate ecclesiarum, quia penitentes etc.* (242.24–25); side-note 242.24. *Consequenciam sequentem*: the inference to "the safer way". *Ex lege Dei et iuris ecclesie*: the genitive *iuris* is taken as parallel to *Dei*, "by the law of God and of the law of the church", i.e. by God's law and the church's. *Cum ere alieno*: *aes alienum*, debt; "another's money" keeps the figure. B reads *sed quantum* (242.31–32).
3. *Sentenciacio*: judicial sentencing, the noun of *sentenciare*; see the report. *Membrum eius*: *eius* taken as the devil's; it could refer to the almsgiver ("his member"), less likely. *Cuius defensio*: the defence of such a person, i.e. of the devil's member, the unrepentant fugitive.
4. Side-note 243.14. *Docto quod*: ablative absolute, "it having been shown that". *Casualiter*: by chance, without fault. *Laboricio*: by labour. *Clericis*: clerics among the creditors, who should forgive.
5. Side-note 243.22. The twenty-fifth year of Edward III is 1351–52; that sanctuary for debt began then is Wyclif's claim, and the enactment is presumably 25 Edw. III st. 5 c. 17 (1352), which first gave *capias* and process of exigent (outlawry) in actions of debt, so that debtors could be arrested (*Statutes of the Realm* I). *Privilegiantes*: those who granted the privilege (here, of Westminster).
6. C. 11 q. 3 c. 100, attributed to Isidore (Loserth, 243.29). The manuscripts read *maledictus est*; Loserth corrects to *erit* from the Decretum (243.30), and his text is translated. The Decretum reads *defendit* where Wyclif has *defenderit* in the second saying (Loserth, 244.1). The two further sayings, of "a certain most holy father" and "another father", stand inside c. 100 itself (*Si quis peccantem defendit ...*; *Si quis alterius errori consentit ...*; Friedberg I, 671), where the Decretum has *defendit*, *consentit*. A in the margin *Contra defensores peccancium* and *Ysidorus* (243.27, 29). *Prepositis*: those set over the place of refuge, the abbot and convent.

7. ***Pro tota suo periodo***: for their whole term of refuge. ***Omnimodam libertatem***: the words of the Westminster privilege as Wyclif reports them (cf. 11-c, 239.6). The forty days: the term of the English common-law sanctuary; Jonah 3:4 ("Yet forty days and Ninive shall be destroyed") for the Ninevites. Side-note 244.16.
8. Side-note 244.25. ***Cum quo stat***: "with which [the prosperity of the realm] can stand", i.e. consistent with it. A and A_1 lack ***homo***; A_1 reads ***committere***; A and B read ***convicere***, and Loserth corrects to ***convincere*** (244.34), translated: "prove" (convict the words of a larger sense).
9. ***Anglia autem ... venit coronarius***: an anacoluthon; ***Anglia*** has no verb, and the sentence resumes with the coroner. ***Dimissa martirizacione sui populi***: the alternative to killing the fugitive. ***Libertas ecclesie non ad eum***: no verb; "extends" is supplied. A and B read ***felononia*** (245.9); A and A_1 lack ***non*** in ***dum tamen non repugnat*** (245.11), and the print is translated. The three choices are abjuring the realm, surrendering to trial, and remaining in the church unfed: the English law of sanctuary as in Bracton (ed. Thorne II, 382–83: abjuration before the coroner, or "food be denied him"). B in the margin ***Pena maledicti*** (245.11); side-notes 245.7, 245.13.
10. ***Privilegium notans casus ...***: taken as a (foreign or papal) privilege that specifies cases; the referent is uncertain. ***Non vendicantes alieno iure***: "who do not claim by a foreign law"; ***quod*** is taken as referring to such claiming. ***Ulterioris privilegii***: "the further privilege", i.e. the English one described, set beside the canon laws; the comparison is loose. ***Pro ambobus***: for both England and other realms.
11. A in the margin ***Contra. Tercia obieccio. Arguitur contra descripcionem privilegii*** (245.26); side-notes 245.26, 245.30. The definition is that of cap. 8: private law granted by a prince for the benefit of the church or a person. A and A_1 read ***privata et concessa*** (245.29). ***Lex individua***: a law in a single instance, as against a law in general.
12. Loserth's alinea letter is wanting in the manuscript (246.1). B reads ***quia concessit ad*** (246.2). A in the margin ***Responsio*** (246.3); side-note 246.1. ***Lex communissima***: the most common law, which binds everything (11-e, 246.26 ff.). ***Vel privilegiat melioratum privilegium***: construed as a second thing that might equivocally be called privilege, whatever privileges, ***melioratum*** being the one bettered; ***privilegium*** may instead be the predicate ("or [if] what privileges the one bettered [is called] privilege"). The likeness: God is called the reward of the blessed not formally but as object.
13. C. 25 q. 1 c. 16, ***Ideo permittente*** (Loserth, 246.10; our modern form). The manuscripts read ***XXV, q. II***; Loserth corrects to q. 1 (246.10), translated. B reads ***privatam legem*** and omits ***legia ... legem*** (246.12–13). The etymology ***privata legia*** (lex) is Isidore's (***Etym.*** V.18, PL 82:202). B in the margin ***Ethymologia privilegii*** (246.4). The Gregory saying is in Gratian's dictum after c. 16, § 2 (***Quam distinctionem Gregorius innuens ait***; Friedberg I, 1011–12), not a canon; the letter is Gregory, ***Reg.*** III.56 to John of Ravenna, on the pallium: ***restat postquam talia agere neque consuetudine generali, neque privilegio vindicas, ut usurpasse te comprobes quod fecisti*** (PL 77:651C). A in the margin ***Gregorius*** (246.10).
14. C. 19 q. 2 c. 2, ***Due sunt*** (Loserth, 246.21). ***Differenciam***: the logical differentia that completes the definition after the genus. The wording Wyclif gives (***qui habent legem Dei scriptam in cordibus suis***) is the canon's own (Friedberg I, 839), not the Vulgate's: Romans 2:15 reads ***qui ostendunt opus legis scriptum in cordibus suis*** (DR "Who shew the work of the law written in their hearts"); his wording is closer to Jer. 31:33 / Heb. 8:10; translated as he gives it. B in the margin, second hand, ***Lex privata est instinctu spiritus sancti*** (246.23).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 242: ***securior*** (hyphenated secu-/rior; main token holds whole word)
  - 243: ***ex*** (162^{d} folio mark glued in main token)
  - 243: ***demerito***
  - 243: ***casualiter*** [NW]
  - 243: ***III^{i}*** (small superscript i after III)
  - 243: ***XI^{a}***
  - 243: ***III^{a}***
  - 244: ***magna***
  - 244: ***regibus***
  - 244: ***regna***
  - 244: ***restringitur***
  - 245: ***descripcione*** (hyphenated descrip-/cione; main token holds whole word)
  - 245: ***privilegiis***
  - 246: ***Tercio***
  - 246: ***melioratum*** [NW]
  - 246: ***XXV^{a}***
  - 246: ***legia*** [NW]
  - 246: ***XIX^{a}***
  - 244: ***pater***
  - 243: ***XXV^{um}*** (superscript um) [-MARK]

Part 5: Common law and privilege; Christ's privileges and the temporal lord's part; whether sin is a privilege

Loserth pp. 246.26–250.16

¶1 246.26–248.20
246.26 *Law is common in two senses; of obligation and assertion.*
247.17 *A law may be common as to a part, yet a privilege in respect of the whole.*
248.1 *b) It is true that the highest privileges are the gift of God only,*
248.13 *yet the ruler may so employ earthly privileges as to make the Church apt to receive higher gifts.*
248.21 *Rites or privileges instituted by Christ are to be specially observed.*

[246] **Sed quia videtur per verba decreti quod membra coincidunt, licet racio non sit diversa, ideo notandum quod lex potest dici communis dupliciter, scilicet obiectiva obligacione vel formali predicacione; primo** [247] **modo est lex communissima quod Deus est super omnia appetendus, cum nedum omnem creaturam racionalem sed omnem creatam substanciam semper obligat. Nam Deus est bonum quod omnia appetunt, et sic omnia alia mandata decalogi sunt leges communes obiective, cum necessario omnes homines obligant. Leges autem communes predicacione sunt species vel genera legum que in suis individuis sunt fundata, ut clericum curare de sua fama et genera similia, sive accepta pro legum privatarum multitudine, sive pro universalibus quiditative predicatis de sua specie. Et sic iste due maneries legum non sunt contrarie in suo analogo, cum canon describit legem publicam que a sanctis patribus scriptis est confirmata; quod notum est competere cuilibet vero privilegio, sicut et descripcio privilegii competit legi communi. Unde illa lex que est communis private parti ecclesie est privilegium respectu sui tocius, ut lex que est communis singulis personis dati monasterii monachorum est privilegium toti domui, et dotacio in temporalibus, si est lex communis toti clero possessionato et singulis personis eiusdem, tunc est privilegium respectu persone cleri dotate, eo quod persone cleri exproprietarie viventi non convenit sed privatim persone priori. Cum ergo iuxta decretum omnis lex privata a spiritu sancto inscribitur, manifestum est quod omnis lex privata concessa est a principe ad utilitatem ecclesie vel persone, eo quod opera trinitatis sunt indivisa ad extra. Deus autem nescit docere vel dare nisi utilia, et sic omnis lex creata individua est privilegium. Et patet quomodo loquendum est logice de privilegiis, detecta equivocacione termini, ut oportet. Ad secundam instanciam negatur assumptum, cum Christus dedit ecclesie duplex genus privilegii, quoddam** [248] **extrinsecum, affirmativum, negativum vel privativum, ut Matthei X°, 9, dicitur quomodo privilegiavit discipulos, quando misit illos ad predicandum: Nolite, inquit, possidere aurum neque argentum neque pecuniam in zonis vestris. Privilegia autem corporalia positiva concedit eis, ut patet Luce X°, 7: In eadem, inquit, domo manete edentes et bibentes que aput illos sunt; dignus est enim operarius mercede sua. Talia autem privilegia instrumentaliter et ministratorie concedi possunt a domino temporali; sed est dare spiritualia privilegia pociora que Christus prius concessit suis discipulis, ut patet Matthei X, 8: Infirmos, inquit, curate, mortuos suscitate, leprosos mundate, demones eicite, Talia autem potestativa privilegia appropriate**

But because it seems from the words of the decree that the members [of the division] coincide, although the aspect is not different, it must therefore be noted that a law can be called common in two ways: namely, by objective obligation or by formal predication.[1] In the first [247] **way the most common law is that God is to be desired above all things, since it binds always not only every rational creature but every created substance. For God is the good which all things desire; and so all the other commandments of the decalogue are common laws objectively, since they necessarily bind all men. But laws common by predication are the species or genera of laws which are founded in their individuals, such as that a cleric should take care of his reputation, and similar genera, whether taken for the multitude of private laws or for universals predicated of their species as to their quiddity.[2] And so these two kinds of law are not contrary in their analogue, since the canon defines public law as that which has been confirmed by the writings of the holy fathers; and this is known to fit every true privilege, just as the definition of privilege fits common law.[3] Hence that law which is common to a private part of the church is a privilege with respect to its whole: as a law which is common to the individual persons of a given monastery of monks is a privilege to the whole house; and an endowment in temporal things, if it is a law common to the whole possessioner clergy and to its individual persons, is then a privilege with respect to the endowed person of the clergy, because it does not belong to the person of the clergy that lives without property, but privately to the former person.[4] Since, therefore, according to the decree every private law is written in by the Holy Spirit, it is manifest that every private law is granted by a prince for the benefit of the church or of a person, because the works of the Trinity outwards are undivided. Now God knows not how to teach or give anything but what is beneficial; and so every created individual law is a privilege. And it is clear how one must speak logically of privileges, once the equivocation of the term has been exposed, as is fitting.[5] To the second objection the assumption is denied, since Christ gave the church a twofold kind of privilege: one** [248] **extrinsic, affirmative, negative or privative, as it is said in Matthew 10:9 how he privileged the disciples when he sent them to preach: "Do not," he says, "possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your purses." And positive bodily privileges he grants them, as is clear in Luke 10:7: "In the same house," he says, "remain, eating and drinking such things as they have: for the labourer is worthy of his hire." Now such privileges**

conceduntur a domino, que licet princeps terrenus non posset concedere, tamen concedendo temporalia privilegia propriatorie potest disponere ut Deus concedat privilegia pociora, sicut aperiens fenestram vel removens prohibens est occasio, unde lumen solis per domum infunditur.

can be granted instrumentally and ministerially by a temporal lord; but there are spiritual privileges, of greater worth, which Christ granted his disciples before, as is clear in Matthew 10:8: "Heal," he says, "the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils."[6] And such privileges of power are granted appropriately by the Lord; and although an earthly prince could not grant them, yet by granting temporal privileges he can, preparatorily, dispose [things] so that God grants the privileges of greater worth; as one who opens a window, or removes what hinders, is the occasion whereby the light of the sun is poured through the house.[7]

¶2 248.21–249.2

[248] Ritus ergo sensibiles quos Christus instituit tamquam signa efficacia spiritualis privilegii sunt diligencius observandi, cum impossibile sit, ut rite observans hec privilegia sensibilia non privilegietur a Deo intrinsecus per privilegia pociora. Ideo (ut dixi proximo capitulo) sunt diligencius quam humanitus adinventa privilegia observanda, sicut patet in parabola domini de Recabitis a vino abstinentibus ex precepto patris sui Recab (ut exponit: Jeremie XXXV, 8). Et hec racio quare Christi privilegia sunt diligencius audienda, reccius exponenda et solicicius defendenda, quia ut illa spernuntur innitendo ad alia, perit religio christiana; et sic domini temporales tenentur privilegia [249] Christi tam positiva quam privativa defendere et omnes ritus illis contrarios animose destruere.

The perceptible rites, therefore, which Christ instituted as efficacious signs of spiritual privilege are to be observed more diligently, since it is impossible that one who duly observes these perceptible privileges should not be privileged by God inwardly through privileges of greater worth. Therefore (as I said in the preceding chapter) they are to be observed more diligently than privileges devised by men, as is clear in the Lord's parable of the Rechabites, who abstained from wine by the precept of their father Rechab (as [the prophet] sets it out, Jeremiah 35:8).[8] And this is the reason why the privileges of Christ are to be heard more diligently, expounded more rightly and defended more carefully: because, as they are spurned by leaning on others, the Christian religion perishes. And so temporal lords are bound to defend the privileges [249] of Christ, both positive and privative, and spiritedly to destroy all rites contrary to them.[9]

¶3 249.3–249.34

[249] Unde videtur mihi quod collegium predicte abbathie primo attenderet, si vendicatum privilegium sit privilegiis Christi contrarium. Secundo quod lucrum reportabit ex privilegio sic defenso, quia indubie si non meritum quoad Deum sed nude mundi gloriam ex privilegio reportat anime detrimentum. Tercio, supposito quod reportet ex operibus misericordie indultis profugis salutem anime, attenderet cum suis fautoribus quod pro veris privilegiis plus necessariis defendendis diligenciam tantam apponerent vel maiorem. Sepe nempe mundo decepti cece preponderant folia fructui, umbram luci, ymmo venenum pruriens temporale perpetue saluti. Ad tercium dicitur quod falsum assumitur, nam peccatum cum non sit privata lex nec concessum principe non est privilegium. Quamvis enim princeps huius mundi excitat ad peccandum, non tamen potest concedere, sicut nec Deus, ad illud licenciam, et si per impossibile concederet ad hoc vel pretense licenciam, hoc non faceret ad privilegiandi commodum

Hence it seems to me that the college of the aforesaid abbey should attend, first, to whether the privilege claimed is contrary to the privileges of Christ. Second, to what gain it will carry away from the privilege so defended; because undoubtedly, if it carries away from the privilege not merit with respect to God but barely the glory of the world, it carries away harm to the soul. Third, supposing that it carries away the salvation of the soul from the works of mercy granted to the refugees, it should attend, with its supporters, to [this]: that they should apply as much diligence, or greater, to defending the true privileges, which are more necessary.[10] For often those deceived by the world blindly weigh the leaves above the fruit, the shadow above the light, indeed an itching temporal poison above everlasting salvation. To the third [objection] the answer is that a falsehood is assumed; for sin, since it is neither a private law nor granted by a prince, is not a privilege. For although the prince of

sed ad dampnum. Conceditur tamen ex immensitate potestatis veri principis quod racione cuiuscunque peccati occasionatur ecclesie Christi verum privilegium, cum timentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum Rom. VIII°, 28; non quod peccatum sit eis privilegium, sed quod profectus de peccato occasionaliter ortus cedat eis in privilegium. Et hoc est verum non solum de alienis peccatis sed de peccatis propriis que predestinati perpetrant. Conceditur tamen quod pena cedit filiis in privilegium, cum stimulus carnis a Deo datus apostolo cessit sibi ad virtutis exercicium, ut patet IIa Cor. XII°.

this world stirs [men] up to sin, yet he cannot, any more than God can, grant licence for it; and if, per impossibile, he granted licence for it, even a pretended one, he would do this not for the advantage but for the harm of the one privileged.[11] Yet it is granted, from the immensity of the power of the true prince, that by reason of any sin whatever a true privilege is occasioned to the church of Christ, since "to them that fear God all things work together unto good" (Romans 8:28): not that sin is a privilege to them, but that the profit arising by occasion from sin turns to their privilege. And this is true not only of others' sins but of the sins of their own which the predestinate commit. Yet it is granted that punishment turns to privilege for the sons, since the sting of the flesh, given by God to the Apostle, turned for him to the exercise of virtue, as is clear in 2 Corinthians 12[:7].[12]

¶4 250.1–250.16
250.1 *although God uses it for good, even to the wicked.*

[250] Unde sancti plus contentantur de tribulacione quam de mundana prosperitate propter securitatem et fructum meriti ampliorem, dampnati autem habent quoddam bonum ultra bonum nature ex merito Christi et sua punicione iusta; quod bonum, licet sit bonum utile beatis et honestum domino punienti, non tamen videtur mihi quod illud bonum sit eis privilegium utile vel honestum sed bonum mitigativum malicie vel quomodocunque aliter apcius nominetur. Unde licet sit privata lex concessa a principe, non tamen ad utilitatem persone cui inest formaliter, nec contendo sed concedo ad sensum equivocum quod illa dampnacio est privilegium beatis, cum racione iuste punicionis suorum hostium qui serviunt eis perpetuo suum gaudium quodam modo maioratur.

Hence the saints are more content with tribulation than with worldly prosperity, because of the security and the ampler fruit of merit; and the damned have a certain good beyond the good of nature, from the merit of Christ and their own just punishment; and this good, although it is a useful good to the blessed and an honourable one to the Lord who punishes, yet it does not seem to me that it is a useful or honourable privilege to them, but a good that mitigates malice, or however else it may more aptly be named. Hence, although it is a private law granted by a prince, yet it is not for the benefit of the person in whom it formally inheres. Nor do I contend [against it], but I grant, in an equivocal sense, that that damnation is a privilege to the blessed, since by reason of the just punishment of their enemies, who serve them perpetually, their joy is in a manner increased.[13]

Notes

1. B in the margin *Lex communis dupliciter*; A *Lex dicitur communis dupliciter* (246.25); side-note 246.26. *Membra*: the members of a division (public and private law in *Due sunt*, 11-d n. 14), not members of the church. *Licet racio non sit diversa*: so the print; "although the aspect (definition) is not different" sits oddly with *licet*, and *licet racio sit diversa* ("although their account differs") would be easier; the print is translated. *Obiectiva obligacione*: common by the range of what the law binds; *formali predicacione*: common as a universal is predicated of many.
2. B reads *Deus bonum* (247.4). A and A_1 read *clericum creare* (247.9). *Clericum curare de sua fama*: an example of a law-type instantiated in individual cases. *Quiditative predicatis*: predicated as what the species is (in quid).
3. The canon is C. 19 q. 2 c. 2, *Due sunt*, as in 11-d n. 14. *In suo analogo*: in the common term of which both are said analogically; *maneries*: kinds. *Quod notum est competere …*: every true privilege is also, in the canon's sense, confirmed by the fathers' writings, so the two members overlap.
4. Side-note 247.17. B omits *dati … personis* (247.19). *Persona cleri dotate*: the endowed clergy taken as one person (body); *persone priori*: "the former person", i.e. the endowed clergy, as against the clergy living without property. The point: endowment is common to all possessioners, yet a privilege relative to the whole clergy.
5. *Iuxta decretum*: *Due sunt* again (private law written in the heart by the Holy Spirit). *A principe*: here God, the giver of the private law. *Opera trinitatis sunt indivisa ad extra*: the axiom in its scholastic form; in substance Augustine, *De Trinitate* I.4.7, *sicut inseparabiles sunt, ita inseparabiliter operentur* (PL 42:824). *Omnis lex creata individua*: every individual created law.

6. Side-note 248.1. Matthew 10:9, Luke 10:7 (Wyclif omits *autem*) and Matthew 10:8, as the Vulgate; DR. *Privativum*: the privilege of not possessing; *positiva*: food and lodging. *Est dare*: "there are" (one can point to). *Ministratorie*: as a minister, serving.
7. A wrote *appropriata* and corrected it to *appropriate* (248.15). For *propriatorie* (248.17; so printed, plate), not a word, A and A_1 read *preparatorie*, which the side-note's "make the Church apt to receive" supports; translated "preparatorily". *Removens prohibens*: the scholastic "remover of an impediment", a cause only by accident, here an occasion (cf. Aristotle, *Physics* VIII.4, 255b24–27). Side-note 248.13.
8. A in the margin *Conclusio. Ritus* (248.21); B *Ritus sensibiles a Christo instituti sunt observandi plus quam alii* (248.24); side-note 248.21. *Proximo capitulo*: not located; chapter 10 has neither the Rechabites nor this comparison. Wyclif draws the same a fortiori from the Rechabites in *De civili dominio* III c. 19 (Society ed. IV, 383). Jeremiah 35:8: the precept was Jonadab's, "the son of Rechab, our father" (DR); Wyclif names the father Rechab. A wrote *Racabitis* and corrected it (248.28). *Ut exponit*: subject unexpressed; taken as the prophet.
9. *Ut illa spernuntur*: "as (in so far as) they are spurned". *Religio christiana*: the Christian religion, not *religio privata*.
10. A in the margin *Nota tria* (249.3). *Predicte abbathie*: Westminster. *Reportabit … reportat*: "carry away" as gain. B omits *detrimentum … salutem* (249.8), so losing the end of the second point and the opening of the third. *Indultis profugis*: granted (as indulgence) to the refugees.
11. *Ad tercium*: the third argument (246.1): every sin is a privilege. *Concessum principe*: ablative without *a*. *Vel pretense*: "even in pretence". *Privilegiandi*: of the one to be privileged.
12. Romans 8:28: the Vulgate has *diligentibus Deum* ("to them that love God", DR); Wyclif's *timentibus Deum* is translated. 2 Corinthians 12:7, *stimulus carnis* (DR "a sting of my flesh"). A in the margin *Nota* (249.34). *Filiis*: the sons of God.
13. Side-note 250.1. *Ex merito Christi et sua punicione iusta*: the good the damned have is that of being justly punished. *Honestum domino punienti*: honourable to the Lord in that he punishes justly. *Mitigativum malicie*: restraining their malice. *Nec contendo*: "nor do I contend [otherwise]". After *maioratur* A adds two lines of Czech verse, which Loserth renders "In England they imprison two faithful priests for the word of God" (250.16); a Bohemian scribe's addition, not Wyclif's.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 247: *modo* (Q alinea letter + 163[b] folio mark glued)
  - 247: *monasterii*
  - 247: *vel* (bold argument numeral 1 glued)
  - 248: ∅ (print has pri-/vativum; main already holds privativum whole at pos 4)
  - 248: ∅ (print has Matthei X°, 9 once; main pos 6 already covers Matthei X° (glued), 9 at pos 7)
  - 248: *zonis* (z-form ȝ in italic zonis; print spelling) [NW]
  - 248: *corporalia* (5 after it is the line number)
  - 248: *Talia*
  - 248: *proximo* (25 after it is the line number)
  - 249: *Christi* (163[d] folio mark in margin)
  - 249: *cum*
  - 250: *Christi*
  - 248: *negativum*
  - 248: *Matthei X°,* (token covers two words; X read as \) [-MARK]

Chapter 12

Part 1: The charge of destroying the church's privileges; God cannot take away without recompense

Loserth pp. 250.18–254.23

¶1 250.18–252.25
250.18 *Objections: 1. We are charged with wishing to overthrow the privileges of the Church. Answer: This charge is false.*
251.1 *Falsehood may consist in act or in word.*
251.14 *Those who say they are priests should live in poverty;*
251.21 *and if they claim secular rule it is a horrible falsehood.*
252.1 *We must not let fear of detraction keep us from our duty.*
252.26 *We detest homicide at Westminster or elsewhere.*

[250]**Ex istis colligi potest solucio tam vulgarium obiectuum quam scolasticorum quos quidam seminant, quando deficiunt eis efficacia argumenta. Sic enim declinant quidam ad commenta mendacii, dicentes quod nos nitimur destruere privilegia sancte matris ecclesie, unde et commovent milites et alios quos credunt ex sperato lucro defensioni privilegii predicti intendere quomodo defenderent ipsum, destruendo eius adversarios, sub obtentu eterni premii ex operibus pietatis.** [251]**Sed tales attenderent ad scolam et fructum mendacii, Nam XXII^a^ q. ultima, ex auctoritate beati Ambrosii sic habetur; Cavete fratres mendacium, quia omnes qui ipsum amant filii diaboli sunt, Nec solum in falsis verbis sed eciam in simulatis operibus mendacium est. Mendacium quippe est christianum se dicere et opera Christi non facere. Mendacium est episcopum, sacerdotem vel clericum se profiteri et contraria huic ordini operari. Et tales leges ecclesie predicari debent tam clericis maioribus quam minoribus, cum sint precipua lex eorum, nec non et laicis, cum pater mendacii cum suis sophistis infecit mendaciis magnam partem vocate ecclesie. Nam pretendentes se esse sacerdotes vel clericos et non facientes quod incumbit illi officio, falso nomine, mendacio et ypocrisi decipiunt plebem Dei. Debent enim exproprietarie vivere tamquam humiles et utiles procuratores pauperum, quorum bona custodiunt. Unde beatus Ysidorus, III° libro, De Summo Bono c. XLII°: Agnoscat, inquit, episcopus servum se esse plebis, non dominum. Verum hoc caritas, non condicio exigit. Et XVI^a^, q. I, sub auctoritate Jeronymi Damaso pape scribitur quod quicquid habent clerici pauperum est. Pretendere ergo dominacionem secularem eciam plus quam laici super tam alienis bonis pauperum est horrendum mendacium. Non ergo debet fidelis propter talia mendacia non predicare populo periculum ex declinacione** [252]**a lege domini, quia ut dicitur XI^a^, q. III^a^, inter verba: Sufficit christiano invocare in testimonium operis purgatam conscienciam atque Deum. Habemus, inquit Gregorius, Paulum dicentem: Gloria nostra hec est, testimonium consciencie nostre. Job quoque dicit: Ecce in celo testis meus. Si, inquit, est nobis testis in celo, testis in corde, dimittamus stultos foris loqui quod volunt. Quid enim aliud detrahentes faciunt nisi quod in pulverem sufflant**

From these things can be gathered the solution both of the popular objections and of the scholastic ones which certain people sow when effective arguments fail them. For thus certain people decline to the fictions of falsehood, saying that we are striving to destroy the privileges of holy mother church; and hence they also stir up knights and others whom they believe, from hope of gain, to be intent on the defence of the said privilege, [as to] how they should defend it, by destroying its adversaries, under pretext of an eternal reward for works of piety.[1] [251] **But such people should attend to the school and the fruit of falsehood. For in C. 22 q. 5 [the last question], on the authority of blessed Ambrose, it is had thus: "Beware of falsehood, brethren, for all who love it are sons of the devil. Nor is there falsehood only in false words, but also in feigned works. For it is a falsehood to call oneself a Christian and not to do the works of Christ. It is a falsehood to profess oneself a bishop, priest or cleric and to work things contrary to this order."[2] And such laws of the church ought to be preached both to the greater clerics and to the lesser, since they are their chief law, and also to the laity, since the father of lies with his sophists has infected a great part of the so-called church with falsehoods. For those who pretend to be priests or clerics and do not do what belongs to that office deceive the people of God by a false name, by falsehood and by hypocrisy. For they ought to live without property, as humble and useful proctors of the poor, whose goods they keep. Hence blessed Isidore, in book 3 of *De summo bono*, chapter 42: "Let the bishop recognize," he says, "that he is the servant of the people, not the lord. But charity, not status, requires this."[3] And in C. 16 q. 1, under the authority of Jerome, it is written to Pope Damasus that whatever clerics have belongs to the poor. To claim, then, secular exercise of lordship, even more than the laity, over goods so much another's, the goods of the poor, is a horrible falsehood.[4] Therefore the faithful man ought not, because of such falsehoods, to fail to preach to the people the danger from turning aside** [252]**from the law of the Lord; because, as is said in C. 11 q. 3 [c. 55], *Inter verba*: "It is enough for a Christian to call a cleansed conscience and**

et in oculos suos terram excitant, ut unde plus detraccionis perflant, inde magis, nichil veritatis videant. Si, inquam, publicarem istam sentenciam quam predico principaliter propter lucrum seculi vel laudem hominum, ego essem me ipso stulcior, lavans laterem, quia scio quod fama vel favor populi est valde flexibilis et vertibilis propter timorem, favorem vel odium instar venti. Sed cum veritas domini manet semper, non movet dicta infidelis commocio fidelem servum Christi, ut omnino taceat, quia Act. XVII° et XIX° legitur quomodo synagoga Judeorum et principes sacerdotum concitaverunt vulgum, Demetrium et artifices facientes edes argenteas Diane, ex quibus quesierunt questum non modicum, commovere populum clamare constanter: Magna Diana Ephesiorum, sed post conversi cognoverunt quod doctrina apostoli fuit eis utilior.

God to witness of his work. 'We have,' says Gregory, 'Paul saying: For our glory is this, the testimony of our conscience. Job also says: Behold my witness is in heaven. If,' he says, 'we have a witness in heaven, a witness in the heart, let us leave the foolish to say outside what they will. For what else do detractors do but blow into the dust and raise earth into their own eyes, so that the more they blow out detraction, the more they see nothing of the truth?'"[5] If, I say, I published this teaching which I preach chiefly for the world's gain or the praise of men, I should be more foolish than myself, washing a brick; for I know that the fame or favour of the people is very pliable and changeable, through fear, favour or hatred, like the wind.[6] But since the truth of the Lord remains for ever, the commotion of the unbeliever does not move the faithful servant of Christ to be wholly silent about what has been said; for in Acts 17 and 19 it is read how the synagogue of the Jews and the chief priests stirred up the crowd, [and] Demetrius and the craftsmen who made silver temples for Diana, from which they sought no small gain, stirred up the people to cry out steadily, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"; but afterwards, converted, they recognized that the apostle's doctrine was more useful to them.[7]

¶2 252.26–253.7
253.8
2. We are charged with derogating from the power of the Pope.
253.18 *God cannot take anything from the righteous without compensation.*

[252]Detestamur autem occisionem hominum nedum in Westmonasterio sed altrinsecus inter regna, sed distinguimus inter extraccionem pro tutela regni, et castigacione hominum salubri hominum legiorum de quo facta fuit nobis questio, et inter occisionem que facta fuit preter preceptum aut voluntatem regis vel sui consilii. Unde hominibus armorum plus optamus prosperitatem [253]et requiem quam adversarii quorum falsa exheredacione et ceca excitacione tot prelia oriuntur. Unde testis sit mihi Deus: Ego vellem si Deo placeret quod nedum illa ecclesia sed quelibet ecclesia Anglicana haberet per precinctum viginti milliarium plenam libertatem pro omnibus fugitivis, unde plenam libertatem sancte matris ecclesie sicio modo meo.

But we detest the killing of men, not only at Westminster but elsewhere, between kingdoms; but we distinguish between dragging out for the safeguard of the kingdom and for the wholesome chastisement of men, liege men, about which a question was put to us, and the killing which was done beyond the command or will of the king or of his council.[8] Hence we wish men-at-arms prosperity [253]and rest more than [do] their adversaries, from whose false disinheriting and blind stirring-up so many battles arise. Hence God be my witness: I would wish, if it pleased God, that not only that church but every church in England had full liberty for all fugitives through a precinct of twenty miles; hence I thirst, in my own way, for the full liberty of holy mother church.[9]

¶3 253.8–254.23

[253]Secundo principaliter arguitur per hoc quod dicta de potestate privilegiandi nedum sonant in Dei blasphemiam sed derogant potestati pape et regalie regum seculi. Dictum est enim quod Deus non potest auferre quicquam ab homine stante iure suo, nisi satisfaciat aliunde; quod repugnat potencie adnichilandi, et multo magis dominus papa non potest licite auferre beneficium a digno nisi deliquerit. Nec rex habet super omnibus bonis sui regni plenum dominium; que videntur sonare blasphemiam et sacrilegium. Hic

Second, it is argued principally, by appeal to this: that what was said about the power of privileging not only sounds to the blasphemy of God but derogates from the power of the pope and the regality of the kings of the world. For it has been said that God cannot take anything away from a man while his right stands, unless he makes satisfaction from elsewhere, which conflicts with the power of annihilating; and much more, that the lord pope cannot lawfully take a benefice away from a worthy man unless he has offended; nor does the king have full lordship over all the goods

negatur conclusio, cum Deus absolute necessario habet summam potestatem privilegiandi, et illa est infinitum maior quam aliqua potestas creata. Quantum ad primam instanciam, concedi debet conclusio: nam si Deus aufert quidquam ab homine stante iure suo sine hoc quod recompenset aliunde, tunc iniuriatur illi homini, quod non potest. Nam iustum est quod haberet ablatum, cum stat ius primum, ut ponitur, sed nemo est causa quare ius illud tollitur nisi Deus, ut ponitur; ergo solus Deus est causa illius iniurie. Et per consequens, cum iusticia sit constans et perpetua voluntas divina, tribuens unicuique quod suum est, patet cum veris sequi quod Deus est contrarius sibi ipsi, quia simul vult quod habent datum bonum, cum sit iustum, et vult quod nunc non habeat, cum aufert. Loquimur enim de habere opposito ablacioni [254] qua Deus aufert, et de iure ad sic habendum pro eadem mensura. Similiter vel est ablatarius contentatus de ablacione Dei vel remurmurat vel est neuter. Sed si contentatus, meretur a Deo meritum vel augmentum meriti, quod est valencius quam foret abicio oblati, et per consequens, Deus per commutacionem vel recompensacionem super remunerat. Si ablatarius remurmurat, perit propter peccatum suum ius habendi, et sumus extra casum conclusionis, sicut Egipcii forisfacientes in capitalem dominum exciderunt a iure bonorum a quibus ex mandato domini habentis ipsa in fisco fuerant spoliati. Cui, inquam, debuit iustus iudex dare bona sic confiscata nisi servis suis qui prius ipsa meruerant? Si autem ablatarius sit neuter quoad actum explicitum, equanimiter tollerat ipsum eventum, et quicquid Deus decreverit faciendum, et per consequens, accrescit in merito; talem enim actum vel habitum confusum oportet inesse omni iusto; et patet conclusio. Unde ista fides de absolute necessaria iusticia et misericordia Dei facit christianos gaudenter pati et gratulanter acceptare quicquid prosperitatis vel pene eis acciderit, quia sciunt demonstrative quod Deus non potest eis humiliter pacientibus deficere, quin loco ablati tribuat pociora.

of his kingdom: things which seem to sound of blasphemy and sacrilege.[10] To this the conclusion is denied, since God, absolutely necessarily, has the highest power of privileging, and it is infinitely greater than any created power. As to the first objection, the conclusion ought to be granted: for if God takes anything away from a man while his right stands, without recompensing from elsewhere, then he does injury to that man, which he cannot do. For it is just that he should have what was taken away, since the first right stands, as is supposed; now no one is the cause why that right is taken away except God, as is supposed; therefore God alone is the cause of that injury.[11] And consequently, since justice is the constant and perpetual divine will that gives to each what is his, it is clear that it follows together with truths that God is contrary to himself, because at the same time he wills that they have the good given, since it is just, and wills that he now not have it, since he takes it away. For we are speaking of having as opposed to the taking away [254] by which God takes away, and of the right to have so, for the same measure [of time].[12] Likewise: either the one deprived is content with God's taking away, or he murmurs against it, or he is neither. Now if content, he merits from God merit or an increase of merit, which is of more worth than the loss of what was taken away would be; and consequently God, by exchange or recompense, over-rewards. If the one deprived murmurs, his right of having perishes through his sin, and we are outside the case of the conclusion: as the Egyptians, committing forfeiture against the chief lord, fell from the right to the goods of which, by command of the Lord who had them in his treasury, they had been despoiled. To whom, I say, ought the just judge to have given the goods thus confiscated but to his servants, who had earlier earned them?[13] But if the one deprived is neither, as regards an explicit act, he bears the event itself with equanimity, and whatever God has decreed is to be done; and consequently he grows in merit; for such an act or indistinct habit must be present in every just man; and the conclusion is clear. Hence this faith concerning the absolutely necessary justice and mercy of God makes Christians suffer joyfully and accept thankfully whatever prosperity or pain befalls them, because they know demonstratively that God cannot fail them when they suffer humbly, without giving things of greater worth in place of what was taken away.[14]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Prima obieccio* (250.18); side-note 250.18. *Commenta mendacii*: fictions of falsehood; *mendacium* is "falsehood" throughout, keeping Ambrose's double sense (lie in word, lie in deed). *Quos credunt ... intendere*: accusative and infinitive after *credunt*; *quomodo defenderent* is loosely attached, "[thinking] how they might defend it". For *defensioni ... intendere* A reads *defensioni ... impedire*, A_1 *defensionem ... impedire* (250.24); the print is translated. *Sub obtentu*: on the pretext.
2. C. 22 q. 5 c. 20, attributed to Ambrose (Loserth, 251.2; *q. ultima* is q. 5; our modern form). A in the margin *Contra mendacium* (251.7); B *Lex pugnans contra mendaces opere vel sermone. Mendacium duplex* (251.9); side-note 251.1. A has, over the alinea, *Malus episcopus, sacerdos vel clericus non est talis* (251.1). *Huic ordini*: the clerical order.
3. A lacks *leges* (251.9). Side-note 251.14. Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) III.42, PL 83:711C: *Agnoscat episcopus servum se esse plebis, non dominum*, as Wyclif has it (Loserth, 251.18, reports *se esse conservum*). A in the margin *Ysidorus* (251.18). *Condicio*: rank, status.
4. C. 16 q. 1 c. 68 (Loserth, 251.23); A in the margin *Jeronymus* (251.21); side-note 251.21. *Super tam alienis bonis pauperum*: goods so wholly another's, namely the poor's.
5. C. 11 q. 3 c. 55, whose incipit is *Inter verba laudantium sive vituperantium* (Gregory, *Registrum* XI.2; Friedberg I, 657–58; Loserth, 252.1, 252.3). The nested quotation follows the canon: the canon quotes Gregory, who quotes 2 Corinthians 1:12 and Job 16:20 (Wyclif omits *enim*; DR). A and A_1 omit *et in ... perflant* (252.9–11). *Inde magis, nichil veritatis videant*: "the more ... the more they see nothing", i.e. the less they see. Side-note 252.1.
6. *Me ipso stulcior*: more foolish than myself, i.e. than I am. *Lavans laterem*: "washing a brick", the proverb for wasted labour (Terence, *Phormio* 186, *purgem me? laterem lavem*). A reads *laudans laterem* (252.14).
7. *Veritas domini manet*: cf. Ps. 116:2 (Vulgate). *Dicta*: taken as the object of *taceat*, "be silent about what has been said". Acts 17:5 (the Jews stir up the city) and 19:24–28 (Demetrius, "silver temples for Diana", "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!", DR). *Principes sacerdotum*: Acts 17 names no chief priests; Wyclif's addition. *Demetrium et artifices ... commovere*: accusative and infinitive after *legitur*, joined loosely to the first clause. *Post conversi*: the conversion is Wyclif's inference (cf. Acts 19:18–20).
8. Side-note 252.26. The killing at Westminster: the violation of the abbey's sanctuary in 1378, which occasioned this chapter's question (11 August 1378; Loserth, Introduction, p. ix). *Altrinsecus inter regna*: elsewhere, in war between realms. *Et castigacione ... legiorum*: the ablative *castigacione* is construed as parallel to *extraccionem* ("and [for] the wholesome chastisement"); *hominum legiorum*: liege men. *De quo*: the question put to Wyclif.
9. *Hominibus armorum*: men-at-arms. *Falsa exheredacione*: false disinheriting (of the rightful holders). *Milliarium*: the manuscripts' form; Loserth notes *milliariorum* would be more correct (253.5). *Sicio*: *sitio*, "I thirst for".
10. A in the margin *Contra. Secunda obieccio* (253.8); side-note 253.8. *Dictum est*: in the earlier treatment of the power of privileging (cap. 8–9). *Quod repugnat potencie adnichilandi*: the objector's point: God can annihilate, so he can take away. *Et multo magis ...*: still governed by *dictum est*.
11. B reads *Hic negetur*; A in the margin *Responsio* (253.18); side-note 253.18. A in the margin *Conclusio* (253.20). *Hic negatur conclusio*: the objection's conclusion, that the teaching is blasphemous; *concedi debet conclusio*: Wyclif's own thesis, that God cannot take away while the right stands without recompense. *Ut ponitur*: as is supposed in the case.
12. *Iusticia ... tribuens unicuique quod suum est*: the definition of justice in Justinian (*Inst.* 1.1 pr.), (*constans et perpetua voluntas ius suum cuique tribuens*), with *divina* added and *unicuique quod suum est* for *ius suum cuique*. A in the margin *Differencie iusticie* (253.27). A and A_1 lack *enim* (253.33). *Cum veris*: with truths (admitted premisses). *Quod habent ... quod ... non habeat*: the print shifts from plural to singular; both refer to the one deprived. *Pro eadem mensura*: for the same measure (instant).
13. B reads *Vel per* (254.6). *Abicio oblati*: so the print; the sense requires "the loss (*ablacio*) of what was taken away (*ablati*)", which is translated. *Super remunerat*: rewards beyond. The Egyptians: Exodus 12:35–36 ("and they stripped the Egyptians", DR); *forisfacientes in capitalem dominum*: by their offence against God as chief lord they forfeited their right. A and A_1 read *confiscancia* (254.13).
14. *Equanimiter*: the manuscripts' corrupt form is corrected by Loserth (254.15). *Quoad actum explicitum*: as regards an explicit act of the will; the *habitus confusus* is the indistinct standing disposition to accept God's will. A in the margin *Conclusio* (254.19). *Tribuat*: Loserth's correction of the manuscripts' *tribuet* (254.23), translated.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 250: *CAP. XII.*
  - 250: *deficiunt*
  - 250: *Sic*
  - 250: ∅ ('is' is English side-note text (This charge is); print: dicentes quod nos, main has quod at 136)
  - 251: *tales* [NW]
  - 251: *profiteri*
  - 251: *ypocrisi*
  - 252: *XI*ª
  - 252: *III*ª (164ª A after it is folio mark + alinea)
  - 252: *regna*
  - 252: *legiorum* (print: hominum legiorum)
  - 253: *illa*
  - 254: *gratulanter* [NW]
  - 252: *lege*
  - 254: *aufert*

Part 2: Every grant implies a condition of worthiness; third objection: privileges to be read mercifully

Loserth pp. 254.24–258.22

¶1 254.24–258.7
254.24 *It is therefore useless to put cases in which God is supposed to do so;*
255.1 *and what God cannot do the Pope cannot do rightly,*
255.8 *nor can secular lords.*
255.13 *I (Wyclif) am the real advocate of Church privileges.*
255.19
3. It is said that the realm, through parliament, has consented and is therefore not injured; Answer: We may do injury to a willing man a) in helping him to sin,
255.27 *b) in not punishing him for sin,*
255.31 *c) still more in taking money to*
256.1 *abet him in his sin*
256.27 *There is implicit sin In acts that lead to sin, even when that result is not intended.*
257.3 *Hence all grants shoald be conditional on worthiness in the grantee.*
257.18 *Even God's promises are thus conditional.*
258.1 *Hence Wyclif's warnings that the clergy may forfeit their privileges.*
258.8
3. It is objected that a) the king's grant should be interpreted mercifully;
258.14 *and that b) a privilege is not proved to be evil by an occasional wrong.*

[254]**Unde vani sunt casus quibus ponitur Deum auferre a justo graciam vel adnichilare hominem sine suo demerito; hoc enim derogaret omnipotencie et supremo dominio Dei nostri. Ideo cum notum sit quod Deus, si sic faceret juste faceret, non restat nisi expectare in fide predicta, quousque probatum fuerit, si poterit, quod Deus possit sic facere; nichil itaque repugnat potencie adnichilandi cum illa non potest esse, et ista exemplaris iusticia in Deo debet esse exemplar cuilibet eius vicario, tam pape quam regi, ut non faciat** [255]**iniuriam alicui. Unde blasphemant quidam extollentes papam sophistice super omne quod dicitur Deus, qui dicunt quod licet sibi auferre beneficium a subdito non demerente nec facta debita recompensacione aliunde; hoc enim non est Deo licitum et si Antichristus illud presumpserit, tunc Christus faceret humiliter pacienti iniuriam recompensam. Et eodem modo dicitur de dominis temporalibus; non enim licet eis spoliare sanctam matrem ecclesiam, nisi prius deliquerit abutendo elemosinis datis pauperibus, et multo magis non licet regi concedere membris diaboli licenciam iniuste oblata a sancta matre ecclesia perpetuo detinendi, quia hoc foret maior iniuria. Unde notare potest indifferens quomodo sum specialior procurator pro conservandis privilegiis et bonis sancte ecclesie, quam illi qui dicunt quod licet dominis temporalibus concedere latronibus ut sine restitucione retineant quecunque bona sancte ecclesie. Et si obicitur quod volenti non fit iniuria, sed totum regnum est virtualiter congregatum in parliamento, ergo consenciente parliamento ad aliquid non fit regno iniuria, licet scelerati habuerint in ecclesia privilegium supradictum, patet quod consequencia non procedit. Nam stat quod signando volenti fiat manifesta iniuria, ut posito quod quis velit peccare et habeat excitatorem et fautorem criminis, hinc primo peccatori volenti fit iniuria a proximo culpabiliter excitante. Ymmo quandocunque prepositus omittit debitam correpcionem propter falsam pietatem volentis sordescere, iniuriatur eidem, ut Hely dampnabiliter iniuriatus est filiis suis Ophni et Finees, quam iniuriam ipsi dampnabiliter voluerunt. Et multo magis fovens hominem in peccato propter pecuniam, iniuriatur** [256]**eidem, et ita generaliter quandocunque quis consentit culpabiliter temptatori; nec est hic sophisma: Petrus vult id quod de facto est peccatum vel formaliter antecedens ad illud, sed non vult peccatum, sicut sophiste dicunt quod formaliter vult percutere Petrum scit quod ille est sacerdos,**

Hence the cases are vain in which God is supposed to take grace away from a just man, or to annihilate a man, without his demerit; for this would derogate from the omnipotence and the supreme lordship of our God. Therefore, since it is known that God, if he did so, would do it justly, nothing remains but to wait in the aforesaid faith until it has been proved, if it can be, that God can do so; and so nothing conflicts with the power of annihilating, since that [unjust taking away] cannot be; and this exemplary justice in God ought to be an exemplar to every vicar of his, pope as well as king, that he do no [255]**injury to anyone.[1] Hence certain people blaspheme, sophistically exalting the pope above all that is called God, who say that it is lawful for him to take a benefice away from a subject who has not deserved it, without due recompense being made from elsewhere; for this is not lawful for God; and if Antichrist should presume it, then Christ would make recompense for the injury to the one who suffers it humbly.[2] And the same is said of temporal lords; for it is not lawful for them to despoil holy mother church unless she has first offended by abusing the alms given to the poor; and much more is it not lawful for a king to grant to members of the devil licence to withhold unjustly, in perpetuity, from holy mother church what has been offered [to her], since this would be a greater injury.[3] Hence an impartial man can note how I am a more special proctor for preserving the privileges and goods of holy church than those who say that it is lawful for temporal lords to grant to robbers that they keep, without restitution, any goods whatever of holy church. And if it is objected that no injury is done to one who is willing; now the whole kingdom is virtually assembled in parliament; therefore, when parliament consents to anything, no injury is done to the kingdom, even though criminals have had the aforesaid privilege in the church: it is clear that the inference does not hold.[4] For it can be that, to point out [a case], a manifest injury is done to one who is willing: as, supposing that someone wills to sin and has an inciter and abettor of the crime, hence, first, injury is done to the willing sinner by his neighbour who culpably incites him. Indeed, whenever a superior omits due correction out of false piety toward one who wills to grow filthy, he does him injury, as Eli damnably did injury to his sons Hophni and Phinehas, an injury which they themselves damnably willed.[5] And**

et tamen non vult percutere sacerdotem. Nam sophisma istud est impossibile (sicut alias declaravi); tunc enim non foret volucio vel concessio implicita, quia si homo vult particulare per accidens implicitum in universali per se primo volito, multo magis vult implicite formaliter consequens ad per se volitum, ut si rex vult quod Petrus clericus habeat dictum privilegium, quia vult quod omnis clericus regni sui habeat dictum privilegium, et Petrus est aliquis talis clericus, multo magis vult omne formaliter sequens ad illud. Unde necessitas cogit eciam avaros concedere hanc logicam, cum aliter non participarent privilegiis vel elemosinis principum, nisi in concessione vel volucione generali, notata in cartis illis, implicite sit concessa participacio elemosine generalis. Et isto modo concedunt catholici quod in Petro procuratore ecclesie concessa est a Christo generaliter in quodam involucro potestas ordinis cuilibet sacerdoti sequenti. Cum ergo peccatum patenter sequitur ex actibus volitis cum suis circumstanciis, videtur quod volens illud antecedens vult saltem implicite peccatum consequens. Sic enim dicit Augustinus quod omne peccatum est voluntarium, et fides scripture sepe dicit quod homo vult et diligit multa mala, et tamen notum est quod non vult ipsa explicite secundum racionem qua mala. Et hec racio quare necesse est dominos temporales in quacunque concessione generalis privilegii vel elemosine perpetue subintelligere [257] condicionem dignitatis persone capacis (ut dictum est XX° cap. libri proximi et sepe alias). Unde (ut dixi hic) Deus non potest subintelleccionem talis condicionis pretermittere, et curia Romana declarat in omni concessione sua de privilegio condicionem debere subintelligi (ut in proximo capitulo allegatur decretum pape XXV^{a} q. I, Ideo permittente). Absit itaque ut imponamus dominis temporalibus tantam blasphemiam quod ipsi non sint Deo subiecti subintelligentes condicionem, si Deo placuerit, cum Jacobi IV° docetur tota christiana religio de cunctis operibus futuris exprimere vel saltem subintelligere si Deus voluerit; aliter enim posset discolus vendicare elemosinas principum stante maxima discolia; et sic inficerentur elemosine (ut dictum est XXIV cap. libri proximi). Unde Archidiaconus dicit quod tales discoli non sunt illi quibus elemosine sunt concesse. Attenderemus ergo ad dictum Dei, 1° Regum II°, 30, concedentis Hely et suo generi sacerdocium perpetuum: Loquens, inquit, locutus sum, ut domus tua et domus patris tui ministraret in conspectu meo usque in sempiternum. Nunc autem dicit Dominus: Absit hoc a me, sed quicunque honorificaverit me, glorificabo eum, qui autem contempnunt me, erunt ignobiles; non potest blaspheme intelligi quod Deus sit contrarius sibi ipsi, cum secundum Apostolum se ipsum

much more does one who fosters a man in sin for money do injury [256] to him; and so, generally, whenever someone culpably consents to a tempter. Nor is there place here for the sophism: "Peter wills that which in fact is a sin, or formally antecedent to it, but does not will the sin"; as the sophists say that [someone] formally wills to strike Peter, knows that he is a priest, and yet does not will to strike a priest.[6] For that sophism is impossible (as I have shown elsewhere); for then there would be no implicit willing or granting; because if a man wills a particular that is implied accidentally in a universal willed per se and primarily, much more does he implicitly will what follows formally, the consequent of what is willed per se: as, if the king wills that Peter the cleric have the said privilege because he wills that every cleric of his kingdom have the said privilege, and Peter is some such cleric, much more does he will everything that follows formally from that.[7] Hence necessity forces even the avaricious to grant this logic, since otherwise they would not share in the privileges or alms of princes, unless in the general grant or willing recorded in those charters a share in the general alms were implicitly granted. And in this way catholics grant that in Peter, the proctor of the church, the power of order was granted by Christ generally, in a kind of wrapping, to every priest who follows.[8] Since, then, sin plainly follows from acts that are willed, with their circumstances, it seems that one who wills that antecedent wills, at least implicitly, the consequent sin. For so Augustine says that every sin is voluntary; and the faith of scripture often says that man wills and loves many evils; and yet it is known that he does not will them explicitly under the aspect by which they are evils.[9] And this is the reason why temporal lords, in any grant whatever of a general privilege or of perpetual alms, must understand as implied [257] the condition of the worthiness of a capable person (as was said in chapter 20 of the preceding book, and often elsewhere).[10] Hence (as I have said here) God cannot omit the implied understanding of such a condition; and the Roman curia declares that in every grant of its concerning privilege the condition must be understood as implied (as the pope's decree in C. 25 q. 1 [c. 16], *Ideo permittente*, is alleged in the preceding chapter).[11] Far be it, therefore, that we should impute to temporal lords so great a blasphemy as that they are not subject to God, understanding as implied the condition: if it please God; since in James 4:15 the whole Christian religion is taught, concerning all future works, to express, or at least to understand as implied: if God will. For otherwise a froward man could claim the alms of princes while the greatest frowardness persisted; and so the alms would be infected (as

negare non potest, sed quia subintellexit condicionem de Hely et suo genere quantum ad sacerdocium perpetuum, quam condicionem ipsi peccando diruperant, necesse fuit ex iusto iudicio veritatis, ut transferretur ab illo ad alium per donum Dei. Aliter enim Deus foret auctor iniurie. Ideo sepe dedi clericis nostris [258] consilium quod honorarent scripturam sacram, tam verbo quam opere, quia sine conservacione huius carte impossibile est quod maneat dignitas ad privilegium vel aliquod bonum gratuitum capiendum. Alie autem carte prosunt quandoque per accidens, sed nunquam nisi in virtute testamenti domini principaliter observati.

was said in chapter 24 of the preceding book). Hence the Archdeacon says that "such froward men are not those to whom the alms have been granted".[12] We should attend, then, to the word of God in 1 Samuel 2:30, when he granted Eli and his line a perpetual priesthood: "I said indeed," he says, "that thy house, and the house of thy father, should minister in my sight, for ever. But now saith the Lord: Far be this from me: but whosoever shall honour me, him will I glorify: but they that despise me, shall be despised." It cannot be understood, except blasphemously, that God is contrary to himself, since according to the Apostle "he cannot deny himself" (2 Timothy 2:13); but because he understood as implied a condition concerning Eli and his line as to the perpetual priesthood, a condition which they had broken by sinning, it was necessary, by the just judgment of truth, that it be transferred from him to another by the gift of God. For otherwise God would be the author of injury.[13] Therefore I have often given our clerics [258] the counsel that they should honour holy scripture, in word as well as in deed; because without the keeping of this charter it is impossible that worthiness should remain for receiving a privilege or any gratuitous good. But other charters are sometimes of use accidentally; but never except in virtue of the testament of the Lord, kept as the principal [charter].[14]

¶2 258.8–258.22

[258] Tercio principaliter obicitur per hoc quod privilegium regum est pie et misericorditer interpretandum, ymmo necessitante casu ad aliquod inconveniens fugiendum est maius inconveniens et inconveniens minus tollerandum. Non ergo sequitur: dato privilegio sequitur inconveniens, ergo ipsum est impium vel tollendum, cum tunc evangelium, passio Christi et omne bonum foret tollendum, cum occasione male accepta malum ex illo provenit. Et istum obiectum clamant tam scolastici quam vulgares in tantum quod unus iuridicus dixit michi nullam esse legem universalem humanam, quin sepe in casu necesse sit ex illa sequi iniusticiam iudicando. Ideo attendendo ad maius bonum fructus quam malum defectus, debet malum nedum permitti sed fieri propter bonum.

The third main objection is by appeal to this: that the privilege of kings is to be interpreted piously and mercifully; indeed, when a case forces [one] into some ill consequence, the greater ill consequence is to be fled and the lesser ill consequence tolerated.[15] It does not follow, therefore: "Given the privilege, an ill consequence follows; therefore it is impious or to be done away with"; since then the gospel, the passion of Christ and every good would have to be done away with, since, by occasion wrongly taken, evil comes from it. And both the schoolmen and the common people cry up this objection, so much so that a certain jurist told me that there is no universal human law from which it is not often necessary, in a [particular] case, that injustice follow in judging. Therefore, attending to the greater good of the fruit rather than to the evil of the defect, evil ought not only to be permitted but to be done for the sake of good.[16]

Notes

1. Side-note 254.24; A in the margin, above fol. 164 without reference mark, *Deus non potest iniuste auferre nec potest annichilare* (254.24). *Ponitur*: is supposed (in the case put). *In fide predicta*: the faith stated at the end of 12-a (254.19–23). *Cum illa non potest esse*: *illa* is taken as the unjust taking away or annihilation of the cases just named; it could also be read of a power so used, "since such [a power] cannot be". *Exemplaris ... exemplar*: Wyclif's play is kept.

2. An allusion, roman in the print: 2 Thessalonians 2:4, "above all that is called God" (DR; Wyclif *super*, Vulgate *supra*), turned on the pope's flatterers. Side-note 255.1. *Non demerente*: who has not deserved [the loss]. *Faceret ... iniuriam recompensam*: literally "would make the injury recompensed".
3. A and A_1 read *dicetur*, "will be said" (255.8); side-note 255.8. *Deliquerit*: the subject is holy mother church. *Licenciam iniuste oblata ... perpetuo detinendi*: construed with *detinere a*, "to withhold from"; *oblata* taken as the offerings made to the church. A and A_1 *membro* for *membris* (255.11); A *detenendi* (255.12).
4. Side-notes 255.13, 255.19; A in the margin, without reference mark, *Obieccio. Materia super voluntate peccati* (255.19). *Specialior procurator*: Wyclif turns back the charge of 12-a (250.20) that he would destroy the church's privileges. *Volenti non fit iniuria*: the legal maxim (cf. Digest 47.10.1.5; *Liber Sextus* 5.12 reg. 27, *Scienti et consentienti non fit iniuria*, Friedberg II). *Sed totum regnum*: the minor premiss, hence "now". *Virtualiter*: by representation.
5. *Signando*: taken as "to point out [a case]", introducing *ut posito*; the gerund has no expressed object. A in the margin *Conclusio* (255.23); B in the margin *Volenti fit iniuria* (255.27). *Primo*: the first of the cases the side-notes letter a–c (255.19, 255.27, 255.31). Eli's failure to correct his sons: 1 Samuel 2:22–25 and 3:13 ("because he knew that his sons did wickedly, and did not chastise them", DR). *Volentis sordescere*: one who wills to grow filthy.
6. A in the margin *Sophisma* (256.2); side-note 256.1. *Quod formaliter vult percutere Petrum scit quod ille est sacerdos*: the print has no subject and no connective before *scit*; construed as "[someone] ... wills ..., knows ...". B reads *cum non vult* at 256.6.
7. B in the margin *Volucio duplex implicita scilicet et explicita* (256.10). *Particulare per accidens implicitum in universali per se primo volito*: a particular implied accidentally in a universal that is willed per se and primarily. *Formaliter consequens ad per se volitum*: what follows formally from what is willed per se. The king's grant to "every cleric" stands for the sanctuary charter's grant to every fugitive.
8. *In quodam involucro*: "in a kind of wrapping", i.e. contained implicitly in the grant to Peter. *Potestas ordinis*: the power of order, the sacramental power. *Sequenti*: taken as "who follows [him]" in succession.
9. A in the margin *Augustinus* (256.27); side-note 256.27. Augustine on sin as voluntary: *De vera religione* 14.27 (PL 34), *usque adeo peccatum voluntarium est malum, ut nullo modo sit peccatum, si non sit voluntarium*, which Wyclif paraphrases. *Secundum racionem qua mala*: under the aspect by which they are evils.
10. A in the margin *Conclusio* (256.31); side-note 257.3. *Subintelligere*: to understand [a condition] as implied, though not written. *Dignitatis persone capacis*: the worthiness of a person capable [of the grant]. *Libri proximi*: the book of Wyclif's *Summa* preceding *De ecclesia*; which work, and its chapters 20 and 24, are not identified.
11. C. 25 q. 1 c. 16, *Ideo permittente* (Loserth, 257.7: *Causa XXV, q. I, cap. XVI*; the modern form is ours). *In proximo capitulo*: chapter 11. *Ut dixi hic*: earlier in this chapter (12-a, 253.20–254.23).
12. James 4:15 has *Si Dominus voluerit* ("If the Lord will", DR); Wyclif's *si Deus voluerit* is translated. *Discolia*: frowardness. A in the margin *Archidiaconus* (257.16). The Archdeacon is the canonists' name for Guido de Baysio (*Rosarium* on the Decretum); so Loserth's index; the passage is not independently checked.
13. A in the margin *Deus donat sub condicione* (257.20); side-note 257.18. 1 Samuel 2:30 (DR; Loserth prints *1° Regum II°, 30*), except that Wyclif reads *honorificaverit* ("shall honour") for the Vulgate's *glorificaverit* ("shall glorify"), and adds *inquit*. "He cannot deny himself": 2 Timothy 2:13 (DR; Loserth, 257.26). *Blaspheme*: "except blasphemously". *Transferretur*: Loserth's correction of the manuscripts' *transferreretur* (257.30), translated.
14. A and B in the margin *Consilium bonum* (258.1); side-note 258.1. *Sine conservacione huius carte impossibile est quod maneat dignitas*: so the print (plate); our Latin had lost *carte impossibile*. *Huius carte*: holy scripture, the charter. *Testamenti domini principaliter observati*: the Lord's testament (scripture), kept as the principal charter, in whose virtue other charters hold.
15. A in the margin *Contra. Tercia obieccio* (258.8); side-note 258.8. *Inconveniens* here in its practical sense, an ill consequence in affairs (CONTEXTUAL, the glossary), and so through the next sentence. *Pie*: "piously"; *pietas* is "piety" throughout this chapter. *Necessitante casu ad aliquod inconveniens*: when a case forces [one] into some ill consequence.
16. B lacks *Non ergo ... tollendum cum* (258.12) in its text and gives it in the lower margin. Side-note 258.14. *Occasione male accepta*: occasion wrongly taken, the distinction Wyclif answers with at 263.33 ff. (12-d). *Scolastici ... vulgares*: as at the chapter's opening (250.18), "schoolmen" and "common people". *Quin ... necesse sit*: every such law, in some case, necessarily yields injustice. The last sentence is the objector's conclusion, answered with Romans 3:8 at 263.27 (12-d).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 254: *demerito* (hyphenated de-/merito; main token holds whole word)
  - 254: *repugnat* (30 is the line number)
  - 255: *iniuriam* (C 164^c margin alinea + folio mark)
  - 255: *aliunde* (5 is the line number)
  - 255: *regnum*
  - 255: *congregatum*
  - 255: *parliamento* (hyphenated parlia-/mento; main token holds whole word)
  - 255: *privilegium* (164^d folio mark glued in other scans)
  - 255: *fiat*
  - 255: *manifesta* (bold argument numeral 1 glued)
  - 256: ∅ (inserted run is the end of p.255 (already in p.255 main); print line begins eidem, et ita)
  - 256: *consentit* (3 D after it is margin numeral + alinea letter)

- **256: *volitum* [NW]**
- **256: *volitis* [NW]**
- **257: *itaque* (165ª folio mark glued)**
- **257: *Regum***
- **257: *II°***
- **258: *tam* ('may' in other scans is English side-note text)**
- **257: *condicionem* (164d folio mark glued)**

Part 3: Privileges need prudent interpreters; the grant depends on the grantee; unjust mercy

Loserth pp. 258.23–263.26

¶1 258.23–263.26
258.23 *Answer: a) We grant the assumption, but the interpretation must be wise.*
259.1 *A statute or privilege may need to be suspended.*
259.18 *Instance of the law made by Darius.*
260.4 *The privilege must in each case be used in accordance with God's law;*
260.19 *nor may rulers grant what is injurious to their subjects or to individual rights.*
261.3 *The concession of privileges depends as much on the grantee as the granter.*
261.27 *We must beware of false mercy,*
262.1 *against which we are warned by St. Ambrose.*
263.3 *A prince who interrupts the course of justice is guilty of wrong.*
263.24 *b) That a judge is to do wrong in obedience to law is contrary to the catholic faith.*

[258] **Ad istum obiectum respondeo concedendo assumptum; sed nec lex Dei nec aliqua lex justa necessitat ad aliquid culpabiliter faciendum, ideo necesse est leges tales habere prudentes interpretes secundum sensum sacre scripture, ut tam privilegiantes quam privilegiati active et passive participant meritorium fructum privilegii, salvato semper iure cuiuslibet et postposita generaliter iniuria undequaque. Unde non est possibile legem rectam statui et casum contingere, quin secundum regulam sacre scripture tolli potest inconveniens peccati, quia ad minimum non existente** [259] **fuga alia tolli debet statutum aut privilegium vel suspendi, nec fallat inscios ignorancia illius veritatis quam Anselmus declarat primo, Cur deus homo, XXI°, quod nec propter salvacionem tocius mundi vel infinitorum, si fuerint, non debet committi peccatum aliquod eciam veniale, quia tunc peccatum esset non peccatum, cum non sit possibile ut quis peccet in quantum facit ut debet, quia tunc debet peccare et prima iusticia exigit ut sic peccet. Sed revera iusticia dispensaret in casu huiusmodi, ut non peccet. Oportet ergo privilegia huiusmodi habere interpretes ad discernendum condicionem que debet subintelligi in tali privilegio, ut si quis proditorie occiderit regem, notorie molitus fuerit regni prodicionem, vel corporaliter aut spiritualiter superinduxerit simul vel paulative depopulatores regni, refugium ecclesie non ad illum. Unde recoleremus statutum nefandum Danielis VI°, 7, ubi dicitur satrapas consuluisse Dario, ut extinguerent Danielem, quod omnis qui peciverit aliquam peticionem a quocunque Deo et homine usque ad triginta dies nisi a rege Dario mittatur in lacum leonum, sed postquam compertum est Danielem tribus temporibus in die adorare Dominum versus Jerusalem, sinistri interpretes regem seduxerant, ut Daniel in lacum leonum mitteretur; sed iniquum iudicium probavit eventus miraculi. Et utinam satrape nostri non seducant principes ex insana interpretacione decreti regii. Nam vel est quodcunque tale decretum illicitum, vel oportet quod solum intelligatur in ipso quod nullius sapit** [260] **iniuriam,**

To this objection I reply by granting the assumption; but neither God's law nor any just law necessitates [anyone] to do anything culpably; therefore it is necessary that such laws have prudent interpreters according to the sense of holy scripture, so that both those who privilege and those who are privileged, actively and passively, share in the meritorious fruit of the privilege, the right of everyone being always saved and injury being set aside generally on every side.[1] Hence it is not possible for a right law to be established and a case to occur in which the ill consequence of sin cannot be removed according to the rule of holy scripture; because, at the least, if there is no [259] **other escape, the statute or privilege ought to be removed or suspended.[2] Nor let ignorance of that truth which Anselm declares in the first [book] of *Cur Deus homo*, chapter 21, deceive the unknowing: that not even for the salvation of the whole world, or of infinitely many [worlds], if there were such, ought any sin, even venial, to be committed; because then sin would be not-sin, since it is not possible that anyone sin in so far as he does as he ought; because then he ought to sin, and the first justice demands that he so sin. But in truth justice would dispense in a case of this kind, so that he does not sin.[3] Privileges of this kind must therefore have interpreters to discern the condition which must be understood as implied in such a privilege: as, if anyone has treacherously killed the king, has notoriously plotted the betrayal of the kingdom, or has brought in, bodily or spiritually, all at once or little by little, despoilers of the kingdom, the refuge of the church [does] not [extend] to him.[4] Hence we should recall the abominable statute of Daniel 6:7, where it is said that the satraps, in order to destroy Daniel, counselled Darius "that whosoever shall ask any petition of any god, or man, for thirty days, but of King Darius, shall be cast into the den of the lions"; but after it was found that Daniel worshipped the Lord three times a day toward Jerusalem, sinister interpreters had led**

quia iuxta dicta in proximo argumento oportet subintelligere in omni tali generali statuto beneplacitum prime iusticie. Oportet ergo secundum regulas scripture docere quod implecio privilegii generalis in casu posito sit consona legi Dei. Et si consiliarii sapientes mundialiter exigunt ex verbis privilegii tamquam concessum omne quod sciverint sophistice palliare, exacta est cum satrapis Medorum blasphema peticio; ipsi enim exigunt concessum a principe omne quod sophistice inferre possunt ex verbis privilegii, sive iustum fuerit sive iniustum, seu parti privilegianti aut privilegiate meritorium fuerit aut demeritorium, et ita sive Deus illud voluerit sive noluerit. Sed in istam blasphemiam non potest princeps seculi nec eciam Deus ipse, ideo instruendi sunt religiose domini seculares, ne ex ignorancia condicionis privilegii et interpretacionis eius participent tali blasphemie; videntur enim cecis secundum formam talem concedere sed non possunt. Sicut autem non possunt concedere quod manifeste vergeret ad destruccionem regni sui vel Dei iniuriam, sic non possunt concedere privilegium quod inferret per se alicui iniuriam vel quod occasione data suis subditis sit dampnosum. Concessio enim talis subdola non est concessio, sicut nec luciferina promissio Matthei IV°, 9, qua Jesu nostro false promiserat quod omnia regna mundi sibi daret, si cadens ipsum adoraverit, non fuisset donacio, nec fas est dogmatizare istam blasphemiam, ut eo ipso quo princeps terrenus decreverit sic esse, sequitur quod sit iustum, quia sanctus Nabuchodonosor qui fuit unus de potencioribus monarchis a mundi principio non potuit vendicare istam potenciam, cum soli Deo sit propria. Et dico ipsum [261] sanctum, quia decret. XXIII^{a}, q. IV. Nabuchodonosor ex testimonio Augustini reputat eum sanctum. Ex istis colligitur quod concessio privilegiorum principum non minus dependet a privilegiandis qui ipsis participent quam ab ipsis principibus. Patet ex hoc quod non foret illis privilegium, nisi supposita capacitate ex vita meritoria participio talis privilegii forent digni; cum ergo talis dignitas essencialiter dependet ab illis privilegiandis et non ab illis privilegiantibus, patet conclusio. Ymmo cum privilegiacio passiva potest inferri ab aliis quam a datis principibus, (non autem potest inesse nisi insit ex dignitate quam privilegiatus perficit in se ipso), videtur quod talis passiva concessio vel privilegiacio prius natura dependet a privilegiandis quam ab istis privilegiantibus a quibus solum causatur per accidens. Concessio vero eciam activa dominorum, secundum racionem qua foret isti clerico privilegium, dependet essencialiter ab eodem clerico, quia si non meruerit, tunc dominus in concessione generali non concessit privilegium illud sibi, ideo (sicut dixi in solucione proximi argumenti)

the king astray, so that Daniel was cast into the den of the lions; but the outcome of the miracle proved the judgment wicked.[5] And would that our satraps may not lead princes astray by a mad interpretation of a royal decree! For either every such decree is unlawful, or only that must be understood in it which savours of [260] injury to no one; because, according to what was said in the preceding argument, in every such general statute the good pleasure of the first justice must be understood as implied. It must therefore be taught, according to the rules of scripture, that the fulfilment of a general privilege in the case supposed is consonant with God's law.[6] And if counsellors, wise in a worldly way, demand from the words of a privilege, as granted, everything that they know how to cloak sophistically, the blasphemous petition has been exacted as with the satraps of the Medes; for they demand as granted by the prince everything that they can sophistically infer from the words of the privilege, whether it be just or unjust, or meritorious or demeritorious to the privileging or the privileged party, and so whether God has willed it or not.[7] But neither a prince of the world nor even God himself can [fall] into this blasphemy; therefore secular lords are to be instructed religiously, lest from ignorance of the condition of a privilege and of its interpretation they share in such blasphemy; for to the blind they seem to grant according to such a form, but they cannot.[8] And just as they cannot grant what would manifestly tend to the destruction of their kingdom or to injury to God, so they cannot grant a privilege that would of itself inflict injury on anyone, or that, by occasion given, would be harmful to their subjects. For such a deceitful grant is not a grant; just as the Luciferian promise of Matthew 4:9, by which [the devil] had falsely promised our Jesus "that he would give him all the kingdoms of the world, if, falling down, he adored him", would not have been a gift. Nor is it right to teach as dogma this blasphemy: that by the very fact that an earthly prince has decreed a thing to be so, it follows that it is just; because holy Nebuchadnezzar, who was one of the more powerful monarchs since the beginning of the world, could not claim that power, since it is proper to God alone. And I call him [261] holy because the Decretum, C. 23 q. 4 [c. 22], *Nabuchodonosor*, on the testimony of Augustine, reckons him holy.[9] From these things it is gathered that the grant of princes' privileges depends no less on those to be privileged, who are to share in them, than on the princes themselves. This is clear from the fact that it would not be a privilege for them unless, their capacity being presupposed, they were worthy, from a meritorious life, of participation in such a privilege; since, then, such worthiness

optimum medium conservandi privilegia est ut privilegiandus conformet se sacre scripture, quia (ut dicitur Matthei V°) eo ipso quo ipsam habuerit adversarium perdit privilegium, quia vitam propriam, in qua vivificata per Christum privilegium fundaretur. Conceditur ergo quod pie et misericorditer racione privilegii principum agendum est cum talibus fugitivis, sed (ut dixi proximo capitulo) cavenda est falsa pietas et misericordia iniusta. Ipsam autem declarat decretum sub auctoritate beati Ambrosii in libro suo De Officiis, [262] ut recitatur XXIII^{a}, q. IV, ubi dicitur: Est iniusta misericordia. Denique scriptum est de quodam: Non misereberis illius, Deuteronomii XIX°, 13, et in libris Regum legitur quod Saul contraxit offensam, quia misertus est Agag regem hostium quem prohibuit divina sentencia servari, I° Regum XV°. Itaque si quis latronem filiis deprecantibus motus et lacrimis coniugis eius inflexus absolvendum putat, cui adhuc latrocinandi aspiret affectus, nonne innocentes tradet exicio qui sic liberat multorum exicia cogitantem? Certe si gladium domini reprimit, vincula dissolvit, laxat exilium, cur latrocinandi qua potest clemenciori via non eripit facultatem qui voluntatem extorquere non potuit? Deinde inter duos, hoc est, accusatorem et reum, pari periculo de capite decertantes, alterum si non probasset, alterum si esset ab accusatore convictus, si non id quod iusticie est iudex exequatur, sed miseretur alterius, aut dampnabit probantem aut dum accusatori favet, quod probare non possit, addicet innoxium. Non potest ergo hec dici iusta misericordia. In ipsa ecclesia, ubi maxime quis misereri debet, teneri autem quam maxime debet forma iusticie, ne quis a consorcio criminacionis abstractus brevi lacrimula atque ad tempus parata vel eciam uberioribus fletibus communionem, quam plurimis debet postulare temporibus, a facilitate sacerdotis extorqueat. Nonne cum uni indulget indigno, ad prolapcionis contagium provocat universos? Facilitas enim venie incentivum tribuit delinquendi. [263] Quotlibet enim sunt tales leges cum racione docentes quod iudex debet secundum leges punire, faciendo utrique parti iusticiam. Princeps ergo precludens cursum talis iusticie est omnino reus iniurie; si enim antedictum privilegium fuit iustum de multis quod non obstante tali aufugio subirent penam legalem, quomodo excusat peccatum principis, quin dimissis magis induratis in suo facinore iniuriaretur Deo et partibus? Non enim facit regis concessio ut sic varietur iusticia quoad Deum, secura ergo via misericordie est dare tali criminoso quadraginta dies penitencie et post punire vel dimittere secundum disposicionem persone culpabilis, quia secundum illam misericordia vel crudelitas est taxanda. Et utinam hoc privilegium in recentibus criminosis observaretur per totam Angliam, aliis sceleratis

depends essentially on those to be privileged and not on those privileging, the conclusion is clear.[10] Indeed, since passive privileging can be brought about by others than the given princes (but it cannot be present unless it is present from the worthiness which the privileged person perfects in himself), it seems that such passive grant or privileging depends, prior in nature, on those to be privileged rather than on those privileging, by whom it is caused only accidentally. And even the active grant of the lords, under the aspect by which it would be a privilege for this cleric, depends essentially on that same cleric; because if he has not merited, then the lord in the general grant did not grant that privilege to him.[11] Therefore (as I said in the solution of the preceding argument) the best means of preserving privileges is that the one to be privileged conform himself to holy scripture; because (as is said in Matthew 5:25) by the very fact that he has it as his adversary he loses the privilege, because [he loses] his own life, in which, quickened through Christ, the privilege would be founded.[12] It is granted, therefore, that by reason of the princes' privilege such fugitives are to be dealt with piously and mercifully; but (as I said in the preceding chapter) false piety and unjust mercy are to be avoided. And the Decretum declares it under the authority of blessed Ambrose in his book *De officiis*, [262] as it is recited in C. 23 q. 4, where it is said: "There is an unjust mercy. Finally, it is written of a certain man: Thou shalt not pity him (Deuteronomy 19:13); and in the books of Kings it is read that Saul incurred offence because he had mercy on Agag, the king of the enemies, whom the divine sentence forbade to be kept alive (1 Samuel 15). So if anyone, moved by [a robber's] children pleading and bent by the tears of his wife, thinks a robber should be released in whom the desire of robbing still breathes, does he not hand the innocent over to destruction, who thus frees one plotting the destruction of many? Certainly, if he holds back the sword of the lord, loosens the chains, looses [from] exile, why does he not, by what milder way he can, take away the means of robbing from one whose will he could not wrest away? Then, between two, that is, accuser and accused, contending at equal peril of their heads, the one if he had not proved [his charge], the other if he were convicted by the accuser: if the judge does not carry out what belongs to justice, but takes pity on one of them, either he will condemn the one who proves, or, while he favours the accuser, he will hand over the innocent [on a charge] which [the accuser] could not prove. This, then, cannot be called just mercy. In the church itself, where one ought most to show mercy, but where the form of justice ought to be held most of

deprehensis post correpcionem terciam secundum legem evangelii Matthei XVIII°, castigatis scilicet vel ociosis in casu quo probabiliter credatur illos intoxicare plus sancte matris ecclesie in futurum, vel aliter proscriptis in casu quo credatur illis prodesse profugis. Tale enim opus ex caritate procedens servaret undique misericordiam et (quantum est in homine) libertatem. Quantum ad secundam difficultatem in qua quidam instant fortiter, quod pro execucione et observacione legis debet iudex facere eciam scienter iniuriam, patet

all, [care must be taken] lest anyone withdrawn from fellowship by an accusation should extort from the easiness of a priest, by a brief little tear made ready for the occasion, or even by more abundant weeping, the communion which he ought to seek through a great many seasons. When he indulges one unworthy man, does he not provoke all to the contagion of a fall? For easiness of forgiveness gives an incentive to offending."[13] [263] For there are any number of such laws teaching, with reason, that the judge ought to punish according to the laws, doing justice to each party. The prince, therefore, who shuts off the course of such justice is wholly guilty of injury; for if the aforesaid privilege was just as regards many, [namely] that notwithstanding such flight they should undergo the legal penalty, how does [it] excuse the prince's sin, so that, when those more hardened in their misdeed are let go, he would not do injury to God and to the parties?[14] For the king's grant does not bring it about that justice is thus varied as regards God. The safe way of mercy, therefore, is to give such a criminal forty days of penance, and afterwards to punish or release him according to the disposition of the guilty person; because according to that [disposition] mercy or cruelty is to be assessed.[15] And would that this privilege were observed for recent criminals throughout all England, other criminals being taken after the third correction according to the law of the gospel, Matthew 18:15–17: chastised, that is, or [kept] idle, in a case where it is probably believed that they would poison more of holy mother church in future; or else outlawed, in a case where it is believed that it would profit them [to be] fugitives. For such a work, proceeding from charity, would preserve mercy on every side and (as far as lies in man) liberty. As to the second difficulty, on which certain people press hard, that for the execution and observance of the law a judge ought to do injury even knowingly, it is clear[16]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Responsio* (258.23); side-note 258.23. *Assumptum*: the objector's premiss that the privilege of kings is to be interpreted piously and mercifully (258.9). *Necessitat ad ... faciendum*: compels [anyone] to do. *Active et passive*: the grantors actively, the grantees passively. *Salvato ... iure ... et postposita ... iniuria*: ablatives absolute.
2. Side-note 259.1. *Inconveniens peccati*: the ill consequence that is sin (CONTEXTUAL, the glossary, the practical sense, as in the objection at 258.8–10). *Non est possibile ... quin ... tolli potest*: "not possible ... in which ... cannot be removed"; the double negative is resolved.
3. A in the margin, without reference mark, *Anselmus. Privilegia principum sunt prudenter interpretanda* (259.3). Anselm, *Cur Deus homo* I.21 (Loserth, 259.3: *Anselmi Opp.* pp. 84–85; *primo* is *primo libro*). Wyclif paraphrases: Anselm has the worlds multiplied to infinity (*Si infinito numero multiplicarentur*, PL 158), but *quamlibet parvum*, not *veniale*. *Nec ... non debet*: the medieval cumulative negative, rendered as one; the apparatus gives B *nec debet* and *non debet* at 259.8. *Sed revera iusticia dispensaret*: if the sin were owed, justice itself would dispense from it, and it would not be sin; the reductio is Wyclif's.
4. *Refugium ecclesie non ad illum*: the clause has no verb; "[does] not [extend]" is supplied. *Depopulatores regni*: despoilers of the kingdom, brought in *corporaliter aut spiritualiter*, "bodily or spiritually".

5. Side-note 259.18. Daniel 6:7 (DR), except that Wyclif has *nisi a rege Dario* for the Vulgate's *nisi a te, rex* ("but of thee, O king"). In the Vulgate the counsel is given by "the princes ..., the magistrates, and governors [*satrapae*]"; *ut extinguerent Danielem* is Wyclif's statement of their motive. Daniel's prayer: 6:10; the den: 6:16; the deliverance: 6:22. B reads *probant* (259.26).
6. *Satrape nostri*: Wyclif's word for church-court officials (the glossary), set beside Darius's satraps. *Nullius sapit iniuriam*: savours of injury to no one. *In proximo argumento*: the answer to the second objection (12-a and 12-b, 253.18–258.7). *Prime iusticie*: of God, the first justice. Side-note 260.4.
7. B reads *exacta cum*, without *est* (260.8). *Exacta est cum satrapis Medorum blasphema peticio*: "the blasphemous petition has been exacted, as with the satraps of the Medes", i.e. it is their petition over again; *cum* could also be read "together with the satraps". *Sophistice palliare*: to cloak by sophistry.
8. *Non potest*: Loserth supplies *incidere*, "fall into" (260.14), translated in brackets. *Tali blasphemie*: so the print; the manuscripts *talis blasphemie* (260.17–18). *Religiose*: an adverb, "religiously", not "religious lords". A in the margin *Conclusio* (260.19); side-note 260.19.
9. Matthew 4:8–9, paraphrased, italic in the print (DR "All these will I give thee, if falling down thou wilt adore me"). B reads *contra Jesu* (260.26). Loserth proposes supplying *diabolus* as the subject (*adde: diabolus*); "[the devil]" is supplied accordingly. A in the margin *Conclusio* (260.28). Nebuchadnezzar "holy": Decretum C. 23 q. 4 c. 22 (Loserth, 261.1: *Decr. sec. pars, causa XXIII, q. IV, c XXII*; the modern form is ours); its incipit is *Nabuchodonosor penitenciam meruit fructuosam*, ascribed to Augustine, *De praedestinatione et gratia* 15, a work not his (Friedberg I, n. 284); the canon does not call him "holy": Wyclif infers it. B in the margin *Nabugodonosor est beatus* (261.1), an early reader's assent.
10. A in the margin *Correlarium* (261.3); side-note 261.3. *Participio*: participation (the glossary), not the grammatical participle. *Supposita capacitate*: their capacity [to receive] being presupposed.
11. *Privilegiacio passiva*: being privileged, against the grantor's active privileging. *Ab aliis quam a datis principibus*: by others than the princes in question. *Prius natura*: prior in the order of nature. *Secundum racionem qua*: under the aspect by which. *Si non meruerit*: if the cleric has not merited.
12. B reads *observandi* for *conservandi* (261.22). *Sicut dixi in solucione proximi argumenti*: 257.33–258.4 (12-b). Matthew 5:25 ("Be at agreement with thy adversary betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him", DR) is cited, not quoted; Wyclif takes scripture as the adversary, a reading found in Augustine, *Sermo* 9.3. *Vivificata*: agrees with *vita*. *Perdit ... quia vitam propriam*: *perdit* is understood again, "[he loses] his own life".
13. A in the margin, without mark, *Nota contra falsam pietatem et iniustam misericordiam* (261.30); side-notes 261.27, 262.1. *Proximo capitulo*: chapter 11. The quotation is a canon of C. 23 q. 4 drawn from Ambrose, *De officiis*; the canon is c. 33, *Est iniusta misericordia* (Friedberg I), and its text is in fact Ambrose, *Expositio in Ps. 118*, sermo 8.25 (PL 15), which the Decretum labels *De officiis*. Loserth corrects the manuscripts from the Decretum: they read *Est iniusta misericordia, est et iusta* (262.1), *laxat exicium* (262.11–12), *probari* (262.19), *facultate* (262.26); his text is translated. He reports the Decretum's *miseratus est* and the manuscripts' *regis* (262.4–5), and the Decretum's *Ita si quis* (262.6). A and A_1 read *latronis coniugis* (262.7) and *libertat* (262.10); B *prolacionis* (262.28). Deuteronomy 19:13 (DR; Wyclif *illius*, Vulgate *ejus*); Saul spared Agag, 1 Samuel 15:8–9. B in the margin *Iudex nulli auferret complementum iusticie motus favore aut pietate aut favore* (262.14). *A consorcio criminacionis abstractus*: construed "withdrawn from fellowship by an accusation"; it could be "withdrawn from fellowship on a charge". *Sentencia*: here a judicial sentence (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), God's sentence on Amalek, so "sentence". *Teneri ... debet forma iusticie, ne quis*: the *ne* clause hangs on the duty to hold the form of justice; "[care must be taken]" is supplied.
14. Side-note 263.3. *Si ... fuit iustum de multis quod ... subirent*: "if ... was just as regards many, that ... they should undergo"; the subject of *excusat* is taken to be the privilege. *Aufugio*: flight [to sanctuary]. *Partibus*: the parties to the suit. *Facinore*: misdeed (the glossary).
15. Forty days: the term a sanctuary-seeker had under English custom before he must abjure the realm. *Disposicionem persone culpabilis*: the guilty person's disposition (penitent or hardened). *Taxanda*: to be assessed.
16. Matthew 18:15–17 (correction privately, before witnesses, then by the church); Loserth prints *XVIII°* without a verse. A and B read *deprehensus* (263.16). *Castigatis ... vel ociosis ... vel ... proscriptis*: ablatives with *aliis sceleratis*; *ociosis* is construed "[kept] idle", i.e. kept from further harm. *Intoxicare plus sancte matris ecclesie*: to poison more of holy mother church. *Secundam difficultatem*: the jurist's claim at 258.17–20 (12-b); side-note 263.24. *Instant*: "press", not the formula *instatur*. The sentence runs on into the next part (12-d).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 258: ∅ ('the' is English side-note text (We grant the); print: Ad istum obiectum)
  - 258: *lex*
  - 258: *Dei*
  - 258: *ad*
  - 259: *fuga* (F alinea + 165^{b} folio mark glued)
  - 259: *veritatis*
  - 261: *sanctum* (G alinea + 165^{c} folio mark in margin)
  - 261: *privilegii*
  - 262: *recitatur*
  - 262: *XXIII*^{a}
  - 262: *Denique*
  - 262: *I°* (full-height capital I with degree sign)
  - 263: *facere* [NW]
  - 263: *iniuriam* [NW]

- **263:** ***patet***
- **261:** ***XXIII[a]***
- **263:** ***XVIII°,*** **(line-final; next line starts castigatis, no verse) [-VERSE]**

Part 4: Occasion given and occasion taken; fourth objection: holy men approved the privilege; the duke's stand

Loserth pp. 263.27–267.34

¶1 263.27–264.32
264.1 *We must distinguish between occasion given and occasion taken.*
264.24 *The existence of other false privileges cannot protect this one.*
264.33
4. Objection: The privilege

[263]**quod hoc est contra fidem catholicam ut patet Rom. III° et VII°, ubi docet apostolus quod non sunt faciendo mala culpe, ut bona eveniant, nam cum tales casuum circumstancie sint casuales, patet quod tunc contingeret ut per maiorem partem duracionis date legis iudicaretur secundum ipsam iniustum iudicium, et tunc foret indubie lex iniusta et nunquam permittenda. Quoad terciam difficultatem super qua clamant scolastici, oportet distinguere (sicut facit Apostolus)** [264]**inter occasionem datam et occasionem acceptam ex lege ad committendum iniuriam: datur autem occasio a lege iniusta ad iniuriam perpetrandum, quando secundum sensum eius cum veris infertur iniuria, ut sensus vendicatur competere dicto privilegio quod omnis fugitivus ad illum locum, sive fuerit dignus sive indignus, habebit ibi omnimodam libertatem; quod declaratum est repugnare divine iusticie. Si autem dicatur quod solum pro dignis vendicatur libertas, tunc vel oportet docere quod fugitivi libertandi sunt digni, vel dicere quod eo ipso quo rex sic concedit, quicunque illuc fugiens erit dignus; dato primo, tunc docto per consilium regis quod datus fugitivus non sit dignus habere refugium, nichil sibi et privilegio libertanti. Si secundum detur, tunc blaspheme extollitur princeps privilegians supra Deum. Deus enim non sic privilegiat locum vel naturam peccabilem, quin ponit in libertate sui arbitrii quod possit reddere se indignum ad percipiendum fructum privilegii concessi. Nec valet deduccio quod tunc iudicium secundum leges humanas foret sepe iniustum cum non attendunt iusticiam quoad Deum: verum concluditur, cum solum lex domini est immaculata convertens animas. Et ita si secundo obicitur quod in Anglia sunt multa privilegia tam iniqua, patet quod improbatio huius privilegii non solvitur sed gravatur, cum multiplicare inconveniens non sit solvere; ymmo manifestior, generalior et contrarior iniusticia verbis, et intencioni privilegii plus dissonaret illi loco et ordini quam alibi in Anglia in manu secularium, ubi communiter non tanta iniuria est commissa.**

that this is against the catholic faith, as is clear from Romans 3:8 and 7:8, where the Apostle teaches that "evils of fault are not to be done, that good may come"; for since such circumstances of cases are matters of chance, it is clear that it would then happen that for the greater part of the duration of a given law an unjust judgment would be given according to it; and then the law would undoubtedly be unjust and never to be permitted.[1] As to the third difficulty, over which the schoolmen cry out, one must distinguish (as the Apostle does) [264]**between occasion given and occasion taken from the law for committing injury. And occasion for perpetrating injury is given by an unjust law when, according to its sense, together with truths, injury is inferred: as [when] the sense claimed to belong to the said privilege is that every fugitive to that place, whether he be worthy or unworthy, will have there liberty of every kind; which has been shown to conflict with divine justice.[2] But if it is said that liberty is claimed only for the worthy, then either it must be shown that the fugitives to be set free are worthy, or it must be said that, by the very fact that the king so grants, whoever flees there will be worthy. Granted the first: then, once it has been shown through the king's council that a given fugitive is not worthy to have refuge, he has nothing to do with the freeing privilege.[3] If the second is granted, then the privileging prince is blasphemously exalted above God. For God does not so privilege a place or a nature capable of sin without placing it in the freedom of its choice that it can render itself unworthy to receive the fruit of the privilege granted. Nor does the deduction avail, that then judgment according to human laws would often be unjust, since they do not attend to justice as regards God: what is inferred is true, since only the law of the Lord is unspotted, converting souls (Psalm 19:7).[4] And so, if, second, it is objected that in England there are many privileges just as wicked, it is clear that the disproof of this privilege is not dissolved but made heavier, since to multiply an absurdity is not to resolve it; indeed, a more manifest, more general injustice, and one more contrary to the words and to the intention of the privilege, would be more out of keeping with that place**

¶2 264.33–264.34

[264]**Quarto principaliter obiciunt tam scolastici quam vulgares: Multi, inquiunt, sancti reges, episcopi, clerici**

and order than elsewhere in England in the hands of seculars, where commonly not so great an injury is committed.[5]

The fourth main objection, from schoolmen and common people alike: "Many," they say, "holy kings, bishops, clerics,

¶3 265.1–265.8
265.1 *has been approved by great authorities.*
265.9 *Answer: It is not certain that it was approved in the sense now put upon it;*
265.19 *and the need of remedy is not felt till mischief arises.*
265.24 *It is foolish to confuse a material building with holy Church.*

[265]**et vulgares approbarunt hoc privilegium, quando regnum processit prospere; qua ergo fronte nos minus sancti, minus scioli vel potentes usurpare audemus violacionem sancte matris ecclesie, cum domini et partes quibus iniuriatum est possunt (quantum in eis est) remittere satisfaccionem et penam recommendando Deo vindictam? Sic enim alique civitates in Anglia sunt servis in perpetuum refugium.**

and common people approved this privilege when the kingdom went forward prosperously; with what face, then, do we, less holy, less wise or powerful, dare to usurp the violation of holy mother church, since the lords and the parties to whom injury has been done can (as far as in them lies) remit satisfaction and penalty, commending vengeance to God? For in this way certain cities in England are a refuge in perpetuity for serfs."[6]

¶4 265.9–266.31
266.7 *The Duke's wish was to preserve every reasonable privilege.*
266.16 *He would have tolerated even insult to the king, but not danger to the kingdom.*
266.27 *It is a sign of irreligion to love scandal.*

[265]**Hic dicitur quod falsum assumitur ad mentem obiectus, nam nec potest esse sanctitas neque prudencia defendere hoc privilegium ad nudum sensum expositum, unde quicunque hunc sensum approbaverant vel fructuose penituerant vel aliter sunt dampnati; nec docetur qui sancti vel approbati viri approbaverant istum sensum. Sed sinistre extortum est ut privilegium ultra fines iusticie contra iuramentum regis et prosperitatem regni, ideo tam excessivo abusui necesse est apponi novum remedium. Et hec racio quare regnum non potens ulterius tollerare crementum iniurie apposuit nunc remedium pocius quam perante. Nam semistultus percipit et impugnat manifestam iniuriam, postquam sciolus insensibilem iniuriam pretermittit. Nec est verbum nisi stultorum dicere quod basilica ut lignum et lapides sit sancta mater ecclesia. Nam spiritus quos Deus vocat ad coronam desponsans in via, sunt sancta mater ecclesia; cuius domus est talis basilica cui in nomine sponsi et sponse est reverencia ymaginis tribuenda; quod fit potissime observata pro illo loco iusticia. Nam sanctitas vite et observacio iusticie plus honoraret locum ecclesie, quam totum aurum vel omnia iocalia corporalia huius mundi, sicut minimum peccatum plus ipsum inficeret in oculis sponsi,** [266]**quam omnes turpitudines vel polluciones corporales possibiles. Nam Deus cuilibet creature quantumlibet turpi illabitur, ipsam causans, quem amorem non potest habere ad peccatum, unde (quantum ego concipio) domini temporales insteterunt prudenter pro loci reverencia et honore ecclesie. Nam sentencia domini mei, domini ducis, fuit quod conservaretur in eis quodcunque privilegium quod**

To this the answer is that something false is assumed in the mind of the objection; for there can be neither holiness nor prudence in defending this privilege expounded in its bare sense; hence whoever had approved this sense either had fruitfully repented or else are damned; nor is it shown which holy or approved men had approved that sense.[7] **But it has been perversely wrested, as a privilege, beyond the bounds of justice, against the king's oath and the prosperity of the kingdom; therefore a new remedy must be applied to so excessive an abuse. And this is the reason why the kingdom, no longer able to tolerate the growth of injury, has now applied a remedy rather than before.**[8] **For a half-fool perceives and attacks a manifest injury after the wise man has passed over an imperceptible injury. Nor is it the word of any but fools to say that the basilica, as wood and stones, is holy mother church. For the spirits whom God calls to the crown, espousing [them] in the way, are holy mother church; whose house is such a basilica, to which, in the name of the bridegroom and the bride, the reverence of an image is to be paid; which is done above all when justice is observed for that place.**[9] **For holiness of life and the observance of justice would honour the place of the church more than all the gold or all the bodily jewels of this world; just as the least sin would infect it more in the eyes of the bridegroom** [266]**than all possible bodily foulnesses or pollutions. For God flows into every creature, however foul, causing it, a love which he cannot have toward**

in honestatem loci sonuerit, quod utilitatem monachorum intulerit, quod ad veram misericordiam et pietatem fugitivis pertinuerit, quod honor regis ac iuramentum suum de conservando cuicunque legio suo iusticiam permiserit, in tantum quod audivimus eum dicere quod tollerabile foret ut profugi haberent ibi refugium in causa alicuius speciei criminis lese regie maiestatis. Defloracio, inquit, filie regis est una species criminis lese regie maiestatis, sed longe hoc a prodicione regni, a defensione iniurie Dei et proximi, et eciam a dampnacione anime incolentis locum illum ex defensione sceleris fugitivi. Ipse autem animose stetit singulariter pro istis iusticiis in tantum quod docuit ubi, per quam et quando oblate sunt sibi mille libre ad procurandum vel promittendum dictos fugitivos cum suo captivo ad terras inimicorum accedere, quod quia visum fuit sibi et regis consilio ipsis confederatis cum hostibus ad periculum regni vergere, noluit assentire. Unde omnino est irreligiositatis condicio invidorum auribus prurientibus de homine ficta scandalosa mendacia et graviter ferre de eo commenta laudabilia que per multos centenarios hominum sunt audita.

sin; hence (as far as I understand) the temporal lords pressed prudently for the reverence of the place and the honour of the church.[10] For the teaching of my lord, the lord duke, was that there should be preserved in them whatever privilege tended to the honour of the place, brought benefit to the monks, pertained to true mercy and piety toward fugitives, [and] was permitted by the honour of the king and his oath to preserve justice for every liege man of his; so much so that we heard him say "that it would be tolerable that fugitives should have refuge there in a case of some species of the crime of lèse-majesté. The deflowering of the king's daughter," he said, "is one species of the crime of lèse-majesté; but this is far from the betrayal of the kingdom, from the defence of injury to God and neighbour, and also from the damnation of the soul of one dwelling in that place, by the defence of the fugitive's crime."[11] And he stood spiritedly, singularly, for these just claims, so much so that he showed where, through whom and when a thousand pounds were offered him to procure, or to promise, that the said fugitives should go with their captive to the lands of the enemies; to which, because it seemed to him and to the king's council, since they were confederate with the enemies, to tend to the danger of the kingdom, he would not assent.[12] Hence it is wholly the mark of irreligion in the envious, with itching ears, [to take in] fictitious scandalous lies about a man, and to take hard the praiseworthy accounts of him that have been heard by many hundreds of men.[13]

¶5 266.32–267.34
267.4 *What religion is there in defending scoundrels, or in keeping a hired house for thieves,*
267.9 *or in saying scoundrels from the punishment that might amend them,*
267.14 *or can the king give unjust privileges?*
267.25 *If the king had to punish within the monastery there would be the less crime there.*

[266] Pars autem adversa visa est nobis omnino stare pro contrario; cum enim domum Dei decet sanctitudo tempore synagoge, quanto magis tempore legis gracie [267] Christo eiciente vendentes et ementes de templo et dicente Matthei XXI°, 13: Domus mea domus oracionis vocabitur, vos autem fecistis illam speluncam latronum? Qualis ergo religio est intra ecclesiam defendere sceleratos, eciam licet evidencia probabili fuerint indurati? Aut qualis utilitas est monacho parare domum conductivam eciam induratis latronibus fugitivis, quamvis in fine vite eorum abbathia habuerit omnia latrocinia que apportant? Aut qualis religio est tercio tueri sceleratos sub pallio false pietatis ad dampnacionem anime eorum et infeccionem ecclesie Anglicane, ubi extra illam speluncam positi parendo iuri communi forent verisimiliter salubriter castigati? Vel quomodo staret quarto cum iuramento regis in recipiendo regni gubernacula, quod stat ut patet ex iuramento regis observacione iusticie cuicunque, ut veneno privilegii foveat eciam membra diaboli ad intoxicacionem et iniuriam regni sui? Nonne Ecclesiastici X°, 8, scribitur: Regnum de gente

But the opposing party seemed to us to stand wholly for the contrary; for since holiness becometh the house of God in the time of the synagogue, how much more in the time of the law of grace, [267] when Christ cast out those who sold and bought from the temple and said (Matthew 21:13): "My house shall be called the house of prayer; but you have made it a den of thieves." What kind of religion, then, is it to defend criminals within the church, even though by probable evidence they have been hardened? [14] Or what benefit is it to a monk to prepare a hired house even for hardened fugitive robbers, although at the end of their life the abbey should have all the plunder they bring? Or what kind of religion is it, third, to protect criminals under the cloak of false piety, to the damnation of their soul and the infection of the English church, when, placed outside that den, by obeying the common law they would probably have been wholesomely chastised? Or how, fourth, would it stand with the king's oath on receiving the government of the kingdom (which stands, as is clear from the king's oath, in the observance of justice to everyone) that

in gentem transfertur propter iniusticias atque iniurias? Sicut enim nichil plus facit ad stabilimentum regni quam observare cuicunque iusticiam et per punicionem prevaricatorum severam, sic nichil plus minatur ruinam regno quam constanter fovere iniurias. Et si obicitur quod iuxta istam sentenciam rex puniret homicidia inibi perpetrata, fateor, sed rectus ordo exigit, ut gravior iniusticia cicius corrigatur: modo vero ex inhabitacione sceleratorum in sanctuario, ex occisione religiosi intra ecclesiam, ex fraccione capitis religiosi eciam graduati intra ecclesiam per unum de suis confratribus, cum similibus que sonant cum habitantibus ecclesiam maioris peccati gravedinem, plus polluunt locum quam effusio sanguinis vel seminis in qua non tanta gravedo criminis est fundata.

by the poison of the privilege he should foster even members of the devil, to the poisoning and injury of his kingdom?[15] Is it not written in Ecclesiasticus 10:8: "A kingdom is translated from one people to another, because of injustices, and wrongs"? For just as nothing does more for the establishment of a kingdom than to observe justice to everyone, and [that] through the severe punishment of transgressors, so nothing more threatens ruin to a kingdom than constantly to foster injuries.[16] And if it is objected that, according to this teaching, the king would punish the homicides perpetrated there, I confess it; but right order demands that the graver injustice be corrected sooner: but as things now are, [the deeds] arising from the dwelling of criminals in the sanctuary, from the killing of a religious within the church, from the breaking of the head of a religious, even a graduate, within the church by one of his own brethren, together with like things which, among those who inhabit the church, sound of the greater weight of sin, pollute the place more than the shedding of blood or of seed, on which no such weight of crime is founded.[17]

Notes

1. The sentence begins at 263.24 (12-c); the "second difficulty" is the jurist's claim (258.17–20, 12-b). Romans 3:8 ("let us do evil that there may come good", DR) and 7:8 ("sin, taking occasion by the commandment", DR), the latter looking forward to the distinction of occasions; Loserth prints *Rom. III° et VII°*. The print italicises *non sunt ... eveniant* (263.28–29). *Mala culpe*: evils of fault (sin), as against evils of punishment. *Casuales*: matters of chance, which may therefore fall at any time. T. The print reads *faciendo* (263.29; plate n300); the English follows *facienda* (Rom. 3:8; our emendation).
2. Side-note 264.1. A and A_1 read *et accionem* (264.1). *Cum veris*: together with truths (admitted premisses), as at 253.29 (12-a). *Sensus vendicatur competere*: the sense is claimed to belong [to the privilege]. A and A_1 read *sive fuerit dignus sive fuerit* (264.6). *Declaratum est*: in 12-b and 12-c (e.g. 259.13–17).
3. *Libertandi*: to be set free (given sanctuary). A and A_1 read *Dato premio* for *dato primo* (264.13). *Nichil sibi et privilegio libertanti*: "nothing [is there] between him and the freeing privilege", the idiom of *quid mihi et tibi*.
4. *Peccabilem*: agrees with *naturam*; the nature that can sin keeps its freedom of choice. *Nec valet deduccio*: the deduction is no objection, since Wyclif grants its conclusion (*verum concluditur*). Psalm 19:7 (Vulgate 18:8; DR), roman in the print.
5. Side-note 264.24. A reads *pravilegia ... pravilegii* (264.25–26). *Inconveniens* here in its logical sense, "absurdity" (CONTEXTUAL, the glossary), where 12-b and 12-c had "ill consequence". *Tam iniqua*: "just as wicked". *Contrarior iniusticia verbis, et intencioni privilegii*: the comma is the print's; *verbis* and *intencioni* are both taken with *contrarior*. *Illi loco et ordini*: the abbey and its order. *Secularium*: of seculars (the glossary, : the word keeps its range).
6. A in the margin *Contra. Quarta obieccio* (264.33); side-notes 264.33, 265.1. *Vulgares* (265.1) closes the list of approvers, after kings, bishops and clerics. *Usurpare ... violacionem*: to take upon ourselves the violation. *Servis ... refugium*: the custom by which a serf who lived a year and a day in a privileged town became free (Glanvill V, *in aliqua villa privilegiata ... a villenagio liberabitur*).
7. A in the margin *Responsio* (265.9); side-note 265.9. *Hic dicitur*: "To this the answer is" (the glossary). *Ad mentem obiectus*: in the sense the objection intends (*obiectus*, genitive of the fourth-declension noun). *Ad nudum sensum expositum*: expounded in its bare (unqualified) sense. *Quicunque ... approbaverant ... sunt dampnati*: the plural verbs are the print's.
8. Side-note 265.19. *Sinistre extortum est ut privilegium ...*: there is no verb after *ut*; taken as "wrested, as a privilege, beyond the bounds of justice"; it could be "wrested so that the privilege [reaches] beyond ...". *Iuramentum regis*: the coronation oath (cf. 267.14). *Apposuit nunc remedium*: the statute of the Gloucester parliament of 1378 against debtors who fled to privileged places to defraud their creditors (2 Ric. II st. 2 c. 3). *Perante*: before.
9. Side-note 265.24. B reads *et fit* (265.29). A and A_1 read *sanctitas vita* (265.30); A in the margin, without mark, *Conclusio. Contra pretensam immunitatem ecclesiarum* (265.30). *Semistultus ... sciolus*: the half-fool sees the manifest injury that the knowing man had let pass as imperceptible. *Basilica*: the church building, the house (*domus*) of the church that is the company of spirits. *Reverencia ymaginis*: the building is honoured as an image of the church. *Desponsans in via*: espousing them in the way (the glossary, *via / patria*).

10. A in the margin *Nota* (266.2). *Illabitur*: flows into (the glossary). *Quem amorem*: the relative draws *amorem* into its clause, "a love which"; God's flowing into and causing every creature is the love he cannot have toward sin. B reads *quam amorem* (266.3). *Insteterunt*: pressed, urged; not the disputation formula.
11. Side-notes 266.7, 266.16. *Dominus dux*: John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster (so Loserth, Introduction, p. xiii). *Sentencia*: his position (CONTEXTUAL, "teaching"). *In eis*: in the churches. *Quod honor regis ... permiserit*: the last of four *quod* clauses, with the king's honour and oath as subject. *Legio*: liege man. *Lese regie maiestatis*: treason against the king's majesty; A and A_1 lack *Defloracio ... maiestatis* (266.16–17). *Incolentis locum illum*: of one dwelling in that place, presumably the monk who harbours the fugitive. The print italicises the duke's words from *tollerabile* through *fugitivi* (266.14–20, except *inquit*), so the whole stretch, *sed longe hoc ...* included, is quoted as his.
12. The fugitives and their captive: Robert Hauley and John Shakell, who fled to Westminster from the Tower having refused to surrender their hostage, the count of Denia's son (Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.* I, 376–77; the case of 07-a); the occasion of the killing of 1378. The thousand pounds is not in Walsingham. *Mille libre*: a thousand pounds. *Per quam*: feminine in the print (a woman as go-between, or *per quam [viam]*, 'by what means'); 'through whom' leaves the gender open. *Ipsis confederatis cum hostibus*: ablative absolute, "since they [the fugitives] were confederate with the enemies".
13. Side-note 266.27. *Auribus prurientibus*: cf. 2 Timothy 4:3 ("having itching ears", DR). The first clause has no infinitive; "[to take in]" is supplied, parallel to *graviter ferre*. *Commenta laudabilia*: praiseworthy accounts, without the sense "fictions" that *commenta mendacii* had at 250.20. *Centenarios*: hundreds.
14. A in the margin *Nota* (267.2); side-note 267.4. *Pars ... adversa*: those who defended the privilege. "Holiness becometh thy house": Psalm 93:5 (Vulgate 92:5, DR), here of *domum Dei*. Matthew 21:13 (DR). *Evidencia probabili*: probable evidence, short of proof.
15. A and A_1 read *conducticiam* for *conductivam* (267.6–7); side-notes 267.9, 267.14. *Domum conductivam*: a hired house, a lodging for hire; *speluncam*, "den", is taken up from Matthew 21:13. *Iuri communi*: the common law. *Quod stat ... observacione iusticie cuicunque*: the oath consists in the observance of justice to everyone (the coronation oath's clause on rendering justice "rightly, impartially", as at 10-d n8). A reads *pravilegii* (267.16).
16. Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 10:8 (DR), which Wyclif breaks off after *iniurias*: the Vulgate continues *et contumelias, et diversos dolos* ("and injuries, and divers deceits"); he writes *de gente* for the Vulgate's *a gente*.
17. A in the margin *Obieccio* (267.25); side-note 267.25. *Homicidia inibi perpetrata*: the killings at Westminster in 1378 (12-a, 252.26). *Modo vero ex ... plus polluunt*: no subject is expressed for *polluunt*; taken as the deeds arising from (*ex*) the things named, with *similibus*. *Occisione religiosi*, *fraccione capitis ... confratribus*: a monk killed in the church and a graduate monk's head broken by a confrere, incidents not identified; Wyclif sets them, as pollutions by the church's own inhabitants, against the killings of 1378 (*homicidia inibi perpetrata*). *Cum habitantibus ecclesiam*: "among those who inhabit the church". The apparatus records a B reading for *intra ... maioris* (267.29), illegible in the OCR. *Effusio sanguinis vel seminis*: the grounds on which canon law holds a church polluted.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 263: *catholicam* (box is inside catholicam; one printed word)
  - 263: *III°*
  - 264: *inter*
  - 264: ∅ (inserted run is the end of p.263; print line begins inter occasionem, nothing between)
  - 264: *a* (print: occasio a lege iniusta; main lacks a)
  - 264: *iniuriam*
  - 264: *tunc* (bold argument numeral 1 glued)
  - 264: *iniqua* [NW]
  - 264: *privilegii*
  - 265: *reg-* (print reg-/num; main holds num separately at pos 6; 'has' is English side-note)
  - 265: *iocalia* [NW]
  - 266: *conservaretur*
  - 266: *in* (main split in into i + n)
  - 266: ∅ (n is the tail of in (pos 46); no separate word)
  - 266: *dicere*
  - 266: *quod tollerabile foret* (main's one token covers three printed words)
  - 266: *regni* [NW]
  - 267: *Christo* (L alinea + 166^{b} folio mark in margin)
  - 267: *mea domus* (main's one token covers two printed words)
  - 267: *que* (bold argument numeral 3 in margin)
  - 267: *staret* (bold argument numeral 4 glued)
  - 267: *observacione* (166^{c} folio mark in margin)
  - 267: *inibi* [NW]
  - 267: *sanctuario*
  - 267: *fundata*

- **266: *omnes***
- **263: ∅ (duplicate: quod already at 184) [DELX]**
- **263: ∅ (duplicate: catholicam already at 189) [DELX]**
- **265: ∅ (second half of reg-num; JOIN onto 5 reg- -> regnum) [DELX]**
- **267: ∅ ('atos' already inside neighbour 64 sceleratos) [DELX]**
- **265: *regnum* (print: reg-/num (agent 13); scan split, side-note "has" glued)**
- **265: ∅ (joined at 5)**

Part 5: Custom yields to truth; the basilica is not the bride; satisfaction cannot be remitted; fifth objection: the Westminster dream

Loserth pp. 268.1–272.21

¶1 268.1–268.19
268.1 *Evil customs should be rooted out at once.*
268.12 *Truth is of more weight than custom,*
268.21 *and makes it an insufficient plea.*

[268] **Mala autem consuetudo propter maioritatem periculi est pocius extirpanda, dicente decreto d. VIII[a]: Mala consuetudo non minus quam perniciosa corruptela est abicienda; que nisi cicius radicitus evellatur in privilegiorum ius ab impiis assumitur, et incipiunt prevaricaciones et varie presumpciones, celeberrime non compresse, pro legibus venerari et privilegiorum more perpetuo celebrari. Et sentencia huius decreti verificata est nimium hiis diebus, unde ad interpretandum rectitudinem consuetudinis et privilegii subiungit decretum sub auctoritate Augustini: Veritate manifestata cedat consuetudo veritati. Nemo consuetudinem racioni et veritati preponat, quia consuetudinem racio et veritas semper excludunt. Cum ergo racio naturalis et veritas scripture patenter convincunt quod dictum privilegium non debet intelligi nude ad literam, sed racione et veritate limitante condicionem sepe expositam, aptari debet singulare pertinens secundum distribucionem accomodam.**

And an evil custom, because of the greatness of the danger, is rather to be rooted out, as the decree says (D.8 c.3): "An evil custom is to be cast away no less than a pernicious corruption; for unless it is quickly torn out by the roots, it is taken up by the wicked into the right of privileges, and transgressions and various presumptions, most notoriously unchecked, begin to be venerated as laws and to be celebrated perpetually in the manner of privileges."[1] And the teaching of this decree has been verified all too much in these days; hence, to interpret the rightness of custom and privilege, the decree adds, under the authority of Augustine (D.8 c.4): "When truth has been made manifest, let custom yield to truth. Let no one put custom before reason and truth, for reason and truth always exclude custom."[2] Since, then, natural reason and the truth of scripture plainly prove that the said privilege ought not to be understood barely according to the letter, but with reason and truth limiting [it by] the condition often expounded, the pertinent singular must be fitted [to it] according to an accommodated distribution.[3]

¶2 268.20–269.11
269.1 *It is mere idolatry to suppose a building to be the Church, the spouse of Christ.*
269.12 *For every crime satisfaction must be made;*
269.31 *so it is wrong to encourage debtors not to make amends,*

[268] **Per hec patet quod forma argumenti quod primo innuitur non procedit, tum quia multi sancti potuerunt consuetudinem predictam improvide approbasse et post penituisse, vel potuit fuisse tunc consuetudo laudabilis propter usum modestum, sed modo versum fuisse in corruptelam fidei contrariam propter malam consuetudinem superadditam gracia cupidinis usurpatam. Unde si racio ista procederet, nunquam impugnaret catholicus malum usum, sed ex consuetudine peccandi prescriberet membrum diaboli contra Deum, cuius oppositum docuit Christus consuetudines phariseicas acutissime reprobando, mundana vero prosperitas tam in personis quam in regnis est sepe kalende preparatorie ad ruinam.** [269] **Quantum ad violacionem sancte matris ecclesie, dictum est quod ipsa non violatur nisi per defectum observancie legis sponsi; unde**

By these things it is clear that the form of the argument that is first hinted at does not hold good: first, because many saints could have approved the aforesaid custom improvidently and afterwards repented; or the custom could then have been praiseworthy because of a moderate use, but now have been turned into a corruption contrary to faith because of an evil custom added on top, usurped for the sake of greed.[4] Hence, if that reasoning held good, a catholic would never attack an evil usage, but a member of the devil would gain title by prescription against God from the custom of sinning; the opposite of which Christ taught by reproving most sharply the customs of the Pharisees. But worldly prosperity, both in persons and in kingdoms, is often the kalends that prepare for ruin.[5] [269] **As to the violation of holy mother church, it has been said that**

non est maior ydolatria credere truncum putridum esse dominum Jesum Christum quam credere domum materialem sive basilicam esse sanctam matrem ecclesiam, sponsam Christi. Unde quia in festis dedicacionis basilice per episcopum laudat ecclesia Deum in hoc quod ecclesiam suam sponsam vocare dignatus est, instruendi sunt simplices sacerdotes ne credant infideliter quod illa basilica sit ecclesia sponsa Christi.

she is not violated except through a failure to observe the law of the bridegroom; hence it is no greater idolatry to believe a rotten tree-trunk to be the Lord Jesus Christ than to believe a material house or basilica to be holy mother church, the bride of Christ.[6] Hence, since on the feasts of the dedication of a basilica by the bishop the church praises God in this, that he has deigned to call his church [his] bride, simple priests are to be instructed not to believe, faithlessly, that that basilica is the church, the bride of Christ.[7]

¶3 269.12–270.15
270.6 *as the satisfaction may have to be made in hell.*
270.16
5. The last charge against us rests on an absurd dream,
270.26 *which may have occurred and have been instigated by the devil.*

[269]Ulterius quantum ad remissionem debiti satisfaccionis, dicitur quod nec temporalis dominus nec Deus ipse potest ipsum omnino remittere, tunc enim Christus frustra fuisset mortuus ad satisfaciendum pro peccato humani generis. Necesse est ergo quod pro quocunque crimine satisfiat in virtute meriti Jesu Christi, vel quod illud crimen eternaliter puniatur. Deus autem non potest concedere licenciam alicui ut eternaliter duret in crimine, et per consequens non potest concedere criminoso licenciam ut non satisfaciat pro delicto. Verumptamen homo potest cum circumspeccione sagaci remittere fratri iniuriam et debitum corporale et Deus remittet culpam postquam misericorditer invenerit peccatorem satisfacere pro debito. Nemo enim posset satisfacere pro minima offensa in tantum dominum, nisi ipse misericorditer levem penitenciam, baptismum vel aliquod opus penale acceptaverit graciose: iusticia, inquam, sua requirit quod solum premiet promerentem. Et patet quantum periculum est occasionare debitoribus fugitivis audaciam, ut non satisfaciant Deo vel homini, cum secundum principia Augustini et iuris [270]canonici non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum, non quod oportet spoliantem restituere idem in numero fratri suo, sed quod satisfaciat omnimode domino capitali. Ipse autem vult ex inflexibilitate sue iusticie quod debitor satisfaciat servo suo debitum corporale, aut sibi equivalens restituendo, vel in pena inferni perpetuo serviendo. Illud autem servicium non est meritorium, sicut meritum quo impotens satisfacit creditori in via, sed est demeritorium prodessens creditori beato, et crucians perpetuo creditorem dampnatum; ideo non satisfaccio sed satispassio nominatur. Ulterius non oportet theologum omnes leges hominum de servitute et manucapcione discutere, sed satis est dicere quod precise de tanto sunt racionabiles de quanto consonant cum sacra scriptura.

Further, as to the remission of the debt of satisfaction, the answer is that neither a temporal lord nor God himself can remit it wholly; for then Christ would have died in vain to make satisfaction for the sin of the human race.[8] It is necessary, therefore, that for every crime satisfaction be made in virtue of the merit of Jesus Christ, or that that crime be punished eternally. Now God cannot grant anyone licence to endure eternally in crime, and consequently he cannot grant a criminal licence not to make satisfaction for his offence. Nevertheless a man can, with shrewd circumspection, remit to his brother an injury and a bodily debt; and God will remit the fault after he has mercifully found the sinner making satisfaction for the debt.[9] For no one could make satisfaction for the least offence against so great a lord unless he himself had mercifully and graciously accepted a light penance, baptism, or some penal work: his justice, I say, requires that he reward only one who deserves it. And it is clear how great a danger it is to give fugitive debtors occasion of boldness, so that they do not make satisfaction to God or to man, since, according to the principles of Augustine and of [270]canon law, "the sin is not forgiven unless what was taken is restored": not that the despoiler must restore to his brother the numerically same thing, but that he make satisfaction in every way to the chief lord.[10] And he wills, from the inflexibility of his justice, that the debtor make satisfaction to his servant for the bodily debt, either by restoring to him an equivalent, or by serving perpetually in the pain of hell.[11] But that service is not meritorious, like the merit by which one who has not the means makes satisfaction to a creditor in the way; rather it is demeritorious, profiting the blessed creditor and perpetually tormenting the damned creditor; therefore it is called not satisfaction but "satispassion".[12] Further, the theologian need not discuss all the laws of men on servitude and mainprise, but it is enough to say that they are reasonable precisely so far as they accord with holy scripture.[13]

¶4 270.16–272.5
271.3 *A great crime was committed, but others worse have taken place there, and all ought to be punished.*
272.10 *Justice should be done, even at the horns of the altar.*

[270] **Quinto et ultimo accusamur a vulgo per sompnia; fingunt enim filii patris mendacii quomodo revelatum est regnum Anglie transire impune, quousque sub quodam rege Ricardo basilica Westmonasterii sit polluta. Alias autem variaciones quas false fabricant non oportet hic recitare, cum mendacium dissonat sibi ipsi. Unde quicquid infortunii regno nostro acciderit applicant ad vindictam Dei de illo homicidio in sanctuario perpetrato, sed nesciunt applicare sequelam nisi per mendacia sompniorum. Hic non contendo si fuerit tale sompnium, quia scimus ex fide scripture quod pater mendacii agitat fantasias fidelium in sompnis, ut eos subvertat vel impediat profectum ecclesie. Nam Matthei XXVII°, 69, legitur uxorem Pilati fuisse illusam a sathana ad impediendum profectum ecclesie ex merito mortis Christi. Nichil, inquit, tibi et iusto illi: multa enim passa sum hodie per visum propter eum. Ulterius** [271] **videtur multis verisimile quod regnum nostrum pacietur in brevi; sed cum non sum propheta cui facta est illa visio, non presumo illud sompnium revelare. Credo autem quod in occisione istorum hominum commissa erant horrenda facinora, sed comparacionem gravedinis ipsorum ad alia difficile est taxare, cum verisimile est quod alie polluciones per occisiones et verberaciones sacerdotum ibi et alibi in Anglia induxerunt in regnum crimina graviora. Ideo vellem quod omnia illa crimina sint correcta, quia certus sum ex fide scripture quod purgato regno a crimine et reconciliato Deo suo non est compossibilis tribulacio ab extrinseco vel intrinseco nisi sibi cesserit ad profectum, quia in oracione ecclesie sic habetur: Nulla ei nocebit adversitas, si nulla dominetur iniquitas. Ulterius tamen plus credendum est vive voci spiritus sancti, quam verbis vel sompniis patris mendacii, cum quandoque inmiscet verum, ut magis fraudulenter decipiat. Videndum est ex verbis scripture pro quibus peccatis contingit regnorum destruccio, et patet ex dicto sapientis Ecclesiastici X° quod iniusticie quoad Deum et iniurie quoad proximum sunt causa precipua. Et cum ad regem pertinet in regno suo utrumque extinguere, patet quod omissio regis in corrigendo clerum suis elemosinis abutentem et in corrigendo secularem miliciam pacem ecclesie perturbantem, est in rege causa precipua. Sed ve speculatoribus qui illud dicerent regi suo; ipsi enim sicut sacerdotes Judee sunt causa precipua persecucionis nostre ecclesie, si contingat, cum in quorum profectu stat regni prosperitas, in eorum defectu stat regni adversitas. Sacerdotes autem Dei debent autonomatice esse induti iusticiam, ideo declinantes ad iniusticiam gravius inficiunt se et suos,** [272] **nam per absenciam vite in membris mors eorum inducitur. Et de isto conqueritur Isaie LVI°, cap. X°: Speculatores eius ceci**

Fifth and last, we are accused by the common people through dreams; for the sons of the father of lies make up how it was revealed that the kingdom of England would pass on unpunished until, under a certain King Richard, the basilica of Westminster should be polluted.[14] And the other variations which they falsely fabricate need not be recited here, since a lie is out of tune with itself. Hence whatever misfortune befalls our kingdom they apply to God's vengeance for that homicide perpetrated in the sanctuary; but they do not know how to apply what follows except through the lies of dreams. Here I do not dispute whether there was such a dream, for we know from the faith of scripture that the father of lies stirs up the fantasies of the faithful in dreams, to overthrow them or to hinder the progress of the church.[15] For in Matthew 27:19 we read that Pilate's wife was deluded by Satan to hinder the progress of the church [that came] from the merit of Christ's death: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man," she says, "for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." Further, [271] **it seems likely to many that our kingdom will suffer shortly; but since I am not the prophet to whom that vision came, I do not presume to reveal that dream.[16] And I believe that in the killing of these men horrible misdeeds were committed; but it is difficult to assess the comparison of their gravity with others, since it is likely that other pollutions, through the killings and beatings of priests there and elsewhere in England, have brought graver crimes into the kingdom.[17] Therefore I would wish all those crimes to be corrected; for I am certain from the faith of scripture that, once the kingdom has been purged of crime and reconciled to its God, no tribulation from without or from within is compossible [with that state] unless it turn out to its profit; for in the prayer of the church it is put thus: "No adversity shall harm it, if no iniquity lords it."[18] Further, nevertheless, more credence is to be given to the living voice of the Holy Spirit than to the words or dreams of the father of lies, since he sometimes mixes in what is true, the more fraudulently to deceive. We must see from the words of scripture for which sins the destruction of kingdoms comes about; and it is clear from the saying of the wise man, Ecclesiasticus 10:8, that injustices as regards God and injuries as regards neighbour are the chief cause.[19] And since it belongs to the king to extinguish both in his kingdom, it is clear that the king's omission in correcting the clergy that abuses its alms, and in correcting the secular knighthood that disturbs the peace of the church, is in the king the chief cause. But woe to the watchmen who were to say**

omnes. Quod si fuerit, credenda est consequencia Christi Matthei XV°, 14°: Cecus si ceco ducatum prestet, ambo in foveam cadunt.

that to their king! For they, like the priests of Judea, are the chief cause of the persecution of our church, if it comes about; since on the failure of those on whose progress the prosperity of the kingdom stands, stands the adversity of the kingdom.[20] Now the priests of God ought by antonomasia to be clothed with justice; therefore, when they turn aside to injustice, they infect themselves and their own more gravely, [272] for through the absence of life in the members their death is brought on.[21] And of this [the prophet] complains in Isaiah 56:10: "His watchmen are all blind." And if this be so, Christ's inference in Matthew 15:14 is to be believed: "If the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit."[22]

¶5 272.6–272.14

[272] Et quoad correccionem brachii secularis, patet quod perturbacio qua iniuste perturbant forinsecus, evidencia topica prenosticat perturbacionem futuram illis per quos staret eorum correccio; Matthei VII°, 2, scribitur: Eadem mensura qua mensi fueritis, remecietur vobis. Et ista est causa quare Salomon ad pacificacionem regni sui ex mandato patris fecit Joab occidi ad cornu altaris, ut patet III°, Regum II° cap., quia Isaie XXXIII° 1, scribitur: Ve qui predaris nonne et ipse predaberis?

And as to the correction of the secular arm, it is clear that the disturbance by which they unjustly cause disturbance outwardly foretells, by topical evidence, a future disturbance for those through whom their correction would have stood; in Matthew 7:2 it is written: "With the same measure that you shall mete withal, it shall be measured to you again." And this is the reason why Solomon, for the pacifying of his kingdom, at his father's command had Joab killed at the horn of the altar, as is clear from 1 Kings 2, because in Isaiah 33:1 it is written: "Woe to thee that spoilest, shalt not thou thyself also be spoiled?"[23]

¶6 272.15–272.21

[272] Non autem intendo quod milites regis occidi debeant, sed arguebam per locum a maiori: Si pro tempore veteris testamenti licuit militem ad cornu altaris occidere, multo magis licet maleficum pro pacificacione regni et mundacione ecclesie salvatum in vita et membris extrahere (ut patet in primo argumento capituli septimi).

But I do not maintain that the king's knights ought to be killed; rather I was arguing by the topic from the greater: if in the time of the old testament it was lawful to kill a knight at the horn of the altar, much more is it lawful, for the pacifying of the kingdom and the cleansing of the church, to drag out an evildoer, saved in life and limb (as is clear in the first argument of the seventh chapter).[24]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Mala consuetudo*; B in the margin *De consuetudinibus abiciendis nota bene* (268.1); side-note 268.1. Gratian, *Decretum* I, D.8 c.3 (Loserth: *Decreti I pars, Dist. VIII, c. III*; the modern form is ours). *Celeberrime non compresse*: "most notoriously unchecked" translates the print; Friedberg's text reads *celerrime*, "very swiftly", but records *celeberrime* in MSS F and G, so the print's reading is attested (Friedberg I, 13–14). *In privilegiorum ius*: into the standing of a privilege.
2. A in the margin *Augustinus* (268.11); side-note 268.12. D.8 c.4 (Loserth: *ib. c. IV*); its first sentence, *Veritate manifestata cedat consuetudo veritati*, is Libosus of Vaga at Cyprian's Council of Carthage, quoted by Augustine, *De baptismo* III (Friedberg I, 13–14). B lacks *consuetudinem ... quia* (268.12–13). *Sentencia* (268.8): the teaching of the decree (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL: teaching / sentence).
3. *Dictum privilegium*: the sanctuary privilege of Westminster (12-a–d). *Condicionem sepe expositam*: the condition of worthiness (264.9–14, 12-d). *Distribucio accomoda*: the logicians' "accommodated distribution", by which a universal sign ranges over the fitting instances only: "every fugitive" is read as every fugitive worthy of refuge. *Singulare pertinens*: the pertinent singular, the instance to which the universal applies. *Racione et veritate limitante*: ablative absolute with the participle in the singular.
4. A in the margin *Ad primum* (268.20); side-note 268.21. *Forma argumenti quod primo innuitur*: the fourth objection's argument from the holy men who approved the privilege (264.33–265.8, 12-d). *Tum quia* has no matching *tum*. A and A_1 lack *tunc ... versum fuisse* (268.23), which Loserth prints from B. *Gracia cupidinis*: for the sake of greed.

5. ***Prescriberet***: would acquire title by prescription (the glossary), the legal title by long use, here won by a custom of sinning. ***Mundana vero prosperitas***: answers the objection's *quando regnum processit prospere* (265.1). ***Kalende preparatorie ad ruinam***: the kalends, the first day of the Roman month, that usher in ruin: prosperity is its prelude.
6. A in the margin ***Conclusio. Ecclesia materialis sive basilica non est sponsa Christi*** (269.4); side-note 269.1. ***Dictum est***: at 265.24–266.1 (12-d). ***Truncum putridum***: the wooden idol of the prophets' polemic.
7. A reads *nec credant*, corrected in A_1 (269.10). The church's praise: the dedication liturgy: ***Deus, qui Ecclesiam tuam Unigeniti tui sponsam vocare dignatus es*** (Gregorian Sacramentary, anniversary of a dedication, *super oblata*, PL 78:162C). ***Infideliter***: faithlessly, against faith. ***Simplices sacerdotes***: simple, unlearned priests.
8. Side-note 269.12. ***Dicitur***: the answer to the objection's claim that the injured can remit satisfaction and penalty (265.5–7, 12-d). Cf. Galatians 2:21 ("then Christ died in vain", DR).
9. A and A_1 read ***invenit*** (269.25). ***Debitum corporale***: a debt in bodily goods, as against what is owed to God. ***Culpam***: the fault, the guilt of the sin.
10. A in the margin ***Spoliator tenetur restituere etc.*** (269.31); side-note 269.31. The maxim ***non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum*** is commonly ascribed to Augustine and received into canon law: it is Augustine to Macedonius in Gratian, C. 14 q. 6 c. 1, ***non remittetur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum*** (Friedberg I, 741–42); Loserth gives no reference. ***Idem in numero***: the numerically same thing. ***Domino capitali***: God as chief lord (the glossary), of whom every lord holds.
11. Side-note 270.6. A_1 reads ***Ipse enim*** (270.4). ***Servo suo***: God's servant, the injured creditor. ***Sibi equivalens restituendo***: ***sibi*** is taken as the servant; it could be God.
12. B in the margin, in another hand, ***Satispassio*** (270.11). ***Satispassio***: "suffering-enough", set against ***satisfaccio***, "doing-enough": the damned pay by suffering, without merit. ***Impotens***: one without the means to pay. ***Prodessens***: profiting, a participle of ***prodesse***.
13. A_1 corrects in the margin to ***mancipacione*** (270.13). ***Manucapcio***: mainprise, the English law's surety for a man's appearance. ***De tanto ... de quanto***: precisely so far as.
14. A in the margin ***Quinta obieccio. Contra*** (270.16); side-note 270.16. ***A vulgo***: by the common people. The prophecy: England would go unpunished until Westminster was polluted under a King Richard; the killing in the abbey church in 1378, under Richard II, is meant (12-a; Wyclif goes on: ***de illo homicidio in sanctuario perpetrato***, 270.23). ***Filii patris mendacii***: cf. John 8:44.
15. A in the margin ***Responsio*** (270.26); side-note 270.26. ***Illo homicidio***: the killing of 1378 (12-a, 252.26). ***Applicare sequelam***: to connect the misfortune with the killing as what follows from it. ***Fantasias***: the images of the imagination.
16. Matthew 27:19 (DR). ***Ad impediendum profectum ecclesie ex merito mortis Christi***: the progress of the church that comes from the merit of Christ's death; Wyclif reads the dream as Satan's attempt to hinder the Passion. ***Cui facta est illa visio***: Wyclif declines to say what the Westminster dream foretold. T. The print reads ***Matthei XXVII°, 69*** (270.29; plate n307), Loserth's misprint; the verse is 27:19.
17. Side-note 271.3. ***Istorum hominum***: plural, the men killed in 1378 (12-a). ***Comparacionem ... taxare***: to weigh their gravity against that of others. ***Verberaciones sacerdotum***: beatings of priests, as at 267.27–29 (12-d).
18. A in the margin ***Conclusio*** (271.10). All the manuscripts read ***reconsiliato*** (271.12). ***Compossibilis***: able to exist together with the kingdom's purged state. The prayer is the ***super populum*** of the Friday after Ash Wednesday, ***Tuere, domine, populum tuum ... quia nulla ei nocebit adversitas, si nulla dominetur iniquitas*** (Sarum, Legg p. 55; Gregorian Sacr., PL 78:57C), quoted exactly. ***Dominetur***: the glossary ***dominari***, here "lords it", of iniquity.
19. A in the margin, without mark of reference, ***Iniusticie quoad Deum et iniurie quoad proximum sunt cause destruccionis regni*** (271.20). Ecclesiasticus 10:8, quoted at 267.21–22 (12-d): "A kingdom is translated from one people to another, because of injustices, and wrongs" (DR); here Wyclif assigns the ***iniusticie*** to God and the ***iniurie*** to neighbour. ***Sapientis***: the wise man, the author of Ecclesiasticus.
20. ***Clerum suis elemosinis abutentem***: the clergy abusing its alms, the endowments. ***Secularem miliciam***: the knights (the glossary, the second estate). ***Ve speculatoribus qui illud dicerent regi suo***: taken as "woe to the watchmen whose part it was to say this to their king", the bishops, who are then blamed as the chief cause; if ***dicerent*** is a plain potential, "who would say it", the woe falls on any who dared tell him. ***Sacerdotes Iudee***: the priests of Judea, as the cause of Christ's persecution. ***Cum in quorum profectu ...***: the relative clause stands before its antecedent ***eorum***.
21. All the manuscripts read ***autonomastice*** (271.32); Loserth prints ***autonomatice***. ***Induti iusticiam***: cf. Psalm 132:9 (Vulgate 131:9, "Let thy priests be clothed with justice", DR). B reads *et membris* (272.1). ***Mors eorum***: the death of the priests themselves, when life fails in the members.
22. Isaiah 56:10 (DR). Matthew 15:14 (DR); the Vulgate has ***caecus autem si caeco***. ***Consequencia Christi***: Christ's inference (the glossary), the conditional "if the blind lead the blind ...".
23. A in the margin ***Correccio perturbancium pacem*** (272.6); A in the margin ***Isaie XXXIII. Racio***, and B in the margin, in another hand, ***Non occides*** (272.13); side-note 272.10. ***Illis per quos staret eorum correccio***: those on whom their correction depended, the king and his officers. ***Evidencia topica***: probable, not demonstrative, evidence (cf. the glossary, ***argumentum topicum***). Wyclif's words are nearly those of Luke 6:38 (***Eadem quippe mensura, qua mensi fueritis, remetietur vobis***), translated with its DR wording; Matthew 7:2 has ***in qua mensura***. Joab: 1 Kings 2:28–34 (Vulgate 3 Kings), at David's charge (2:5–6). Isaiah 33:1 (DR).
24. ***Intendo***: maintain (the glossary). ***Milites regis***: the king's knights who led the violation of 1378 (Sir Alan Buxhull and Sir Ralph Ferrers; 12-a); Joab, David's commander, is the ***miles*** of the old testament, hence "knight" (the glossary). ***Salvatum in vita et membris***: with life and limb spared. ***Primo argumento capituli septimi***: 07-a, 143–44, from Joab killed at the altar, ***fugitivum salvum in vita et membris extrahere***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 268: ***periculi*** (hyphenated peri-/culi; main token holds whole word; 166[e] M is folio mark + alinea)
  - 268: ∅ ('insufficient' is English side-note text (and makes it an insufficient plea))
  - 268: ***quam***
  - 269: ***Nemo***
  - 269: ***fugitivis***

- **270: *non***
- **270: *inferni***
- **270: *fingunt***
- **270: *filii* [NW]**
- **270: *fidelium***
- **270: *sathana* (30 after ad is the line number) [NW]**
- **270: *Nichil***
- **271: *videtur* (P alinea + 167ª folio mark in margin)**
- **271: *hominum* (5 is the line number)**
- **272: *Christi***
- **272: *14°***
- **272: *perturbacio***
- **272: *III°***
- **272: *1* (old-style arabic 1, x-height (Isaie XXXIII° 1))**
- **272: *et***
- **268: *VIIIª***
- **269: *iuris***
- **270: *dimittitur***
- **272: *absenciam***
- **272: ∅ (second half of in-ducitur; neighbour 8 already inducitur.) [DELX]**

Part 6: The doctor's double dream; privileges defended by patience; the patron not to be excommunicated

Loserth pp. 272.22–274.24

¶1 272.22–273.3
272.22 *Another story of a dream.*
273.10 *Let the dreams be true, still justice should be enforced in the abbey.*
273.17 *More devotion is the right way for the convent to defend its privileges.*

[272]**Unde audivi quemdam doctorem negare consequenciam, eo quod dicta ecclesia fuit miraculose consecrata, sed nec templum nec altare in quo occisus est Joab fuit taliter consecratum. Illud autem duplex sompnium nichil movet. Dico autem duplex sompnium, quia non docetur quin illud templum Salomonis fuit per inhabitacionem sanctorum prophetarum, sapientis et sancti regis in suis floribus, cum alio devoto populo, locus a domino per talem populum consecratus; plus enim valet ad sanctificacionem loci populus sanctus inhabitans cuius spiritus perungitur oleo gracie a spiritu sancto, quam valet corporalis linicio parietum secundum cerimonias sacerdotum. Nam illa sanctificacio** [273]**est plus fundabilis ex scriptura, ut patet II° Machabeorum V°, et Exodi XXXII° dicit propheta: Consecrastis manus vestras hodie.**

Hence I have heard a certain doctor deny the inference, on the ground that the said church was miraculously consecrated, whereas neither the temple nor the altar at which Joab was killed was so consecrated.[1] But that double dream moves nothing. And I say "double dream" because it is not shown that that temple of Solomon was not, through the indwelling of the holy prophets, and of the wise and holy king in his flowering, with the other devout people, a place consecrated by the Lord through such a people;[2] for a holy people dwelling [there], whose spirit is anointed through and through with the oil of grace by the Holy Spirit, avails more for the sanctification of a place than the bodily anointing of the walls according to the ceremonies of the priests. For that sanctification [273] **is more firmly grounded in scripture, as is clear from 2 Maccabees 5:19, and in Exodus 32:29 the prophet says: "You have consecrated your hands this day."[3]**

¶2 273.4–274.4
274.17 *They ought not to excommunicate the household of their patron.*

[273]**Secundum sompnium est de quodam piscatore qui sompniavit se locutum fuisse cum beato Petro dicente se ipsum velle dictam basilicam manibus propriis consecrare. Unde vidit consequenter in nocte vehemens lumen in basilica illa splendescere cum assistencia aliorum signorum consecracionem illam testancium. Sed**

The second dream is about a certain fisherman who dreamed that he had spoken with blessed Peter, who said that he himself wished to consecrate the said basilica with his own hands. Hence he then saw in the night a powerful light shining in that basilica, with the attendance of other signs

da utrumque sompnium, et videamus quid obest loco sancto extraccionem legitimam ac meritoriam, preceptam a rege ibi perficere specialiter tantum opus misericordie quod vergeret ad basilice purgamentum. Unde consuluissem dicto abbati et eius conventui quod equanimiter tollerassent illatam iniuriam sanctificando se ipsos et celebrando devocius pro rege et suis progenitoribus. In illa autem paciencia facilius superassent quam insurgendo frontose per excommunicacionem in privatam regis familiam. Sicut enim privilegium ecclesie quesitum est per pacienciam Christi et suorum membrorum, sic est conformiter defendendum. Unde Christus dedit privilegia facillima ad querendum pro quibus docuit non esse corporaliter contendendum, sed in eorum defensionem esse humiliter paciendum, ut docetur XXIII[a], q. I, in principio. Privilegia autem humana sunt condicionis opposite, cum in sua impetracione sunt sumptuosa, in sua defensione sunt laboriosa, et in sua retribucione sunt dampnosa, sicut est de superbia et suis singulis filiabus. Quis, inquam, contenderet circa privilegium nolendi possidere aurum vel argentum, et sic de aliis privilegiis Christi superius memoratis? Ipsa enim donantur per apercionem oris [274]anime et continuantur per pacienciam persecucionis atque iniurie et demum augmentantur usque ad summum gradum libertatis in requie.

witnessing to that consecration.[4] But grant both dreams, and let us see what harm it does a holy place to carry out there a lawful and meritorious extraction, commanded by the king, especially so great a work of mercy, which would tend to the cleansing of the basilica.[5] Hence I would have counselled the said abbot and his convent to bear with equanimity the injury inflicted, sanctifying themselves and celebrating more devoutly for the king and his forebears. And in that patience they would have prevailed more easily than by rising up brazenly, with excommunication, against the king's private household.[6] For as the privilege of the church was acquired through the patience of Christ and of his members, so is it to be defended in conformity [with that]. Hence Christ gave privileges most easy to acquire, for which he taught that one must not contend bodily, but in their defence must suffer humbly, as is taught in C.23 q.1, at the beginning.[7] But human privileges are of the opposite condition, since in their obtaining they are costly, in their defence laborious, and in their return ruinous, as is the case with pride and each of its daughters. Who, I say, would contend over the privilege of not wishing to possess gold or silver, and so with the other privileges of Christ recalled above? For they are given through the opening of the mouth [274]of the soul, and continued through patience under persecution and injury, and finally increased up to the highest degree of liberty in rest.[8]

¶3 274.5–274.24

[274]Stulticia ergo est fastidiando certa privilegia secularia ista contempnere. Et ista doctrina docetur Baruch 1°, 11 ex consilio Jeremie et captivitatis sapiencia sub hiis verbis: Orate pro vita Nabugodonosor, regis Babilonis, et pro vita Baltazar, filii eius, ut sint dies eorum sicut dies celi super terram. Si ergo tempore veteris testamenti, quando nondum perfecte docta est scola paciencie per Christum, non excommunicaret populus Dei regem infidelem qui destruxit templum, civitatem et gentem, et insuper ecclesiam eorum spoliavit cunctis suis insigniis et ministros ecclesie captivavit, sed e contrario benedixit, quanto magis tempore paciencie legis evangelice non excommunicaret vicarius Christi patronum suum vel eius familiam propter eius legitimum factum ad regni ac ecclesie fulcimentum vel propter opus unius persone nepharium, preter voluntatem regis vel sui consilii perpetratum, specialiter cum Christus Luce IX° docuit non sic maledicere eciam infideli. Erubescerent, inquam, interim recipere corporales elemosinas et defensionem corporis et bonorum a peculiari patrono cui taliter maledicunt.

It is folly, then, out of fastidiousness to despise these sure secular privileges.[9] And this doctrine is taught in Baruch 1:11, from the counsel of Jeremiah and the wisdom of the captivity, in these words: "And pray ye for the life of Nabuchodonosor the king of Babylon, and for the life of Balthasar his son, that their days may be upon earth as the days of heaven."[10] If, then, in the time of the old testament, when the school of patience had not yet been perfectly taught by Christ, the people of God would not excommunicate an unbelieving king who destroyed the temple, the city and the nation, and moreover despoiled their church of all its ornaments and led the ministers of the church captive, but on the contrary blessed [him], how much more, in the time of patience of the gospel law, should a vicar of Christ not excommunicate his patron or his household, for his lawful deed for the support of the kingdom and of the church, or for the wicked deed of one person, perpetrated beyond the will of the king or of his council; especially since Christ in Luke 9:55 taught not so to curse even an unbeliever.[11] They should blush, I say, meanwhile

to receive bodily alms and the defence of body and goods from a particular patron whom they curse in this way.[12]

Notes

1. A in the margin *Responsio quedam* (272.22); side-note 272.22. *Consequenciam*: the inference *a maiori* just drawn from Joab (272.15–21, 12-e). *Dicta ecclesia*: the abbey church of Westminster, whose miraculous consecration is the second dream (273.4–9).
2. *Duplex sompnium*: the doctor's reply rests on two dreams: the first, that the temple was not consecrated (exposed here); the second, the fisherman's (273.4). *Non docetur quin ... fuit*: it is not shown that it was not. *In suis floribus*: in his flowering, Solomon in his prime.
3. *Perungitur*: anointed throughout. *Linicio parietum*: the anointing of the walls in the rite of dedication. 2 Maccabees 5:19: "But God did not choose the people for the place's sake, but the place for the people's sake" (DR). The manuscripts give *Exod. XXII*; Loserth prints XXXII (273.2). Exodus 32:29 (DR), where the Vulgate continues *Domino*, "to the Lord"; *propheta*: Moses.
4. The fisherman's dream: the Westminster legend that St Peter himself consecrated the abbey church, seen by a fisherman (Aelred of Rievaulx, *Vita S. Edwardi*, PL 195:756B, where it is a waking apparition to a Thames fisherman on the eve of the dedication).
5. Side-note 273.10. *Da utrumque sompnium*: grant both dreams for the sake of argument. *Extraccionem ... preceptam a rege*: the removal of the fugitives from sanctuary at the king's order in 1378 (12-a). *Opus misericordie*: Wyclif counts the extraction a work of mercy.
6. A in the margin *Consilium* (273.14); B reads *consiluissem* (273.14); side-note 273.17. *Abbati et eius conventui*: the abbot and monks of Westminster. *Per excommunicacionem in privatam regis familiam*: the excommunication of members of the king's household for the violation (pronounced at the abbey's instance by the archbishop and four suffragans and published by the bishop of London; Loserth, Introduction, p. x). *Frontose*: brazenly.
7. A in the margin *Defensio privilegiorum ecclesie* (273.23). Gratian, *Decretum* II, C.23 q.1 c.1 (Loserth: *Decr. sec. pars, causa XXIII, q. I, cap. I. Nisi bella*; the modern form is ours); Gratian inscribes it *Gregorius*, but Friedberg identifies it as Origen, *Hom. in Iosue* 16.1. *In principio*: at the head of the question.
8. *Impetracione*: obtaining by request (the glossary). *Retribucione*: what they bring back to their holders. *Superbia et suis singulis filiabus*: pride and the vices that are its daughters. *Privilegiis Christi superius memoratis*: the privileges of Christ set out earlier in cap. 12. B reads *per apcionem* (273.33). *Apercionem oris anime*: the opening of the soul's mouth, to receive them.
9. *Certa privilegia secularia ista*: taken as the sure secular privileges the monks hold of the king, his alms and protection (274.21–24); *fastidiando*: out of fastidiousness, disdaining them. They could be read instead as secular privileges set against Christ's, but the sentence then lacks the privileges despised.
10. A and A, lack *doctrina* (274.5). Baruch 1:11 (DR). Loserth notes the place as corrupt in the manuscripts and suggests *captivitatis paciencia*, "the patience of the captivity" (274.6); the print's *sapiencia* is translated. *Ex consilio Jeremie*: Baruch's book follows Jeremiah's and sends its letter from the captivity.
11. *Vicarius Christi*: here the abbot, as a priest and so Christ's vicar; the term is not reserved to the pope. *Patronum suum*: the king, as patron of Westminster. *Eius legitimum factum*: the extraction the king commanded; *opus unius persone nepharium*: the killing, done by one man without the king's will. Luke 9:54–55: Christ rebukes the disciples who would call down fire on the Samaritans.
12. Side-note 274.17. *Erubescerent*: they, the monks of Westminster, should blush. *Peculiari patrono*: their own particular patron.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 273: *II*°
  - 273: *manus*
  - 273: *qui* (R is the alinea letter)
  - 273: *perficere* [NW]
  - 273: ∅ (print has in-/surgendo; main already holds insurgendo whole at pos 118)
  - 273: *Christus*
  - 273: *XXIII*ª
  - 274: *1* (old-style arabic 1, x-height (Baruch I°, 1); the 5 after it is the line number)
  - 274: *scola* (167ᶜ folio mark glued)
  - 273: *V*°, [-VERSE]

Chapter 13

Part 1: Temporary alms better than perpetual: the definitions, and the proof that they are more authentic

Loserth pp. 274.26–278.32

¶1 274.26–276.17
274.26 *Temporary alms are better than perpetual.*
275.1 *Definition of each.*
275.12 *Let us suppose perpetual alms in themselves to be good;*
275.26 *still temporary are better, since they have Christ's sanction,*
276.18 *and were practised in the primitive church.*
274.26
1. *Temporary alms are more in God's way of working, and are so far, better.*

[274]**Ex istis incidit declarare sentenciam quam dixi superius scilicet quod humana elemosina temporalis foret elemosina humana perpetua tam clero quam elemosinanti cum paribus magis autentica, magis meritoria et altrinsecus plus secura.** [275]**Et ne equivocetur in termino, supponatur quod humana elemosina perpetua sit elemosina corporalis, data ab homine simpliciter sub nomine elemosine perpetue, sicut in cartis regum Anglie sepe fit mencio. Elemosina enim humana temporalis est elemosina data ab homine sine tali titulo expressata, sicut dantur bona vocata mobilia communitatibus vel personis egentibus. Prima autem elemosina fit communiter de redditibus secularibus, de proventibus ecclesiarum vel de impensionibus annuis ad perpetuitatem secundum traditiones humanas signo sensibili obligatorio limitatis. Suppono secundo positivum cuiuscunque partis conclusionis proposite; nam contingit secularem existentem in gracia pie dare tales elemosinas perpetuas, ergo contingit eas esse elemosinas autenticas, meritorias et securas; nec contendet amicus vel adversarius circa probacionem huius, cum leges ecclesie approbant dotaciones, fundaciones et appropriaciones perpetuas factas clero. Non autem sic approbarent factum illud, nisi fuerit autenticum, meritorium et securum; ergo conclusio. Unde adversarii clamant quod iustissime, necessariissime et decentissime ecclesia taliter est dotata, in tantum quod non licuit dominis temporalibus sine excommunicacione et dampnacione perpetua taliter non dotasse. Istis suppositis probatur conclusio per hoc quod Christus expresse facto exemplavit et verbo docuit temporalem elemosinam, non autem dictam elemosinam perpetuam; ergo conclusio. Illud autem quod docetur expressius in scriptura, quod procedit signancius a persona magis autentica et in quo plus crescit ecclesia, habet tres condiciones superius recitatas. Nam negligencia vel fatuitas fuisset in Christo, si dedisset legem ad gubernandum suam ecclesiam, et regulam abiectam** [276]**vel minus necessariam expressius declarasset, regulam autem plus necessariam occultasset; ideo antiqui doctores ceperunt ex fide scripture quod testamentum Christi datum est ecclesie, tam in materia quam in forma, secundum quod est necessarium et expedicius, ut dirigat viantes per artam**

From these things it falls [to me] to declare the teaching which I stated above, namely that temporary human alms would be, other things being equal, more authentic, more meritorious, and on either side more secure than perpetual human alms, both for the clergy and for the almsgiver.[1] [275]**And lest there be equivocation in the term, let it be supposed that perpetual human alms is bodily alms given by a man without qualification under the name of perpetual alms, as is often mentioned in the charters of the kings of England. For temporary human alms is alms given by a man without such a title expressed, as so-called movable goods are given to communities or to needy persons.[2] And the first alms is commonly made from secular revenues, from the income of churches, or from annual payments assigned in perpetuity according to human traditions by a perceptible obligatory sign.[3] Second, I suppose the positive of each part of the proposed conclusion: for it is possible that a secular in grace piously gives such perpetual alms; therefore it is possible that they are authentic, meritorious and secure alms; nor will friend or adversary dispute over the proof of this, since the laws of the church approve perpetual endowments, foundations and appropriations made to the clergy. Now they would not so approve that deed unless it were authentic, meritorious and secure; therefore the conclusion.[4] Hence the adversaries cry out that most justly, most necessarily and most fittingly the church has been so endowed, so much so that it was not lawful for the temporal lords not to have so endowed [it] without excommunication and perpetual damnation. These things supposed, the conclusion is proved by this, that Christ expressly exemplified by deed and taught by word temporary alms, but not the said perpetual alms; therefore the conclusion. Now that which is taught more expressly in scripture, which proceeds more markedly from a more authentic person, and in which the church grows more, has the three conditions recited above.[5] For it would have been negligence or folly in Christ if he had given a law to govern his church, and had declared more expressly a lowly** [276]**or less necessary rule, but had hidden the more necessary rule; therefore the ancient doctors took it from the faith**

viam ducentem ad patriam, et per consequens, ut doceat quomodo viator est disposicior ad beatitudinem acquirendam. Illa autem que scriptura tacet, ut de nomine canis Tobie, de die iudicii et de futuris persecucionibus seculi, expedit particulariter ignorare. Cum ergo Christus et eius apostoli ceperunt ab homine dumtaxat elemosinas temporales et docuit suos discipulos precise tales recipere, ut patet Matthei X° et Luce X° ut dictum est XI° capitulo de privilegiis, manifestum videtur quod Christus preponderavit in ecclesia sua altrinsecus illum modum dandi et recipiendi elemosinas creature.

of scripture that the testament of Christ was given to the church, both in matter and in form, according as is necessary and more expedient, to direct those on the road along the strait way leading to the homeland, and consequently to teach how a wayfarer is better disposed to acquire blessedness.[6] And the things on which scripture is silent, such as the name of Tobias's dog, the day of judgment, and the future persecutions of the world, it is expedient [for us] to be ignorant of in particular. Since, then, Christ and his apostles took from man only temporary alms, and he taught his disciples to receive precisely such, as is clear from Matthew 10 and Luke 10, as was said in the eleventh chapter, on privileges, it seems manifest that Christ gave greater weight in his church, on either side, to that manner of giving and receiving the alms of a creature.[7]

¶2 276.18–276.23

[276]Et confirmacio huius est quod per illas elemosinas trecentis annis et amplius plus viguit ecclesia christiana. Privilegia ergo tam singulariter et signanter concessa a principe pacis pro quibus noluit suos contendere (ut dictum est in fine proximi capituli) sunt secularibus privilegiis pociora.

And the confirmation of this is that through those alms the Christian church flourished the more for three hundred years and more. Therefore the privileges granted so singularly and markedly by the prince of peace, for which he did not wish his own to contend (as was said at the end of the last chapter), are of more worth than secular privileges.[8]

¶3 276.24–278.6
277.18
2. Temporary alms imply more humility.
277.24 *Man's power over things is temporary and he cannot give rights that he does not possess.*
278.15 *Many perpetual alms are given without conditions as to the character of the grantee.*

[276]Sed particularius descendendo probatur specialius particulatim conclusio, et primo quod elemosina temporalis foret seculari elemosinanti magis autentica, nam talis elemosinacio foret tam operi quam doctrine verbali regis regum similior; cum ergo operacio membri ecclesie sit eo magis autentica quo est capiti similior, quia de tanto est ab auctore approbacior, sequitur conclusio. Loquor autem de opere cum suis circumstanciis secundum quod plus sonant in moralem iusticiam (in quantum huiusmodi), sic quod de se habet plus rectitudinis operis boni de genere; et hoc intelligo [277] per istam particulam cum paribus. Contingit autem per accidens occisionem hominis vel eius punicionem esse magis autenticam, quia plus Deo placentem quam data liberacio a morte vel restitucio ad prosperitatem in bonis nature vel fortune, supposito quod precedat ex maiori caritate. Verumptamen cum operacio que secundum se et secundum suas circumstancias est exemplari suo in Christo similior, debet correspondenter esse caritativior, suppono quod loquamur de autenticacione operis (in quantum huiusmodi), et cum omnis autenticacio operis nostri correspondet proporcionaliter approbacioni Christi, patet conclusio. Nemo enim debet facere opus misericordie nisi secundum doctrinam quam didicit a Christo, sed cum Christus docuit nos dare temporalem elemosinam et non

Now, descending more particularly, the conclusion is proved more specially, part by part; and first, that temporary alms would be more authentic for the secular almsgiver; for such almsgiving would be more like both the work and the verbal teaching of the King of kings; since, then, the activity of a member of the church is the more authentic the more like it is to the head, because to that extent it is more approved by its author, the conclusion follows.[9] And I speak of the work with its circumstances, according as they tend more toward moral justice (as such), so that of itself it has more of the rightness of a work good in kind; and this I understand [277] by that phrase "other things being equal".[10] But it can happen accidentally that the killing of a man, or his punishment, is more authentic, because more pleasing to God, than a deliverance from death granted [him] or a restoration to prosperity in the goods of nature or of fortune, supposing that it proceeds from greater charity. Nevertheless, since an activity which in itself and in its circumstances is more like its exemplar in Christ ought correspondingly to be more charitable, I suppose that we are speaking of the authentication of the work (as such); and since every authentication of our work corresponds proportionally to Christ's approval, the conclusion is clear.[11] For no one ought to do a work of mercy except according to the doctrine he has

sic perpetuam, sequitur quod temporalis elemosinacio sit magis autentica. Item, proporcionaliter ut operacio meritoria sapit maiorem humilitatem, est Deo placencior, et per consequens plus autentica apud magistrum qui est mitis et humilis corde; sed sic est de elemosinacione temporali respectu elemosinacionis perpetue. Ergo illa est magis autentica. Minor probatur ex hoc quod solius domini temporis qui est Deus est per se concedere donum perpetuum, unde (ut alias declaravi) non subiacet potestati hominis concedere donum pro aliquo tempore, nisi pro tempore quo ipse potest habere vel dominari eidem, cum Deus non potest concedere ius extensius sive uberius quam ipsemet potest habere. Cum ergo non sit in potestate secularis domini habere perpetuo tale donum, videtur quod non sufficit per se tam extense quicquam concedere. Et confirmacio huius est quod homo non potest ratificare perpetuitatem dominii suo heredi naturali cui magis afficitur tamquam magis capaci. Quomodo ergo rectificabit elemosinam ab approbacione Christi magis extraneam? Sicut ergo Edgarus et sanctus Edwardus [278]non habuerunt potestatem ad dandum suis heredibus naturalibus dominium regni nostri, sicut patet ex conquestu sequente, sic videtur quod non suffecerunt donare accessorium persone tam extranee, ymmo sicut Willielmus conquestor non tenebatur restituere principale sic nec accessorium.

learned from Christ; now since Christ taught us to give temporary alms and not so perpetual, it follows that temporary almsgiving is more authentic. Again, in proportion as a meritorious activity savours of greater humility, it is more pleasing to God, and consequently more authentic with the master who is meek and humble of heart; now so it is with temporary almsgiving in respect of perpetual almsgiving. Therefore it is more authentic.[12] The minor is proved from this, that it belongs to the lord of time alone, who is God, of himself to grant a perpetual gift; hence (as I have declared elsewhere) it does not lie in the power of man to grant a gift for any time except for the time during which he himself can have it or exercise lordship over it, since God cannot grant a right more extensive or more ample than he himself can have.[13] Since, then, it is not in the power of a secular lord to have such a gift in perpetuity, it seems that he does not suffice of himself to grant anything so extensively. And the confirmation of this is that a man cannot ratify the perpetuity of lordship to his natural heir, to whom he is more attached as to one more capable. How then will he rectify an alms further estranged from Christ's approval? As, then, Edgar and Saint Edward [278]did not have power to give the lordship of our kingdom to their natural heirs, as is clear from the conquest that followed, so it seems that they did not suffice to give the accessory to a person so foreign; indeed, just as William the Conqueror was not bound to restore the principal, so neither [was he bound to restore] the accessory.[14]

¶4 278.7–278.11

[278]Et confirmacio est ex hoc quod multas tales elemosinas Saxonum transmutavit et monachos Normanie introduxit; quod si omnino fuisset illicitum, maior pars cleri possessionati in Anglia alienum bonum sine titulo usurparet.

And the confirmation is from this, that he transferred many such alms of the Saxons and brought in monks of Normandy; and if this had been wholly unlawful, the greater part of the possessioner clergy in England would be usurping another's good without title.[15]

¶5 278.12–278.32

[278]Item, videtur quod multe carte perpetue elemosine sapiunt ex parte elemosinantis et male interpretantis blasphemiam et superbiam, cum multi domini seculares presumunt quod est in potestate eorum dare simpliciter in perpetuam elemosinam signatum redditum, qualibet condicione elemosinarii pretermissa; quod declaratum est proximo capitulo Deo non posse competere, cum 1° Regum II° legitur quod Deus condicionem Hely notaverat, sic quod non obstante quacunque promissione non tenet concessio, nisi servicium Dei virtuose peragat. Si ergo Deus qui potest iustificare impium et scit condiciones ac dignitates tocius generis succedencium subintellegit condicionem, ceca presumpcio videretur in homine qui nec potest

Again, it seems that many charters of perpetual alms savour of blasphemy and pride on the part of the almsgiver and of the one who interprets [them] wrongly, since many secular lords presume that it is in their power to give without qualification, in perpetual alms, a designated revenue, passing over every condition of the almsman; which was declared in the last chapter cannot belong to God, since in 1 Samuel 2:30 we read that God had noted the condition of Heli, so that, notwithstanding any promise, the grant does not hold unless he performs the service of God virtuously.[16] If, then, God, who can justify the ungodly and knows the conditions and deserts of the whole line of successors, understands a

donare per tantam periodum nec iustificare aliquem eius datarium, ut asserat se concedere datam elemosinam cuilibet illius generis absolute; in hoc enim implicat se sic concedere, sive Deus voluerit sive noluerit; quod non potest, cum nemo potest quicquam concedere, nisi prius Deus ipsum concesserit: ideo racione talis mendacii dissolvuntur multe elemosine vocate perpetue.

condition [as implied], it would seem blind presumption in a man, who can neither give for so long a period nor justify any grantee of his, that he should assert that he grants the given alms to anyone of that line absolutely;[17] for in this he implies that he so grants whether God wills or not; which he cannot, since no one can grant anything unless God has first granted it: therefore, by reason of such a lie, many so-called perpetual alms are dissolved.[18]

Notes

1. Chapter 13 begins at 274.25. A in the margin *Utrum elemosina humana corporalis perpetua sit fundanda* (274.26) and *Conclusio* (274.28); side-note 274.26. *Temporalis*: temporary, for a time, against *perpetua*; not "temporal" (*temporalia*, temporal goods). *Cum paribus*: other things being equal, explained at 276.33–277.1. *Altrinsecus*: on either side, for clergy and giver alike. *Autentica*: authentic, carrying authority (Christ's approval, 276.28–30). *Sentenciam*: the thesis taught (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL: teaching / sentence). *Sentenciam quam dixi superius*: the place is Wyclif's and not identified here. A and A_1 read *plus secatur* (274.30).
2. Side-note 275.1. *Sub nomine elemosine perpetue*: the grant "in perpetual alms" of English charters, the tenure in frankalmoign (*libera eleemosina*, as in Glanvill XIII, the assize *utrum*). *Sine tali titulo expressata*: without such a title expressed. *Bona vocata mobilia*: so-called movable goods, chattels.
3. B reads *de pencionibus* (275.10). *Impensionibus annuis*: annual payments, pensions. *Signo sensibili obligatorio*: the charter and seal, the perceptible sign that binds. *Limitatis* agrees with *impensionibus*, perhaps with all three sources of the alms.
4. A_1 comments in the margin *possibilitatem vel posicionem* (275.12–13); side-note 275.12. *Positivum*: the positive degree ("authentic, meritorious, secure") of each part, the conclusion asserting the comparative. *Contingit*: it is possible. A and A_1 lack *perpetuas* (275.14).
5. A in the margin *Racio* (275.26); side-note 275.26. *Probatur conclusio*: the minor, that Christ taught temporary alms, is stated first (with *ergo conclusio*), the major after it: what is so taught has the three conditions. *Signancius*: more markedly.
6. A and A_1 read *necessarius* (276.5). *Ceperunt ex fide scripture*: "took from the faith of scripture", with the verb governing *ex* (the glossary, *ex fide*). *Artam viam ducentem ad patriam*: cf. Matthew 7:14 ("strait is the way that leadeth to life", DR). *Antiqui doctores*: unnamed. *Tam in materia quam in forma*: in content and in form.
7. Side-note 276.18 (at the next paragraph). *Nomine canis Tobie*: the dog of the book of Tobias, whose name scripture does not give. *Matthei X° et Luce X°*: Christ's charge to the twelve and to the seventy-two (Matthew 10:9–10, Luke 10:7). B reads *XX. cap.* for *XI° capitulo* (276.16); the cross-reference is to 11-e, 247–48 (Matt. 10:9, Luke 10:7, Christ's privileges to the disciples); B's XX is wrong. *Elemosinas creature*: alms from a creature, as against God's gifts. *Preponderavit ... altrinsecus*: gave more weight, for giver and receiver alike.
8. *Trecentis annis et amplius*: the church's first three centuries, before its endowment. *Principe pacis*: Christ (cf. Isaiah 9:6). *In fine proximi capituli*: 273.17–274.4 (12-f). *Pociora*: of more worth.
9. A in the margin *Confirmacio* (276.24); side-note 276.24. *Particulatim*: part by part, taking the three comparatives in turn; this is the first. *Regis regum*: Christ. A and B abbreviate *approbacior*; A_1 reads *approbabilior*; B reads *de tanto ab* (276.30). *Operacio*: activity, the doing of the work.
10. *Plus sonant in moralem iusticiam*: tend more toward moral justice. *In quantum huiusmodi*: as such, i.e. considered as almsgiving. *Rectitudinis operis boni de genere*: the rightness of a work good in kind (by its object), before the further goodness charity gives. *Cum paribus*: 274.28.
11. *Per accidens*: by the circumstances of a case, not by its kind. *Data liberacio a morte*: a pardon from death. *Bonis nature vel fortune*: goods of nature (life, health) or of fortune (wealth). *Exemplari suo in Christo*: its pattern in Christ's life. *Caritativior*: more charitable, fuller of charity (the glossary, *caritas*). *Autenticacione*: the being authentic.
12. Side-note 277.18. Matthew 11:29 ("because I am meek, and humble of heart", DR). *Sapit maiorem humilitatem*: savours of greater humility.
13. Side-note 277.24. *Solius domini temporis*: of God alone as lord of time, who alone can grant for all time. *Ut alias declaravi*: perhaps *De civili dominio* (not traced). *Cum Deus non potest concedere ius extensius ...*: the premise argues downward from God: not even God grants a right beyond what he can have, so neither can man. *Ius*: a right (the glossary).
14. *Edgarus et sanctus Edwardus*: King Edgar and Edward the Confessor, remembered as benefactors of the monasteries, Westminster among them (their privileges are quoted at 205.3–206.26, 10-a). *Conquestu sequente*: the Norman conquest of 1066. *Accessorium ... principale*: in law the accessory follows the principal: the endowment follows the lordship of the kingdom. *Persone tam extranee*: the endowed church, a stranger to the giver's line. B reads *extranie* (278.4). *Rectificabit*: will make good.
15. William's transfer of Saxon endowments to Norman houses and monks. B lacks *fuisset ... titulo* (278.9). *Cleri possessionati*: the possessioner clergy, the endowed religious (the glossary).
16. Side-note 278.15. *Signatum redditum*: a designated revenue. *Declaratum est proximo capitulo*: cap. 12, 12-b, 256–57. 1 Samuel 2:30 (Vulgate 1 Kings): the Lord's promise to Heli's house withdrawn. A_1 corrects to *teneret*; B reads *servicio* (278.21). A in the margin *Racio* (278.22).
17. *Qui potest iustificare impium*: cf. Romans 4:5 ("him that justifieth the ungodly", DR). A and A_1 read *subintellexit* (278.24) and *durare per tantam* (278.25–26). *Subintellegit condicionem*: understands a condition as implied (the glossary). *Generis*: the line of successors to the grant. *Datarium*: grantee.
18. *Implicat se sic concedere*: he implies that he grants in this way, the lie that dissolves the grant. *Nisi prius Deus ipsum concesserit*: unless God has first granted it [to the granter].

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **275: *Christus***
  - **276: *Christus***
  - **276: *a* (print: concessa a principe; main lacks a)**
  - **276: *foret* (hooked ascender = f)**
  - **277: *Contingit***
  - **277: *sufficit* (hyphenated suf-/ficit; main token holds whole word) [NW]**
  - **278: *II°***
  - **277: *per* (alinea B and 167d folio mark glued)**
  - **277: *et***
  - **278: *potestatem***

Part 2: No heir is bound to continue his forefathers' alms, and the pope may claim no tribute

Loserth pp. 278.33–282.34

¶1 278.33–279.27
279.1 *Such conditions must be always understood, but would be better expressed.*
279.28 *Temporary alms would probably endure longer than those called perpetual.*

[278] **Religiosior ergo foret concessio expressa condicione quod persone sint habiles et quod Deo sit placitum;** [279] **quam condicionem licet oportet intelligere, tamen illa expressa foret contencionum plurium sedativa et disposicionis plus vigilis causativa et sic racione humilitatis foret magis autentica et racione declinacionis a ritu gentili ad religionem Christi foret plus meritoria et racione pluris adiutorii plus secura. Et ita videtur presumpcio quod quis obliget heredes suos simpliciter ad continuacionem talis elemosine, cum non subiacet potestati sue dignificare quoscunque tales elemosinarios, nec potest obligare se ipsum vel alium ad premiandum indignos, cum heres plus obligatur veritati a qua per se capit hereditatem, quam patri carnali a quo capit solum per accidens. Et hec est racio quare catholice dicitur regem Anglie semper esse infra etatem, cum debet corrigere errores tam sui quam progenitorum suorum, sive ex ignorancia sive ex inadvertencia deceptus fuerit; aliter enim attemptaret defendere iniusticias contra Deum. Ideo absit nos inponere regi et regno tantam demenciam ut inveteratus dierum malorum defenderet antiquum errorem tractum in consuetudinem, cum secundum decretum, allegatum XI° cap°, error cui non resistitur approbatur. Et patet consideranti attencius quomodo omnis elemosina humana vocata perpetua est realiter ex lege Dei invincibili temporalis, cum oportet omnino condicionem quam Deus apponit subintelligi, quamdiu ditarius manserit dignus participare elemosina quoad Deum.**

Therefore the grant would be more religious with the condition expressed, that the persons be qualified and that it be pleasing to God; [279] **and although this condition must be understood, yet, expressed, it would allay many contentions and cause a more watchful disposition; and so by reason of humility it would be more authentic, by reason of its turning aside from the gentile rite to the religion of Christ it would be more meritorious, and by reason of greater help it would be more secure.**[1] **And so it seems presumption that anyone should bind his heirs without qualification to the continuation of such alms, since it does not lie in his power to make worthy any such almsmen whatever, nor can he bind himself or another to reward the unworthy; since the heir is more bound to the truth, from which he takes his inheritance of itself, than to his fleshly father, from whom he takes it only accidentally.**[2] **And this is the reason why it is said catholically that the king of England is always under age: since he ought to correct the errors both of himself and of his forefathers, whether he was deceived from ignorance or from inadvertence; for otherwise he would attempt to defend injustices against God. Therefore God forbid that we should impute to the king and the kingdom such madness that, "grown old in evil days", he should defend an ancient error drawn into custom, since according to the decree alleged in the eleventh chapter, "an error that is not resisted is approved".**[3] **And it is clear to one who considers more attentively how every so-called perpetual human alms is in reality, by the invincible law of God, temporary, since the condition which God attaches must by all means be understood as implied: as long as the one enriched remains worthy to share in the alms as regards God.**[4]

¶2 279.28–280.10
280.11 *The giver's example would be followed and the succession of gifts kept up.*
280.27 *An heir is not bound to approve of his ancestor's gifts.*

[279] **Unde talis attencio et expressio hominis elemosinantis ex maiori humiliacione, ex maiori Deo confirmacione, et maiori errorum exclusione magis disponeret ad perpetuacionem elemosine per Christum quam elemosina humana irreligiose vocata perpetua.** [280] **Nam perpetuare elemosinas est Christo proprium, eo quod est dominus, simpliciter assistens omni tempori, potens iustificare elemosinarium, a qua iustificacione (iuxta dicta proximo capitulo) dependet humana donacio; et sic est de successione hereditaria de qua minus videtur. Deo enim est proprium heredes in perpetuitate successionis hereditarie limitare. Unde creditur quod multi fundantes elemosinas nominetenus perpetuas in penam sue superbie a perpetuitate generis hereditarie defecerunt.**

Hence such attention and expression on the part of the man who is almsgiver, from greater humbling, from greater confirmation to God, and from greater exclusion of errors, would dispose more toward the perpetuation of the alms through Christ than a human alms irreligiously called perpetual.[5] [280] **For to perpetuate alms belongs properly to Christ, in that he is lord, present without qualification to every time, able to justify the almsman, on which justification (according to what was said in the last chapter) human giving depends; and so it is with hereditary succession, in which this is less apparent. For it belongs properly to God to assign heirs in the perpetuity of hereditary succession. Hence it is believed that many who founded alms perpetual in name have, in punishment of their pride, failed of the perpetuity of their hereditary line.**[6]

¶3 280.11–280.16

[280] **In talibus ergo elemosinis unus princeps concedit pro suo tempore subintellecta supradicta condicione et imprecatur suum heredem sic facere, et ex meritoriis donis multorum sibi succedencium cum graciosa disposicione materie facit Deus unam elemosinam perpetuam, si sibi sit placitum.**

In such alms, therefore, one prince grants for his own time, the condition stated above being understood as implied, and prays that his heir may do likewise; and from the meritorious gifts of many who succeed him, with a gracious disposing of the matter, God makes one perpetual alms, if it pleases him.[7]

¶4 280.17–280.33

[280] **Unde hic instatur sophistice quod temporalis dominus meritorie facit elemosinam perpetuam, cum meritorie faciat partem eius. Sed iste obiectus non vadit contra sensum expositum, ymmo si procedit de faccione elemosine perpetue secundum partem, eque probaret quod una vidua paupercula plus faceret in casu elemosinam talem perpetuam, posito quod plus mereatur ut Deus elemosinam utrimque perficiat; nam 1° Corinthiorum III°, 6, scribitur: Ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit, sed Deus incrementum dedit. Unde patet consideranti subtiliter quod nullus heres procedens post progenitorem dotantem ecclesiam tenetur approbare fundatam elemosinam nisi ex libera voluntate. Patet primo sic: Non tenetur facere aliquod opus meritorium nisi ex libera voluntate, non tenetur sic approbare nisi secundum racionem operis meritorii, ergo non tenetur sic approbare nisi ex libera voluntate.**

Hence here it is objected sophistically that a temporal lord meritoriously makes a perpetual alms, since he meritoriously makes a part of it. But that objection does not go against the sense set out; indeed, if it proceeds from the making of a perpetual alms in respect of a part, it would equally prove that one poor little widow would in some case do more to make such an alms perpetual, supposing that she merits more that God should complete the alms on both sides; for in 1 Corinthians 3:6 it is written: "I have planted, Apollo watered: but God gave the increase."[8] **Hence it is clear to one who considers subtly that no heir coming after a forefather who endowed the church is bound to approve the founded alms except of free will. It is clear, first, thus: he is not bound to do any meritorious work except of free will; he is not bound so to approve except in the character of a meritorious work; therefore he is not bound so to approve except of free will.**[9]

¶5 281.1–281.28
281.9 *God ordains all good works to be done of free will.*
281.16 *(I must not be supposed to mean that*

[281] **Et hoc est notum intelligentibus textum Apostoli Philipp. IIIo, 3, et Gal. VI°, 14°, dicentis: Michi autem absit gloriari nisi in cruce domini Jesu Christi. Item, ex precepto Dei et eius successione hereditaria filii adoptivi non tenetur heres continuare aliquod bonum**

[281] **And this is known to those who understand the text of the Apostle, Philippians 3:3 and Galatians 6:14, where he says: "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ."**[10] **Again, by the precept of God and by the heir's hereditary succession to him as an**

lords should cease their payments to the Church.)

opus nisi ex libera voluntate; sed Deus, pater heredis plus obligat quam pater suus carnalis, ergo multo magis ex obligacione patris carnalis non tenetur sic facere nisi ex libera voluntate. Deus enim posuit hominem in tanta libertate, quod non potest sibi quicquam absolute precipere nisi meritorium, et per consequens adiecta condicione, ut libere illud perficiat. Unde Augustinus super Psalmum CXLVIII^{um}: In tuo, inquit, arbitrio Deus te esse voluit, cui pares locum, Deo aut diabolo, cum paraveris, qui possidebit ipse imperabit. Sed absit ut aliquis reportet me quod dem occasionem dominis temporalibus ad spoliandum sanctam ecclesiam vel ad continuandum elemosinas quas progenitores eorum inceperant, cum ex conclusione sequatur formaliter quod tenentur elemosinas tales perficere. Scit enim logicus quod si non sic elemosinare nisi libere tunc tenentur, quis queso urgeret regem Anglie coaccione civili continuare elemosinas patris sui? Non rex preteritus, tum quia par in parem non habet imperium, tum eciam quia ipsis in regno incompossibilibus est plenum ius ad regem posterum derivatum, nec imperatori pertinet, cum regnum nostrum non sit imperio sic subiugatum.

adopted son, the heir is not bound to continue any good work except of free will; now God, the heir's father, binds more than his fleshly father; therefore much more, by the obligation of his fleshly father, he is not bound so to act except of free will. For God has placed man in such liberty that he cannot command him anything absolutely except what is meritorious, and consequently with the condition added, that he perform it freely. Hence Augustine on Psalm 148: "God willed," he says, "that it should lie in your choice for whom you prepare the place, for God or for the devil; when you have prepared it, he who possesses it will rule."[11] But God forbid that anyone should report me as giving occasion to temporal lords to despoil holy church, or to discontinue the alms which their forefathers began, since it follows formally from the conclusion that they are bound to complete such alms.[12] For the logician knows that if they are not bound so to give alms except freely, then they are bound [so to give them]. Who, I ask, would compel the king of England by civil coercion to continue the alms of his father? Not the past king, both because "an equal has no command over an equal", and also because, the two being incompossible in the kingdom, the full right has passed to the later king; nor does it belong to the emperor, since our kingdom is not so subjected to the empire.[13]

¶6 281.29–282.34
282.1 *The Pope has no power to enforce payments from the King,*
282.16 *but the King is bound to continue his ancestor's alms,*
282.26 *though he may vary their application.*

[281]Ex quibus sequitur quod non pertinet ad papam propter obligacionem regis et regni antiquis temporibus [282]pensionem vel elemosinam annualem ab istis requirere, nam in lege Christi talis perpetuus redditus non habetur nec ex lege imperiali post dotacionem factam a cesare, quia integrum imperium non habet ius, unde liceat sibi exaccionem huiusmodi vendicare. Requireretur ergo ut papa in hoc humilis elemosinarius regis petat ratificacionem talis elemosine, cum omnia que habet in Anglia tenet de rege, tum quia dominium regni nostri non est subiectum imperio, et per consequens non parti imperii decise ad Romanum pontificem, tum eciam quia sic regnum nostrum foret per mortificacionem temporalium nimium diminutum et per consequens virtute brevis regii; ad quod dampnum rex statim revocaret quod tam improvide est concessum. Rex vero ex vocali promissione, ex scripti personali obligacione, vel ex paternali affeccione potest esse obligacior ad progenitorum suorum elemosinas gratis continuandum, sed potissime racione obligacionis qua Christo tenetur sub obtentu beatitudinis impertiri opera misericordie membris suis (ut patet Matthei XXV°); et cum maius opus misericordie sit fraterna coreccio, patet quod heredes

From which it follows that it does not belong to the pope, on account of an obligation of the king and the kingdom in ancient times, [282]to require from them a pension or annual alms; for in the law of Christ such a perpetual revenue is not found, nor by imperial law after the endowment made by Caesar, because the whole empire has no right whereby it might be lawful for him to claim an exaction of this kind.[14] It would be required, then, that the pope, in this the king's humble almsman, should ask for the ratification of such an alms, since all that he has in England he holds of the king: both because the lordship of our kingdom is not subject to the empire, and consequently not to a part of the empire cut off for the Roman pontiff; and also because our kingdom would in this way be too much diminished by the amortization of temporal goods, and consequently, by virtue of the king's writ *ad quod damnum*, the king would at once revoke what has been so improvidently granted.[15] But the king, by a spoken promise, by the personal obligation of a writing, or by fatherly affection, can be more bound to continue freely the alms of his forefathers; but most of all by reason of the obligation by which he is bound to Christ, as the condition of obtaining blessedness, to bestow

sunt secundum leges Dei et hominum ad ipsam amplius obligati. Unde (ut dixi superius) plus faceret in casu ad continuacionem elemosine progenitorum, auferendo ipsam a discolis et convertendo eam in alios pios usus quam quantumlibet multiplicando collacionem temporalium minus provide. Et ex talibus operibus misericordie sibi succedentibus eciam diversis in genere fit unum opus misericordie successivum, cum tota ecclesia a principio mundi usque ad novissimum electum habet unum opus misericordie secundum quod ecclesia plene complacet sponso suo.

works of mercy on his members (as is clear from Matthew 25); and since the greater work of mercy is fraternal correction, it is clear that heirs are, according to the laws of God and of men, more bound to it.[16] Hence (as I said above) he would in some case do more toward the continuation of his forefathers' alms by taking it from the froward and turning it to other pious uses than by multiplying, however much, the conferring of temporal goods less providently. And from such works of mercy succeeding one another, even though diverse in kind, there comes to be one successive work of mercy, since the whole church, from the beginning of the world to the last elect, has one work of mercy, according to which the church fully pleases her bridegroom.[17]

Notes

1. Side-note 279.1; A in the margin *Conclusio* (279.6). *Religiosior*: more religious, more fitting to the religion of Christ, set against the *ritus gentilis*, the pagan rite of giving without condition. *Habiles*: qualified. *Sedativa ... causativa*: allaying, causing. *Autentica*: carrying Christ's approval (13-a, n. 1).
2. *Dignificare*: make worthy. *Per se ... per accidens*: the heir has his inheritance of itself from truth (God's grant), from his father only accidentally; so his first obligation runs to truth.
3. A and A$_1$ read *Et hec racio* (279.13), A in the margin *Conclusio*. *Regem Anglie semper esse infra etatem*: a maxim of English law (source not traced). *Inveteratus dierum malorum*: Daniel's words to the elder, Daniel 13:52 ("O thou that art grown old in evil days", DR). The decree is Gratian, D.83 c.3, per Loserth (*Dec. I pars, dist. LXXXIII, c. III*; the modern form is ours), who refers back to p. 235 (cap. 11); Gratian heads it *Item Innocentius* (Friedberg I, 293–94).
4. *Temporalis*: temporary, the the glossary's *elemosina temporalis*, against *perpetua*. *Ditarius*: the one enriched by the alms (cf. *ditare*, the glossary), the almsman. *Quoad Deum*: in God's sight.
5. Side-note 279.28; B reads *elemosinant* (279.28–29). *Ex maiori Deo confirmacione*: we read a greater confirming [of the alms] to God, its being made fast in God's will; "greater conformity to God" would be *conformacione*, which the print does not have. *Per Christum* goes with *perpetuacionem*: Christ alone perpetuates.
6. A in the margin *Conclusio* (280.1, 280.7). *Simpliciter assistens omni tempori*: present without qualification to every time, as lord of time (13-a, 277.24). *Iuxta dicta proximo capitulo*: cap. 12 (12-b, 256–57), on the grant that depends on the grantee's worthiness. *De qua minus videtur*: hereditary succession depends on God in the same way, though it is less apparent. *Limitare*: assign (the glossary).
7. Side-note 280.11. B reads *interpretatur* for *imprecatur* (280.13), and *graciose* (280.14). *Imprecatur*: prays for, invokes. *Materie*: the matter of the alms, the succession of gifts out of which God makes one perpetual alms.
8. A and B in the margin *Instancia* (280.17). *Obiectus*: the objection (the glossary, *objectum*). B reads *ex faccione* (280.21). The reply turns the objection: if contributing a part made one a maker of the perpetual alms, a poor widow (cf. Luke 21:2–3) who merited more would contribute more. *Utrimque*: on both sides, of the lord's gift and of the widow's merit; "in either case" is possible. 1 Corinthians 3:6 is the Douay–Rheims.
9. Side-note 280.27; A in the margin *Conclusio* (280.27). B lacks *nisi ... meritorii* (280.31). The minor premiss stands without a connective in the Latin. *Secundum racionem operis meritorii*: in the character of a meritorious work.
10. Loserth: after *Philipp.* the manuscripts leave a gap, and he supplied *III, 3* (281.1). Philippians 3:3 ("glory in Christ Jesus", DR); Galatians 6:14 is the Douay–Rheims, but Wyclif lacks *nostri* ("our Lord"). *Hoc* points back to the proof just given (280.29–33).
11. Side-note 281.9. *Eius successione hereditaria filii adoptivi*: the heir succeeds to God as an adopted son (cf. Romans 8:15–17); the construal of *eius* is ours. The argument runs from the greater obligation (God's) to the lesser (the fleshly father's). The Augustine is *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 148.2 (PL 37, 1938; Loserth: *Opp.* IV.ii, p. 1673), quoted freely: Augustine has *In tuo autem arbitrio Deus esse voluit ... Deo, an diabolo*. *Arbitrio*: choice.
12. Side-note 281.16; A in the margin *Nota solucionem obiectus*. The print has *ad continuandum*; Loserth queries *discontinuandum (?)* (281.18). We translate "discontinue", which the argument needs: Wyclif is disclaiming any encouragement to lords to withdraw their alms; "or to continue the alms" would say the opposite. *Formaliter*: by the form of the inference. *Perficere*: complete.
13. A and A$_1$ read *quod si non tenentur* (281.21); we translate with their *tenentur*, which the print's sentence needs, and supply the bracket. B reads *urget* (281.22–23); A in the margin *Non tenetur filius continuare dotacionem elemosine patris sui*. *Par in parem non habet imperium*: the canonists' maxim, drawn from Innocent III's *quum non habeat imperium par in parem* (X 1.6.20, *Innotuit*; again Clem. 5.11.1). *Incompossibilibus*: the past and the present king cannot reign together. B reads *non sit imperatori* (281.28).
14. Side-note 282.1; A in the margin *Conclusio* (281.29). *Obligacionem regis et regni antiquis temporibus*: the annual tribute of a thousand marks that King John undertook in 1213 (cf. 354.1, 15-g). *Dotacionem factam a cesare*: Constantine's endowment of the church. *Sibi*: the pope; the empire itself, whole, has no such right to hand on.

15. B reads ***artificacionem*** (282.7); A in the margin ***Conclusio. Parti imperii decise ad Romanum pontificem***: the part of the empire cut off for the pope by Constantine's gift. A and A_1 read ***dirimitum*** (282.12–13); ***regii*** is Loserth's correction (A A_1 ***regie***, B ***regei***, 282.13). We construe ***virtute brevis regii ad quod dampnum*** across the working transcription's semicolon as the royal writ ***ad quod damnum***, the inquiry into the damage of a grant in mortmain (20 Edw. I, 1292: no licence to amortize without an ***inquisicio ... si sit ad dampnum domini Regis vel aliorum***; ***Statutes of the Realm*** I); taken apart, ***ad quod dampnum*** would be "at which loss".
16. Side-note 282.16; A in the margin ***Conclusio*** (282.16). ***Vocali promissione ... scripti personali obligacione***: a promise by word, a personal bond in writing. ***Sub obtentu beatitudinis***: as the condition of obtaining blessedness. Matthew 25:35–40, the works of mercy done to Christ's members. ***Fraterna coreccio***: fraternal correction (cf. Matthew 18:15); ***ad ipsam***: to it.
17. Side-note 282.26. ***Ut dixi superius***: the place is not identified here. ***Successivum***: a successive entity, one whose parts exist one after another (the glossary). ***Novissimum electum***: the last of the elect.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 279: ***confirmacione*** (hyphenated confir-/macione; main token holds whole word)
  - 280: ***facere*** (hooked ascender = f)
  - 280: ***III°***
  - 280: ***Deus***
  - 281: ***14°***
  - 281: ***in***
  - 281: ***meritorium***
  - 282: ***Christi***
  - 282: ***obligacione***
  - 282: ***paternali*** [NW]
  - 279: ***quam*** (alinea C and 168a folio mark glued)
  - 280: ***perpetuare***
  - 282: ***pensionem***

Part 3: Two objections: the old law's perpetual alms, and the merit of larger and longer alms

Loserth pp. 283.1–287.20

¶1 283.1–283.10
283.1 *It is objected that there were perpetual foundation under the O. T.*
283.11 *Answer: These were ordained by God,*
283.21 *who could and did withdraw them;*
283.28 *and do not authorise human foundations exempt from regulation.*

[283]**Contra dicta obicitur primo per hoc quod in veteri testamento erant multe tales elemosine, religiones et ritus perpetui approbati, cum ergo tante auctoritatis sit vetus testamentum ut novum, sequitur quod licitum est fundare tales elemosinas perpetuas auctoritate veteris testamenti. Nam ex hinc sumitur solucio decimarum, ut dictum est libro III° cap.... ex testimonio Henrici de Gandano et sancti Thome; et assumptum patet Levitici VI° et VII° Exodi XXVII° et sepe alibi in scriptura.**

Against what has been said, it is objected, by appeal to this, first, that in the old testament there were many such alms, religions and perpetual rites approved; since, then, the old testament is of as great authority as the new, it follows that it is lawful to found such perpetual alms on the authority of the old testament. For from here the payment of tithes is derived, as was said in book 3, chapter ..., from the testimony of Henry of Ghent and of Saint Thomas; and the assumption is clear from Leviticus 6 and 7, Exodus 27, and often elsewhere in scripture.[1]

¶2 283.11–284.21
284.6 *The clergy of the O. T. was limited as to what it might receive.*
284.22 *Much more should the clergy of Christ set an example of unworldliness.*

[283]**Hic patet quod obieccio ista non impugnat predicta, cum conclusio sit concedenda. Sed utinam sic arguentes attenderent ad sufficientem similitudinem utrobique, primo quomodo in veteri testamento ordinata est talis perpetuitas, singulariter a Deo et non ab homine. Unde libri legales et prophetales sic inchoant talia privilegia perpetua: Hec dicit dominus; et tunc cum auctor utriusque testamenti expressit voluntatem suam sufficienter in evangelio, non usurparent superaddere ordinacionem que videtur ordinacioni Dei contraria**

Here it is clear that this objection does not impugn what was said before, since the conclusion is to be granted. But would that those who argue so would attend to a sufficient likeness on both sides: first, how in the old testament such perpetuity was ordained singularly by God and not by man. Hence the books of the law and of the prophets begin such perpetual privileges thus: "Thus saith the Lord"; and then, since the author of both testaments has expressed his will sufficiently in the gospel, they would

ipso domino inconsulto. Considerarent secundo quomodo omnes dicte elemosine vocate perpetue erant solum periodice, sicut patet in materia de cessacione legalium et persone privilegiate racione delicti a domino privilegiante proporcionaliter ammovente, ut patet de Datan et Abiron Numeri XVI°, de Hely et suis filiis 1° Regum II° et IV° capitulis, et de sacerdotibus, scribis et phariseis tempore Christi, qui omnes proporcionaliter ad abusum privilegii sunt puniti. Quomodo ergo vendicaremus colorate privilegium ab homine preter Deum, et super hoc exempcionem a tutela et regulacione illius privilegii ab illo [284]qui privilegiat citra Deum? Locus enim a similitudine ex lege veteri hoc non petit; stet homo in limitibus privilegii unius persone et tunc limitari convenit regimen plenum illius privilegii ad illam personam singulariter concedentem. Tercio notaret sic arguens quomodo clerus veteris testamenti, quando vixit carnaliter, limitatus est per Deum sine solicitudine circa proventus vel redditus adquisitos vel datos humanitus, quid de oblacionibus, primiciis vel loco ad inhabitandum percipiet, quanto magis clerus spiritualis Christi pauperis et egeni excluderet se striccius a mundialibus de alimentis et tegumentis secundum regulam Apostoli 1° Tim. VI° contentatus? Nam Ezechiel. XLIV°, 28— 30, sic scribitur: Non erit autem sacerdotibus hereditas, ego hereditas eorum. Et possessiones non dabitis eis in Israel, ego enim possessio eorum. Victimam et pro peccato et pro delicto ipsi comedent et omne votum in Israel ipsorum erit. Et primitiva omnium pecorum primogenitorum et omnia libamenta ex omnibus que offerunt sacerdotum erunt.

not usurp [the right] to add on an ordinance which seems contrary to the ordinance of God, without consulting the Lord himself.[2] Let them consider, second, how all the said so-called perpetual alms were only for a period, as is clear in the matter of the cessation of the legal [observances], and of the privileged person, whom the privileging Lord removed by reason of an offence, in proportion [to it], as is clear of Dathan and Abiron, Numbers 16, of Heli and his sons, 1 Samuel chapters 2 and 4, and of the priests, scribes and Pharisees in the time of Christ, who were all punished in proportion to their abuse of the privilege.[3] How, then, should we claim with colour a privilege from man apart from God, and on top of this an exemption from the protection and regulation of that privilege by him [284]who privileges short of God? For the topic from likeness drawn from the old law does not ask for this: let a man stay within the limits of the privilege of one person, and then it is fitting that the full government of that privilege be assigned to that person who singularly grants [it].[4] Third, let one who argues so note how the clergy of the old testament, when it lived carnally, was assigned by God, without anxiety about income or revenues acquired or given by men, what it should receive from offerings, first-fruits, or a place to dwell in: how much more would the spiritual clergy of Christ, poor and needy, exclude itself more strictly from worldly things, content with food and covering according to the Apostle's rule, 1 Timothy 6:8?[5] For in Ezekiel 44:28–30 it is written thus: "And the priests shall have no inheritance, I am their inheritance: neither shall you give them possessions in Israel, for I am their possession. They shall eat the victim both for sin and for trespass: and every vowed thing in Israel shall be theirs. And the firstfruits of all the firstborn of the cattle, and all the libations of all things that they offer, shall be the priests'."[6]

¶3 284.22–287.20
285.13
2. It is objected a) that the more the alms, the greater the charity,
285.19 *b) that alms can be given to none better than to the clergy.*
285.30 *Answer: a) True, if the alms are rightly directed;*
286.2 *but merit does not depend wholly on the amount given but on the spirit of the giver.*
286.13 *Alms must be given*

[284]Habuerunt autem loca pro inhabitacione et alendis pecoribus (ut patet Josue XXI° et ultimo). Si ergo clerus Aaronita tam carnalis, tam laboriose solicitus circa ceremonias legis tam limitate et stricte habuit temporalia, quanto magis clerus Christi qui exemplo conversacionis et verbo predicacionis docuit mundum relinquere et conversando in celestibus ad eorum annichilationem laicos edocere? Et hec racio legis Dei, Deuteronomii XVIII°, 1, quare precipit populo sub hiis verbis: Non habebunt sacerdotes et Levite et omnes qui de eadem tribu sunt partem et hereditatem cum reliquo populo Israel, quia sacrificia domini et oblaciones eius [285]comedent et nichil aliud accipient de possessione fratrum suorum: Dominus enim ipse est hereditas eorum, sicut locutus est illis. Et sic intelligo scripturam sacram Numeri

And they had places to dwell in and to feed their cattle (as is clear from Joshua 21 and the last [chapter]). If, then, the Aaronite clergy, so carnal, so laboriously anxious about the ceremonies of the law, had temporal goods so limitedly and strictly, how much more the clergy of Christ, who by the example of [their] manner of life and by the word of preaching taught [men] to leave the world, and, by living in heavenly things, to teach the laity [to bring] those [goods] to nothing?[7] And this is the reason of God's law, Deuteronomy 18:1, why it commands the people in these words: "The priests and Levites, and all that are of the same tribe, shall have no part nor inheritance with the rest of the people of Israel, because they shall eat the sacrifices of the Lord, and his oblations, [285]and they

286.15
1. to the poor,
286.16
2. as a service to God,
286.18
3. without thought of worldly reward.
286.29 *The founder of perpetual alms usually fails in all three points.*

XVIII°, 20, cum dicitur: Dixitque dominus ad Aaron: In terra eorum nichil possidebitis nec habebitis partem inter eos, ego pars et hereditas tua. Haberent autem sacerdotes de optimis vescibilibus sine sollicitudine (ut patet ex Exodi XIX°, Levitici 1° et IV° et capitulis sequentibus). Ex istis potest colligi conclusio quod moderna cleri dotacio non est fundabilis in altero testamento. Secundo principaliter obicitur per hoc quod dare aliquantam elemosinam pro aliquanto tempore est cum paribus alicuius meriti; dare cum paribus tantam vel maiorem elemosinam per tempus diucius foret meriti amplioris, et per consequens pro tempore legis gracie, quando debet esse superhabundans caritas, debet dari elemosina largissima quoad quantitatem muneris, quoad libertatem donacionis et quoad diuturnitatem temporis. Sed cui donarent laici nisi clero Christi a quo recipiunt elemosinas ampliores? Ergo sancti reges et prelati, leges ecclesie et ostensiones miraculi docent cum racione de maioritate meriti quod talis dotacio ecclesie sit meritoria utrobique. Quis, inquam, dubitat quin, si Petrus meritorie dederit elemosinam et, servato merito, superaddiderit quomodolibet elemosinam ampliorem, quin eciam cresceret meritum aggregatum? Hic dicitur concedendo primam conclusionem: eo quod apostoli et alii cariores Christi discipuli dederunt omnia sua temporalia, sequendo Christum in evangelica paupertate, ita quod nec dacio nec recepcio est [286] per se culpabilis sed carencia boni modi, notandum tamen quod maioritas meriti dantis elemosinam nec absolute attenditur penes quantitatem aut valorem dati nec penes quantitatem temporis pro quo datur, quia iuxta diffinicionem Christi, Luce XXI°, 2, Mulier paupercula mittendo quadrantem in gazophilacium plus omnibus misit. Ideo attendendum est ad caritatem a qua procedit elemosinacio corporalis. Et patet quod modus elemosinandi respicit discrecionem qua elemosinans relevet indigentem. Ideo evangelium non precipit ut relinquens bona sua det Christi apostolis sed pauperibus ut cecis, claudis atque debilibus. Secundo requirit rectitudo modi elemosine, ut tribuens observet servilem humiliacionem qua sciat se esse nudum ministrum Dei cui prestita sunt bona fortune, ut humiliter ac caritative distribuat. Et tercio requirit modus rectus elemosinandi ut elemosinans observet puram et simplicem intencionem non appetendo mundi gloriam. Et ideo docet Christus Matthei VI°, 2, 3, quod faciendo elemosinam non canes ante te tuba sicut ypocrite, sed nesciat sinistra, hoc est, intencio expectans retribucionem temporalem, quid faciat dextra; pars intencionis qua recte et pure spiritualis retribucio perpetua pro alio seculo expectatur et secundum quod ista plus adequantur cum maiori caritate est

shall receive nothing else of the possession of their brethren: for the Lord himself is their inheritance, as he hath said to them." And so I understand holy scripture, Numbers 18:20, where it is said: "And the Lord said to Aaron: You shall possess nothing in their land, neither shall you have a portion among them: I am thy portion and inheritance." And the priests would have of the best things to eat without anxiety (as is clear from Exodus 19, Leviticus 1 and 4, and the chapters following).[8] From these things the conclusion can be gathered that the modern endowment of the clergy cannot be founded in either testament.

Second, principally, it is objected, by appeal to this, that to give some alms for some time is, other things being equal, of some merit; to give, other things being equal, as much or greater alms for a longer time would be of more ample merit; and consequently in the time of the law of grace, when charity ought to be superabundant, the most generous alms ought to be given as to the quantity of the gift, as to the freedom of the giving, and as to the long duration of the time. Now to whom should laymen give, if not to the clergy of Christ, from whom they receive more ample alms? Therefore holy kings and prelates, the laws of the church and the showings of miracle teach, with the reason from the greatness of merit, that such endowment of the church is meritorious on both sides.[9] Who, I say, doubts that, if Peter has given alms meritorily and, the merit being kept, has added on in any way a more ample alms, the aggregate merit would also increase?[10]

To this the answer is, granting the first conclusion (in that the apostles and other dearer disciples of Christ gave all their temporal goods, following Christ in evangelical poverty, so that neither giving nor receiving is [286] of itself culpable, but the lack of a good manner), that it must nevertheless be noted that the greatness of the merit of one who gives alms is not reckoned absolutely by the quantity or value of what is given, nor by the quantity of the time for which it is given; for according to Christ's determination, Luke 21:2–3, the poor little woman, by putting a farthing into the treasury, put in more than all.[11] Therefore one must attend to the charity from which bodily almsgiving proceeds. And it is clear that the manner of giving alms has regard to the discretion by which the almsgiver relieves the needy. Therefore the gospel does not command that one who leaves his goods should give them to the apostles of Christ, but to the poor, such as the blind, the lame and the feeble.[12] Second, the rightness of the manner of alms requires

maior elemosina in donante. Ex quo patet cum veritate facti quod elemosine vocate perpetue in maiori parte vel semper habent minus de racione elemosine quam dande elemosine temporales. Nam taliter elemosinans deficit communiter in discrecione dando magis egentibus, deficit secundo in humiliacione credendo quod data sunt sua ad ordinandum quomodocunque voluerit sine superiori domino ipsum ut nudum servum suum et organum [287]excitante, et demum communiter in elemosina tam corporali quam spirituali surrepit affeccio vane glorie vel boni utilis temporalis; et (si non fallor) oculus cesaris quodammodo infectus fuerat in hiis tribus. Quis rogo sciret docere quod cesar vel alius dominus secularis in fundando tam publice perpetuas elemosinas non intendit vane gloriam solempnitatis nominis sui et sui generis longis temporibus duraturam? Quod si illud preponderat intencioni dextere, faciendo elemosinas de alieno, peccat mortaliter. Et patet ad formam argumenti concedendo conclusionem et sequelam: Nam maxima elemosina in via est ut quis relinquat penitus civilem possessionem in mundo et ponat vitam presentem pro honore Dei et utilitate ecclesie dicente Christo Johannis XV, 13: Maiorem caritatem nemo habet quam ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis, talis ei dat omnia bona sua fortune et omnia bona sua naturalia, et cum iusti sunt omnia, patet quod in tali dacione fundatur elemosina largissima; et patet conclusio.

that the giver observe a servile humbling by which he knows himself to be the bare minister of God, to whom the goods of fortune have been lent, so that he may distribute [them] humbly and charitably. And third, the right manner of giving alms requires that the almsgiver keep a pure and simple intention, not desiring the glory of the world. And therefore Christ teaches, Matthew 6:2–3, that in doing alms you should not sound a trumpet before you as the hypocrites [do], but let the left hand (that is, the intention that expects a temporal reward) not know what the right hand does: [the right hand being] the part of the intention by which a spiritual and perpetual reward for the other world is rightly and purely expected; and according as these are more matched with greater charity, the alms in the giver is greater.[13] From this it is clear, with the truth of the fact, that so-called perpetual alms for the most part, or always, have less of the nature of alms than temporary alms to be given. For one who gives alms in that way commonly fails in the discretion of giving to those more needy; he fails, second, in humbling, believing that what is given is his own to order as he will, with no superior lord moving him as his bare servant and instrument; [287]and finally, commonly, in alms both bodily and spiritual, there creeps in an affection of vainglory or of a useful temporal good; and (if I am not mistaken) Caesar's eye was in some way infected in these three.[14] Who, I ask, could teach that Caesar or another secular lord, in founding perpetual alms so publicly, does not aim at the vainglory of the solemnity of his name and of his line, to last for long ages? And if that outweighs the intention of the right hand, he sins mortally, making alms out of what is another's.[15] And [the answer] to the form of the argument is clear, by granting the conclusion and what follows: for the greatest alms on the way is that one should leave civil possession in the world entirely and lay down his present life for the honour of God and the profit of the church, as Christ says, John 15:13: "Greater charity no man hath than that a man lay down his life for his friends"; such a one gives him all his goods of fortune and all his natural goods; and since all things are the just man's, it is clear that in such a giving the most generous alms is founded; and the conclusion is clear.[16]

Notes

1. Side-note 283.1; A in the margin *Contra. Prima obieccio. Religiones*: religious institutions of the old law, untagged. After *cap.* the manuscripts leave a gap (Loserth, 283.7); which work's "book 3" is meant is not identified here. Thomas on tithes is *ST* II-II q. 87 a. 1, which Wyclif discusses in *De civili dominio* I c. 42 (Society ed. I, 339–40), concluding that Thomas cannot ground clerical tithes on the New Testament; Henry of Ghent: Loserth refers forward to 317, *Quodlibet* VI q. 23, on papal grants of tithes, which argues from jurisdiction, not from the old law. Leviticus 6–7 and Exodus 27 are given by chapter only; the "perpetual" ordinances are Lev. 6:13, 18, 20 and 7:34, 36 (*religione perpetua*) and Exod. 27:21 (*perpetuus erit cultus*).

2. Side-note 283.11; A in the margin *Responsio*; A spells *inpungnat* (283.11). *Conclusio sit concedenda*: Wyclif grants that the old law had such perpetual alms, and denies that it follows for men now. *Hec dicit dominus*: the prophets' formula. *Ipso domino inconsulto*: without consulting the Lord.
3. Side-note 283.21; A in the margin *Conclusio* (283.21). *Periodice*: for a period. *Cessacione legalium*: the ceasing of the legal (ceremonial) observances under the gospel. *Persone privilegiate ... ammovente*: we construe the privileged person as the one the Lord removes; "and of the privilege removed from the privileged person" is possible. Numbers 16; 1 Samuel 2 and 4 (Vulgate 1 Kings). B reads *cum suis filiis* (283.27).
4. Side-note 283.28. *Colorate*: with colour, that is, on a plausible ground (the glossary, *color*), not "under a pretext". *Citra Deum*: short of God (cf. *citra Christum*). A and A_1 lack *unius ... privilegii* (284.1). The argument: if the likeness with the old law is pressed, the one who grants a privilege keeps its government, so the likeness yields no exemption.
5. Side-note 284.6. *Limitatus est ... quid ... percipiet*: it was assigned by God what it should receive (the glossary, *limitare*). *Christi pauperis et egeni*: of Christ poor and needy. 1 Timothy 6:8 ("having food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content", DR), alluded to, not quoted.
6. Ezekiel 44:28–30 in Wyclif's form: *sacerdotibus* for the Vulgate's *eis*, *possessiones* for *possessionem*, *pecorum* added ("of the cattle"), *offerunt* for *offeruntur*; he stops before the end of 44:30. The Douay–Rheims is followed where he agrees. A in the margin *Racio* (284.14).
7. Side-note 284.22. Joshua 21:2 (*urbes ad habitandum, et suburbana earum ad alenda jumenta*), executing Numbers 35:2–3. *Et ultimo*: "and the last [chapter]", or "and lastly"; the reference is doubtful. *Ad eorum annichilationem*: we take *eorum* of the world's goods, which the clergy teaches the laity to bring to nothing; "to their own self-emptying" is possible.
8. Deuteronomy 18:1–2 and Numbers 18:20 are the Douay–Rheims; Wyclif adds *populo* (Deut. 18:1) and stops Numbers 18:20 before "in the midst of the children of Israel". B reads *fratruum* (285.3). Exodus 19 has no priestly portions; Exodus 29 (Aaron and his sons eating the consecration offerings) may be meant (our conjecture; the print gives *XIX°* without comment). A in the margin *Conclusio* (285.11). *In altero testamento*: in either testament.
9. Side-notes 285.13, 285.19; A in the margin *Contra. Secunda obieccio* (285.13). *Cum paribus*: other things being equal (13-a, n. 1). *Ostensiones miraculi*: miracles shown in favour of endowed churches. *Utrobique*: for giver and receiver alike.
10. *Petrus*: any man, the schoolmen's example name, not the apostle. The second *quin* repeats the first, a common pleonasm of the period.
11. Side-notes 285.30, 286.2; A in the margin *Responsio* (285.30) and *Conclusio* (286.1); B reads *carencicia* (286.1). Luke 21:2–3 in Wyclif's words: the Vulgate has *vidua haec pauper plus quam omnes misit* (DR "this poor widow hath cast in more than they all"); the *quadrans*, "farthing", is Mark 12:42. *Diffinicionem*: determination.
12. Side-notes 286.13, 286.15; A in the margin *Conclusio* (286.8). The list recalls Luke 14:13 ("the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind", DR); the command to leave one's goods for the poor, Matthew 19:21.
13. Side-notes 286.16, 286.18. The manuscripts give *Matth. V. 34*; Loserth prints *VI, 2, 3* (286.19). Matthew 6:2–3 in Wyclif's words (Vulgate *noli tuba canere ante te*); the gloss of the left and right hands as two intentions is his. *Ista ... adequantur*: the right intention and the alms, matched with greater charity.
14. Side-note 286.29. A and A_1 read *ut organum* for *et organum*. *Deficit ... in discrecione dando magis egentibus*: he fails in the discretion that gives to the more needy. *Bona fortune*: goods of fortune. *Cesaris*: the emperor who endowed the church; Constantine is named at 288.13.
15. A in the margin *Conclusio* (287.5). *Vane gloriam*: vainglory. *Intencioni dextere*: the right-hand intention of 286.24–25. *De alieno*: out of what is another's: the goods are God's, and the giver his bare minister (286.16–17).
16. A in the margin *Ad argumentum*; A and A_1 read *concedo conclusionem* (287.11–12). John 15:13: Wyclif has *Maiorem caritatem ... quam ut*, the Vulgate *Majorem hac dilectionem ... ut* (DR "Greater love than this"); we keep "charity" for *caritas*. *Ei*: to God, it seems. *Cum iusti sunt omnia*: all things belong to the just, Wyclif's teaching on the lordship of the just (*De civili dominio* I, ch. 1, p. 5, on Augustine, Ep. 153.26 and Prov. 17:6 LXX; ch. 9, p. 65, *Iusti ergo sunt omnia*; cf. 311.3–5).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 283: *auctoritatis* [NW]
  - 283: *III°*
  - 283: *utrobique* (utro-/bique; main token holds whole word (a = alinea letter))
  - 283: *II°*
  - 283: *puniti* (30 is the line number)
  - 284: *solicitudine*
  - 284: *Christi*
  - 284: *I* (x-height old-style 1, not capital I)
  - 285: *est*
  - 285: *Dixitque* (Dixit-/que; main token holds whole word)
  - 285: *Christi*
  - 286: ∅ ('of' is the English side-note; main already has de at 202)
  - 287: *demum*
  - 283: *XVI°,* [-VERSE]

Part 4: The measure of alms; the third objection, from security; the primitive church and the schisms

Loserth pp. 287.21–290.19

¶1 287.21–288.8
287.21 *Those who live without property give alms best.*
287.29 *The worth of alms does not depend on their amount.*
288.4 *or the miser would be justified by a large bequest.*
288.20 *b) We ought to give to the clergy what enables them to minister spiritually;*
288.27 *all beyond should be given to the poor.*

[287] **Quoad quantitatem muneris, quoad libertatem donacionis et quoad diuturnitatem temporis patet quod viventes exproprietarie religione perpetua faciunt elemosinas largissimas et ordinatissimas, quia primo miserentur anime sue placentes Deo, et secundo facientes spiritualia opera misericordie toti mundo ex vi communionis sanctorum plus ad honorem Dei prosunt ecclesie quam secularis accumulans quotlibet temporalia domui private secundum religionem preter evangelicam adinvente. Unde absit fidelem credere quod proporcionaliter ad quantitatem molis vel valoris donati in foro seculi attenditur quantitas elemosine donatoris, cum infinitum maiorem elemosinam contingit quantumlibet minus valere in foro seculi.** [288] **Tunc enim apostoli fecissent elemosinas nimis parcas, et mundiales extollerentur supra precipuos religiosos in merito, dareturque secularibus occasio ad inordinate querendum et ad inordinate retinendum bona fortune, ut in fine condendo grande testamentum dent grandem elemosinam abbathie vel clero, quia certum est quod proporcionaliter ad elemosinam vel opus misericordie viatoris est beatificandus in patria.**

As to the quantity of the gift, as to the freedom of the giving, and as to the long duration of the time, it is clear that those who live without property in a perpetual religion give the most generous and best-ordered alms; for, first, they "have pity on their own soul, pleasing God", and, second, doing spiritual works of mercy to the whole world by force of the communion of saints, they profit the church more, to the honour of God, than a secular who heaps up any amount of temporal goods for a private house devised according to a religion other than the gospel's.[1] Hence God forbid that a believer should believe that the quantity of the giver's alms is reckoned in proportion to the quantity of the bulk or the value of what is given in the world's market, since it can be that an infinitely greater alms is worth however much less in the world's market.[2] [288] **For then the apostles would have made too sparing alms, and worldly men would be exalted above the leading religious in merit, and occasion would be given to seculars to seek and to keep the goods of fortune inordinately, so that at the end, by making a great testament, they might give a great alms to an abbey or to the clergy; for it is certain that a wayfarer is to be beatified in the homeland in proportion to his alms or work of mercy.[3]**

¶2 288.9–289.15
289.16
3. Objection: Perpetual alms profit most, because they make the clergy secure to perform their duty.
289.23 *Answer: This is a mere assumption, temporary alms would enable them much better to do their duty.*

[288] **Unde logici cognoscunt quomodo data elemosina est alia maior; que alia est priori quantumlibet maior elemosina. Unde contingit quod potus aque frigide sit maior elemosina danti ex simpliciori oculo et maiori fervore caritatis, quam fuit dotacio qua Constantinus dotavit ecclesiam, vel elemosina qua rex terrenus fundavit grandissimam abbathiam. Nam nisi spirituale opus misericordie prevaleat corporali, stante isto cursu ecclesie, domini seculares forent nimis exaltati in celo et viri apostolici nimis mediocriter premiati. Et patet ad questionem qua queritur, cui seculares darent elemosinas nisi clero; nam illis tenentur dare prudenter de quanto sustinerent eorum privilegia data a Christo, et continuarent eorum disposicionem ad rependendum elemosinas spirituales. Alias autem elemosinas darent corporaliter magis egentibus. Unde si ex ceca pietate et falsa misericordia nimis onerant clerum cum possessione civili, contingit eos ex hinc incidere in excommunicacionem et heresim racione ablacionis primevi privilegii concessi a Christo suis discipulis, ut meminit Canon XXII[a] d. Omnes. Et ita concedo quod dotacio ecclesie fuit altrinsecus meritoria, sed dotacio ac status in quo Christus ipsam** [289] **instituit fuit perfeccior. Unde verisimile**

Hence logicians know how, any alms being given, there is another greater; and that other is an alms greater than the former by any amount whatever. Hence it can be that a drink of cold water is a greater alms, for one who gives it with a simpler eye and with greater fervour of charity, than was the endowment with which Constantine endowed the church, or the alms with which an earthly king founded a very great abbey.[4] For unless the spiritual work of mercy outweighed the bodily, as this course of the church stands, secular lords would be too much exalted in heaven and apostolic men too moderately rewarded. And [the answer] is clear to the question that asks to whom seculars should give alms, if not to the clergy: for they are bound to give to them prudently as much as would sustain their privileges given by Christ and continue their disposition to repay spiritual alms. And other alms they should give in bodily form to those more needy.[5] Hence if, out of blind piety and false mercy, they overload the clergy with civil possession, it happens that they thereby fall into excommunication and heresy, by reason of the taking away of the primeval privilege granted by Christ to his disciples, as the canon *Omnes* in distinction 22 recalls.[6] And so I grant that the endowment of

est quod multi ex defectu serpentine prudencie in ista elemosina ecclesie altrinsecus sunt dampnati; diuturnior autem elemosina est breviori prestancior, sed nemo dicit quod diuturnitas elemosine penes formam diuturnitatis expresse in cartis regulariter attendatur, cum stat elemosinam horalem de correpcione fraterna manere perpetuo in fructu, ubi elemosina cartalis sub nomine perpetuitatis expressa extinguitur infra annum tam in substancia elemosine quam in fructu. Sic ergo dans prudenter, ferventer et paulative elemosinas continue plus crescit et superaddit elemosinas quam ceteris paribus faceret sub signo elemosine perpetue dando simul, quia fervor caritatis et vigil custodia rectificande elemosine forent meritorius conservata.

the church was meritorious on either side, but the endowment and state in which Christ [289] instituted it was more perfect. Hence it is likely that many, from lack of the serpent's prudence, have been damned on either side in that alms of the church; and a longer-lasting alms is more excellent than a briefer one, but no one says that the long duration of an alms is to be reckoned, as a rule, by the form of duration expressed in charters, since it can be that an hour's alms of fraternal correction remains perpetually in its fruit, where a charter alms expressed under the name of perpetuity is extinguished within a year, both in the substance of the alms and in its fruit.[7] So, then, one who gives alms prudently, fervently and little by little grows continually more, and adds on alms more, than, other things being equal, he would by giving all at once under the sign of perpetual alms; because the fervour of charity and the watchful keeping of the alms that is to be set right would be meritoriously preserved.[8]

¶3 289.16–289.22

[289] Tercio principaliter arguitur per hoc quod elemosina debet sic dari, ut generi secularium elemosinanti accresceret maior utilitas et generi cleri elemosinandi accresceret plus excitativa securitas ad vigilanter perficiendum officium clericale; sed quis dubitat quin hoc contingeret sub forma dotacionis perpetue? Ergo illa est dotacione temporali prestancior.

Third, principally, it is argued by appeal to this, that alms ought to be given in such a way that a greater utility would accrue to the line of seculars giving the alms, and a security more stirring to the vigilant performance of the clerical office would accrue to the line of clergy receiving the alms; now who doubts that this would come about under the form of perpetual endowment? Therefore that is more excellent than temporary endowment.[9]

¶4 289.23–290.10

290.1 *In the primitive Church there were no foundations, but immediate distribution.*

[289] Hic dicitur quod verum assumitur, unde pro minori quilibet christianus debet credere quod in temporalibus dotacio temporalis excluso signo perpetuitatis humane elemosine foret undiquaque perfeccior: et patet defectus consequencie. Unde pro declaracione prime partis maioris assumpte patet eius veritas ex dictis, cum talis elemosinacio foret factis Christi et apostolorum conformior, et per consequens elemosinanti utilior. Unde Act. III° legitur quomodo possessores agrorum vendebant et ponebant ante pedes apostolorum, non ut hereditarie vel perpetue possiderent, sed ut divideretur singulis prout cuique opus [290] erat. Nec solum servata est illa forma elemosinandi in Judea, ubi Deus scivit apostolos non perpetuo permansuros, sed in Asia, in India, in Ethiopia et ubicunque terrarum christiani conversi sunt et presbiteri constituti; sed indubie illi ex maiori fervore caritatis, ex maiori prudencia ac simplicitate quam nostri succedentes qui sub forma dotacionis perpetue dabant sua et magis quieta, ac in pace Christi plus firmata est ecclesia illa primitiva conversa quam fuit nostra ecclesia cesarea sic dotata.

To this the answer is that what is assumed [in the major] is true; hence, as to the minor, every Christian ought to believe that in temporal goods a temporary endowment, with the sign of the perpetuity of human alms excluded, would be in every respect more perfect: and the defect of the inference is clear.[10] Hence, for the declaration of the first part of the major [premiss] assumed, its truth is clear from what has been said, since such almsgiving would be more conformed to the deeds of Christ and of the apostles, and consequently more useful to the almsgiver. Hence in Acts 4:34–35 we read how the owners of lands sold and laid [the price] before the feet of the apostles, not that they should possess hereditarily or perpetually, but that distribution should be made to every one according as he had [290] need.[11] Nor was that form of giving alms kept only in Judaea, where God knew that the apostles would not remain forever, but in Asia, in India, in Ethiopia, and wherever in the world Christians were converted and presbyters appointed; but without doubt those [gave theirs] with greater fervour of charity, with greater prudence

and simplicity, than our successors, who gave theirs under the form of perpetual endowment; and that primitive converted church was quieter and more firmly established in the peace of Christ than was our caesarean church so endowed.[12]

¶5 290.11–290.19

[290] Unde illud magnum scisma factum per Sergium monachum sicut et illud scisma quod hodie pullulat per duos pseudomonachos cum aliis particularibus divisionibus in ecclesia causata sunt ex insaciabili affeccione cleri ad temporalia, quam nisi occasione dotacionis cesaree verisimiliter non haberent. Si enim non esset ista dotacio, non sic contenderent pro primatu, cum circa preeminenciam servilis humilitatis non fit contencio.

Hence that great schism made by Sergius the monk, as also that schism which is sprouting today through two false monks, together with other particular divisions in the church, were caused by the clergy's insatiable affection for temporal goods, which very likely they would not have except on the occasion of the caesarean endowment. For if that endowment did not exist, they would not so contend for the primacy, since there is no contention about pre-eminence in servile humility.[13]

Notes

1. Side-note 287.21. The answer to the second objection continues, taking its three heads (quantity, freedom, duration: 285.20–21) in turn. *Religione perpetua*: in a perpetual, vowed religious life. *Miserentur anime sue placentes Deo*: Ecclesiasticus 30:24 ("Have pity on thy own soul, pleasing God", DR). *Domui private ... adinvente*: a house of a private religion, devised by a rule other than the gospel (cf. the glossary, *religio privata*).
2. Side-note 287.29. *In foro seculi*: in the world's market, by the world's reckoning of value. *Molis vel valoris*: of bulk or of value. *Contingit*: it is possible.
3. Side-note 288.4; A in the margin *Conclusio* (288.7). *Mundiales*: worldly men. *Precipuos religiosos*: the leading religious, those of the most perfect life. *Condendo grande testamentum*: by a large bequest at death.
4. A in the margin *Nota*. *Data elemosina est alia maior*: for any alms given there is a greater, the logicians' quantity with no maximum; for *maior* in the second clause B reads *purior quantumlibet* (288.10), "purer by any amount", and the construal of the second clause is ours. *Potus aque frigide*: cf. Matthew 10:42. *Simpliciori oculo*: cf. Matthew 6:22.
5. B reads *prevalet* (288.16). Side-notes 288.20, 288.27; A in the margin *Conclusio* and B in the margin *Ecclesie dotacio fuit meritoria* (288.20). The question is the objection's, 285.19–20. *Rependendum*: to repay; the clergy return spiritual alms for bodily ones.
6. The canon is Gratian, D.22 c.1 (*Omnes*), per Loserth (*Decr. I pars, d. XXII, c. I*; the modern form is ours). Its § 1 makes a heretic of whoever *Romanae ecclesiae priuilegium ab ipso summo omnium ecclesiarum capite traditum auferre conatur* (Friedberg I, 73–74): the privilege is the Roman church's, given by Christ; Wyclif applies it to Christ's privilege of poverty.
7. *Altrinsecus*: on either side, for givers and receivers (as 274.30). *Serpentine prudencie*: Matthew 10:16 ("wise as serpents", DR). *Cum stat*: since it is consistent that, it can be that. *Horalem*: of an hour. *Elemosina cartalis*: alms granted by charter.
8. *Paulative*: little by little. *Simul*: all at once. *Rectificande elemosine*: the alms that is to be set right as occasion shows. *Meritorius* stands where an adverb is needed; we translate "meritoriously".
9. Side-note 289.16; A in the margin *Contra. Tercia obieccio. Generi secularium elemosinanti ... generi cleri elemosinandi*: the line (lineage, succession) of lay givers and of clerical receivers. *Excitativa securitas*: a security that stirs them to their duty.
10. Side-note 289.23; A in the margin *Responsio*. *Verum assumitur*: we take it of the major, which Wyclif grants (its first part is declared next); the minor, that perpetual endowment best serves both, is denied. Loserth's side-note reads the phrase as "a mere assumption". *Defectus consequencie*: the inference fails.
11. The passage is Acts 4:34–35 (cf. Acts 2:45), paraphrased; the print's *Act. III°* is either Wyclif's slip or the text's. The last clause follows the Douay–Rheims of 4:35. B reads *quomodo possessiones* (289.31). Side-note 290.1.
12. *Sed indubie illi ...*: the clause has no verb of its own; we supply it from *dabant sua* in the relative clause. *Nostri succedentes*: those who came after among us, the later givers. *Ecclesia cesarea*: the caesarean church, the church as endowed by Caesar (cf. the glossary, *clerus cesareus*).
13. A in the margin *Nota* (290.11). Sergius the monk: the renegade monk who instructed Muhammad (n. 15-b n5); Wyclif lays the Muslim schism to the endowed church's avarice also in *Sermones* I, 178 (*maior pars ecclesie per Sergium monachum venenatur*). Loserth's Pope Sergius III (897–904; Gregorovius III, 242) does not fit *monachum*, and he later grouped this page with 333 and 517 (*De pot. pape* 374 foot). *Hodie*: Loserth dates it 1378 and takes the *duos pseudomonachos*, "two false monks", to be Urban VI and Clement VII. *Dotacionis cesaree*: Constantine's endowment.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 288: *seculares* (K is margin letter)
  - 288: *XXII*ª

- **289: *christianus***
- **289: *temporalibus* (tempora-/libus; main token holds whole word (25 line number))**
- **289: *perfeccior***

Part 5: Endowment breeds war; the false security of charters

Loserth pp. 290.20–294.10

¶1 290.20–292.1
290.20 *Quarrels and wars would end if the Church kept Christ's privilege of poverty.*
291.11 *The Church is disordered when the clergy encroaches upon the work and reward assigned by God to the laity.*
292.2 *All the evils in the Church spring from worldliness.*
292.18 *The security that comes of endowments is a false one.*

[290] **Immo ut probabiliter creditur tota dissensio inter regna et gentes diversarum sectarum exoritur propter omissionem culpabilem consiliorum ac privilegiorum que Christus instituit clero suo. Nam si omnes redditus quibus in christianismo dotatur ecclesia, forent inter seculares dominos distributi et clerus ostenderet in se concorditer ac efficaciter contemptum seculi ac tercio predicaret laicis vigilanter de fallaci affeccione temporalium pro momento quo peregrinamur a domino, et quomodo instantaneum seculare desiderium inducit dampnacionem perpetuam, brevis autem mundi contemptus preparat efficaciter ad beatitudinem consequendam,** [291] **tunc cessarent bella in christianismo, vel simpliciter vel in parte, et disponeretur ecclesia Christi ad conquirendum armis virtutum populum infidelem. Sic enim fuit tempore apostolorum, quando exproprietarie pure secundum Christi consilia vixit clerus, sed commixtus sinistris tradicionibus humanis cum dexteris Christi consiliis, vinum in quo inebriaretur ecclesia est limphatum et genus nervorum caritatis ecclesie debilitatum et sine custode zizannium discordie undique seminatum. Cum enim corpus ecclesie sit limitatum a Deo, quibus cibis et qualiter secundum partes dispares pasceretur, Deus sicut tribuit commensurale alimentum spirituale per prelatos distribuendum fidelibus, sic dat escam corporalem parciendam per activos tam predicatoribus in agro quam contemplatoribus in lecto. Ideo usurpantibus illis violentis officium et consumentibus inordinate eorum pabulum necesse est totum corpus ecclesie esse inordinatum ex defectu observacionis ordinis suarum parcium. Si enim fit bolismus in homine et breviter quocunque membro secundum appetitum caninum contra regulas virtutis regitive trahente alterius nutrimentum vel occupante alterius membri officium, fit in toto corpore discrasia. Si enim viator haberet vermem in stomacho qui consumeret nutrimentum membrorum, quomodo servaretur sanitas et valitudo eorum? Sic si sacerdotes Baal cum uxoribus et filiis consumunt mendaciter per meatus nocturnos et subterraneos bona plebis, patet littera Danielis XIV°: sic autem est in corpore ecclesie cuius virtus regitiva est patris sapiencia; et leges eius, ut mandata atque consilia, sunt privilegia singulariter membris ecclesie officium**

Indeed, as is probably believed, the whole dissension between kingdoms and peoples of different sects arises from the culpable omission of the counsels and privileges which Christ instituted for his clergy. For if all the revenues with which the church is endowed in Christendom were distributed among the secular lords, and the clergy showed in themselves, with one accord and to good effect, contempt of the world, and thirdly preached watchfully to the laity of the deceitful affection for temporal goods for the moment in which we are pilgrims away from the Lord,[1] and of how an instantaneous worldly desire brings on perpetual damnation, while a brief contempt of the world prepares effectively for attaining blessedness, [291] **then wars would cease in Christendom, either without qualification or in part, and the church of Christ would be disposed to conquer the unbelieving people with the arms of the virtues. For so it was in the time of the apostles, when the clergy lived purely without property according to the counsels of Christ; but, [the clergy] being mingled with left-hand human traditions together with the right-hand counsels of Christ,[2] the wine with which the church was to be inebriated has been watered, and the kind of the sinews of the church's charity weakened, and, there being no keeper, the cockle of discord sown everywhere.[3] For since the body of the church has been assigned by God what foods it should be fed with, and how, according to its unlike parts, God, as he grants commensurate spiritual nourishment to be distributed to the faithful through the prelates, so gives bodily food to be shared out through the active, to the preachers in the field as well as to the contemplatives in bed.[4] Therefore, when those violent ones usurp [their] office and inordinately consume their fodder, the whole body of the church must be disordered, from failure to observe the order of its parts.[5] For if bulimia arises in a man, and, in short, if any member, by a canine appetite against the rules of the governing power, draws away the nourishment of another or occupies the office of another member, a dyscrasia arises in the whole body.[6] For if a wayfarer had a worm in his stomach which consumed the nourishment of the members, how would**

operandi et nutrimentum limitancia, ut membra superiora debent pasci precipue spiritu animali et regere ac movere membra supposita; [292]quod si dislocantur et innaturaliter pascuntur, necesse est ut in aliis membris fiat discordia.

their health and strength be preserved?[7] So it is if the priests of Baal with their wives and children consume the goods of the people deceitfully, through nightly and underground passages, as the letter of Daniel 14 makes clear; and so it is in the body of the church, whose governing power is the wisdom of the Father.[8] And its laws, as the commandments and counsels, are privileges assigning singly to the members of the church the office of working and their nourishment, as the higher members ought to be fed chiefly by the animal spirit, and to rule and move the members placed beneath; [292]and if these are dislocated and fed unnaturally, discord must arise in the other members.[9]

¶2 292.2–292.17

[292]Unde credo quod nunquam in corpore ecclesie cessabit simpliciter bellum, dolus atque contencio, antequam cleri dislocacio, secularis officii usurpacio, et per consequens officii speculatoris omissio sit per virtutem regitivam ecclesie restituta; in tanta namque armonia constituta est pars mundi superior quod secundum Commentatorem una stella addita celo vel moveret cum fatigacione et pena, vel simpliciter non moveret; et multo magis in regno celorum quod est ecclesia contrariacio superiorum suo motori facit quod tota ecclesia fatigabiliter sit turbata. Tota autem contrariacio stat in hoc quod bona temporalia plus bonis perpetuis sunt amata. Ideo ve illis qui stulte faciunt in affeccione pastorum temporalia spiritualibus anteponi.

Hence I believe that war, guile and contention will never cease without qualification in the body of the church before the dislocation of the clergy, the usurpation of secular office, and in consequence the omission of the office of watchman, has been set right by the governing power of the church. For the upper part of the world is constituted in such harmony that, according to the Commentator, one star added to the heaven would either move with fatigue and pain or would not move, without qualification;[10] and much more, in the kingdom of heaven, which is the church, the contrariety of superiors to their mover makes the whole church troubled to the point of fatigue. And the whole contrariety consists in this, that temporal goods are loved more than perpetual goods. Therefore woe to those who foolishly cause temporal things to be put before spiritual in the affection of pastors.

¶3 292.18–292.28

[292]Si autem prelati sint magis avari, honoris mundani plus cupidi, plus viventes secundum fastum seculi, per bella excitata de bonis pauperum ad vindicandum proprias iniurias amplius secularibus insistentes, et (quod periculosissimum est) sub pallio sanctitatis quicquid perpetraverint fuco adulterandi verbum Dei sophistice defendentes, quomodo cum isto circulo quinarii stabit regnum? Scio quod in ista rota currus diaboli seducerentur (si fieri potest) eciam electi, et non sic preparatur ad hic augendum populum domini sed satellitum Antichristi.

But if prelates are more avaricious, more covetous of worldly honour, living more according to the pomp of the world, pressing harder upon secular things through wars stirred up out of the goods of the poor to avenge their own injuries, and (what is most dangerous) defending sophistically, under the cloak of holiness, whatever they have perpetrated, with the paint of adulterating the word of God, how will the kingdom stand with this circle of five?[11] I know that on this wheel of the devil's chariot even the elect would be led astray (if it can be), and so no preparation is made here for increasing the people of the Lord, but [the people] of the henchmen of Antichrist.[12]

¶4 292.29–294.10

293.1 *The true security depends on the promise of Christ who commanded us*

[292]Et quantum ad secundam partem assumpti, patet quod infideliter vendicatur a clericis in talibus dotacionibus a mundo securitas; nam carta evangelii quam Christus concessit non potest deficere.

And as to the second part of the assumption, it is clear that security from the world is claimed faithlessly by clerics in such endowments; for the charter of the gospel which Christ granted cannot fail.[13] Hence in

not to be careful for these things.

Unde Matthei VI°, 25, precipit clero suo ne sit sollicitus [293] quid manducabit vel bibet, aut quomodo induatur, sicut solliciti sunt viventes gentiliter, quia, ut arguit per locum a maiori: Si Deus providet pastum volucribus celi et tegumentum liliis agri, quanto magis domesticis fidei? Si enim tempore legis veteris quando minus suadebatur elemosina, Psalmista dicat, Psalmo XXXVI°, 26: Junior fui, etenim senui et non vidi iustum derelictum nec semen eius querens panem, quanto plus hodie? Tollat ergo clerus offensam domini non declinando a lege sua, sicut communiter facimus affectando inordinate voluptatem et curiositatem, et non est compossibile quod ad deterioriacionem desint nobis necessaria vite nostre, quia Matthei VI°, 33, dicit veritas: Querite ergo primum regnum Dei et iusticiam eius, et hec omnia adicientur vobis. Privilegium autem Christi concessum Luce X°, suis discipulis est securius quam carta vel concessio mundana, cum dominus mundi qui mentiri non poterit sic precipit: In quamcunque domum intraveritis ibi manete edentes et bibentes que apud illos sunt. Sed debemus cavere sollicite ne amittamus hoc privilegium per abusum, quod fit quando contra regulam et vitam apostoli sumus hospitibus onerosi. Quomodo ergo stat cum fide et religione christiana quod clerus confederatus et obligatus mundo per cartas plus confidit in dotacione cesarea quam divina, cum Luce XXI°, 34, precipiat ut caveamus a crapula et curis seculi. Et patet ex fide scripture quomodo observantes ordinem illum preposterum sunt insecurissimi quoad homines et quoad Deum. Oportet enim primo quod originetur in Deo securitas que non potest fundari nisi in observancia legis sue. Et [294] hec racio quare Deus ad abstergendum cecitatem mundanam ab oculis mentis nostre ordinat nunc translacionem regnorum in qua extinguitur cleri mundana securitas, nunc permittit predones, fures, incendium vel alium eventum fortuitum evenire. Unde tollantur temporalia in quibus seculares clerici prepostere confidebant, et nunc tercio permittit dissensiones oriri inter partes, tollens seculi potentes de medio per quod coniectura providencie humane eciam in superioribus ecclesie sepius est cassata.

Matthew 6:25 he commands his clergy not to be solicitous [293] what they shall eat or drink, or how they shall be clothed, as those who live like the heathen are solicitous; because, as he argues by the topic from the greater: if God provides food for the birds of the air and covering for the lilies of the field, how much more for those who are of the household of the faith?[14] For if in the time of the old law, when alms were less urged, the Psalmist says in Psalm 36:26, "I have been young and now am old; and I have not seen the just forsaken, nor his seed seeking bread," how much more today?[15] Let the clergy therefore remove the offence of the Lord by not turning aside from his law, as we commonly do by inordinately desiring pleasure and curiosity; and it is not compossible that the necessaries of our life should fail us to [our] impairment, for in Matthew 6:33 the Truth says: "Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you." And the privilege of Christ granted to his disciples in Luke 10 is more secure than a worldly charter or grant, since the Lord of the world, who cannot lie, commands thus: "Into whatsoever house you enter, there remain, eating and drinking such things as they have."[16] But we must take careful heed not to lose this privilege through abuse, which happens when, against the rule and life of the apostle, we are burdensome to our hosts. How then does it stand with the faith and the christian religion that the clergy, confederated with and bound to the world by charters, trusts more in caesarean endowment than in divine, since in Luke 21:34 he commands that we beware of surfeiting and the cares of the world?[17] And it is clear from the faith of scripture how those who observe that preposterous order are most insecure as regards men and as regards God. For security must first originate in God, and it cannot be founded except in the observance of his law. And [294] this is the reason why God, to wipe worldly blindness from the eyes of our mind, now ordains the transfer of kingdoms, in which the worldly security of the clergy is extinguished, now permits robbers, thieves, fire or some other chance event to come about, so that the temporal goods in which secular clerics preposterously trusted may be taken away; and now, thirdly, he permits dissensions to arise between parties, removing the mighty of the world from the midst, whereby the conjecture of human providence, even in the superiors of the church, is quite often brought to nothing.[18]

Notes

1. 2 Cor. 5:6, *peregrinamur a Domino* (DR "we are absent from the Lord"); the glossary's "pilgrims" keeps Wyclif's Augustinian sense. *Ac tercio* counts a third condition after the distribution of the revenues and the clergy's showing contempt of the world.
2. *Commixtus* (nom. sg.) has no verb of its own and is taken with *clerus*; it may instead be meant absolutely ("once [the clergy] was mingled ..."). *Sinistris ... dexteris* plays on left and right hand: human traditions against Christ's counsels.
3. *Genus nervorum* ("the kind of the sinews") is printed without variant and translated as it stands; a word may be lost or corrupt here (e.g. *omne genus*), see the report. *Limphatum*: wine mixed with water (cf. Isa. 1:22, "thy wine is mingled with water"). The cockle sown without a keeper recalls Matt. 13:25.
4. *In agro ... in lecto*: the field and the bed of Luke 17:34–36 (Matt. 24:40), read of preachers and contemplatives. *Activos*: those of the active life, who share out bodily food.
5. Loserth's foot (291.17): "*violentis*; recte: *violenter*" ("those usurping the office violently"). His print keeps *violentis*, which construes; translated as printed. *Illis* are the clergy who take over the office and fodder of the laity (side-note 291.11).
6. Medical terms: *bolismus* (bulimia, ravenous hunger), *appetitus caninus*, *virtus regitiva* (the governing power of the body), *discrasia* (dyscrasia, ill mixture of the humours). B *discrusia*.
7. *Consumeret* (291.25) is broken across the line in the print (*con-*|*sumeret*) and is restored from the plate.
8. Dan. 14:1–21 (Bel and the dragon), where the priests with their wives and children came in by hidden doors and consumed the offerings (14:20); the Vulgate's idol is Bel, Wyclif writes *Baal*. The period is loose (*Sic si ... patet ... sic autem est*): taken as "so it is if ..., as Daniel shows; and so it is in the church".
9. *Spiritus animalis*: the "animal spirit" of the physicians, seated in the head, which governs sense and motion; the higher members are the clergy.
10. The Commentator is Averroes (so Loserth's index); the passage is untraced. *Moveret* may be transitive, "would move [the heaven]".
11. *Adulterandi verbum Dei*: 2 Cor. 4:2 ("nor adulterating the word of God"). A in marg. (292.18): *Nota quinque*, the five vices just counted, which make the *circulus quinarii*. B (292.21–22) adds *et per quod*.
12. Matt. 24:24 ("insomuch as to deceive (if possible) even the elect"). *Ad hic augendum* (print): B *hoc augendum* ("for increasing this people"), A_1 *sic agendum*; the print construes and is kept.
13. B *terciam partem* (292.29). The "assumption" is the premiss Wyclif is proving in this chapter; its second part concerns the security of endowments (side-note 292.18).
14. Wyclif's paraphrase is nearer Matt. 6:31 (*quid manducabimus, aut quid bibemus, aut quo operiemur*) than 6:25; Loserth refers the argument to 6:26–28 (birds of the air, lilies of the field). *Domesticis fidei* is Gal. 6:10 (DR). *Clero suo*: Wyclif reads the disciples as Christ's clergy.
15. Ps. 36:25 in the Clementine (the print gives verse 26); Wyclif's words agree with the Vulgate.
16. Luke 10:7 (*manete, edentes et bibentes quae apud illos sunt*), opened with the words of Luke 9:4 (*in quamcumque domum intraveritis, ibi manete*), which Loserth cites. *Autem* here moves to the next privilege. The rule of the apostle: 2 Thess. 3:8, "lest we should be chargeable to any of you".
17. Luke 21:34 paraphrased (DR "lest perhaps your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting ... and the cares of this life"). *Dotacione cesarea*: endowment from Caesar, against God's provision (cf. the glossary *ecclesia cesarea*).
18. *Unde tollantur*: the subjunctive is taken as the purpose of the losses God permits ("so that ... may be taken away"); it could be a wish ("hence let ... be taken away"). A A_1 *servantes ordinem* for *observantes* (293.29).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 290: *inter* (20 is the line number)
  - 290: *Christus*
  - 291: *Christi*
  - 292: *cleri*
  - 292: *plus*
  - 293: *quid* (170a folio mark)
  - 293: *Christi*
  - 293: *X°,* (line-final; next line starts suis, no verse) [-VERSE]

Part 6: The three degrees of clerical heresy

Loserth pp. 294.11–299.8

¶1 294.11–295.8
294.11 *This false security hinders Christ's priests from warning the people.*
295.17 *The most dangerous heresy is common among the clergy and in three degrees:*
295.24

[294]Ulterius consideret Christi discipulus si ista vocata mundana securitas assecurat altrinsecus elemosinatores ac elemosinatos de accepcione operum misericordie quoad Deum. Nonne ista mundialitas retardat Christi presbiteros, ut ascendant ad speculam scripture in qua possent omnia pericula ecclesie a mundi principio usque in finem premuniendo ecclesiam speculari (ut notat scriptura

Further, let Christ's disciple consider whether this so-called worldly security assures, on either side, the almsgivers and the almsmen of the acceptance of their works of mercy as regards God.[1] Does not this mundanity hold back Christ's presbyters from climbing to the watchtower of scripture, from which they could watch for all the

1. Clerks aspire to office in the Church for worldly ends;

Jeremie XXXI° et Ezechiel XXXIII°)? Notet secundo si ista copiosa mundana securitas facit istos speculatores sompniferos et ignaros ad ista pericula ecclesie previdendum, illos autem facit timidos ad pericula dampnacionis populi predicendum, et alios qui forent altilia facit reptilia, indispositos ad orandum pro subditorum salute, inter Deum et populum mediando, vel ad merendum sibi et aliis sacramenta ministrando vel evangelium predicando. Unde notaremus parabolam Christi, Luce XII°, ubi precipit cavere ab omni avaricia, quia non in diviciis cuiusquam vita eius est, sicut probat de quodam divite, sollicitante se circa inhorreacionem bonorum suorum, et eadem nocte fuit anima eius rapta per demones. Cogitaremus insuper illud Ezechielis XVI°, 49: Hec fuit iniquitas Sodome, sororis tue, superbia, saturitas panis et habundancia et ocium, que quatuor [295]si sint in clero occasione dotacionis, imminet exinde periculum. Si autem occasio sit data vel accepta per accidens ex tali dotacione perpetua, ubi temporalis elemosinacio foret securior, patet periculum tam in elemosinante quam elemosinato isti seculari ritui innitendo. Deus autem necessitat divites huius seculi, ut continue ministrent clero in vite necessariis, quantum de clero est necessarium ecclesie militanti.

dangers of the church, from the beginning of the world to the end, forewarning the church (as scripture notes in Jeremiah 31 and Ezekiel 33)?[2] Let him note secondly whether this copious worldly security makes these watchmen drowsy and ignorant for foreseeing these dangers of the church, and makes those others fearful of foretelling the dangers of the people's damnation, and makes others, who would be fatted fowl, creeping things,[3] unfit to pray for the salvation of their subjects, mediating between God and the people, or to merit for themselves and others by ministering the sacraments or preaching the gospel. Hence we should note Christ's parable in Luke 12, where he commands us to beware of all covetousness, because a man's life is not in his riches, as he proves of a certain rich man who busied himself about storing his goods in barns, and that same night his soul was snatched away by demons.[4] We should consider moreover that word of Ezekiel 16:49: "This was the iniquity of Sodom thy sister, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance, and idleness"; and if these four [295]are in the clergy by occasion of endowment, danger hangs over [them] from it.[5] And if the occasion is given or taken by accident from such perpetual endowment, where temporary almsgiving would be more secure, the danger is clear both in the almsgiver and in the almsman who leans upon this secular rite.[6] But God constrains the rich of this world to minister continually to the clergy in the necessaries of life, as much of the clergy as is necessary to the church militant.

¶2 295.9–296.6
296.7
2. The clergy spend money wrongfully or hoard it;

[295]Et patet quod non est securitas domino seculari elemosinam suam taliter impertiri, cum veritas precipit sibi Luce XVI, 9, ut faciat sibi amicos de mammona iniquitatis, non autem spirituales et periculosissimos inimicos. Sed Matthei X, 36, dicit Christus: Inimici eius, domestici eius. Nulli enim plus subdole faciunt scisma in sancta matre ecclesia tamquam magis periculosi heretici quam illi qui videntur esse capitales ecclesie induti vestibus ovium. Unde quamvis tam de laicis quam de clero sint multi heretici, ut patet de tribus personis prescitis que relinquentur in finali iudicio (de quibus Matthei XXIV, 1), periculosior et communior heresis pululat in clero, cuius (ut alias exposui) sunt tres gradus. Primus est quando in clero quis aspirat ad dignitatem ecclesiasticam symoniace pocius propter questum et fastum cum eis sequentibus quam meritorium officium spiritualiter serviendi. De ista heresi loquitur decretum Ia, q. I, sub auctoritate Gregorii sic dicentis: Fertur symoniaca heresis que prima contra ecclesiam Dei diabolica supplantacione surrepsit et in ipso ortu suo zelo apostolice ulcionis percussa atque dampnata

And it is clear that there is no security for a secular lord in bestowing his alms in such a way, since the Truth commands him in Luke 16:9 to "make unto [him] friends of the mammon of iniquity," not spiritual and most dangerous enemies. But in Matthew 10:36 Christ says: "His enemies, they of his own household."[7] For none make schism in holy mother church more craftily, as more dangerous heretics, than those who seem to be the chief men of the church, clothed in the garments of sheep. Hence, although there are many heretics among the laity as well as among the clergy, as is clear of the three foreknown persons who will be left at the final judgment (of whom Matthew 24:1), a more dangerous and commoner heresy sprouts in the clergy, of which (as I have set out elsewhere) there are three degrees.[8] The first is when someone in the clergy aspires to an ecclesiastical dignity simoniacally, rather for gain and pomp, with what follows on them, than for the meritorious office of serving spiritually. Of this heresy the Decretum speaks at 1 q. 1, under the authority of Gregory, who says thus: "The simoniac heresy, which first

est, in regni nostri finibus dominari. [296]Tales enim hereticos debet superior in ecclesia et precipue verus Christi vicarius extirpare; omnis enim symoniacus est hereticus (ut patet Iª, q. I. Quisquis). Nec videtur apcior destruccio huius heresis quam tollere proprietatem temporalium gracia cuius est talis dignitas symoniace affectata.

crept in against the church of God by the devil's supplanting, and at its very birth was struck and condemned by the zeal of apostolic vengeance, is reported to lord it within the borders of our kingdom."[9] [296]For such heretics the superior in the church, and especially the true vicar of Christ, must root out; for every simoniac is a heretic (as is clear from 1 q. 1, *Quisquis*).[10] Nor does there seem a more apt destruction of this heresy than to take away the ownership of the temporal goods for whose sake such dignity is simoniacally desired.

¶3 296.7–298.24
297.12 *3, Priests receive the endowments but do not repay them with service.*
298.22 *It is heretical to infringe the privileges of the Roman Church and lawbreakers do this.*

[296]Secundus gradus heresis a prelatis venandus et ab utroque brachio destruendus est, cum persona dotata ecclesie, que debet esse procurator, non dominus elemosinarum datarum pauperibus, ut patet in principio capituli huius et libro III Decretalium, De Donacionibus, capº: Fraternitatem, cum, inquam, talis expendit bona ecclesie prodigaliter in pompa seculi vel consumit ipsa in cognacione vel affeccione carnali, aut tercio detinet thesaurum pauperum avare affeccione terreni commodi, tunc est periculosus hereticus sed periculosissimus persona conventualis istis condicionibus heresis maculata. Patet ista heresis, ymmo antechristiana vesania ex dicto beati Gregorii posito in decretis XVIª, q. VII, sic dicentis: Pervenit ad nos fama sinistra quod quidam episcoporum non sacerdotibus proprie diocesis decimas atque christianorum oblaciones conferant, sed pocius laicalibus personis, militum videlicet sive servitorum vel (quod gravius est) eciam consanguineis. Unde si quis amodo episcopus inventus fuerit huius divini precepti transgressor, inter maximos hereticos et pessimos antichristos non minimus habeatur, et sicut Nicena synodus de simoniacis censuit, et qui dat episcopus [297]et qui recipiunt ab eo laici, sive pacto sive beneficio, eterni incendii ignibus deputentur. Et multo magis communitas que debet esse religiosior et est in isto peccato pertinacior et antichristus profundior, cuiusmodi forent religiosi, viventes seculariter, distribuentes bona pauperum cognacioni sue, ut fiat mundo inclitus, militaribus atque iuridicis, ut defendant suos redditus, et (quod foret pessimum) si darent cognacioni sue carnalibus et famulis inhabilibus presentacionem ad beneficia ecclesiastica virtute iuris patronatus. Et omnia ista innuit beatus Gregorius. Tercius gradus clericalis heresis est, cum sacerdos occupat statum et bona ecclesie sine hoc quod rependat debitum ministerium ad quod pretextu elemosine et acceptacionis solempnis officii obligatur; talis autem ut sic excommunicatur a domino, quia si laicus excommunicatur ab homine, eo quod iniuste detinet decimas vel elemosinas debitas sacerdoti, multo plus sacerdos excommunicatur

The second degree of heresy, to be hunted down by prelates and destroyed by both arms, is when the endowed person of the church, who ought to be the proctor, not the lord, of the alms given to the poor (as is clear at the beginning of this chapter and in book III of the Decretals, *De donationibus*, chapter *Fraternitatem*) — when, I say, such a one spends the goods of the church prodigally in the pomp of the world, or consumes them on kindred or carnal affection, or thirdly withholds the treasure of the poor through avaricious affection for earthly advantage: then he is a dangerous heretic, but most dangerous is a conventual person stained with these conditions of heresy.[11] This heresy, indeed this antichristian madness, is clear from the saying of blessed Gregory placed in the Decretum at 16 q. 7, who says thus: "An ill report has reached us that certain of the bishops confer the tithes and the oblations of christians not on the priests of their own diocese but rather on lay persons, namely knights or servants, or (what is graver) even on kinsmen. Hence if any bishop henceforth shall be found a transgressor of this divine precept, let him be held not the least among the greatest heretics and worst antichrists; and as the Nicene synod decreed concerning simoniacs, both the bishop who gives [297]and the laymen who receive from him, whether by bargain or by favour, are to be assigned to the fires of eternal burning."[12] And much more [is] a community [a heretic] which ought to be more religious and is more pertinacious in this sin and a deeper antichrist: such would be the religious living in a secular manner, distributing the goods of the poor to their kindred, so that it may become renowned to the world, [and] to military men and lawyers, so that they may defend their revenues, and (what would be worst) if they gave to their carnal kindred and to unqualified servants presentation to ecclesiastical benefices by virtue of the right of patronage.[13] And blessed Gregory hints at all these things. The third degree of clerical heresy is when a priest occupies the estate and goods of the church without repaying the due

a domino qui iniuste post maiorem obligacionem detinet spirituales elemosinas subditorum. Obligacio, inquam, est maior, cum non licet sibi elemosinas spirituales subtrahere eciam subdito subtrahente elemosinas corporales. Sacerdotes enim Christi debent benefacere persequentibus et diligere inimicos, et iterum subtraccio spiritualis elemosine est periculosior, cum minatur perpetuam perdicionem corporis et anime, sed neutrum tam evidenter subtraccio elemosine corporalis. Unde Jeremie XLVIII°, 10 dicitur: Maledictus qui facit opus domini fraudulenter; et multo magis est maledictus qui recipit onus ducatus gregis dominici, quem vel proditorie ducit in precipicium, vel fraudulenter omnino subtrahit ministerium, de quo dictum est libro VI°, [298]cap. XX° et tribus sequentibus. Omnis autem excommunicatus eciam rite ab homine est hereticus, et evidencius omnis excommunicatus a Deo. Unde IV^{a}, q. I Quod autem, sub auctoritate secunde synodi Nicolaus papa sic loquitur: Hereticos, inquiunt, dicimus tam eos qui ab ecclesia olim proiecti sunt, quam qui post hec a nobis anathematizati sunt. Porro si adhuc nec sic credatis, audite. Preter hos autem aiunt et eos qui fidem simulant confiteri scismaticos esse et eos qui seorsum a comunicantibus nobis episcopis collectas faciunt. Demum vero, et si quidam ab ecclesia super causis quibusdam reprehensi sunt et proiecti et excommunicati, sive ex clero sive ex laicali ordine. Dicimus omnes huiusmodi hereticos atque scismaticos. Unde glosa dicit ibidem quod omnis excommunicatus est hereticus, et allegat decretum, XXIII^{a}, q. IV^{a}, Ipsa pietas, et XXIV^{a}, q. III, Illi. Et concordant dicta de heresi libro VI°. Omnis enim vel peccans mortaliter est ut sic divisus a communione sancte matris ecclesie quod sonat hereticus. Item, omnis qui nititur auferre privilegium Romane ecclesie est ut sic hereticus; quod dissipantes legem de sacerdotum officio maxime faciunt in effectu.

ministry to which he is bound by reason of the alms and of his acceptance of a solemn office; and such a one, as such, is excommunicated by the Lord; for if a layman is excommunicated by man because he unjustly withholds tithes or alms due to the priest, much more is the priest excommunicated by the Lord who unjustly, after a greater obligation, withholds the spiritual alms of his subjects. The obligation, I say, is greater, since it is not lawful for him to withdraw spiritual alms even when the subject withdraws bodily alms. For the priests of Christ must do good to those who persecute [them] and love their enemies; and again, the withdrawal of spiritual alms is more dangerous, since it threatens perpetual perdition of body and soul, but the withdrawal of bodily alms [threatens] neither so evidently.[14] Hence it is said in Jeremiah 48:10: "Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord deceitfully"; and much more cursed is he who receives the burden of leading the Lord's flock, which he either treacherously leads to the precipice or from which he fraudulently withdraws [his] ministry altogether, of which it was said in book VI, [298]chapter 20 and the three following.[15] Now everyone excommunicated by man, even duly, is a heretic, and more evidently everyone excommunicated by God. Hence at 4 q. 1, *Quod autem*, under the authority of the second synod, pope Nicholas speaks thus: "'We call heretics,' they say, 'both those who were long ago cast out of the church and those who after this were anathematized by us.' Further, if even so you do not yet believe, hear. 'And besides these,' they say, 'those also who feign to confess the faith are schismatics, and those who hold assemblies apart from the bishops in communion with us. Lastly, also if some have been reproved by the church over certain causes and cast out and excommunicated, whether of the clergy or of the lay order. We call all such heretics and schismatics.'"[16] Hence the gloss says there that everyone excommunicated is a heretic, and alleges the Decretum, 23 q. 4, *Ipsa pietas*, and 24 q. 3, *Illi*.[17] And what was said of heresy in book VI agrees. For everyone [excommunicated], or sinning mortally, is as such divided from the communion of holy mother church, which is what "heretic" signifies.[18] Again, everyone who strives to take away the privilege of the Roman church is as such a heretic; and those who scatter the law on the office of priests do this most of all in effect.[19]

¶4 298.25–299.8

[298]Item, tales periuri sunt nedum, quia negant fidem quam Christo promiserant in baptismo, in recepcione sacerdotalis ordinis et in recepcione illius officii, sed iurati sunt specialiter ad defendendum et retinendum (quantum sufficiunt) iura Romane ecclesie et regulas

Again, such men are perjurers,[20] not only because they deny the faith which they had promised to Christ in baptism, in receiving the priestly order and in receiving that office, but [because] they are specially sworn to defend and retain (as far as they are able) the rights of the Roman

sanctorum patrum (ut patet III° Decretalium De Iure [299]Iurando. Ego episcopus). Quod si in isto contra Romanam ecclesiam incurrunt periurium, quomodo non papa primus divideret eos a sua ecclesia cui tam proditorie sic illudunt? Heresis ergo symoniacorum in ingressu non per hostium, in progressu quo prodigaliter consumunt bona pauperum, et maxime in omissione debiti officii curatorum videtur inficere tam ecclesiam quam Romanum imperium.

church and the rules of the holy fathers (as is clear from book III of the Decretals, *De iure [299]iurando, Ego episcopus*).[21] And if in this they incur perjury against the Roman church, how would the pope not be the first to divide them from his church, which they so treacherously mock? The heresy of simoniacs, therefore — in their entry, not by the door; in their progress, in which they prodigally consume the goods of the poor; and above all in the omission of the due office of curates — seems to infect both the church and the Roman empire.[22]

Notes

1. ***Elemosinatores***, "almsgivers", paired with ***elemosinatos***, "those given alms" (294.12). A in marg. (294.11): ***Nota bonas consideraciones. Nota contra securitatem dotacionis.***
2. Watchmen: Jer. 31:6 (***custodes***) and Ezek. 33:2–7 (***speculatorem dedi te***, 33:7); Wyclif gives chapters only. ***Retardat ... ut ascendant***: "holds back [them] so that they [do not] climb"; the sense is a hindrance.
3. ***Altilia*** are fatted fowl (Matt. 22:4, "my fatlings"); set against ***reptilia*** the word seems to mean birds that fly (cf. ***volatilia***), the clergy who should rise in contemplation. Translated as printed.
4. Luke 12:15–20 paraphrased (Vulgate ***non in abundantia cujusquam vita ejus est ex his quae possidet***); "snatched by demons" is Wyclif's gloss on 12:20 (***animam tuam repetunt a te***).
5. Ezek. 16:49, cut after ***otium*** (Vulgate adds ***ipsius et filiarum ejus***); the four are pride, fulness of bread, abundance and idleness.
6. ***Temporalis elemosinacio***: almsgiving from time to time, against perpetual endowment ("temporary", as the glossary ***elemosina temporalis***).
7. Matt. 10:36: Vulgate ***inimici hominis***, Wyclif ***inimici eius***. The sheep's garments recall Matt. 7:15. ***Capitales ecclesie***: "the chief men", kept apart from ***caput***.
8. ***Matthei XXIV, 1*** (A A_1 omit ***XXIV***): verse 1 does not fit. The three left behind are in the field and at the mill (Matt. 24:40–41) and in bed (Luke 17:34); the reference is translated as printed.
9. Decretum C. 1 q. 1 c. 28 (***Fertur***), Gregory I: Loserth (295.28), modern form ours. ***Dominari*** here is pejorative.
10. Decretum C. 1 q. 1 c. 5 (***Quisquis***): Loserth (296.3), modern form ours.
11. Decretals X 3.24.2 (***Fraternitatem***): Loserth (296.11), modern form ours. ***Utroque brachio***: the spiritual and the secular arm. ***Persona conventualis***: a religious house as a corporate person.
12. Decretum C. 16 q. 7 c. 3 (cf. C. 1 q. 3 c. 13). Loserth (296.19): the canon is not of Gregory I but of Gregory VII, and Hus took over the error. The Decretum reads ***sive precio sive beneficio*** (Loserth, 297.1) where Wyclif has ***sive pacto***.
13. The period has no main verb: "[is a heretic]" is understood from the preceding sentences; ***ut fiat mundo inclitus*** has no expressed subject (the community, or each member). A A_1 omit ***pertinacior ... viventes*** and read ***particulariter distribuentes*** (297.4–5).
14. Matt. 5:44 ("do good to them that hate you ... pray for them that persecute"), paraphrased.
15. ***Libro VI°, cap. XX et tribus sequentibus***: Wyclif's cross-reference to another book of his ***Summa***; which work is meant is not identified; also ***libro VI°*** below.
16. Decretum C. 4 q. 1 c. 2 (***Quod autem***), Nicholas I citing the second synod (of Constantinople): Loserth (298.3–4), modern form ours. ***Inquiunt*** is Loserth's correction from the canon (A A_1 ***inquam***, B ***inquit***); the Decretum reads ***audite quod subditur***; B ***dicamus omnes*** (298.14). The clause ***Demum ... ordine*** stands incomplete as quoted.
17. The ordinary gloss on C. 4 q. 1 c. 2, and its allegations C. 23 q. 4 c. 24 (***Ipsa pietas***) and C. 24 q. 3 c. 25 (***Illi***): the gloss, v. ***ab ecclesia***, reads ***Not. quod omnis excommunicatus dicitur hereticus, ut j. 23 q. 4 ipsa pietas*** (glossed Decretum, 1588), with no allegation of ***Illi***.
18. ***Omnis enim vel peccans*** lacks the first member of ***vel***; "[excommunicated]" is supplied from the argument (alternatively ***vel*** = "even": "everyone, even [one] sinning mortally"). ***Quod sonat hereticus***: heresy as division (from ***haeresis***, sect).
19. The privilege of the Roman church: cf. Decretum D. 22 c. 1 (***Omnes***, Nicholas II: who takes away the Roman church's privilege falls into heresy), § 1, ***qui autem Romanae ecclesiae priuilegium ... auferre conatur, hic proculdubio in heresim labitur*** (Friedberg I, 73–74; PL 187:122C).
20. ***Periuri*** (298.25): read on the plate, where the OCR gave ***penun***.
21. Decretals X 2.24.4 (***Ego episcopus***, the bishop's oath to the Roman church): Loserth (298.30) gives book II; Wyclif says III. ***Nedum ... sed***: "not only ... but".
22. ***Non per hostium***: John 10:1 ("He that entereth not by the door"). After ***imperium*** A adds ***Myly Czechowe***, "Dear Czechs" (Loserth 299.8), a Bohemian copyist's address.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 294: ***ad*** (20 is the line number)
  - 295: ***∅*** (170c is a folio mark)
  - 295: ***1*** (x-height old-style 1)
  - 295: ***zelo*** (italic z clear) [NW]
  - 296: ***Christi***
  - 296: ***Iª***

- **296: *diocesis* [NW]**
- **297: ∅) [GAP]**
- **297: *gradus***
- **297: *ut sic* (main token covers 170d ut * sic; folio mark and * dropped)**
- **298: *excommunicatus* (ex-/communicatus; main token holds whole word)**
- **298: ∅ (print ex-/communicatus; main already holds excommunicatus whole at pos 7)**
- **298: *IVª***
- **298: *XXIIIª***
- **298: *IVª***
- **298: *officio***
- **298: *in***
- **298: *effectu***
- **298: *fidem* (25 is the line number)**
- **298: *Christo***
- **299: *Iurando* (italic capital I; 170d folio mark)**
- **294: *ocium***
- **296: *enim***
- **298: *III°* (degree sign visible)**
- **294: *superbia,* (4 is a margin numeral) [-MARK]**
- **294: *quatuor* (qua- at foot of p.294, tuor at head of p.295 (leaf n0332); output token holds both) [-MARK]**
- **294: *XII°,* (no verse; the 3 at line end is a margin numeral) [-VERSE]**
- **297: *recipiunt* (print: et qui recipiunt ab eo (plate, agent 6); the other scans aligned p.296 dat here)**

Chapter 14

Part 1: The endowment of the Roman church; Christ held no civil lordship

Loserth pp. 299.10–302.2

¶1 299.10–300.6
299.10 *Two doubts to be solved: 1. Whether the endowment of the Roman Church is consistent with the faith.*
299.22 *Probably in its first intention it was directed to help the clergy to minister more effectually;*
300.1 *and otherwise it is certainly not consistent with Christ's religion,*
300.7 *Modern prelates say that Christ was ruler over the world and they inherit his rights (as vicars).*
300.18 *This is a great heresy:*
300.21 *I. as contrary to Christ's teaching;*

[299] **Antequam respondeam ad magistrales obiectus, sunt duo dubia breviter transcurrenda. Primo, quomodo stat cum fide scripture dotacio Romane ecclesie. Videtur enim ex multis dictis superius expresse innui quod non sine gravi peccato altrinsecus potest tale privilegium temporale contra Christi privilegia introduci. Sed videtur probabile (ut alias sepe dixi) quod illa dotacio sicut et particularium ecclesiarum possunt sic racionabiliter colorari, quod seculares domini videntes quod vita exproprietaria qualem Christus et sui apostoli vixerant est seculari ac civili conversacione perfeccior, et sic ad exonerandum eos, ad accumulandum eis meritum, ad multiplicandum milites Christi qui distrahant mundum a vita mundana, cum talis sit ad multiplicandum religionem Christi habilior, dederunt titulo elemosine suum seculare dominium, non ut sacerdotes Christi civiliter aut seculariter dominentur, sed ut servantes humilitatem, paupertatem et penalitatem priorem fideliter ministrent pauperibus elemosinas ad hoc datas, ut vel sic distraheretur mundus a conversacione civili et ritu quem** [300] **ante Christum observaverant mundiales. Nec credo quod ista condicione dimissa nec secularium dotacio nec cleri Christi admissio cum religione Christi sit compossibiliter sustinenda; talis autem dotacio, sonans in puram et perpetuam elemosinam, utrimque est tota trinitate auctorizabilis et fundabilis in scriptura.**

Before I reply to the master's objections, two doubts are to be run through briefly.[1] First, how the endowment of the Roman church stands with the faith of scripture. For from many things said above it seems to be expressly implied that such a temporal privilege cannot be brought in against Christ's privileges without grave sin on either side. But it seems probable (as I have often said elsewhere) that that endowment, as also that of particular churches, can be given colour reasonably in this way:[2] that secular lords, seeing that the propertyless life such as Christ and his apostles had lived is more perfect than a secular and civil manner of life, and so, to unburden them, to heap up merit for them, to multiply the soldiers of Christ, who would draw the world away from worldly life (since such [a life] is more apt for multiplying the religion of Christ), gave their secular lordship by title of alms,[3] not that the priests of Christ should exercise lordship civilly or secularly, but that, keeping their former humility, poverty and hardship, they should faithfully minister to the poor the alms given for this, so that at least in this way the world might be drawn away from the civil manner of life and the rite which [300] **worldly men had observed before Christ. Nor do I believe that, once this condition is dropped, either the endowment by seculars or its acceptance by the clergy of Christ can be compossibly upheld with the religion of Christ; but such endowment, sounding in pure and perpetual alms, is on both sides authorizable by the whole Trinity and capable of being founded in scripture.[4]**

¶2 300.7–300.17

[300] **Sed hic recalcitrant moderni prepositi, dicentes quod licet eis civiliter ac seculariter dominari, et quod secularis dominacio fuit iure poli debita Christi vicariis, cum Christus dominatus fuit seculariter toti mundo. Unde (ut inquiunt) Constantinus non dotavit ecclesiam, sed illud dominium quod ipse ac predecessores sic occuparunt tyrannice, humiliter et debite diviserunt, unde Christus, Petrus, Clemens et alii precedentes beatum Silvestrum habuerunt ius plenum ad totum imperium, sed non erant in possessione ante concessionem humilem Constantini.**

But here the modern superiors kick back, saying that it is lawful for them to exercise lordship civilly and secularly, and that secular exercise of lordship was due to Christ's vicars by the law of heaven, since Christ exercised lordship secularly over the whole world.[5] Hence (as they say) Constantine did not endow the church; but the lordship which he and his predecessors had thus occupied tyrannically they humbly and duly divided; hence Christ, Peter, Clement and the others who preceded

¶3 300.18–302.2
301.1 *He and his apostles refused all civil power.*
301.15
2. It is against the canons.

[300]Et inter omnes hereses dissipantes religionem christianam et fidem scripture hec est una precipua. Primo, inquam, claudicat in hoc quod dicit Christum habuisse ius ad dominandum civiliter, cum conversacione et sermone secundum testimonia sanctorum doctorum exponencium fidem evangelii docebat oppositum. Ipse enim dicit Luce, IX°, 58: Vulpes foveas habent et volucres celi nidos, filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput suum reclinet. Super quo dicit venerabilis Beda super Lucam lib. II°, c. IV°: Quid me propter divicias et seculi lucra cupis sequi, cum tante sim paupertatis ut nec hospiciolum quidem habeam et non meo utar tecto? Et ad istum sensum illud exponitur a beato Jeronymo nec contrarie ab aliquo sancto (ut alias explanavi). [301]Item, si Christus et sui apostoli habuissent ius ad civiliter dominandum, et faciliter ex oblacione mundi potentum possent fuisse positi in possessione pacifica, ut patet de Evangelista et aliis sanctis: sequitur quod ex desidia fuissent valde culpabiles, cum possent ita faciliter quesivisse ius sibi et sue ecclesie et excusasse sibi iniuriantes a sua intrusione. Hoc autem est contra evangelium Luce XXII°, ubi decidens questionem de maioritate inter apostolos dicit quod opposito modo se habet ad ritum gentilem, cum maioritas inter eos attenditur penes maioritatem servicii ex humilitate maiori. Ex quo Iª Petri V°, 3, capit ipse pro principio quod sui clerici non sint dominantes in clero. Item, illud est expresse contra iura canonica, cum sub auctoritate Augustini, distinccione VIIIª canon sic loquitur: Quo iure defendis villas ecclesie divino vel humano? Divinum ius in divinis scripturis habemus, humanum ius in legibus regum. Unde quisquis possidet quod possidet? Nonne jure humano? Nam iure divino domini est terra et plenitudo eius. Pauperes et divites una terra supportat. Iure ergo humano dicitur: Villa hec mea est. Tolle, inquit, iura imperatoris et quis audet dicere: Villa hec mea est, meus est iste servus, mea est hec domus? Si autem ut teneantur ista ab hominibus, regum iura fecerunt, vultis reticeamus leges ut gaudeatis? Unde infra, XCVIª distinccione, Constantinus, incorporat ecclesia cartam cesaris sub forma qua dotavit ecclesiam. Cum ergo lege scripture, lege sanctorum doctorum et iuris canonici non sit fundabilis secularis dominacio cleri [302]Christi, qua temeritate sompniarent discoli istam blasphemiam?

blessed Silvester had full right to the whole empire, but were not in possession before the humble grant of Constantine.[6]

And among all the heresies that scatter the christian religion and the faith of scripture, this is one of the chief. First, I say, it limps in this, that it says Christ had a right to exercise lordship civilly, since in manner of life and in speech, according to the testimonies of the holy doctors who expound the faith of the gospel, he taught the opposite. For he himself says in Luke 9:58: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests: but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." On which the venerable Bede says, on Luke, book II, chapter 4: "Why do you desire to follow me for the sake of riches and the gains of the world, when I am of such poverty that I have not even a little lodging and use no roof of my own?"[7] And it is expounded in this sense by blessed Jerome, and not otherwise by any saint (as I have explained elsewhere).[8] [301]Again, if Christ and his apostles had had a right to exercise lordship civilly, and could easily have been put in peaceful possession by the offering of the mighty of the world, as is clear of the Evangelist and other saints, it follows that they would have been very culpable through sloth, since they could so easily have sought the right for themselves and for their church, and have excused those who wronged them from their intrusion.[9] But this is against the gospel, Luke 22, where, deciding the question of greatness among the apostles, he says that it stands with them in the opposite way to the gentile rite, since greatness among them is reckoned by greatness of service out of greater humility.[10] From this, in 1 Peter 5:3, he takes it as a principle that his clerics should not be "lording it over the clergy." Again, that is expressly against the canon laws, since, under the authority of Augustine, the canon in distinction 8 speaks thus: "By what right do you defend the estates of the church, divine or human? The divine right we have in the divine scriptures, the human right in the laws of kings. Whence does each one possess what he possesses? Is it not by human right? For by divine right 'the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' The poor and the rich one earth supports. By human right, therefore, it is said: This estate is mine. Take away, he says, the rights of the emperor, and who dares to say: This estate is mine, this servant is mine, this house is mine? But if the rights of kings have brought it about that these things are held by men, do you want us to keep silent about the laws, so that you may rejoice?"[11] Hence below, in distinction 96, *Constantinus*, the church incorporates the charter of Caesar in the form in which he endowed the church.[12] Since

therefore by the law of scripture, by the law of the holy doctors and of canon law, the secular exercise of lordship by the clergy [302]of Christ cannot be founded, with what rashness would the froward dream up this blasphemy?

Notes

1. *Magistrales obiectus*: the objections of a master (a doctor in theology) that Wyclif has undertaken to answer; A in marg. (299.16) marks the coming *Responsio*. A in marg. (299.10): *Materia pro dotacione ecclesie*.
2. *Colorari*: to give colour, a plausible ground, in the period sense ("colour of title"), not "pretext". *Possunt* is plural because the endowments of the particular churches are counted with that of Rome.
3. *Ad exonerandum eos ... eis*: most likely the lords themselves (*eos* for *se*), whom the gift unburdens and enriches with merit; possibly the clergy. *Milites Christi* are the soldiers of Christ (2 Tim. 2:3), not the knightly estate.
4. *Sonans in puram et perpetuam elemosinam*: the formula of tenure in free alms (frankalmoign). *Cleri Christi admissio*: the clergy's admitting, i.e. accepting, the endowment; *utrimque*, on the side of giver and receiver.
5. *Ius poli*, "the law of heaven", against *ius fori*, the law of the court; the pair is Augustine's, *Sermo* 355.4.5 (PL 39, 1572: *jure fori, non jure poli*). The side-note (300.7) reads *prepositi* as "prelates".
6. *Diviserunt* ("divided", with Constantine and his predecessors as subject) is printed without variant; the sense may want *dimiserunt* ("gave up"). Translated as printed (see the report). On the claim, Constantine merely restored to the pope what Christ already held by right.
7. Luke 9:58 (DR); the manuscripts read *Luce VIII* (Loserth 300.24). Bede, *In Lucae evangelium expositio* III, on Luke 9:58 (PL 92, 460), cited by Wyclif as book II, chapter 4 (Loserth 300.27: *Opp.* V, 262); Bede takes the words from Jerome, *In Matth.* I, on 8:20 (PL 26, 52–53). A has *ut nec* followed by a gap; A_1 *meum hospiciolum* (300.29).
8. Jerome on the same saying (Matt. 8:20), in his commentary on Matthew, book I (PL 26:52–53; Bede borrows it).
9. *De Evangelista*: which evangelist was offered possession by the mighty is not said; to be identified. *Excusasse ... a sua intrusione*: to have cleared those who wronged them of their intrusion (by recovering the right).
10. Luke 22:24–27, paraphrased; 22:25 (DR) "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them." The next sentence quotes 1 Pet. 5:3 (DR); *ipse* is Peter.
11. Decretum D. 8 c. 1 (*Quo iure*), from Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 6.25: Loserth (301.16), modern form ours. Within it Ps. 23:1. A A_1 *scriptum habemus*, B *scriptis*, Loserth corrects from the canon (301.19); A A_1 *possideret* (301.20). *Reticeamus* ("keep silent about") is printed without note; Augustine and Gratian read *recitemus* ("recite"). Translated as printed.
12. Decretum D. 96 c. 14 (*Constantinus*), the Donation of Constantine: Loserth (301.28), modern form ours. *Ecclesia* is taken as the subject (the church in its canon law); it may be a scar for *ecclesie*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **299: *CAP. XIV.***
  - **300: *credo* (171a folio mark and A margin letter)**
  - **300: *cleri***
  - **300: *quod* ('ruler' is English side-note)**
  - **300: *cum***
  - **300: *filius* (italic f clear) [NW]**
  - **300: *lib* [NW]**
  - **300: *II°***
  - **301: *Iª***
  - **301: *XCVIª***
  - **302: *Christi***
  - **300: *Christum***
  - **300: *Christi***
  - **301: *XXII°,* [-VERSE]**

Part 2: Christ could not hold civil lordship, and did not die to win it for his clergy

Loserth pp. 302.3–306.14

¶1 302.3–305.28
302.3 *If Christ could not rule civilly, how can his servants do so?*
302.26 *Christ could not rule either in his godhead or his manhood: not as to his godhead, which cannot be involved in active life;*
303.1 *not as to his manhood, since he is one with his spouse, the Church, with whom all would be shared.*
303.32 *If the prelates are right, Constantine and all later emperors were heretics,*
304.4 *since they only handed over a part of what was due and kept back the rest.*
305.1 *and the Popes have by consent shared in their sin.*
305.11 *Christ did not die for worldly gain, but all the clergy receive from him was won by his passion;*

[302]**Ideo (ut sepe diffuse exposui) Christus non potuit dominari civiliter, quomodo ergo doceret servos imitatores precipuos taliter dominari? Nonne dicit Apostolus, IIª Corinthiorum, VIII°, 9, quod pro nobis inops et egenus factus est? — Nonne recitat apostolus Thymotheo suo coepiscopo I, Tim. VI°, 8: Habentes, inquit, alimenta et quibus tegamur hiis contenti simus? Si ergo sit blasphemia imponere Christo quod sibi non potest conpetere, et (ut sepe ostendit dominus Ardmacanus) non potest competere Christo dominacio civilis, cum trahit secum de natura rei peccatum veniale, qua fronte presumeret fidelis imponere redemptori suo istam blasphemiam, specialiter cum nec ex scriptura veteris testamenti nec novi sit fundabilis talis dominacio cleri Christi? Si enim sit fundabilis dicas ubi? Et cum non sit contradiccio in scriptura sacra, oportet tollere leges veteris testamenti et novi que sonant in oppositum, ut patet de illis legibus allegatis hic et proximo capitulo. Ymmo cum leges ut plus necessarie sunt in scriptura sacra clarius expressate (ut patet IV°, De Doctrina Christiana), magnum defectum imponeret sic opinans auctori scripture quod nullibi exprimit dominacionem illam tam necessariam sue ecclesie. Item, Christus non potuit dominari civiliter secundum deitatem nec secundum humanitatem, ergo non potuit dominari civiliter quoad deitatem. Non est dubium fideli, cum secundum illam non potest esse activus viator proprietarius vel pars populi nec secundum suam humanitatem, sive solus fuerit homo, sive in puro statu innocencie cum toto suo genere, sive post lapsum ipso posito capite ecclesie ut est modo, duobus modis prioribus non foret civilitas, nec tercio modo foret ipse tam proprietarius. Pro cuius** [303]**declaracione suppono dictum beati Gregorii, XXXIII° Moralium, cap° primo, super illo Job XIX°, 25: Scio quod redemptor meus vivit. Sciendum, inquit, est quod redemptor unam personam se cum sua ecclesia quam assumpsit exibuit; de ipso enim dicitur: Qui est caput Christus. Rursumque de eius ecclesia scriptum est: Et corpus Christi quod est ecclesia. Et sequitur quod Christum et ecclesiam unam personam credimus, hoc eciam unius persone actibus signari videamus. Ista fide supposita arguo sic: Non est possibile quod Christus, sponsus ecclesie, faciat vel habeat quicquam humanitus nisi secundum communicacionem tocius sue ecclesie, quia aliter esset sponsus ingratus sponse sue, cum sit personaliter sibi ydemptificatus, sed quelibet tanta communicacio excludet proprietatem civilem; ergo non est possibile quod Christus sponsus ecclesie vivat secundum proprietatem civilem. Et hec est racio quare Christus amavit bona communia et Apostolus tantum reprobat eos qui querunt que sua**

Therefore (as I have often set out at length) Christ could not exercise civil lordship; how then would he teach his servants, his chief imitators, to exercise lordship in that way? Does not the Apostle say, 2 Corinthians 8:9, that for us he was made needy and poor?[1] Does not the apostle rehearse it to Timothy his fellow bishop, 1 Timothy 6:8: "Having," he says, "food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content"?[2] If therefore it is blasphemy to impute to Christ what cannot befit him, and (as the lord of Armagh often shows)[3] civil exercise of lordship cannot befit Christ, since by the nature of the thing it brings venial sin with it, with what face would a believer presume to impute this blasphemy to his redeemer, especially since such an exercise of lordship by the clergy of Christ cannot be founded on the scripture either of the old testament or of the new? For if it can be founded, tell me where. And since there is no contradiction in holy scripture, one would have to set aside the laws of the old testament and of the new which sound to the opposite, as is clear of the laws alleged here and in the preceding chapter. Indeed, since laws, as being more necessary, are more clearly expressed in holy scripture (as is clear from book 4 of *On Christian Doctrine*),[4] whoever held this opinion would impute a great defect to the author of scripture, that he nowhere expresses that exercise of lordship, so necessary to his church. Again, Christ could not exercise civil lordship according to his Godhead nor according to his humanity; therefore he could not exercise civil lordship as to the Godhead. There is no doubt for a believer,[5] since according to it he cannot be an active wayfarer, a proprietor, or part of a people; nor according to his humanity, whether he had been man alone, or in the pure state of innocence with his whole race, or after the fall, he himself being set as head of the church as he is now: in the two former ways there would be no civil condition, nor in the third way would he be a proprietor as such.[6] For the [303]**declaration of this I suppose the saying of blessed Gregory, *Moralia* 33, chapter 1, on that text of Job 19:25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth":[7] "It must be known," he says, "that the Redeemer showed himself one person with his church, which he assumed; for of him it is said, 'Who is the head, Christ'; and again of his church it is written, 'And the body of Christ, which is the church.'"[8] And it goes on: as we believe Christ and the church one person, so we may see this signified also by the actions of one person.[9] With this faith supposed, I argue thus: it is not possible that Christ, the bridegroom of the church, should do or have anything humanly except in sharing with his whole church, because**

sunt. Unde Christus nunquam comedit, dormivit vel quomodolibet se habuit humanitus, nisi prius intendendo profectum tocius ecclesie militantis, dormientis et triumphantis, eciam plus quam profectum proprium sue humanitatis. Sed quis diceret personam hominis ut sic proprietarium civilem? Et istum articulum fidei ignorarunt primo apostoli, quando dixerunt: Magister manduca, et ille: Ego cibum habeo manducare quem vos nescitis, Johannis IV°, 31, 32. Et super ista racione fundata est primeva apostolorum religio, vivendo exproprietarie, postposita vita et occupacione seculari vel civili. Item, supposita veritate opinionis predicte, sequitur cum veris quod Constantinus post dotacionem ecclesie remansit hereticus sicut et omnes succedentes domini seculares; quod repugnat approbacioni ecclesie. Et [304] consequencia probatur, supponendo tamquam datum falsigraphi quod de iure debetur pape, Christi vicario et clero suo tota civilis dominacio huius mundi. Et arguo sic: Ad hoc quod debitor vel iniuste aliena detinens sit absolutus quoad Deum, oportet quod plene satisfaciat, sed sic non fecit Constantinus, cum medietatem imperii sibi retinuit. Cum ergo illa medietas fuit tantum debita sicut medietas occidua restituta, videtur quod remansit in debito sicut prius, nam secundum Augustinum, Epistola XXXVII[a], non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum. Unde (sicut dixi in materia De Privilegiis) Deus non potest remittere vel licenciare debitorem, ne satisfaciat, et hinc dixi periculosum esse quod quis auctorizet vel foveat sufficientem fugitivum, ne solvat creditori debitum corporale, dicente Augustino in supradicta epistola ad Macedonium: Illud, inquit, fidentissime dixerim, eum qui pro homine ad hoc intervenit, ne mala oblata restituat, et qui ad se fugientem, quantum honeste potest, ad restituendum non compellit, socium esse fraudis et criminis. Numquid credimus prepositum loci refugii posse honeste compellere fugitivum sufficientem, ut vel exeat locum tamquam eius violator, vel quod satisfaciat secundum quantitatem apportati vel sufficienciam fugitivi? Illa enim foret honestas legi Dei consona, sed applausus movens ad detencionem iniustam, et specialiter gracia participii foret diabolica facesia. Ideo (ut sepe dixi) vel oportet negare fidem scripture, racionem et sanctos doctores, vel dicere quod talis defensio sapit hereticam pravitatem. Et idem videtur supposita opinione predicta de dominio cleri Christi; cum enim taciturnitas [305] huius sit consensus, consensus autem talis est cum facilitate eque dampnabilis, videtur quod sic opinantes, ex hoc quod sic tacent dicere ius suum et iniuriam in qua dampnabiliter indurantur domini temporales, peccant mortaliter. Nec valet eis fingere quod beatus Silvester remisit Constantino residuum, quia (ut ista secta credit tamquam

otherwise he would be a bridegroom displeasing to his bride, since he is personally identified with her;[10] now any sharing so great will exclude civil property; therefore it is not possible that Christ, the bridegroom of the church, should live according to civil property. And this is the reason why Christ loved common goods, and the Apostle so greatly reproves those who seek the things that are their own. Hence Christ never ate, slept, or bore himself humanly in any way, without first intending the profit of the whole church militant, sleeping and triumphant,[11] even more than the proper profit of his own humanity. But who would call the person of a man, as such, a civil proprietor? And the apostles at first were ignorant of this article of faith, when they said, "Master, eat," and he: "I have meat to eat which you know not," John 4:31–32.[12] And on this reason the primitive religion of the apostles was founded, living without property, secular or civil life and occupation set aside. Again, supposing the truth of the aforesaid opinion, it follows, with truths, that Constantine after the endowment of the church remained a heretic, as did all the secular lords succeeding him; which is repugnant to the church's approval.[13] And [304] the inference is proved, supposing as the false writer's given that by right the whole civil exercise of lordship of this world is owed to the pope, the vicar of Christ, and to his clergy. And I argue thus: for a debtor, or one who unjustly withholds what is another's, to be absolved as regards God, he must make full satisfaction; now Constantine did not do so, since he kept half of the empire for himself. Since therefore that half was as much owed as the western half that was restored,[14] it seems that he remained in debt as before; for according to Augustine, Epistle 37, the sin is not forgiven unless what was taken away is restored.[15] Hence (as I said in the matter *On Privileges*)[16] God cannot release or license a debtor not to make satisfaction; and hence I said it is dangerous that anyone should authorize or shelter a fugitive who has the means, so that he does not pay his creditor a bodily debt, as Augustine says in the aforesaid letter to Macedonius: "This," he says, "I would say most confidently: that he who intervenes for a man to this end, that he may not restore what was wrongly taken, and who does not compel one fleeing to him to restore, as far as he honourably can, is a partner in the fraud and the crime."[17] Do we suppose that the superior of a place of refuge can honourably compel a fugitive who has the means either to leave the place as its violator or to make satisfaction according to the amount brought in or the means of the fugitive?[18] For that would be honourableness in accord with God's law; but favour that moves to unjust detention, and especially

principium) non licet Christi vicario vel clero suo vel alienare vel cedere iuri patrimonii crucifixi, sic videlicet quod tam illud quam sibi equivalens sit simpliciter extra possessionem civilem cleri Christi. Item, nec est privilegium nec dos nec possessio adquisita Christi vicario nisi pro qua caput Christus fuerat crucifixus, sed Christus non fuit tanta passus pro dotacione civili vel seculari sue ecclesie clericorum, ergo talis dotacio vel dominacio civilis non est pure clero Christi conveniens. Assumptum patet ex hoc quod Christus meruit humano generi totam graciam et omnia ad ipsam consequencia que haberet, sed iuxta alibi dicta sine gracia et caritate non est simpliciter iusta possessio; ergo nec dos nec privilegium inest clero Christi, nisi quod Christus sibi meruit paciendo; nec credo fidelem contradicere huic sentencie: nam omnes patres veteris testamenti, omnes gentiles post et ante qui vel erant iustificati vel salvati, hoc obtinuerant merito fidei et passionis Christi, cum aliter fuissent dampnati nec unquam ab originali peccato purgati et per consequens nunquam iustificati moraliter.

for the sake of participation, would be devilish trickery.[19] Therefore (as I have often said) one must either deny the faith of scripture, reason and the holy doctors, or say that such a defence savours of heretical depravity. And the same seems [to follow] when the aforesaid opinion on the lordship of Christ's clergy is supposed; for since silence [305] about this is consent, and such consent, when speaking is easy, is equally damnable, it seems that those who hold this opinion, from the fact that they are thus silent about stating their right and the wrong in which the temporal lords are damnably hardened, sin mortally.[20] Nor does it avail them to pretend that blessed Silvester remitted the remainder to Constantine, because (as this sect believes as a principle) it is not lawful for Christ's vicar or his clergy either to alienate or to give up the right of the patrimony of the crucified, namely in such a way that both it and its equivalent should be without qualification outside the civil possession of Christ's clergy. Again, there is neither privilege nor dowry nor possession acquired for Christ's vicar except that for which Christ the head had been crucified; now Christ did not suffer such things for the civil or secular endowment of his church of clerics;[21] therefore such endowment or civil exercise of lordship is not purely befitting Christ's clergy. The assumption is clear from this, that Christ merited for the human race all the grace, and everything that follows upon it, that it would have; now according to what is said elsewhere, without grace and charity there is no just possession without qualification; therefore neither dowry nor privilege belongs to Christ's clergy except what Christ merited for it by suffering. Nor do I believe that a believer contradicts this teaching;[22] for all the fathers of the old testament, all the gentiles after and before who were either justified or saved, had obtained this by the merit of faith and of the passion of Christ, since otherwise they would have been damned and never cleansed of original sin, and consequently never justified morally.

¶2 305.29–306.14
306.9 *so unless civil rule was the object of his crucifixion the clergy have not received it.*

[305] Nec dubium theologo qui noscit quomodo homo intendit, meretur vel emit aliqua principaliter et aliqua secundarie, accessorie vel confuse, quin Christus, sicut passus est pro redempcione tocius ecclesie, sic et pro redempcione cuiuslibet membri sui et pro quolibet bono sibi utili ad hunc finem. Si enim dicimus [306] quod iustus amat omnia, quod sacerdos rite excommunicat pro decimis et quod homo emendo equum emat quamlibet partem eius emibilem, Christus ergo omnisciens emendo a patre totum genus humanum emit accessorie omne bonum sibi utile vel privilegium citra Christum. Sic enim

Nor is there doubt for a theologian who knows how a man intends, merits or buys some things principally and some secondarily, accessorily or indistinctly, that Christ, as he suffered for the redemption of the whole church, so also [suffered] for the redemption of each of his members and for every good useful to it to this end. For if we say [306] that the just man loves all things, that a priest duly excommunicates for tithes, and that a man in buying a horse buys every purchasable part of it, then Christ, all-knowing, in buying the whole human race from the Father, bought accessorily every good useful to it, or privilege short of Christ.[23] For so

dicit Apostolus, Romanorum VIII°, 32, quod proprio filio Deus non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum: quomodo ergo non cum ipso omnia nobis donavit? Ideo audenter assero quod vel dominacio cleri moderni est illicita, vel non licet excommunicare pro decimis, vel Christus crucifixus est pro dominacione illa sue ecclesie adquirenda; nec aliter est presumibile quod sponsa Christi vocaret dotem cesaream patrimonium crucifixi.

the Apostle says, Romans 8:32, that God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all: "how then hath he not, with him, given us all things?"[24] Therefore I boldly assert that either the exercise of lordship of the modern clergy is unlawful, or it is not lawful to excommunicate for tithes, or Christ was crucified to acquire that exercise of lordship for his church; nor otherwise is it to be presumed that the bride of Christ would call the caesarean dowry the patrimony of the crucified.

Notes

1. 2 Cor. 8:9 reads *propter vos egenus factus est* (DR "he became poor, for your sakes"); *inops et egenus* is Wyclif's own wording, perhaps coloured by the psalter's *inops et pauper* (Ps. 85:1).
2. 1 Tim. 6:8 (DR); Wyclif omits the Vulgate's *autem*. *Coepiscopo*: Timothy as fellow bishop, Paul being counted a bishop.
3. *Dominus Ardmacanus*: Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh (d. 1360), whose *De pauperie Salvatoris* argues that Christ held no civil lordship (bk VI cc. 18–23, capitula in Poole's ed. of *De dominio divino*, 1890; civil lordship and venial sin, bk IV c. 10, p. 395).
4. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* IV, as Wyclif cites it; the passage is not identified by the editor or by us; cf. II.9.14 and III.26.37, on what is plainly set down in Scripture. *Ut plus necessarie* may instead mean "the more necessary they are, the more clearly they are expressed".
5. The print puts the full stop after *quoad deitatem*, so the conclusion reads "as to the Godhead" and the next sentence stands without a subject. The sense, and Loserth's side-note ("not as to his godhead, which cannot be involved in active life"), ask for *ergo non potuit dominari civiliter. Quoad deitatem non est dubium fideli*. The English follows the print's stops; read it in that sense.
6. *Civilitas*, "civil condition", the state of a member of a civil order. *Tam proprietarius* is rendered "a proprietor as such"; it may mean "so far a proprietor" (i.e. not even then a proprietor in the civil sense).
7. Gregory, *Moralia*, as Wyclif cites it ("book 33, chapter 1"); the editor gives no reference. The words are *Moralia* XXIII.1.2 (PL 76, 251), on Christ and the church as one person; the print's XXXIII is a slip.
8. Eph. 4:15 (*qui est caput Christus*, DR "who is the head, even Christ") and Col. 1:24 (*pro corpore eius quod est ecclesia*, DR "for his body, which is the church"), as Gregory quotes them.
9. *Et sequitur quod ... credimus ... videamus*: the *quod* reads as Gregory's "as/since we believe"; it could also introduce the whole sentence ("and it follows that, [as] we believe ...").
10. *Ingratus* with a person's dative could also be "ungrateful to his bride"; the point is that a bridegroom who kept his goods from his bride would not be pleasing to her. *Communicacio*, "sharing", in the sense of holding in common.
11. The church militant, sleeping (the souls in purgatory) and triumphant: Wyclif's threefold church.
12. John 4:31–32, with *Magister* for the Vulgate's *Rabbi* (DR "Rabbi, eat").
13. *Sequitur cum veris*: "it follows, true premisses being added". The opinion is that the clergy are owed civil lordship by right (304.1–3).
14. A and A$_1$ omit *fuit ... medietas* (304.8), an eye-skip from *medietas* to *medietas*; the print's fuller text is translated.
15. Augustine, Ep. 153 (old numbering cited by Wyclif as 37) to Macedonius, 153.20 (PL 33, 662): *non remittetur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum*; Wyclif has *dimittitur*. The editor's reference (304.10 foot): "Epistola (CLIII) ad Macedonium, Opp. tom. II, p. 532".
16. Wyclif's earlier treatment of the Westminster privilege, *De ecclesia* chs. 7–11: God cannot license a man to keep another's due unsatisfied, 148.25–149 (07-c) and 213 (10-c).
17. The print reads *mala oblata* (304.19), "evil things offered". A's marginal note at this place, *Tenentur male ablata restitui*, and Augustine's text read *male ablata*, "things wrongly taken"; that is translated (our emendation). Augustine, Ep. 153.21 (PL 33, 663), the same letter as note 15.
18. The question of sanctuary for debtors; Wyclif refers back to his treatment of Westminster's privilege (212.21–213, 10-c), written after the affair of August 1378; the Gloucester parliament that autumn legislated against debtors in sanctuary (2 Ric. II st. 2 c. 3).
19. *Applausus*, "favour", the sanctuary's countenance of the fugitive; *gracia participii*, for the sake of a share in what he brought. *Facesia* (A *facessia*) = *facetia*, a trick.
20. *Cum facilitate*: "when it would be easy [to speak]", which makes silence culpable. *Dicere ius suum et iniuriam* depends on *tacent*: they keep silent about stating their right and the lords' wrong.
21. *Sue ecclesie clericorum*: "of his church of clerics", i.e. of the clerical part of his church.
22. *Sentencia*: the position taught (CONTEXTUAL; here "teaching", not a judicial sentence).
23. The three examples are analogies for buying "accessorily": what is wanted principally carries its parts and appurtenances with it. *Sibi* refers to the human race bought.
24. Rom. 8:32; Wyclif adds *ergo* and omits *etiam* (DR "how hath he not also, with him, given us all things?").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 302: *civiliter*

- **302: *II[a]***
- **302: *Thymotheo* (Thy-/motheo; main token holds whole word; print has y)**
- **303: *Scio* (italic Scio; side-note text follows)**
- **303: *quam* (5 is the line number)**
- **304: ∅ (only is the English side-note) [NW]**
- **305: *huius sit* (main token covers 171d huius sit; folio mark dropped)**
- **305: *accessorie* [NW]**
- **306: ∅ (print ex-/communicat; main already holds excommunicat whole at pos 7)**
- **306: *accessorie* [NW]**
- **306: *Deus***
- **306: *cleri***
- **306: *illicita***
- **303: *ecclesie***
- **303: *XIX°, 25:* (print has verse 25 followed by colon) [-VERSE]**

Part 3: The clergy live on alms and owe spiritual alms in return

Loserth pp. 306.15–310.29

¶1 306.15–307.2

306.15 *It is a mere fiction to say that such rule by the clergy is not a privilege, but common law.*
307.3 *Christ did not contradict himself, and he taught his apostles to live without properly,*
307.20 *and to distribute spiritual alms.*

[306] **Nec valet fingere quod dominacio illa non sit privilegium sed lex communis, quia est lex privata diu post fundacionem ecclesie Christi concessa singulariter clero suo. Ideo patet ex descripcione privilegii quod sit sibi privilegium notabile pro hac vita. Sic enim purgacio mortuorum est privilegium sancte ecclesie quam tamen multi non appetunt. Minor autem argumenti sic ostenditur: Non fuit in Christo falsitas, dolus sive duplicitas, cum secundum Apostolum, II Corinth. I°, 18, non fuit in ipso Est et non, sed fuisset cum paribus, si fuisset crucifixus, ut post clericatum sui imitatores seculariter dominentur. Ergo hoc non intenderat paciendo; ipse enim non potuit dominari seculariter sed vixit pauperem vitam summe exproprietarie; quod et docuit suos precipuos apostolos quos voluit esse exemplaria imitanda future ecclesie. Ipsis enim dixit quod haberent nolicionem possidendi aurum vel argentum, quod non diligerent mundum nec mundialia, sed quod omnino relinquerent cuncta** [307] **que possident et tollentes crucem sequantur eum (ut patet Matthei X°, Luce XIV° et sepe alibi in evangelio).**

Nor does it avail to pretend that that exercise of lordship is not a privilege but common law, because it is a private law granted singly to his clergy long after the foundation of Christ's church. Therefore it is clear from the definition of privilege that it is a notable privilege for it for this life.[1] For so the cleansing of the dead is a privilege of holy church, which many nevertheless do not desire. Now the minor of the argument is shown thus:[2] there was in Christ no falsehood, guile or duplicity, since according to the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 1:18, there was not in him "It is and It is not";[3] now there would have been, other things being equal, if he had been crucified so that after taking clerical state his imitators should exercise lordship in secular fashion.[4] Therefore he had not intended this in suffering; for he himself could not exercise secular lordship, but lived a poor life, supremely without property; and this he also taught his chief apostles, whom he willed to be patterns for the future church to imitate. For he told them that they should have an unwillingness to possess gold or silver,[5] that they should not love the world nor worldly things, but that they should utterly leave all things [307] **that they possess and, taking up their cross, follow him (as is clear from Matthew 10, Luke 14 and often elsewhere in the gospel).**

¶2 307.3–307.33

[307] **Cum ergo in facto movit apostolos suos ad facto et conversacione interpretandum hec mandata secundum vitam exproprietariam et penalem, nec unquam innuit eis dominacionem civilem, fuisset nimis magnus seductor, si cum istis paribus dominacionem civilem pro statu**

Since therefore in deed he moved his apostles to interpret these commands, by deed and by manner of life, according to a life without property and of hardship, and never hinted civil lordship to them, he would have been an exceedingly great seducer if, these things being equal,

cleri moderni intendebat ipsis adicere. Nam capitalibus exemplaribus in quibus dedit nobis potestatem et regulam vivendi precipit et monuit exemplando oppositum, nec est credibile quod desereret clerum suum, tacens omnino necessarium ad conversacionem ipsorum secundum suum beneplacitum regulandam; tunc enim fuisset omnino negligens et subdolus, sic quod omnes defectus nostros possemus in suam negligenciam racionabiliter retorquere; quod cum sit nefas dicere, credamus ex fide scripture et testimonio sanctorum doctorum quod in apostolis docuit totum genus cleri sequentis vivere pure exproprietarie de elemosinis corporalibus laicorum et pro mutuo nexu caritatis habendo, non minus obligavit clerum suum ad retribucionem elemosine spiritualis, sic quod clerici sint necessariores et digniores in ecclesia quam econtra, et plus indigent seculares clericis quam econtra, sicut spiritualis elemosina est prestancior corporali, et sic oportet quod laici mendicent elemosinas spirituales a clericis ad quarum retribucionem clerici amplius obligantur, sicut oportet ut clerici mendicent elemosinas corporales a laicis ad quarum retribucionem multum valde sed non adeo laici sunt astricti, nec graviter feramus maioritatem obligacionis huiusmodi, quia hoc redundat in excellenciam clericorum.

he intended to add civil lordship to them for the state of the modern clergy.[6] For in the chief patterns, in which he gave us the power and rule of living, he commanded and admonished the opposite by his example; nor is it credible that he would desert his clergy, keeping wholly silent about what was necessary for ruling their manner of life according to his good pleasure; for then he would have been altogether negligent and deceitful, so that we could reasonably turn all our failings back upon his negligence. Since this is wicked to say, let us believe from the faith of scripture and the testimony of the holy doctors that in the apostles he taught the whole kind of the clergy that followed to live purely without property on the bodily alms of the laity; and for the having of a mutual bond of charity he bound his clergy no less to the repayment of spiritual alms,[7] so that clerics are more necessary and more worthy in the church than the reverse, and seculars need clerics more than the reverse, as spiritual alms are more excellent than bodily. And so laymen must beg spiritual alms from clerics, to the repayment of which the clerics are the more bound, just as clerics must beg bodily alms from laymen, to the repayment of which the laymen are very greatly, but not so much, bound. Nor let us take ill the greatness of such an obligation, because this redounds to the excellence of the clerics.

¶3 308.1–309.7
308.22 *There should be no distinction of secular and regular, but all the clergy should live only on alms.*
309.8 *Religion itself, like alms, has been perverted,*
309.19 *and pride has taken the place of serviceable humility.*

[308] Christus enim est plus obligatus creature sue quam econtra, cum ex lege sua eterna et titulo gracie prevenientis constituit se debitorem suis servis fidelibus, non ut solum daret eis bonum aliquod temporale, sed ut daret eis se ipsum in premium sempiternum; tantum autem non potest creatura beata domino obligari, et sic tenetur sacerdos rependere subditis spirituales elemosinas. Ideo (ut dixi proximo capitulo) deficiens a satisfaccione illius debiti gravius excommunicatur a domino, et per consequens periculosius cadit in heresim in tantum quod, si Deus per impossibile deficeret a debito ad quod se obligavit, graciose promittendo et meritum proficiendo, ipse foret summus hereticus. Nec feramus graviter quod quantumcunque nobiles quoad mundum ad tantum se humilient pro Christo quod deveniant elemosinarii pauperum subditorum, tum quia Christus nobilissimus recepit ad sui egenciam relevandam tam a viris secularibus quam a devotis feminis elemosinas corporales, tum eciam quia ex tali humiliacione et ministerii complecione crescit prepositi maioritas quoad Deum. Sic ergo non est quoad hoc distinccio inter fratres, inter possessionatos et inter curatos, viventes de decimis et oblacionibus, quin omnes debemus vivere exproprietarie de

For Christ is more bound to his creature than the reverse, since by his eternal law and by title of prevenient grace he made himself debtor to his faithful servants, not only to give them some temporal good, but to give them himself as an everlasting reward; but a blessed creature cannot be bound to the Lord to so great an extent; and so the priest is bound to repay spiritual alms to his subjects. Therefore (as I said in the preceding chapter)[8] one who fails in the satisfaction of that debt is more gravely excommunicated by the Lord, and consequently falls more dangerously into heresy, so much so that if God, to suppose the impossible, failed in the debt to which he bound himself by graciously promising and by making merit profitable,[9] he would be the supreme heretic. Nor let us take it ill that men, however noble as regards the world, humble themselves for Christ so far as to become almsmen of their poor subjects: both because Christ, most noble, received bodily alms to relieve his need, from secular men as well as from devout women; and also because from such humbling and fulfilment of ministry the greatness of the superior grows as regards God. So therefore there is in this respect no distinction among friars, among possessioners and among curates living on tithes and offerings,

elemosinis laicorum et omnes debemus esse procuratores, non civiles possessores bonorum pauperum, iuxta preceptum Christi Matthei X°, nec potest conventualis conversacio vel solitaria aut prelacia maior vel minor tollere hoc debitum, sed omnes tenemur esse fideles dispensatores thesauri spiritualis vel corporalis domini secundum mensuram donacionis Christi; illi autem sunt superiores quoad Deum qui instar apostolorum plus deserentes mundum seminant efficacius verbum Dei. Unde ritus moderni [309] isti maxime religioni supperadditi alios iuvando facilitant et alios retardando difficultant, sed utrobique qui ex maiori caritate plus defenderit et docuerit legem domini accepcior erit illi; non enim est personarum accepcio apud Deum, sed quicunque ex maiori caritate pro illo plus passus fuerit, magis penaliter vixerit et sponse sue magis profecerit, sibi accepcior erit.

but that we all ought to live without property on the alms of the laity, and we all ought to be proctors, not civil possessors, of the goods of the poor, according to Christ's command, Matthew 10;[10] nor can conventual or solitary manner of life, or greater or lesser prelacy, take away this debt; but we are all bound to be faithful dispensers of the Lord's treasure, spiritual or bodily, "according to the measure of the giving of Christ";[11] and those are superior as regards God who, like the apostles, forsaking the world the more, sow the word of God more effectively. Hence the modern rites added on [309] to this greatest religion make it easier for some by helping them and harder for others by holding them back;[12] but in either case, whoever from greater charity has more defended and taught the law of the Lord will be more acceptable to him; for "there is no respect of persons with God",[13] but whoever from greater charity has suffered more for him, lived more in hardship, and profited his bride more, will be more acceptable to him.

¶4 309.8–310.13
310.1 *How ecclesiastical rule grew up.*
310.14 *St. Thomas died to maintain the right of rebuking kings and enforcing discipline in the clergy.*

[309] Ex istis potest speculator perpendere quomodo perversa est elemosinancium intencio, et per consequens religio Christiana, nam ubi donata sunt clero temporalia non ut civiliter dominentur, sed ut ecclesiastica elemosina serviliter dispensetur; non ut proprietarie splendidi vel seculariter conversetur; sed ut sine personarum accepcione, postposito affectu carnis et sanguinis, elemosina divitum magis egentibus ministretur; non ut clerus deses in spirituali servicio contendat seculariter pro primatu, sed ut vigilancius ex maiori beneficio intendat humilius quomodo se et suos subditos liberet a reatu. Sed iudicet considerans statum seculi, que istarum parcium est pocior hiis diebus; nam ad tantum invaluit oleum peccatoris quod, ubi dicerentur christiani ex oleo gracie et humili imitacione regis justicie, iam nimis multi sunt Antichristi ex diffusione olei regis superbie ad cuius probacionem a nominetenus sanctuario Christi incipite. Nonne vendicat antipapa, vicarius Luciferi, quod debet super omnes imperatores, reges et principes seculariter dominari, et ob reverenciam ordinis sibi debet undique secundum modum seculi magis splendide ministrari; et ad hoc intorquet scripturam sacram et dicta sanctorum. Et idem vendicant multi eius discipuli, verecundantes vocari subditorum elemosinarii [310] sive servi, sed conversando excessive seculariter introducunt se dominos reciproce nominari. Nam in primitiva ecclesia dixerunt se regulariter esse servos, tempore vero Augustini propter dominacionem insolencium destruendo vicia vocati sunt domini. Sed hodie plane nituntur omissione et commissione in conversacione ostendere quod

From these things the watchman can weigh how perverted is the intention of the almsgivers, and consequently the Christian religion. For whereas temporal goods were given to the clergy not that they should exercise civil lordship, but that the church's alms should be dispensed in the manner of a servant; not that they should be splendid as proprietors or live in secular fashion, but that, without respect of persons, the affection of flesh and blood set aside, the alms of the rich should be ministered to the more needy; not that the clergy, slothful in spiritual service, should contend in secular fashion for primacy, but that, the more watchfully because of the greater benefice, it should attend the more humbly to how it may free itself and its subjects from guilt[14] — but let him who considers the state of the world judge which of these sides is the stronger in these days. For the oil of the sinner has so prevailed that, where men would be called Christians from the oil of grace and humble imitation of the king of justice, now very many are Antichrists from the spreading of the oil of the king of pride;[15] for the proof of which, "begin ye at" the sanctuary of Christ that is so in name only.[16] Does not the antipope, the vicar of Lucifer,[17] claim that he ought to lord it in secular fashion over all emperors, kings and princes, and that out of reverence for his order he ought everywhere to be served more splendidly after the manner of the world? And to this end he twists holy scripture and the sayings of the saints. And many of his disciples claim the same, ashamed to be called almsmen [310] or servants of their subjects; but by living

pretendunt se esse dominos seculares; quod cum repugnat legi Dei et ordini, patet quanta monstruositas foret ex heresi circa fidem scripture sacre in ecclesiam introducta. Corrigendi ergo sunt blasphemi qui denigrant (quantum in eis est) causam Christi martirii, scilicet quod mortuus est pro dominacione seculari suis clericis adquirenda.

excessively in secular fashion they bring it about that they are named lords in turn. For in the primitive church they called themselves, as a rule, servants; but in the time of Augustine, on account of the exercise of lordship in destroying the vices of the insolent, they were called lords.[18] But today they plainly strive, by omission and commission in their manner of life, to show that they claim to be secular lords; and since this is repugnant to God's law and order, it is clear how great a monstrosity would be brought into the church from heresy about the faith of holy scripture. Therefore the blasphemers are to be corrected who blacken (as far as in them lies) the cause of Christ's martyrdom, namely [by saying] that he died to acquire secular lordship for his clerics.

¶5 310.14–310.29

[310]Et sic fingunt ingrati quod sanctus Thomas Cantuariensis obiit pro dominacione seculari ablata clero Anglie restituenda et dominacione civili habita confirmanda. Christus enim econtra mortuus est pro salvacione humani generis et ad docendum suos discipulos et specialiter clerum secularia desideria abnegare (ut dicit Apostolus ad Titum II°). Et sanctus Thomas mortuus est ad constanter corripiendum reges et dominos, ne precipitent clerum in officio seculari nec impediant quominus corripiatur a suo episcopo, et per consequens ad docendum episcopos nostre provincie ne ab ista correpcione, et per consequens a defensione privilegiorum et iuris ecclesie timore servili de amissione temporalium retrahantur. Et utinam sacerdotes superiores nostri regni addiscerent intellectu et affectu istam geminam leccionem.

And so men displeasing [to God] pretend that Saint Thomas of Canterbury died to restore the secular lordship taken from the clergy of England and to confirm the civil lordship it had.[19] For Christ, on the contrary, died for the salvation of the human race and to teach his disciples, and especially the clergy, to deny worldly desires (as the Apostle says to Titus, chapter 2).[20] And Saint Thomas died to rebuke kings and lords steadfastly, lest they cast the clergy headlong into secular office or hinder its being corrected by its bishop; and consequently to teach the bishops of our province not to be drawn back from this correction, and consequently from the defence of the privileges and right of the church, by servile fear of losing temporal goods.[21] And would that the higher priests of our kingdom would learn, with understanding and affection, this twofold lesson.

Notes

1. ***Lex privata***: a privilege is etymologically a "private law" (***privata lex***), the definition Wyclif invokes. ***Sibi*** is the clergy.
2. The minor of the argument at 305.11–13: Christ did not suffer for the civil endowment of his clergy.
3. 2 Cor. 1:18–19 (DR "was not, It is, and It is not"); Wyclif's words are closest to v. 19, ***non fuit est et non***.
4. ***Cum paribus***, "other things being equal" (as ***ceteris paribus***); so again at 307.8, ***cum istis paribus***. ***Post clericatum***: after they took clerical status.
5. ***Nolicio***, the act of not-willing (scholastic ***nolitio***). Matt. 10:9 (***nolite possidere aurum neque argentum***); 1 John 2:15; Luke 14:27, 33; Matt. 10:38, as Wyclif's references allow.
6. The hypothesis: that Christ, having taught a propertyless life, secretly meant his later clergy to hold civil lordship.
7. A and A_1 omit ***non*** (307.30), which would reverse the sense; the print is translated.
8. The editor refers to p. 296 ff. (308.8 foot), in chapter 13.
9. ***Meritum proficiendo***: "by making merit profitable", i.e. by binding himself to reward merit. ***Per impossibile***: an impossible supposition, made for the argument.
10. Matt. 10:9–10, the mission charge.
11. Eph. 4:7 (DR "according to the measure of the giving of Christ"). ***Fideles dispensatores*** recalls 1 Cor. 4:1–2.
12. ***Isti maxime religioni***: the religion of Christ, "greatest" of religions; possibly "added to this religion above all". The modern rites are the orders' rules.
13. Rom. 2:11.
14. The sentence beginning ***nam ubi*** has no main clause of its own; it breaks off and Wyclif resumes with ***Sed iudicet***. ***Proprietarie splendidi vel seculariter conversetur*** mixes plural and singular (the clergy); the sense is clear. ***Ex maiori beneficio***: the greater the benefice, the greater the duty.

15. Ps. 140:5, *oleum autem peccatoris non inpinguet caput meum* (DR "let not the oil of the sinner fatten my head"); the play is on *christiani* and the oil of anointing (chrism).
16. Ezek. 9:6, *a sanctuario meo incipite* (DR "begin ye at my sanctuary").
17. The editor identifies the antipope as Robert of Geneva, Clement VII (309.26 foot), elected September 1378.
18. *Propter dominacionem insolencium destruendo vicia*: probably "on account of [their] lordship over the insolent, in destroying vices"; the genitive may also go with *vicia*. *Regulariter*, "as a rule", not "as regulars".
19. *Ingrati* stands without a dative; the glossary's sense "displeasing [to God]" is taken. "The ungrateful" is possible. A notes *Ficcio* in the margin at 310.14.
20. Titus 2:12 (DR "denying ungodliness and worldly desires").
21. Thomas Becket (d. 1170), who resisted Henry II over the trial of criminous clerks. *Nostre provincie*: the province of Canterbury.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 306: *privilegii*
  - 307: *ergo*
  - 307: *nimis*
  - 309: *et* (15 is the line number)
  - 309: *Nonne* (172c folio mark)
  - 310: *Nam*
  - 310: *Can-* (Can-/tuariensis; main token holds first half)
  - 310: *tuariensis* (second half of Can-/tuariensis)
  - 310: *obiit*
  - 310: *II°*
  - 307: *excellenciam* (excel- / lenciam on next line; main token holds whole word)
  - 309: *isti* (alinea G and 172b folio mark glued)
  - 308: *X°,* (line-final; next line starts nec, no verse) [-VERSE]

Part 4: Objections: the patrimony of the crucified and the two swords

Loserth pp. 310.30–314.27

¶1 310.30–312.13

310.30 *Objection: All things belong to Christ and he has given all to his vicars.*

311.1 *Answer: It is true that the righteous have all things, but to use them in Christ's service.*

311.26 *Objection: 1. All things are Christ's,*

312.7 *therefore his chief followers have a special right to possession.*

312.14 *Answer: This also is true;*

[310]Sed contra dicta arguitur per hoc quod omnia bona mundi sunt patrimonium crucifixi, sed totum suum patrimonium concessit Petro et eius vicariis: ergo illorum sunt omnia bona mundi, licet ergo eis super suo patrimonio dominari. [311]Hic concedenda est conclusio (ut alias diffuse exposui), nam iusti sunt omnia iure poli (ut docet Apostolus, Romanorum VIII°, et Augustinus, epistola XXXVII^{a}, ad Macedonium). Unde clerici debent sequi patrem suum abiciendo dominacionem civilem, dominando pure evangelice ex titulo caritatis. Hoc enim habent exemplatum a Christo et aliud usurpant a cesare; quod si plus appreciantur imitari cesarem quam Christum, quis dubitat quin ex degeneracione perdunt utrumque? Potest ergo clerus habere quotlibet bona ex titulo elemosine ad supplendum suum officium et distribuendum pauperibus, et in hoc imitarentur Christum et eius apostolos, non autem in dominando civiliter, cum hoc foret oppositum in adiecto, et secundum istam racionem foret eis patrimonium crucifixi. Unde consideraremus ne blaspheme nominemus occupacionem bonorum Christi abutendo eis heretice (ut dictum est in fine proximi capituli) vel ne nominemus divicias secundum illam racionem patrimonium crucifixi. Si, inquam,

But against what has been said it is argued by appeal to this, that all the goods of the world are the patrimony of the crucified; now he granted his whole patrimony to Peter and his vicars; therefore all the goods of the world are theirs; therefore it is lawful for them to exercise lordship over their patrimony.[1] [311]To this the conclusion is to be granted (as I have set out at length elsewhere), for to the just all things belong by the law of heaven (as the Apostle teaches, Romans 8, and Augustine, Epistle 37 to Macedonius).[2] Hence clerics ought to follow their father by casting off civil lordship, exercising lordship purely in the manner of the gospel by title of charity. For this they have as exemplified by Christ, and the other they usurp from Caesar; and if they value imitating Caesar more than Christ, who doubts that by degeneracy they lose both? The clergy therefore can have any amount of goods by title of alms, to supply their office and to distribute to the poor, and in this they would imitate Christ and his apostles; but not in exercising civil lordship, since this would be a contradiction in the adjunct;[3] and on this ground it would be for them the patrimony of the crucified.[4] Hence we should take care lest we

sit patrimonium crucifixi, faciamus ut utendo eis ad similitudinem crucifixi imperciamur ea fideliter membris pauperibus crucifixi, ut demum participemus merito crucifixi, unde abusus noster foret maxime revocabilis considerando attente de nomine patrimonii crucifixi. Contra ista arguo, primo quod omnia bona ecclesie, sive in laicis sive in clero, sunt de patrimonio crucifixi, ipse enim est heres habens in capite omnia bona mundi, et nos titulo adopcionis filialis participamus [312]eorum. Nam Psalmo VIII°, 8, de illo dicitur: Omnia subiecisti sub pedibus eius, et Luce X°, 22, dicit iste primogenitus ex multis fratribus: Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo, et Psalmo II° alloquitur pater eum: Postula a me et dabo tibi gentes hereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terre. Ex istis sic arguo: Nemo vere possidet quicquam in terra nisi vel Christus vel eius filius, sed quicquid talis possederit, est patrimonium crucifixi, ergo nemo de iure quidquam possidet nisi titulo patrimonii crucifixi, et per consequens superiores filii, cuiusmodi sunt clerici et specialiter eius vicarii, prius et excellencius debent possidere de eius patrimonio quam alii seculares.

blasphemously give that name to the occupation of Christ's goods while abusing them heretically (as was said at the end of the preceding chapter),[5] or lest we call riches on that ground the patrimony of the crucified. If, I say, it is the patrimony of the crucified, let us so act that, using these things after the likeness of the crucified, we faithfully impart them to the poor members of the crucified, so that at last we may share in the merit of the crucified; hence our abuse would be most readily recalled by considering attentively the name "patrimony of the crucified". Against this I argue, first, that all the goods of the church, whether among the laity or among the clergy, are of the patrimony of the crucified; for he is the heir holding in chief all the goods of the world,[6] and we by title of filial adoption share [312]in them. For in Psalm 8:8 it is said of him: "Thou hast subjected all things under his feet"; and in Luke 10:22 this "Firstborn amongst many brethren" says: "All things are delivered to me by my Father"; and in Psalm 2 the Father addresses him: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession."[7] From these I argue thus: no one truly possesses anything on earth except either Christ or his son; now whatever such a one has possessed is the patrimony of the crucified; therefore no one by right possesses anything except by title of the patrimony of the crucified;[8] and consequently the superior sons, of which kind are clerics and especially his vicars, ought to possess of his patrimony earlier and more excellently than other seculars.

¶2 312.14–312.33

[312]Hic dicitur quod utraque conclusio est concedenda. Nam iure altissimo habet ipse tam secundum deitatem quam secundum humanitatem omnia bona mundi, et secundum derivacionem ab ipso fonte iusticie, secundum gradus dignitatum participant alii bonis suis, in tantum quod si ipse non fuisset incarnatus, non fuisset in toto genere humano lapso simpliciter iusta possessio, sic quod omnes patres veteris testamenti quibus Deus disposuit regnum, sive gentiles ut Job, Nabuchodonosor et similes, sive Hebrei tempore utriusque legis, omnes, inquam, receperunt possessiones iure Christi; qui passione sua rectificavit titulos omnium membrorum suorum, ymmo quodammodo profuit toti mundo, cum omnes dampnati, omnia inanimata, et breviter tota universitas creata recipit quandam perfeccionem secundam ex vita Christi, cum totus mundus secundum quamlibet partem sui racione meriti Christi perfeccius servit Deo, cum aliter mundus foret colobon, et partes inordinate forent perpetuo sibi ipsis contrarie.

To this the answer is that each conclusion is to be granted. For by the highest right he has, according to his Godhead as well as according to his humanity, all the goods of the world; and by derivation from him as the very fount of justice, others share in his goods according to the grades of their dignities; so much so that, if he had not become incarnate, there would not have been in the whole fallen human race any just possession without qualification; so that all the fathers of the old testament to whom God appointed a kingdom, whether gentiles like Job, Nebuchadnezzar and the like, or Hebrews in the time of either law, all, I say, received their possessions by Christ's right.[9] For by his passion he set right the titles of all his members; indeed in a way he profited the whole world, since all the damned, all inanimate things, and in short the whole created universe receive a certain second perfection from the life of Christ, since the whole world in every part of it serves God more perfectly by reason of

¶3 313.1–314.9
313.4 *but that special possession binds them all the more to use and not to abuse.*
313.30 *Objection: 2. Christ was both king and priest, so the Popes should be the same.*
314.10 *Answer: Christ had rights which he did not give to Peter.*

[313]**Ideo creditur probabiliter quod Christus necessitatus fuit lapsu supposito ad suam fabricam reparandam. Ideo dicit Luce ultimo quod oportuit Christum pati. Omnes ergo domini seculares et breviter omnia membra ecclesie titulo illius domini utuntur patrimonio crucifixi, et ideo oportet quod omnes eius filii, tam clerici quam laici, caveant de abusu. Et ita concedendum est quod clerici et specialiter Christi vicarii habeant prius et perfeccius patrimonium crucifixi; sed tunc oportet quod imitentur modum suum habendi et utendi quantum sufficiunt. Ipse enim habuit hec in via puro titulo gracie et humane elemosine et precise sub illa mensura sub qua fuit exproprietarie necessarium ad edificacionem ecclesie et medium ad supportandum ministerium spirituale, et idem genus modi habendi reliquit appropriate clericis sortis sue, ut patet XII, q. Iª, Clericus. Iste autem est modus habendi perfeccior, quia a modo mundano distraccior et modo habendi beatorum similior. Quando enim triumphantes vitam eternam possidebunt, Deus eos constituit super omnia bona sua, et tunc non habebunt usum vescendi vel corporalem imperfectum ut modo, sed usum spiritualem per intencionem in verbo, et de quanto viator ceteris paribus plus ad talem usum accesserit, de tanto perfeccius procedit; quod faciunt hii qui plus laborant ad edificacionem ecclesie et stricte, humiliter et immundialiter accipiunt graciam necessitatis nature, quantum requiritur pro hoc fine. Sed secundo obicitur per hoc quod Christus fuit simul rex et sacerdos humanitus, sed omne privilegium quod habuit humanitus concessit Petro et eius vicariis, ergo ipsi debent esse simul reges et sacerdotes,** [314]**habentes utrumque gladium. Sic enim legitur apostolos habuisse tempore capcionis Christi duos gladios, et Petro precepit Christus quod poneret gladium suum in vaginam. Ex quo verbo innuitur quod ecclesia Christi et navicula Petri debent habere utrumque gladium, ut notat beatus Bernardus et quotlibet iura canonica cum concordanciis doctorum. Et hoc videtur beatum Petrum innuere Ia Petri IIº, 9, quando dicit: Vos estis genus electum, regale sacerdocium etc.**

Christ's merit; for otherwise the world would be maimed, and its parts, disordered, would be perpetually at odds with themselves.[10]

Therefore it is believed with probability that Christ was necessitated, the fall being supposed, to repair his workmanship. Therefore he says in the last [chapter] of Luke that "it behoved Christ to suffer".[11] All secular lords, therefore, and in short all the members of the church use the patrimony of the crucified by title of that lord; and therefore all his sons, clerics as well as laymen, must beware of abuse. And so it must be granted that clerics, and especially Christ's vicars, have the patrimony of the crucified earlier and more perfectly; but then they must imitate his manner of having and using it, as far as they are able. For he had these things on the way by pure title of grace and of human alms, and precisely under that measure under which it was necessary, without property, for the building up of the church, and a means of supporting the spiritual ministry; and the same kind of manner of having he left as their own to the clerics of his lot, as is clear in [Decretum C.] 12 q. 1 [c.] *Clericus*.[12] And this is the more perfect manner of having, because it is further withdrawn from the worldly manner and more like the manner of having of the blessed. For when the triumphant shall possess eternal life, God has set them over all his goods,[13] and then they will not have the use of eating, or an imperfect bodily use as now, but a spiritual use through attention in the Word;[14] and the more a wayfarer, other things being equal, has approached such use, the more perfectly he proceeds; which those do who labour more for the building up of the church, and strictly, humbly and unworldly receive the favour that nature's necessity needs, as much as is required for this end. But secondly it is objected, by appeal to this, that Christ was at once king and priest humanly; now every privilege that he had humanly he granted to Peter and his vicars; therefore they ought to be at once kings and priests, [314]**having both swords. For so we read that the apostles had two swords at the time of Christ's arrest, and Christ commanded Peter to put his sword into its sheath.[15] From which word it is hinted that the church of Christ and the bark of Peter ought to have both swords, as blessed Bernard notes, and any number of canon laws with the concordances of the doctors.[16] And blessed Peter seems to hint this in 1 Peter 2:9, when he says: "You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood," etc.[17]**

¶4 314.10–314.21

[314]Hic respondeo concedendo maiorem, sed nego minorem tamquam summe hereticam. Christus enim habuit humanitus ius primogeniture nomine redemptoris humani generis et nomine capitis universalis ecclesie cum multis aliis singularibus privilegiis, que nec quanta potuit facere inesse Petro vel alicui vicario Christi formaliter, sicut Augustinus recitat super Joh., Omelia VI[a]. Verumtamen Augustinus recitat super Joh., Omelia V[a], Christus potuit communicasse Petro, Johanni vel alteri potestatem, ut christiani baptizarentur in nomine eorum, si sic voluisset, sed nec voluit nec docuit, quod implicat quod non sic potuit voluisse.

To this I reply by granting the major, but I deny the minor as supremely heretical. For Christ had humanly the right of primogeniture, in the name of redeemer of the human race and in the name of head of the universal church, with many other singular privileges, which, great as they were, he could not make to belong formally to Peter or to any vicar of Christ,[18] as Augustine relates on John, Homily 6. Yet, as Augustine relates on John, Homily 5, Christ could have communicated to Peter, John or another the power that Christians should be baptized in their name, if he had so willed; but he neither willed it nor taught it, which implies that he could not have so willed.[19]

¶5 314.22–314.27

[314]Sed ulterius concedo (ut sepe alias) quod nedum ecclesia sed clerus Christi habet utrumque gladium. Ecclesia quidem cum habeat duas partes, scilicet clerum et laycos, quarum prior pars habet gladium spiritualem in se formaliter et pars laycalis secundum principes seculi habet gladium corporalem in se formaliter.

But further I grant (as often elsewhere) that not only the church but the clergy of Christ has both swords. The church indeed [has both], since it has two parts, namely clergy and laity, of which the former part has the spiritual sword formally in itself, and the lay part, in the princes of the world, has the bodily sword formally in itself.[20]

Notes

1. A and A_1 read *obicitur* for *arguitur* (310.30); the sense is the same. A's margin: *Contra. Obieccio.*
2. Augustine, Ep. 153 to Macedonius (the editor, 311.4 foot: "Ep. CLIII in the modern editions"), which quotes Prov. 17:6 (LXX), "to the faithful man belongs the whole world of riches". Wyclif's Romans 8 is most likely 8:32, *cum illo omnia nobis donavit*, which he quotes at 306.10.
3. *Oppositum in adiecto*: a contradiction between a term and what is added to it ("civil lordship" joined to "imitating Christ").
4. *Secundum istam racionem*: "on this ground", i.e. goods held by title of alms for office and the poor are rightly called the patrimony of the crucified.
5. The editor refers to p. 297 (311.18 foot), the end of chapter 13. *Nominemus occupacionem*: lest we give the name "patrimony of the crucified" to mere occupation of Christ's goods.
6. *In capite*: feudal "in chief", the tenure of a tenant holding directly of the lord (cf. *capitalis dominus*, the glossary). B reads *finalis* for *filialis* (311.29).
7. Ps. 8:8; Luke 10:22; Rom. 8:29 ("Firstborn amongst many brethren"); Ps. 2:8 (all Vulgate; DR wording).
8. A and A_1 omit *ergo ... crucifixi* (312.9), an eye-skip between two *crucifixi*; the print's fuller text is translated.
9. *Inquam* is Loserth's emendation; the manuscripts read *omnes in quantum* (312.24 foot). *Utriusque legis*: probably the law of nature and the law of Moses.
10. *Colobon* (312.32) is the manuscripts' form; Loserth notes that *colobos*, "truncated", is right. Rendered "maimed". A reads *et vita* for *ex vita* (312.29).
11. Luke 24:46 (DR "it behoved Christ to suffer"; cf. 24:26).
12. Decretum, C. 12 q. 1 c. 5 *Clericus* (the editor, 313.17 foot: "Decret. II pars, causa XII, q. I, c. V"; the modern form is ours). *Sortis sue*: "of his lot", the play on *clerus*, Greek *kleros*. *Appropriate* is adverbial: as proper to them.
13. The print reads *constituit*, "has set"; A and A_1 read *constituet*, "will set" (313.21), the words of Matt. 24:47 (DR "he shall place him over all his goods"). The print is translated; the future gives the more natural sense.
14. *Per intencionem in verbo*: the beatific use of goods by attending to them in the divine Word, not by consuming them.
15. Luke 22:38 (the two swords); John 18:11 (DR "Put up thy sword into the scabbard").
16. Bernard, *De consideratione* IV.3.7, on the two swords (PL 182:776); the canon law is above all Boniface VIII's *Unam sanctam* (*Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1; Friedberg II, 1245–46), which has both of Wyclif's texts, *Ecce gladii duo hic* and *Converte gladium tuum in vaginam*. Neither is referenced by the editor here.
17. 1 Pet. 2:9, without the Vulgate's *autem* (DR "But you are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood").
18. *Que nec quanta potuit facere inesse*: the print, which does not construe cleanly. Rendered as if *quanta* agreed with *que* ("great as they were"); *quantum*, "however much he could", would give "which, however great his power, he could not make ...". B omits *ius* (314.12).
19. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 5.7, 9, 11 (PL 35, 1417–19; the editor, 314.18 foot: "Aug. In Joh. Ev. cap. I, tract. V, Opp. tom. III, pars II, p. 323"); the reference to *Omelia VI[a]* is Wyclif's and is not identified. *Verumtamen Augustinus recitat ... Omelia V[a]* repeats the formula of the clause before (both are printed, 314.16–18). *Potuit voluisse*: "could not have willed it", given his will and teaching.

20. The sentence has no main verb: ***Ecclesia quidem cum habeat ...*** is followed only by the relative clauses. "[Has both]" is supplied from the sentence before (our supplement). ***Secundum principes seculi***: the lay part bears the sword in, or by way of, its princes.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 310: ***vicariis***
  - 311: ***a*** (print has 'usurpant a' at line end before cesare; main lacks this a)
  - 311: ***arguo***
  - 312: ***II°***
  - 312: ***Christus***
  - 313: ***patrimonio*** [NW]
  - 313: ***filii***
  - 313: ***Iª***
  - 313: ***vicariis***
  - 314: ***II°***
  - 314: ***nego***
  - 314: ***VIª***
  - 314: ***Vª***
  - 311: ***VIII°,*** [-VERSE]

Part 5: The two swords, and the clergy's civil lordship not founded in scripture

Loserth pp. 314.28–318.26

¶1 314.28–316.10

315.7 *The spiritual sword is formally committed to the priest,*

315.18 *with an indirect control of the secular sword, which is in the hands of the laity.*

315.26 *The powers which were in Christ the vine are divided between the branches.*

316.11 *If it is asked where in Scripture rule is forbidden to the clergy, we reply by asking where it is allowed.*

[314]**Intelligo autem per utrumque gladium ad sensum misticum potenciam castigandi, priorem potenciam** [315]**castigandi spiritualiter tam filios ecclesie quam eciam inimicos, et secundum gladium potestatem corporaliter cohercendi. Et cum iste due partes ecclesie sicut omnia eius membra in omnibus que habent communicant, patet quod utraque istarum parcium habet modo suo utrumque gladium, modo quo loquitur Apostolus II Corinthiorum II°, 3: Meum gaudium omnium vestrum est. Sacerdos itaque habet gladium spiritualem in se formaliter et sue iurisdiccioni subiectum, ut regulet eius usum. Sed ad hoc requiritur noticia utriusque testamenti, ut sciat docere quomodo et qualiter est ille gladius exercendus; aliter enim non daret Deus gladium illum in manus ydiote, frenetici sive litargici, qui non sciat uti ipso, ad defensionem ecclesie secundum regulas pugnandi quas Christus instituit, sed omnino ad dampnum vel perturbacionem ecclesie. Habet ergo secularis gladium temporalem in se subiective ad illud officium exequendum; sacerdos autem habet, si sciverit, illum gladium obiective ad eius officium regulandum, et sic utraque pars ecclesie comparticipat fructu gladii utriusque. Christus autem fuit simul rex et sacerdos, habens in se subiective utrumque gladium, modo quo impossibile fuit ut Petro vel eius vicario communicetur, eo quod principium generis et exemplar oportet esse perfectius, habens simplicius omnes raciones tocius generis christiani. Unde oportet quod post illud caput sive principium tocius christiani generis sint**

And by each sword, in the mystical sense, I understand a power of chastising: by the first, the power of chastising [315]**spiritually both the sons of the church and its enemies too, and by the second sword the power of coercing bodily. And since these two parts of the church, like all its members, share in everything they have, it is clear that each of these parts has both swords in its own manner, in the manner in which the Apostle speaks, 2 Corinthians 2:3: "My joy is the joy of you all." The priest, then, has the spiritual sword in himself formally, and subject to his jurisdiction, so that he may regulate its use.[1] But for this a knowledge of both testaments is required, so that he may know how to teach how and in what manner that sword is to be exercised; for otherwise God would not be giving that sword into the hands of an unlettered man, a frenzied or a lethargic man, who does not know how to use it, for the defence of the church according to the rules of fighting which Christ instituted, but wholly to the harm or disturbance of the church.[2] A secular, therefore, has the temporal sword in himself subjectively, for carrying out that office; but the priest has that sword, if he has the knowledge, objectively, for regulating its office; and so each part of the church shares in the fruit of both swords.[3] But Christ was at once king and priest, having both swords in himself subjectively, in a manner in which it was impossible that [it] be communicated to Peter or to his vicar, because the principle and exemplar**

duo rami disparis vicarie, scilicet laicorum et clericorum; et in illis ramis fundatis in eadem vite sunt quoad subiectacionem impermixte due maneries potestatum. Nec sufficit aliquis Christi vicarius sine peccato plene exercere unam illarum potestatum; multo magis ipsis confuse commixtis. Unde ad figurandum [316] illas potestates precipit Christus gladios eius virtutibus et diffinivit sufficienciam in duobus. Et (ut notat beatus Bernardus ad papam Eugenium) per hoc quod precipit Petro ponere gladium in vaginam, prohibuit clero in persona vel causa sua execucionem gladii corporalis. Christus autem servans inseparabiliter summum gradum innocencie, scivit sine defectu vel confusione utrumque gladium regulare et utriusque status honores accipere (ut alias explanavi), nec potuit cum istis statibus civiliter dominari.

of a kind must be more perfect, holding more simply all the aspects of the whole Christian kind. Hence after that head or principle of the whole Christian kind there must be two branches of disparate vicarship, namely of the laity and of the clergy; and in those branches, founded in the same vine, there are two sorts of powers, unmixed as to the subject [that bears them].[4] Nor is any vicar of Christ sufficient to exercise one of those powers fully without sin; much more so with them mixed together in confusion. Hence, to figure [316] those powers, Christ commanded swords for its powers, and defined their sufficiency as two.[5] And (as blessed Bernard notes to Pope Eugenius), by commanding Peter to put up the sword into the scabbard, he forbade the clergy the execution of the bodily sword in their own person or cause.[6] But Christ, keeping inseparably the highest degree of innocence, knew how to regulate both swords without defect or confusion and to receive the honours of both estates (as I have explained elsewhere); and he could not, with these estates, exercise lordship civilly.[7]

¶2 316.11–316.29

[316] Et si queratur ubi scriptura prohibet clerum civi- liter dominari, interrogo sic querentem unam aliam questionem: Cum omne privilegium ecclesie sit fundabile in scriptura, ubi in scriptura fundatur clero potestas vel utilitas taliter dominandi? Nam secundum Augustinum, II° De Doctrina Christiana, in fine: Si aliquid utile est, ibi invenitur; sed nulla talis cleri dominacio ibi invenitur, ergo nulla talis cleri dominacio est utilis. Maior istius racionis est assercio archidoctoris Augustini qui multum horrebat mendacium; que maior vel est necessaria vel summe heretica, quod non dicetur ob reverenciam tanti sancti. Et pro minori huius argumenti est plana induccio per singulas partes alterius testamenti; vel si non sit plana induccio, dicat falsigraphus ubi fundatur clero Christi taliter dominativa possessio. Nam tam necessarium et tam notabile privilegium foret ab auctore scripture et capite ecclesie alicubi expressatum. Sed ego non reperi, nisi dicatur yronice vel per antifrasim quod

And if it is asked where scripture forbids the clergy to exercise lordship civilly, I ask the one so asking another question: since every privilege of the church can be founded in scripture, where in scripture is the power or the usefulness of exercising lordship in this way founded for the clergy? For according to Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* 2, at the end: "If anything is useful, it is found there";[8] now no such exercise of lordship by the clergy is found there; therefore no such exercise of lordship by the clergy is useful. The major of this argument is the assertion of the arch-doctor Augustine, who greatly abhorred a lie; and this major is either necessary or supremely heretical, which will not be said out of reverence for so great a saint. And for the minor of this argument there is a plain induction through the several parts of either testament; or, if the induction is not plain, let the false writer say where possession that lords it in this way is founded for the clergy of Christ.[9] For so necessary and so notable a privilege would have been expressed somewhere by the author of scripture and head of the church. But I have not found it, unless it be said ironically or by antiphrasis that[10]

¶3 317.1–318.3
317.2 *Three texts that might do if they could be taken ironically.*
317.27 *Opinion of Henry de Gandano.*
318.4 *who was very mild in his expressions,*

[317] in hiis tribus locis fundatur dominacio civilis clericorum. Primo in illo Luce XXII°, 25, 26: Reges gencium dominantur eorum, vos autem non sic; ubi notum est quod Christus approbavit dominacionem secularem regum gentilium, ut patet de Job, de Nabuchodonosor et de aliis regibus tam preteritis quam futuris. Sed

the civil exercise of lordship of the clergy is founded in these three places. First, in that of Luke 22:25–26: "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them ... but you not so"; where it is known that Christ approved the secular exercise of lordship of the gentile kings, as is clear of Job, of Nebuchadnezzar, and of other kings both past and future. But according

iuxta beatum Bernardum interdixit eam suis apostolis. Secundus locus scripture in quo taliter fundaretur seculare dominium clericorum foret preceptum Christi Matthei X°, 9: Nolite possidere aurum neque argentum; iuxta quod locutus est Petrus ceco, ut legitur Actorum III, 6°, dicens: Argentum et aurum non est mihi, quod autem habeo hoc tibi do. Et hinc tradit pro regula, V° capitulo sue prime epistole, quod non simus dominantes in clero sed forma facti gregis ad deserendum mundum et eius concupiscencias, non coacte et invite, sed sponte et ex animo. Tercius locus scripture est dictum Apostoli, Iª Tim. VI°, 8, dicentis: Habentes ergo alimenta et quibus tegamur, hiis contenti simus. Ille autem non est contentus alimento et tegumento qui ultra hec exigit nedum temporalium superaffluenciam ad ministrandum sed ad dominandum, nec solum clericaliter sed seculariter. Unde contendimus instancius circa iurisdiccionem et secularem dominacionem tamquam nobis privilegium requisitum, quod tangit Doctor Solempnis, VI° quolibeto q. XXIIIª, sed cum formidine; quod, inquit, ecclesiastici temporalium habeant jurisdiccionem forte non multum expedit et erat forte venenum [318] quod legitur cecidisse in ecclesia Dei tempore Constantini qui in iurisdiccione sua dotavit ecclesiam, sed non assero.

to blessed Bernard he forbade it to his apostles.[11] The second place of scripture in which the secular lordship of the clergy would be founded in this way would be Christ's command, Matthew 10:9: "Do not possess gold, nor silver"; in keeping with which Peter spoke to the blind man, as we read in Acts 3:6, saying: "Silver and gold I have none; but what I have, I give thee."[12] And hence he gives as a rule, in the fifth chapter of his first epistle, that we should not be lording it over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock for forsaking the world and its desires, not by constraint and unwillingly, but willingly and from the heart.[13] The third place of scripture is the saying of the Apostle, 1 Timothy 6:8: "Having therefore food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content."[14] Now he is not content with food and covering who beyond these demands a superabundance of temporal goods not only for ministering but for lording it, and not only in clerical fashion but in secular fashion. Hence we contend more insistently about jurisdiction and the secular exercise of lordship as a privilege required for us, a point the Solemn Doctor touches on, *Quodlibet* 6, q. 23, but with misgiving: "That the clergy," he says, "should have jurisdiction over temporal goods is perhaps not very expedient, and it was perhaps the poison [318] which we read fell into the church of God in the time of Constantine, who endowed the church in his jurisdiction; but I do not assert it."[15][16][17]

¶4 318.4–318.26

[318] Iste autem doctor reprobatus fuit acute, quia tractavit de potestate pape, ideo innuit cum formidine quod debuit constanter asserere, ut docet Hugo de Sancto Victore, libro II° De Sacramentis, parte II°, capitulis III° et VII°. Nam quod amplius est quam liber usus fructus in clero, vergens ad ritum mundanum, malum est, quia sacerdotalis officii tardativum. Cum ergo in istis locis scripture non fundatur clero civilitas sed plane contrarium, nec est scriptura sibi ipsi contraria, utinam illud dominium esset suspensum a clero, quousque in scriptura sacra eius invenerit fundamentum, et vellem si Deo placeret quod nullus sacerdos haberet primatum vel privilegium ecclesie quousque cartam illius invenerit in scriptura. Cum enim nemo debet privilegium appetere nisi sibi utile, et secundum Augustinum si utile est, ibi invenitur, videtur quod ad clericum privilegiandum pertinet quod cartam tam autenticam inveniat in scriptura; tunc enim laboraremus circa eius noticiam, niteremurve in deposicione sic nobis adversaria ex deformitate vite nostre ad cartam illam. Et tercio non acceptaremus tantum onus nisi quasi nolentes ad magnam instanciam populi pro spirituali suffragio nos urgentis.

And this doctor had been sharply rebuked because he treated of the pope's power; therefore he hinted with misgiving what he ought to have asserted steadfastly, as Hugh of St Victor teaches, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 2, chapters 3 and 7.[18] For whatever in the clergy is more than the free use of the fruits, tending to a worldly rite, is evil, because it is a hindrance to the priestly office.[19] Since therefore in these places of scripture civil standing is not founded for the clergy, but plainly the contrary, and scripture is not contrary to itself, would that that lordship were suspended from the clergy until it has found its foundation in holy scripture; and I would wish, if it pleased God, that no priest should have a primacy or privilege of the church until he has found its charter in scripture.[20] For since no one ought to desire a privilege unless it is useful to him, and according to Augustine, "if it is useful, it is found there", it seems that it belongs to the cleric who is to be privileged that he find so authentic a charter in scripture; for then we would labour over the knowledge of it, or we would strive at a laying aside, so adverse to us from the deformity of our life, [answering] to that charter.[21] And thirdly, we

would not accept so great a burden except as though unwilling, at the great urging of the people pressing us for spiritual aid.[22]

Notes

1. As printed, both members describe the spiritual sword: the priest has it "in himself formally" and "subject to his jurisdiction". What follows (the priest has "that sword", the temporal one, objectively, to regulate the secular's office) and the side-note at 315.18 suggest that the second member meant the temporal sword; the plate shows no word lost at 315.7–8. Translated as printed.
2. *Ydiota* is the unlettered man, not the fool. The *enim* clause argues from the contrary: given to one without knowledge of the testaments, the sword would serve not the defence of the church but its harm.
3. *Subiective*: as the subject that bears the power; *obiective*: as the object of the priest's knowledge and direction. *Secularis* is here the layman, the lay part of the church against the clergy.
4. *Genus* is both the logical genus (a principle "more perfect" than the kind it heads) and the Christian people; "kind" keeps both. *Quoad subiectacionem*: as to the subject in which each power inheres. *Confuse commixtis* just after is "mixed together in confusion", not the cognitive *confusus* of the glossary.
5. 316.1: the print *precipit Christus gladios eius virtutibus* hardly construes. A reads *gladios eius*; A_1 *gladios virtutibus*; B *gladios enis* (sic) *virtutibus*. Luke 22:36–38 (the command to buy a sword; "Lord, behold, here are two swords. ... It is enough") is plainly in view, and *eius* may stand for *emi* ("commanded swords to be bought"), but no witness has it and the emendation is not adopted.
6. Bernard, *De consideratione* IV, the editor's reference (316.3 foot: Opp. p. 1036); in the modern form *De consid.* 4.3.7, ours. The command is John 18:11, "Put up thy sword into the scabbard."
7. *Nec potuit*: even holding both estates without confusion, Christ could not exercise civil lordship. B's margin at 314.14 asks the question this answers: if Christ had power to coerce bodily by reason of his regality, why is civil lordship denied to him?
8. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 2.42.63, the editor's reference (316.15 foot, read as "cap. XLII ... 63"); modern form ours.
9. *Alterius testamenti* may be "of either testament" (each in turn) or "of the other testament" (the New, against the Old); the induction is the same either way.
10. The editor's paragraph ends here mid-sentence; the clause runs on at 317.1.
11. DR Luke 22:25–26, the intervening words left out by Wyclif. Bernard's ruling that lordship is forbidden to the apostles is *De consideratione* II.6.10–11 (PL 182; *Planum est: apostolis interdicitur dominatus*).
12. In Acts 3:2 the man is lame (*claudus*), not blind; the print has *ceco*, and the apparatus records no variant.
13. 1 Pet. 5:2–3, paraphrased; the Vulgate has *neque ut dominantes in cleris, sed forma facti gregis ex animo* and *non coacte, sed spontanee*. Wyclif adds "for forsaking the world and its desires". A reads *sub forma*.
14. The Vulgate has *Habentes autem*; Wyclif's *ergo* is translated.
15. *Ecclesiastici* (CONTEXTUAL): here the clergy, who are to have jurisdiction over temporal goods. *In iurisdiccione sua* may mean "within his jurisdiction" or "with his jurisdiction", i.e. by granting it.
16. Henry of Ghent, *Quodlibet* 6 q. 23 (on papal grants of tithes from lay goods), quoted nearly word for word: *quod ecclesiastici temporalium habent iurisdictionem, forte non multum expedit; deerat forte venenum, quod legitur cecidisse in ecclesia Dei tempore Constantini* (ed. 1613, I, 170); the editor identifies the Solemn Doctor only (317.27 foot). The "poison" is the story of the voice heard in the air at Constantine's donation, told by Higden, *Polychronicon* IV.26: *Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei* (Rolls ed. V, 130), a chronicle Wyclif cites by name for it in *De potestate pape* c. 6. A and B note *Henricus de Gandano* in the margin; B adds *hereticus*, which the editor refers not to Henry but to John of Jandun.
17. *Sed non assero* (318.3), lost from the OCR text and restored from the plate: Henry hedges the poison story.
18. *Ut docet Hugo* hangs on what Henry "ought to have asserted steadfastly". Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II.2.3 and II.2.7, Wyclif's reference: chapter 3 sets clergy and laity as the church's two walls, chapter 7 how the church holds earthly things; the two powers themselves are chapter 4 (PL 176).
19. *Ritus* is any usage or observance, not only a liturgical rite; "rite" is kept for it throughout. *Liber usus fructus*: the free use of the fruits, against ownership.
20. *Civilitas*: civil standing, the condition of holding civil lordship. The subject of the first *invenerit* is the clergy.
21. 318.22–24 is hard to construe. Taken here: *in deposicione* (a laying aside, of our deformed life or of what the charter forbids), with *adversaria* agreeing with it ("so adverse to us"), and *ad cartam illam* "answering to that charter". *Adversaria* may instead be a neuter plural ("what is so adverse to us"); the plate shows the print as we have it.
22. *Instancia* here is urging, not an objection (*ad instanciam*, at someone's urging). *Suffragium* is "aid", not the church's suffrages.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 315: *cum*
  - 315: *gladium* (20 is the line number)
  - 315: *Christus*
  - 315: *generis*
  - 315: *vicarie*
  - 316: *Christus*

- **316: *interrogo***
- **316: *questionem*** **(English side-note words glued in other scans)**
- **316: *II°***
- **317: *I[a]***
- **317: *XXIII[a]***
- **318: ∅ ('very' is the English side-note; main already has Iste at 15)**
- **318: *II°***
- **318: *II°***
- **318: *III°***
- **318: *cecidisse***
- **318: *ecclesia***
- **315: *noticia*** **(glued margin mark dropped) [-MARK]**

Part 6: Objections from rites, from the endowment, and from Nicholas Putanensis

Loserth pp. 318.27–322.4

¶1 318.27–320.27
318.27 *All ceremonies should likewise be grounded in Scripture.*
319.11 *Scriptural authorities for the true law of endowment*
319.30 *Objection: 3. Rule is a perfection and so belongs to the more perfect part of the Church.*

[318]**Si autem arguitur per locum a simili quod ritus nostri non valent, cum non sint fundabiles in scriptura, dico quod docto hoc de quocunque ritu est conclusio concedenda, quia tunc non sonaret ritus talis pietatem vel religionem Christi. Unde pro illis que non expresse docentur in scriptura sacra, si quadam evidencia topica suadentur, non debemus** [319]**multum contendere sed conclusiones expressas ipsius scripture omnibus modis defendere. Et error huius sentencie fecit divinam theologiam contempni et leges exteras exaltari; de quo conqueritur dominus per prophetam Osee VIII°, 12: Scribam, inquit, ei multiplices leges meas que velut aliene computate sunt. Et revera rex et lex sua sese in dileccione et odio consequuntur. Et hec est causa tocius confusionis ecclesie, quod claudicat plus intendens legi humanitus superaddite quam divine. Et si queratur ubi in scriptura fundatur lex supradicta fundans dotacionem ecclesie, dicitur quod fundacio proporcionaliter ad eius necessitatem fundatur implicite in illo Luce XVI°, 9: Facite vobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis, et in illo Ia Tim. VI°, 17: Divitibus huius seculi precipe non sublime sapere, nec sperare in merito diviciarum, sed facile tribuere, et in illo Luce X°, 5, 7: In quamcunque domum intraveritis ibi manete edentes et bibentes que aput illos sunt: dignus est enim operarius mercede sua. Nunquam autem fundari potest in scriptura quod sacerdocio Christi conveniat dominacio civilis et sicut non est contendendum circa sequelam tante dotacionis ex scripturis cum merito clericorum, sic non est contendendum circa ablacionem eius si eveniat, nisi forte de quanto docetur ex scriptura quod auferens excedit regulam caritatis vel quod occupacio illorum bonorum per clerum foret sancte ecclesie utilior. Tercio arguitur per hoc quod dominacio civilis est perfecta tam a Christo quam a philosophis approbata; perfecciori**

But if it is argued by appeal to the topic from likeness that our rites are not valid, since they cannot be founded in scripture, I say that, once this has been shown of any rite whatever, the conclusion is to be granted, for then such a rite would not sound of the piety or religion of Christ.[1] Hence for those things which are not expressly taught in holy scripture, if they are recommended by some topical evidence, we ought not to [319] **contend much, but to defend in every way the express conclusions of scripture itself. And error over this teaching has caused divine theology to be despised and foreign laws to be exalted;[2] of which the Lord complains through the prophet, Hosea 8:12: "I shall write to him," he says, "my manifold laws, which have been accounted as foreign." And truly a king and his law follow upon each other in love and in hatred. And this is the cause of the whole confusion of the church, that it limps, attending more to the law added on by men than to the divine. And if it is asked where in scripture the law mentioned above, which founds the endowment of the church, is founded, the answer is that the foundation, in proportion to its necessity, is founded implicitly in that of Luke 16:9: "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity"; and in that of 1 Timothy 6:17: "Charge the rich of this world not to be highminded, nor to trust in the merit of riches, but to give easily";[3] and in that of Luke 10:5, 7: "Into whatever house you enter, there remain, eating and drinking such things as they have: for the labourer is worthy of his hire."[4] But it can never be founded in scripture that civil exercise of lordship befits the priesthood of Christ; and just as one must not contend over so great an endowment as what follows from the scriptures together with the merit of the clergy,**

ergo parti ecclesie debet potestas illa infundi per Christum a quo est omnis potestas. [320]Sicut ergo beatus Silvester non accepit illam partem imperii a Constantino, sic nec aliquis sacerdos cuiusquam terreni principis accepit ab eo dominacionem huiusmodi secularem sed immediate a Christo; prius enim tempore vel natura fuit beatus Silvester dignus habere dominacionem illam imperii quam cesar sibi diviserat, et per consequens prius fuit data a Deo, quam cesar ipsam sibi resignaverat, et cum eque digni fuerunt prius alii Christi vicarii, videtur quod eciam illis infuit potestas taliter dominandi. Et ista videtur sentencia cuiusdam Nicolai Putanensis super epistolam ad Romanos, qui vocat episcopos ex hinc miseros, quod volunt se subicere in onere tributi et aliis serviciis exactis a brachio seculari. Et fundat se super dicto Apostoli Hebreis VII°: Omnimodo maior est ille qui benedicit, quam ille cui benedicitur, et per hoc probat Apostolus quod Melchisedech rex Salem qui gessit typum Christi fuit maior quam Abraham cui benedixit (ut legitur Gen. XIV°). Sicut ergo sacerdocium est dignius imperio, sic oportet Romanum pontificem esse digniorem imperatore accipiente imperium ab illo pontifice, et per consequens, oportet conferentem habere illud imperium, et non esse subiectum suo elemosinario, quia tunc non foret papa omnimode ipso maior, sed secundum eandem racionem qua benedicit et confert sibi spirituale imperium foret ipso subieccior.

so one must not contend over its removal if it happens, unless perhaps in so far as it is taught from scripture that the one removing it exceeds the rule of charity, or that the occupation of those goods by the clergy would be more useful to holy church.[5] Thirdly, it is argued by appeal to this, that civil exercise of lordship is perfect, approved both by Christ and by the philosophers; therefore that power ought to be infused into the more perfect part of the church by Christ, from whom is all power.[6] [320]Just as, therefore, blessed Silvester did not receive that part of the empire from Constantine, so no priest of any earthly prince has received from him secular exercise of lordship of this kind, but immediately from Christ;[7] for blessed Silvester was worthy, earlier in time or in nature, to have that exercise of lordship over the empire which Caesar had divided off to him, and consequently it was given by God earlier than Caesar had resigned it to him; and since other vicars of Christ before [him] were equally worthy, it seems that the power of exercising lordship in this way was in them also.[8] And this seems to be the teaching of a certain Nicholas Putanensis on the Epistle to the Romans, who for this reason calls bishops wretched, that they are willing to subject themselves in the burden of tribute and other services exacted by the secular arm.[9] And he bases himself on the saying of the Apostle, Hebrews 7: "In every way greater is he who blesses than he who is blessed"; and by this the Apostle proves that Melchisedech, king of Salem, who bore the type of Christ, was greater than Abraham, whom he blessed (as we read in Genesis 14).[10] Just as, therefore, the priesthood is worthier than the empire, so the Roman pontiff must be worthier than the emperor who receives the empire from that pontiff; and consequently the one conferring must have that empire and not be subject to his almsman; for then the pope would not be in every way greater than he, but by the same reckoning by which he blesses him and confers on him a spiritual empire he would be more subject than he.[11]

¶2 320.28–322.4
321.1 *Extravagant rights of rule are often claimed for priests.*
321.12 *All civil rule smacks of sin.*

[320]In isto puncto sunt nimis multi maniaci, putantes nedum maiores sacerdotes sed minores singulos debere [321]super omnes reges et principes seculariter dominari, in tantum quod iste Nicolaus dicit quod reges debent esse advocati sacerdotum, quia si ipsi eque immediate haberent potestatem illam cum sacerdotibus, ecclesia non servaret monadem, eo quod forent duo capita eque primo. Et in istam blasphemiam ex defectu intellectus scripture incidunt multi iuriste facientes suos prepositos insanire. Conceditur ergo quod dominacio civilis sit quodammodo perfecta et necessaria perfecte

On this point there are far too many madmen, who think that not only the greater priests but every one of the lesser ought [321]to lord it in secular fashion over all kings and princes, so much so that this Nicholas says that kings ought to be the advocates of priests, because if they had that power as immediately as the priests, the church would not keep its monad, in that there would be two heads equally first.[12] And into this blasphemy many jurists fall through a defect of understanding of scripture, making their superiors go mad. It is granted, therefore, that civil exercise of lordship is in a way perfect, and necessary to one perfectly

supposito ad dominandum tam clericos quam laycos insolentes. Sapit tamen (in quantum talis) veniale peccatum; ideo non potuit Christo competere, nec auctorizatur in Christo et evangelio expresse sed innuitive, et ideo inferiori parti ecclesie quam Apostolus Ia Cor. VI°, 4, vocat contemptibilem debet competere. Illa ergo dominacio non pure capit complecionem suam a Christo, sicut spiritualis dominacio vel potestas, sed completur ut sic per ritus humanos. Unde pro tali complecione et legum aggregacione dicit Augustinus super Joh., Omelia VIª (ut recitavi superius) quod non iure Dei sed imperatoris dicimus quod hec villa vel domus est mea, non quod ius Dei sit omnino alienum a constitucione civilis dominii, cum oportet legem Dei dare graciam que est civilis dominii fundamentum, sed non secundum illam culpam quam contrahit est a Deo. Et sic intelligo Augustinum in Epistola XXXVIIª ad Macedonium sic dicentem: Inter mundanos quedam iura constituuntur que appellantur civilia, non quod hinc fiat ut bene utentes sint, sed ut male utentes minus molesti sint. Quando autem hec iura consonant legi Dei que est per se iusta, tunc [322] evenit quod sunt iusta, et quando deficiunt ab eius regulacione sunt iniusta. Ideo dicit veritas Matthei V°, 20: Nisi habundaverit iusticia vestra plus quam scribarum et phariseorum, non intrabitis in regnum celorum.

placed for lording it over insolent clerics as well as laymen.[13] Yet (as such) it savours of venial sin: therefore it could not befit Christ, and it is not authorized in Christ and the gospel expressly but by hint; and therefore it ought to belong to the inferior part of the church, which the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 6:4, calls contemptible.[14] That exercise of lordship, therefore, does not take its completion purely from Christ, as spiritual lordship or power does, but is completed, as such, through human rites. Hence, regarding such completion and gathering of laws, Augustine says on John, Homily 6 (as I recited above), that it is not by the law of God but by that of the emperor that we say "this villa or house is mine";[15] not that the law of God is wholly foreign to the constitution of civil lordship, since the law of God must give grace, which is the foundation of civil lordship; but in respect of the fault that it contracts, it is not from God. And so I understand Augustine in Epistle 37 to Macedonius, saying thus: "Among worldly men certain laws are established which are called civil, not that by them it comes about that [men] are good users, but that bad users may be less troublesome."[16] And when these laws accord with the law of God, which is just of itself, then [322] it comes about that they are just, and when they fall short of its regulation they are unjust. Therefore the Truth says, Matthew 5:20: "Unless your justice abound more than that of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."[17]

Notes

1. B reads *tunc sonaret*, without the negative (318.30); the print's *non* is needed for the argument and is kept. *Docto hoc*: once it has been shown that the rite cannot be founded in scripture.
2. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): the position taught, here the rule just stated, that the express conclusions of scripture are to be defended before topical arguments. *Error huius sentencie* is error over (against) this teaching.
3. 1 Tim. 6:17–18, joined: the Vulgate has *in incerto divitiarum*, "in the uncertainty of riches"; Wyclif's *in merito* is translated.
4. Luke 10:5 and 10:7, joined: the Vulgate has *primum dicite: Pax huic domui* and *In eadem autem domo manete*; Wyclif's *ibi manete* is translated.
5. B reads *concedendum* for *contendendum* in both members (319.23, 25: "one must not grant ..."). The print is kept.
6. The third objection (A's margin, 319.30: *Tercia obieccio*): civil lordship is perfect, so it belongs to the more perfect part of the church, the clergy. The answer begins at 320.28.
7. *Sacerdos cuiusquam terreni principis* is taken as "a priest of any earthly prince" (a priest under any prince), with *ab eo* referring to that prince. It may be that a preposition (*a cuiusquam*) has dropped.
8. B reads *sibi dimiserat*, "had let go to him", for *diviserat* (320.6–7); A and A_1 omit *ipsam* (320.8). The print construes and is kept.
9. "Nicholas Putanensis" on Romans: A's margin names him (320.11); the editor does not identify him or the commentary.
10. Heb. 7:7, paraphrased; the Vulgate (the editor, 320.15 foot) has *Sine ulla autem contradictione, quod minus est, a meliore benedicitur*, which Wyclif quotes at 324.17. Gen. 14:18–20.
11. *Suo elemosinario*: the emperor, who on Nicholas's view receives the empire from the pope as alms.
12. *Monas*: the church's unity under one head; the editor glosses it *unitate* at 325.7.
13. All the manuscripts read *ad domandum*, "for taming" (321.10 foot); *dominandum* is the editor's emendation. The print construes and is kept, though *domandum* suits *insolentes* well. *Perfecte supposito* is taken as a dative ("to one perfectly placed"); it may be an ablative absolute, "on a perfect supposition". B reads *perfecta et intra*.
14. A and A_1 read *Christo in evangelio*, "in Christ in the gospel" (321.13).
15. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 6.25–26; the editor refers back to p. 301 (321.21 foot). *Ius* here is law (the body of law), against the subjective right. B reads *sed iure imperatoris*.
16. Augustine's Epistle 37 in Wyclif's numbering is Ep. 153 to Macedonius in the modern editions (cf. 311.4 foot); the passage is presumably 153.26 (PL 33, 665).

17. **B omits from *sunt iniusta* to *ideo dicit veritas* (322.2); A reads *vestra quam plus* (322.3).**
How the Latin of this passage was established
- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **318: ∅ ('in' is the English side-note (grounded in); main already has nostri at 198)**
  - **319: *Christo***
  - **319: *perfecciori* (print perfecciori; ff ligature) [NW]**
  - **319: *infundi***
  - **320: *subieccior* [NW]**
  - **321: *super* (173d folio mark)**
  - **321: *laycos* (print has y; 174a folio mark)**
  - **321: *VI^{a}***
  - **321: *sint***
  - **322: *evenit***
  - **319: *multum* (173c folio mark glued)**

Part 7: Silvester received alms, not lordship; the two greatnesses of pope and emperor

Loserth pp. 322.5–326.31

¶1 322.5–323.10
322.5 *Silvester accepted alms, not civil authority,*
322.15 *which would have been inconsistent with his orders.*
322.25 *Christ bade his clergy be subject to princes.*
323.11 *Priesthood is nobler than civil rule,*
323.15 *but with a nobleness that depends on service, not on position,*

[322]**Falsum ergo assumitur quod sacerdos Christi accipit dominacionem civilem a Christo, sicut nec Silvester accepit a cesare, sed elemosinam accepit ab eo. Prius ergo tempore et natura habuit Silvester omnia bona imperii, immo fuit dominus super astra et omnia inferiora homine in natura, sed non titulo civili, ymmo titulo gracie quo iusti sunt omnia; sed post accepit in usum corporalem titulo elemosine post donacionem cesaris, et adhuc in illa elemosinacione cesaris prius naturaliter sed non prius tempore egit Deus. Unde nec Constantinus nec Deus ipse potuit donasse dominacionem civilem beato Silvestro stante puro ordine clericali, ideo cum illa non habet auctoritatem a scriptura sacra, et cum secundum Augustinum si sit utilis, in scriptura sacra invenitur, manifesta patet quod non ad sensum catholicum intelligitur illa carta Constantini, posita in decretis, XCVI^{a} d., Constantinus, quod resignavit sibi ibidem dominacionem civilem, sed elemosinam vocatam perpetuam vel stante civili dominio apud cesarem vel extincto. Et quantum ad dictum Nicolai Putanensis, patet quod equivocat vel blasphemat. Nam Christus facto et verbo precepit et docuit clericos suos subdi principibus, sic enim precepit Petro Matthei XVII°, 25, quod solveret didragmam cesari pro Christo et Petro figurante suam ecclesiam, et interrogatus si licet dare censum cesari, ostenso sibi denario cuius imago et superscripcio erat cesaris, sic subiungit: Reddite ergo** [323] **que sunt cesaris cesari et que sunt Dei Deo. Et Petrus ex ista doctrina precepit suis (quod et facto docuit) ut sint subiecti regibus et ducibus eciam discolis (ut patet prima Petri II°, 18). Et Apostolus docet Rom. XIII°, 7, quomodo debemus obedire principibus, cui tributum dantes**

It is falsely assumed, therefore, that a priest of Christ receives civil exercise of lordship from Christ, just as Silvester did not receive it from Caesar either, but received alms from him. Earlier, therefore, in time and in nature Silvester had all the goods of the empire; indeed he was lord over the stars and all things lower than man in nature, but not by civil title, rather by the title of grace, by which "all things belong to the just"; but afterwards he received [them] for bodily use by the title of alms, after Caesar's donation; and even in that almsgiving of Caesar God acted first by nature, but not first in time. Hence neither Constantine nor God himself could have given civil exercise of lordship to blessed Silvester while the pure clerical order stood; therefore, since it has no authority from holy scripture, and since according to Augustine, "if it is useful, it is found in holy scripture", it is manifestly clear that that charter of Constantine, placed in the Decrees, dist. 96, *Constantinus*, is not understood in the catholic sense [as saying] that he there resigned civil exercise of lordship to him, but [as giving] so-called perpetual alms, with civil lordship either remaining with Caesar or extinguished.[1] And as to the saying of Nicholas Putanensis, it is clear that he equivocates or blasphemes. For Christ by deed and by word commanded and taught his clerics to be subject to princes; for so he commanded Peter, Matthew 17:25, to pay the didrachma to Caesar for Christ and for Peter, who figured his church; and when asked whether it is lawful to give tribute to Caesar, a denarius having been shown him whose image and inscription were Caesar's, he adds thus: "Render therefore to Caesar [323] **the things**

tributum, et cui vectigal vectigal, et multo magis nos qui sumus elemosinarii secularium principum debemus esse subiecti nostris elemosinantibus, cum tam graves et sancti apostoli non sic dotati a principibus ita fecerunt.

that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's."[2] And Peter, from this doctrine, commanded his own (which he also taught by deed) "to be subject to kings and governors, even to the froward" (as is clear from 1 Peter 2:18).[3] And the Apostle teaches, Romans 13:7, how we ought to obey princes, giving tribute to whom tribute, and custom to whom custom; and much more ought we, who are almsmen of secular princes, to be subject to our almsgivers, since apostles so weighty and holy, not so endowed by princes, did so.[4]

¶2 323.11–324.16
324.4 *Nor does it follow that priesthood includes the right to rule.*
324.24 *That the Emperor is blessed by the Pope does not make the Pope an Emperor,*
324.34 *or by the same rule he would be married.*

[323]Ulterius conceditur quod sacerdocium est dignius civili imperio, et sic minimus sacerdos (in quantum talis) est maior quam temporalis dominus (in quantum talis), cum potestas spiritualis sit prestancior corporali. Sed notandum (ut supra dixi) quod est dare duplicem dignitatem et maioritatem, scilicet quoad iudicium Dei secundum leges suas vel quoad iudicium mundi secundum suas leges. Quoad iudicium Dei secundum suas leges diffinit Christus Matthei XI°, 11, quod inter natos mulierum non surrexit maior Johanne Baptista, nam persona humilior et ad utilitatem ecclesie ministrativior est quoad Deum maior (ut patet Luce XXII°, 27). Secundo modo ille qui secundum leges humanas habet primatum in reputacione eorum superiorem vocatur apud mundum maior et dignior, licet sit aput Deum indignior; et isto modo constituit Constantinus quod episcopus Romanus sit dignior aliis, ut patet XCVI[a] d., non respiciens sive fuerit dignior sive indignior quoad Deum. Unde nec imperator nec cardinales habent potestatem constituendi hominem in tali dignitate, nec licet fideli asserere quod, eo ipso quo isti sic decreverunt vel elegerunt, oportet Deum [324]assistere dando constituto in tali primatu dignitatem et maioritatem simpliciter quoad Deum, quia illud sacramentum non est fundabile ex scriptura sacra. Istis premissis patet quod Christi sacerdocium et clericatus in exproprietariis sortis sue est dignius dominacione civili, sed summa stulticia foret ex istis concludere quod omnis sacerdos debet excellencius dominari civiliter. Nam iuxta istam vesaniam sequeretur quod Deus et omnes angeli excellencius quam papa dominarentur civiliter. Iste ergo dignitates in papa et imperatore sunt disparium specierum nec sunt compossibiles in eadem persona simplici propter imperfeccionem quam sapit civile dominium. Unde passiva elemosinacio est perfeccior quam civilis dominacio, et (ut alias dixi) vocata civilitas in mixto clerico facit subiectum imperfeccius, quam foret pure clericus ceteris paribus.

Further, it is granted that the priesthood is worthier than civil empire, and so the least priest (as such) is greater than a temporal lord (as such), since spiritual power is more excellent than bodily. But it is to be noted (as I said above) that there is a twofold dignity and greatness: namely as to the judgment of God according to his laws, or as to the judgment of the world according to its laws.[5] As to the judgment of God according to his laws, Christ defines, Matthew 11:11, that "there hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist"; for the humbler person, and the one more given to ministering for the usefulness of the church, is greater as to God (as is clear from Luke 22:27). In the second way, he who according to human laws has a primacy superior in their reputation is called greater and worthier before the world, though he be less worthy before God; and in this way Constantine established that the Roman bishop should be worthier than the others, as is clear from dist. 96, not regarding whether he was worthier or less worthy as to God.[6] Hence neither the emperor nor the cardinals have power to establish a man in such dignity, nor is it lawful for a believer to assert that, by the very fact that they have so decreed or elected, God must [324]assist by giving to the one established in such a primacy dignity and greatness without qualification as to God; for that sacrament cannot be founded from holy scripture.[7] These things premised, it is clear that the priesthood of Christ, and the clerical state in the propertyless of his lot, is worthier than civil exercise of lordship;[8] but it would be the height of folly to infer from these that every priest ought to exercise lordship civilly more excellently. For according to this madness it would follow that God and all the angels would exercise lordship civilly more excellently than the pope. These dignities, therefore, in the pope and the emperor are of disparate species, and they are not compossible in the same simple person, because of the imperfection which civil lordship savours of. Hence passive almsgiving is more perfect than civil exercise of lordship; and (as I have

said elsewhere) so-called civil standing in a mixed cleric makes the subject less perfect than he would be as purely a cleric, other things being equal.[9]

¶3 324.17–325.21
325.11 *Pope and Emperor have each a primacy but in different ways.*
325.22 *According to the claims made for the clergy every priest would be civilly above the King;*

[324]Et quantum ad auctoritatem apostoli, Hebreorum VII°, 7, dicitur quod (sic habet textus noster) sine ulla autem contradiccione quod minus est a meliori benedicitur; quod intelligendum de benediccione auctoritativa, non positiva obice in benedicente. Nam omnia opera domini benedicunt creatori, et sacerdos, membrum diaboli, benedicit predestinato, carissimo filio Dei. Ideo maneat quicunque sacerdos sine hoc quod contradicat suo ordini et est melior layco (in quantum huiusmodi) cui potestative benedicit. Sed longe hoc ad inferendum quod clericus debet dominari civiliter, cum racione maioritatis infertur oppositum. Clericus ergo debet aufugere primatum, gloriam et excellenciam quoad mundum, et in hoc consistit eius maioritas quoad Deum. Nec video quomodo fundabitur pure ex fide scripture quod oportet imperatorem accipere imperium a suo pontifice. Consonum tamen est quod benedicat electo tamquam superior quoad [325]Deum, sed non oportet si confirmaverit imperatorem quod ipse sit excellencius imperator, quia tunc foret coniugatus et omnis ordinis. Sicut ergo Deus potest conferre alteri denominacionem creatam, licet in se non habeat hanc vel talem, sed habet in se virtutem excellenciorem, sic est de prepositis ecclesie. Nec movet consideracio de monade, quia solus Christus est caput universalis ecclesie, sanccior in clero militante, ad cuius ducatum maior pars militantis ecclesie ambulat vias domini, est caput militantis ecclesie quoad Deum. Sed ille in quem militans ecclesia consenserit ut primatem est caput militantis ecclesie quoad mundum. In alio autem genere primatus est imperator, et sic tam papa quam imperator uterque alteri subiectus, sed papa simpliciter superior si non ponat contradiccionem in nomine. Et sicut materia prima et forma sunt duo genera causarum quarum est dare materiam causam primam in suo genere, et formam causam primam in suo genere, et mundum primum ex eis compositum utroque genere perfeccionum, sic est in elementari composicione militantis ecclesie.

And as to the authority of the Apostle, Hebrews 7:7, the answer is that (so our text has it) "And without all contradiction, that which is less is blessed by the better"; which is to be understood of authoritative blessing, with no positive obstacle in the one blessing.[10] For all the works of the Lord bless the Creator, and a priest who is a member of the devil blesses a predestinate man, a most dear son of God.[11] Therefore let any priest whatever remain without contradicting his order, and he is better than the layman (as such) whom he blesses with power.[12] But this is far from inferring that a cleric ought to exercise lordship civilly, since by reason of greatness the opposite is inferred. A cleric, therefore, ought to flee primacy, glory and excellence as to the world, and in this consists his greatness as to God. Nor do I see how it will be founded purely from the faith of scripture that the emperor must receive the empire from his pontiff. Yet it is fitting that he bless the one elected, as superior as to [325]God; but it does not follow, if he has confirmed the emperor, that he himself is emperor more excellently, for then he would be married and of every order.[13] Just as, therefore, God can confer on another a created naming, though he does not have this or such a one in himself, but has in himself a more excellent power, so it is with the superiors of the church. Nor does the consideration of the monad move [us], because Christ alone is head of the universal church; the holier [man] in the clergy militant, under whose leadership the greater part of the church militant walks the ways of the Lord, is head of the church militant as to God. But he on whom the church militant has agreed as primate is head of the church militant as to the world.[14] And in another genus of primacy is the emperor; and so pope and emperor are each subject to the other, but the pope is superior without qualification, if he does not set a contradiction in the name.[15] And just as prime matter and form are two genera of causes, of which one must posit matter as first cause in its genus, and form as first cause in its genus, and the first world composed of them with both genera of perfections, so it is in the elemental composition of the church militant.

¶4 325.22–326.11
326.1 *and competent to make him yield up his kingdom.*

[325]Unde absit fidelem credere quod quilibet sacerdos Christi (in quantum huiusmodi) sit superior in dominacione civili quam aliquis rex vel dominus secularis, ut dicit doctor predictus. Si tamen papa

Hence far be it from a believer to believe that every priest of Christ (as such) is superior in civil exercise of lordship to any king or secular lord, as the aforesaid doctor says.[16] Yet if the pope had that exercise of lordship

326.12 *So the chief rule in England was claimed for Gregory XI.*
326.22 *Such claims are insane.*
326.25 *Supreme power might as well be claimed for every friar,*

haberet dominacionem illam immediate a Christo et non ex titulo elemosine cesaris, non video quin oporteret concedere quod papa et totum genus sacerdotum dominaretur seculariter super singulos reges terre, ita quod sicut quelibet superficies dicitur infinitum maior quam linea, sic quelibet sacerdotis dominacio civilis foret infinitum maior quam aliqua dominacio principis secularis. Et potest hoc confirmari, cum sacerdos et [326] specialiter papa potest iniungere cuicunque principi virtute potestatis clavium quod renunciando toti dominacioni sue det ecclesie in perpetuam elemosinam cuncta que possidet. Vicarius ergo Christi potest virtute clavium habere quotquot bona voluerit ex privilegio concesso Petro Matthei XVI°. Sed (ut dixi superius) nec tenetur secularis pandere sibi peccata, quantumcunque restrinxerit potestatem clavium, nec talem penam acceptare sive consilium pro salutari penitencia nisi gratis voluerit, et si vicarius Christi inordinate urgeat, tenetur resistere.

immediately from Christ, and not by the title of Caesar's alms, I do not see but that one would have to grant that the pope and the whole race of priests would lord it in secular fashion over every one of the kings of the earth, so that, just as any surface whatever is said to be infinitely greater than a line, so any priest's civil exercise of lordship whatever would be infinitely greater than any exercise of lordship of a secular prince. And this can be confirmed, since a priest, and [326] especially the pope, can enjoin on any prince whatever, by virtue of the power of the keys, that, renouncing his whole exercise of lordship, he give the church as perpetual alms all that he possesses. The vicar of Christ, therefore, can by virtue of the keys have as many goods as he wishes, by the privilege granted to Peter, Matthew 16. But (as I said above) a secular is not bound to lay open his sins to him, however hard he has pressed the power of the keys, nor to accept such a penalty or counsel as a salutary penance unless he freely wishes; and if the vicar of Christ presses inordinately, he is bound to resist.[17]

¶5 326.12–326.26

[326] Nec moveat quod Gregorius XI fuerit in genere secularis dominii capitalis dominus regni nostri, ex hoc quod potuit catholicare omnes cartas religiosorum possessionatorum in Anglia, quo facto fuissent exempti a iurisdiccione regali. Item, potuit arrestare per bullas suas quemcunque hominem legium regis nostri eciam infra regnum nostrum, non petita licencia a rege, et tercio (quod maximum est) ipse potest hereticare quod domini temporales possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente, et per consequens catholicare eius oppositum. Ista, inquiunt quidam, fecit de facto satis legitime. Sed deliramenta sunt ista, quia sic rex Anglie teneret de utroque archiepiscopo in capite, non econtra; sicut enim papa se habet ad cesarem, sic archiepiscopus noster se habet ad regem quoad illud genus dominii.

Nor let it move [us] that Gregory XI was, in the genus of secular lordship, chief lord of our kingdom, on the ground that he could declare catholic all the charters of the religious who are possessioners in England, which done, they would have been exempt from the royal jurisdiction.[18] Again, he could arrest by his bulls any liege man of our king whatever, even within our kingdom, without asking leave of the king; and thirdly (what is greatest) he can pronounce heretical [the proposition] that temporal lords can take away temporal goods from a delinquent church, and consequently declare its opposite catholic.[19] These things, some say, he did in fact quite lawfully. But these are ravings; for so the king of England would hold of each archbishop in chief, not the reverse; for as the pope stands to Caesar, so our archbishop stands to the king as to that genus of lordship.[20]

¶6 326.27–326.31

[326] Item, tunc omnes fratres ex vi potestatis clavium dominarentur seculariter toti mundo, quod est contra professionem eorum et (ut ipsi vere credunt) contra legem Christi. Sic enim quilibet dominus secularis iniuriaretur presbitero detinendo sua temporalia.

Again, then all the friars, by force of the power of the keys, would lord it in secular fashion over the whole world, which is against their profession and (as they truly believe) against the law of Christ. For so every secular lord would wrong a presbyter by withholding his temporal goods.[21]

Notes

1. ***Decretum* D. 96 c. 14 (*Constantinus*)**, the editor's reference (322.21 foot: "Dec. I pars, dist. XCVI, c. XIV"); the modern form is ours. The alms are "perpetual" whether Caesar's civil lordship continues beside them or is extinguished. S. "If it is useful, it is found in holy scripture" (322.18–19, italic in the print): Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* II.42.63, *si utile est, ibi invenitur* (PL 34:65), paraphrased.
2. Matt. 17:25 in the editor's numbering (the stater is at Vulgate 17:26, "give it to them for me and thee"); in Matthew the didrachma is asked by its collectors, and Wyclif's "to Caesar" is his reading of the episode. Matt. 22:21 (the editor, 322.28 foot).
3. The command to be subject to kings and governors is 1 Pet. 2:13–14; "even to the froward" is 2:18, said of servants and their masters.
4. The manuscripts read *Rom. XII*; the editor corrects the chapter (323.5 foot). Rom. 13:7 in DR wording; Wyclif's *dantes* ("giving") replaces the Vulgate's *Reddite … omnibus debita*.
5. A omits *dare* (323.15); B omits *quoad — leges* (323.17). *Dignitas* is "dignity" throughout, *dignior* "worthier"; *maioritas* is "greatness".
6. The same canon of D. 96, Wyclif's reference without a canon number, c. 14 (*Constantinus*, a palea), where the Roman pontiff is made *celsior et princeps cunctis sacerdotibus* (Friedberg I, 343–44). A and A_1 read *episcopus suus* (323.27); B reads *ministracior* for *ministrativior* (323.22).
7. ***Tali dignitate*: the dignity as to God just denied to the electors. *Illud sacramentum* is taken as "that sacrament", a sacred bond by which election would bind God to confer worth; "mystery" is possible.**
8. ***Sors* is the clergy's lot (*clerus*, Greek *klēros*); *in exproprietariis sortis sue*: in those of that lot who own nothing.**
9. ***Persona simplex* and *mixtus clericus*: the unmixed person against the cleric who also holds civil lordship. A reads *ceteris pauperibus* (324.16), corrected in A_1.**
10. Heb. 7:7, as the Vulgate (*a meliore*) and the editor (320.15 foot). *Non positiva obice in benedicente* is taken as "with no positive obstacle in the one blessing"; it may stand for the scholastic *non posito obice*, "no obstacle being placed" (324.19).
11. Cf. Dan. 3:57, "All ye works of the Lord, bless the Lord." The manuscripts read *membra*; *membrum* is the editor's (324.23 foot).
12. ***Maneat … sine hoc quod contradicat suo ordini*: provided he does not contradict his order, the priest as such is better than the layman he blesses.**
13. The pope who blesses the emperor no more becomes emperor than, blessing marriages and conferring orders, he becomes married and of every order (side-note 324.34). B's margin (324.32): the receiving of the empire is not founded in faith or scripture.
14. The editor glosses *monade* as *unitate* (325.7 foot). A and B note in the margin *de triplici capite*: Christ, head of the universal church; the holier cleric, head of the church militant as to God; the primate, its head as to the world. The clause *sanccior in clero militante … est caput* (325.9–10) stands without a connective, perhaps with one lost.
15. ***Si non ponat contradiccionem in nomine*: if the pope does not contradict his own name, living against what "pope" means (cf. *contradicat suo ordini*, 324.21).**
16. ***Doctor predictus*: Nicholas Putanensis (320.11, 322.24).**
17. The subject of *restrinxerit* is taken to be the vicar of Christ: however hard he has pressed the power of the keys. *Secularis* is the lay prince. The argument from 325.33 is a reductio, the confirmation granting what the pope's direct lordship would imply.
18. ***Catholicare* / *hereticare*: to pronounce catholic / heretical. The second and third claims refer to Gregory XI's bulls of 1377, which ordered Wyclif's arrest and condemned his conclusion on taking temporalities from a delinquent church (*Fasciculi zizaniorum*, pp. 242–4, 248); the first, a power to confirm all the possessioners' charters, is a general papal claim.**
19. Among the conclusions condemned in 1377 was that temporal lords may take away temporal goods from a delinquent church (the sixth article; *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, p. 248). B reads *bullas suas quidcunque* (326.16).
20. The reply turns the feudal claim back: if the pope were chief lord over the empire, the archbishops would by the same proportion be chief lords over the king of England, who would hold of them in chief.
21. ***Sua temporalia* is taken as the presbyter's goods withheld from him; it may be the lord's own goods, kept back from the priest.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 322: *acci-* (acci-/pit; main token holds first half (R is margin letter)) [NW]
  - 322: *pit* (second half of acci-/pit) [NW]
  - 322: *XCVI*ª
  - 322: *Christus*
  - 323: *II*°
  - 323: *18* (old-style 1 at x-height + 8)
  - 323: *11* (leaf zoom: old-style 11 after XI°)
  - 323: *XCVI*ª
  - 324: ∅ ('it' is the English side-note (Nor does it); main already has Istis at 21)
  - 324: *patet*
  - 324: *subiectum*
  - 325: *habeat* (174c folio mark)
  - 325: *superior* [NW]
  - 325: *cum*
  - 326: *XI* (print 'Gregorius XI. fuerit'; main lacks XI between Gregorius and fuerit)
  - 326: *dominii* [NW]

- **326: *capitalis* [NW]**
- **326: *dominus***
- **326: *regni***
- **326: *nostri***
- **326: *legium* [NW]**
- **326: *quod* (print (quod; 3 is a margin argument numeral)**
- **326: *hereticare* [NW]**
- **323: *que* (174a folio mark glued; italic que)**
- **325: ∅ (second half of mun-dum; neighbour 93 already mundum.) [DELX]**

Part 8: The donation of Constantine would make the pope Caesar's almsman

Loserth pp. 326.32–328.25

¶1 326.32–328.6
326.32 *or simple priest;*
327.7 *who indeed on the theory would be chief lord of all our goods.*
327.19 *Moreover on the same theory the donation of Constantine was impossible and heretical.*
328.7 *And if that were put aside nothing to the same effect would be found in scripture.*

[326]**Item, quilibet simplex sacerdos habet parem potestatem ordinis cum papa, et ad illam potestatem ordinis consequitur essencialiter proporcionalis potestas secularis dominii;** [327]**ergo quilibet simplex sacerdos habet titulum de iure ad dominandum seculariter toti mundo. Sed dic buphotracti maledicti tot dominati; tunc enim nec foret ordo nec civilis dominacio, nec oporteret sacerdotes acquirere sibi titulos in suscipiendo ordines, cum illo titulo ordinum excellunt seculariter quemlibet regem mundi. Item, parem potestatem dominandi seculariter habet quilibet presbiter regni nostri, sicut haberet supposito quod ipse solus foret sacerdos in Anglia et rex noster conquireret quotquot regna, sed tunc foret secularis dominus capitaliter omnium bonorum regni nostri. Ergo et modo de iure. Aliter enim sequeretur quod civilis dominacio pape dependeret ab integritate dominacionis imperii, et per consequens, papa nitendo destruere imperium, destrueret proprium civile dominium, vel si ipse debet dominari seculariter super omnes naciones iam infideles, per idem quilibet sacerdos habet ius ad taliter dominandum. Item, tunc superflueret carta cesaris tamquam impossibilis et heretica, non ergo incorporanda foret in canone tamquam paris auctoritatis cum dictis sanctorum doctorum, ut patet XCVI[a] d. Constantinus; ibi enim dicitur quod Constantinus quarto die sui baptismi contulit privilegium Romano pontifici et ordinavit ut, sicut ipse imperat aliis regibus, sic eius episcopus aliis sacerdotibus, unde iudicat et discernit quod episcopus Romanus habeat potestatem utendi insigniis regalibus, unde et sanccivit, dixit et consuluit quod ditavit ac sua largitate concessit et ex imperiali potestate statuit et confirmavit ut usque in finem mundi dona** [328]**sua et privilegia maneant illibata. Et multa alia verba ibi inseruit que iuxta succedentem superbiam sonarent in heresim, quia innuerent papam esse elemosinarium cesaris, et per consequens ipsum posse revocare donatum condicione**

Again, every simple priest has a power of order equal with the pope, and on that power of order there follows essentially a proportional power of secular lordship; [327]**therefore every simple priest has a title by right to exercise lordship in secular fashion over the whole world. But say *buphotracti*: "cursed be so many lords!"[1] For then there would be neither order nor civil exercise of lordship, nor would priests need to acquire titles for themselves in receiving orders,[2] since by that title of orders they excel in secular fashion any king in the world. Again, every presbyter of our kingdom has a power of exercising secular lordship equal to what he would have on the supposition that he alone were a priest in England and our king conquered ever so many kingdoms; now in that case he would be secular lord, as head, of all the goods of our kingdom. Therefore now also, by right. For otherwise it would follow that the pope's civil exercise of lordship depended on the integrity of the empire's exercise of lordship, and consequently that the pope, by striving to destroy the empire, would destroy his own civil lordship; or, if he ought to exercise secular lordship over all the nations that are now unbelievers, by the same token every priest has a right to exercise lordship in that way. Again, Caesar's charter would then be superfluous, as impossible and heretical; it would not, therefore, have to be incorporated in the canon as of equal authority with the sayings of the holy doctors, as is clear in dist. 96, *Constantinus*.[3] For there it is said that Constantine, on the fourth day after his baptism, conferred a privilege on the Roman pontiff and ordained that, as he himself commands other kings, so his bishop [should command] other priests; whence he judges and decrees that the Roman bishop should have the power of using the royal insignia; whence too he sanctioned, said and counselled what he had enriched [him with] and granted of his largesse,**

dirupta, cum dicit se ordinare ut per manus beati Silvestri et successorum eius omnia disponantur.

and by imperial power established and confirmed that to the end of the world his [328]gifts and privileges should remain inviolate.[4] And he inserted there many other words which, in the light of the pride that followed, would sound like heresy, because they would imply that the pope is Caesar's almsman, and consequently that he [Caesar] can revoke the gift when the condition is broken,[5] since he says that he ordains that all things be disposed by the hands of blessed Silvester and his successors.

¶2 328.7–328.25

[328]Et credo, si ista carta relicta fuerit, non invenirent cartam aliam in scriptura. In tales infinitas vesanias antichristinas inducitur populus in ecclesia propter reliccionem evangelii, propter oblivionem paupertatis Christi et candentem cupiditatem ad fastum seculi. Vidit enim quod, si beatus Silvester recepit secundum dictam formam dominium illud a cesare, tunc cesar habens integrum imperium, tam large benedicens pape foret quoad seculum ipso maior, cum partem sue magnificencie impertitus fuisset elemosinario suo pape. Ideo querunt mendaciter alias minas hereticas et blasphemas, dicentes quod Christus, Petrus et alii dominati sunt civiliter toti mundo, et illo iure, non iure cesaris gaudent suo dominio. Idem est expresse contra Augustinum super Joh., Omelia VI[a], et contra decretum distinccione VIII[a], Quo iure, et contra beatum Bernardum, libro II ad papam Eugenium: Esto, inquit, ut alia racione tibi vindices dominatum sed non iure apostolico, quod probat efficaciter ex scriptura.

And I believe that, if this charter were abandoned, they would not find another charter in scripture. Into such endless antichristian madnesses the people in the church are led, because of the abandoning of the gospel, because of forgetfulness of Christ's poverty, and a burning greed for the pomp of the world. For they see[6] that, if blessed Silvester received that lordship from Caesar according to the said form, then Caesar, having the whole empire and blessing the pope so largely, would be greater than he as regards the world, since he would have bestowed part of his magnificence on his almsman the pope. Therefore they lyingly seek out other heretical and blasphemous threats,[7] saying that Christ, Peter and others exercised civil lordship over the whole world, and that by that right, not by Caesar's right, they enjoy their lordship. This is expressly against Augustine on John, Homily 6, and against the Decretum, distinction 8, *Quo iure*, and against blessed Bernard, book 2 to Pope Eugenius: "Granted," he says, "that you claim lordly rule for yourself on some other ground, but not by apostolic right";[8] which he proves effectively from scripture.[9]

Notes

1. 327.2: A and A_1 read *Sed dum*; Loserth judges that some words seem to have fallen out here and asks what *buphotracti* means. He prints Matthew's conjecture *Dic bufo crati: maledicti tot dominati*, "Say, toad, to the harrow: cursed be so many lords!", which renders the Anglo-Norman proverb *Debez eient tanz meistres, dist le crapod al herce* (cursed be so many masters, said the toad to the harrow), in English "Many masters, quoth the toad to the harrow". The print is translated and the word left in Latin; the participle *dominati* is rendered "lords".
2. *Titulos … in suscipiendo ordines*: the canonical title (a benefice or assured living) required of a candidate for holy orders. *Ordo* in "neither order nor civil exercise of lordship" may be the sacrament or ordered society; the sentence turns on both.
3. Decretum D. 96 c. 14 *Constantinus*, the Donation (form ours; Loserth gives the canon by its incipit, noting that Wyclif's account is drawn from it "with some words changed"; the chapter number is confirmed).
4. *Sanccivit, dixit et consuluit quod ditavit …*: *quod* is taken as relative, "what he had enriched [him with]"; as a conjunction it would give "that he had enriched [him]". The sentence strings together the canon's verbs of grant.
5. *Ipsum posse revocare*: taken as Caesar, the donor, who could revoke an alms whose condition was broken; grammatically it could be the pope. *Iuxta succedentem superbiam*: "in the light of the pride that followed", that is, the later papacy's.
6. 328.12: the print *Vidit* (so on the plate) has no subject that construes; B *Vident* agrees with *querunt* below and is translated. Print *Vidit*, B *Vident*. 328.14 B reads *integrum dominium* for *integrum imperium*.
7. 328.17: the print reads *minas*, "threats" (so on the plate), which construes only loosely with *querunt*; a corrupted word (e.g. *vias*, "ways") is possible. Translated as printed.

8. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 6.25; Decretum D. 8 c. 1 *Quo iure* (Loserth; form ours); Bernard, *De consideratione* II.6.10 (PL 182, 748: *Esto, ut alia quacunque ratione haec tibi vindices: sed non apostolico jure*), quoted loosely. *Vindices* is Loserth's emendation from Bernard's text; the manuscripts read *vendicens*. Bernard's noun is *dominatus*, rendered "lordly rule" to keep it apart from *dominium*.

9. After *scriptura* A adds the scribe's Czech prayer *Hospodyne racz pomoc psati*, which Loserth glosses *Domine velis adiuvare scribentem*, "Lord, be pleased to help the writer"; A_1 has "cap. XVI" in the text here.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 327: *ergo* (print p.327 l.1 '174d ris dominii; ergo')
  - 327: *destruere* (15 is the line number)
  - 327: *XCVI*ª
  - 328: *et*
  - 328: ∅ (print p.328 begins 'sua et privilegia'; the inserted run is the end of p.327)
  - 328: *VI*ª
  - 328: *VIII*ª
  - 326: *essencialiter*
  - 326: *secularis dominii* (secula- here, 174d ris dominii at top of p.327; main token covers both words)
  - 328: *maneant*

Chapter 15

Part 1: May the king take away the clergy's temporal goods? the duty to warn, and the precedents

Loserth pp. 328.27–332.19

¶1 328.27–330.12
328.27 *A second doubt is whether the king may withdraw Church temporalties on account of abuse, or when the clergy are in contempt.*
329.9 *Many think he may, and that the clergy should tell the king so.*
330.13 *Three futile reasons for not warning:*
330.15
1. *The king would take away our temporalties.*

330.20
2. *The matter has been decided in the Papal Court.*

330.30
3. *The realm goes on well while the clergy is silent.*

[328]**Secundum dubium est, si rex Anglie a clero suo legio potest legitime auferre temporalia donata ecclesie** [329]**pro cleri sui abusu elemosine vel contemptu. Et est dubium istud necessariissimum ad tractandum, quia multis et magnis de regno nostro videtur quod pars affirmativa conclusionis sit satis catholica, aliis autem pinguioribus regis elemosinariis videtur quod conclusio sit omnino heretica. Et indubitanter assero quod, si conclusio ista sit heretica, supposito facto regali regum Anglie, vel totum regnum vel maior pars eius est exhinc infectum heretica pravitate: et cum sacerdotes et specialiter episcopi et scolastici regni nostri tenentur predicere regi et regno suo periculum, patet quod ipsi specialiter et regnum communiter tenentur in isto puncto cognoscere veritatem. Non enim sunt rex et regnum adeo indurati quin, docto quod dogma illud foret hereticum, ipsum non amplius practizarent, sed ad vocem multitudinis cleri sui concito revocarent. Sic enim ad predicacionem Jone Ninivite salubriter penitebant (ut patet Jone III° et Matthei XII°), sic eciam Nabugodonozor conversus est ab infidelitate et salvatus finaliter virtute Dei et prudencia Danielis (ut patet in canone XXIII, q. IV. Nabuchodonosor ex historia prophete et testimonio Augustini); et revera videtur maior disposicio in regno nostro et eius principibus quam fuit in predicto populo infideli. Quomodo ergo foret fidelis vel caritative diligens regem suum qui videret ipsum ex ignorancia super oram baratri paratum ad precipicium sempiternum et assistente revocandi noticia in sepe conversionis ex negligenti desidia permitteret tam gravem populum in corpore et anima perpetuo interire, specialiter si ad speculandum et prenarrandum regis et regni pericula sit pinguiter premiatus? Nonne dicit Deus prophete** [330]**Ezechielis XXXIII°, 7, 8: Et tu fili hominis speculatorem dedi te domui Israel, audiens ergo ex ore meo sermonem annunciabis eis ex me. Si me dicente ad impium: Impie, morte morieris, non fueris locutus, ut custodiat se impius a via sua, ipse impius in iniquitate sua morietur, sanguinem autem eius de manu tua requiram. Et multo magis in tempore legis gracie, quando debemus ex lege Christi habere ampliorem noticiam et amorem et insuper habemus a rege temporalem retribucionem amplius quam habuit Ezechiel vel quam**

The second doubt is whether the king of England can lawfully take away from his liege clergy the temporal goods given to the church, [329] **for his clergy's abuse of the alms or for contempt.**[1] **And this doubt is most necessary to treat, because to many great men of our kingdom it seems that the affirmative side of the conclusion is catholic enough, but to others, the king's fatter almsmen, it seems that the conclusion is altogether heretical. And I assert without doubt that, if this conclusion is heretical, given the royal deed of the kings of England, either the whole kingdom or the greater part of it is thereby infected with heretical depravity; and since the priests, and especially the bishops and the schoolmen of our kingdom, are bound to foretell its danger to the king and his kingdom, it is clear that they especially, and the kingdom generally, are bound to know the truth on this point. For the king and kingdom are not so hardened that, once it had been taught that that doctrine was heretical, they would not cease to put it into practice, but would quickly revoke it at the voice of the multitude of their clergy. For so at the preaching of Jonah the Ninevites did penance to their salvation (as is clear in Jonah 3 and Matthew 12); so too Nebuchadnezzar was converted from unbelief and finally saved by the power of God and the prudence of Daniel (as is clear in the canon C. 23 q. 4 *Nabuchodonosor*, from the history of the prophet and the testimony of Augustine);**[2] **and truly there seems to be a greater disposition in our kingdom and its princes than there was in that unbelieving people. How then would he be faithful, or love his king in charity, who saw him through ignorance on the brink of the abyss, ready for the everlasting plunge, and, though knowledge of how to call him back was at hand in the hedge of conversion,**[3] **through negligent sloth allowed so weighty a people to perish forever in body and soul, especially if he is richly rewarded for watching over and foretelling the dangers of king and kingdom? Does not God say to the prophet,** [330] **Ezekiel 33:7–8: "So thou, O son of man, I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel: therefore thou shalt hear the word from my mouth, and shalt tell it them from me. When I say**

propheta alius veteris testamenti. Dampnabilis ergo foret nostra segnicies.

to the wicked: O wicked man, thou shalt surely die: if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked man from his way: that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but I will require his blood at thy hand." And much more in the time of the law of grace, when we ought, from the law of Christ, to have fuller knowledge and love, and moreover have from the king a temporal reward beyond what Ezekiel or any other prophet of the old testament had. Damnable, therefore, would be our sloth.

¶2 330.13–330.30

[330] Nec valet ista triplex infamis instancia, prima qua dicitur quod rex et regnum forent exhinc exasperati ad auferendum temporalia que habemus. Ista enim accusans obieccio indicat quod plus diligimus nostra temporalia quam datorem, cum irreligiose plus timemus amissionem nostrorum temporalium quam amissionem perpetuam corporis et anime regis nostri. Secunda instancia dicit quod ista materia ventilata est et decisa in Romana curia coram papa. Revera non credo sed, supposito quod sic, illi quibus illud est cognitum sunt accusabiles tamquam proditores qui sic celant istud periculum. Nam infinitum plus est periculi quam si quotlibet corporales hostes ex scitu celantis invaderent et destruerent funditus regnum nostrum, et insuper cum tales dampnantes istam materiam sunt mortui vel divisi, stultum foret expectare publicacionem decisionis eorum in tanto periculo. Tercia instancia dicit quod tam rex quam regnum

Nor does this threefold infamous objection hold. The first is the one in which it is said that the king and kingdom would thereby be provoked to take away the temporal goods we have. For this objection accuses [us] and shows that we love our temporal goods more than the giver,[4] since we irreligiously fear the loss of our temporal goods more than the perpetual loss of the body and soul of our king. The second objection says that this matter has been aired and decided in the Roman curia before the pope. Truly, I do not believe it; but, supposing that it were so, those to whom it is known are open to accusation as traitors, who thus conceal this danger. For there is infinitely more danger in it than if any number of bodily enemies, with the knowledge of the one who conceals it, invaded and utterly destroyed our kingdom; and moreover, since such as condemn this matter are dead or divided,[5] it would be foolish to await the publication of their decision in so great a danger. The third objection says that both the king and the kingdom

¶3 330.31–331.16
331.7 *Such a serious, question ought to be settled.*
331.17 *History of the question. William I. rearranged many foundations or transferred them.*
331.33 *Suppression of the Templars.*

[330] processit prospere, quando clerus noster a tractatu talis materie supersedit. Ista ficticia destructa [331] est superius XII. cap.; et in proposito inficit se ipsam. Quomodo, inquam, regno nostro inesset prosperitas, quando a rege et capitalibus eius tam prelatis quam dominis defenderetur tanta iniquitas. Error enim cui non resistitur approbatur; sed altera istarum est nedum error sed heresis pro qua dignum esset ut rex et totum suum sacerdocium destruatur. Ideo non dubium rex et domini seculares sed specialiter prelati regni facerent in isto diligenter inquirere veritatem et excitarent defenderentque theologos hoc tractantes, cum eis incumbit errores tales discutere et de periculo regem et regni incolas premunire. Et revera ex utraque parte contradiccionis sequitur grande periculum, eo quod, sive sit hereticum sive non sit hereticum, supposito facto magna pars regni nostri ex adhesione, ex defensione vel omissione inficitur heretica pravitate.

prospered when our clergy refrained from treating such a matter.[6] This fiction [331] was destroyed above, in chapter 12; and in the present case it infects itself. How, I say, would there be prosperity in our kingdom when so great an iniquity was defended by the king and his chief men, prelates as well as lords? For an error that is not resisted is approved; now one or the other of these is not only an error but a heresy, for which it would be fitting that the king and all his priesthood be destroyed.[7] Therefore without doubt the king and the secular lords, but especially the prelates of the kingdom, should cause the truth to be diligently inquired into in this, and should rouse and defend the theologians who treat it, since it falls to them to discuss such errors and to forewarn the king and the inhabitants of the kingdom of the danger. And truly great danger follows from either side of the contradiction, in that, whether it is heretical or not heretical, given the deed, a great part of our kingdom is infected

with heretical depravity through adherence, through defence, or through omission.

¶4 331.17–332.19
332.3 *Recent examples of temporalties seized.*

[331]Intendo ergo isto modo procedere: primo narrare factum regum Anglie in hac parte, secundo recitare opiniones doctorum in materia, et tercio obicere contra illas. Quantum ad primum, patet legenti cronicas regni nostri quomodo Willelmus conquestor multas elemosinas regum Saxonum de abbatiis, de episcopatibus et aliis dotacionibus sub nomine perpetue elemosine pro perpetuo variavit, nunc subtrahendo, nunc transferendo et nunc loco cleri prioris extraneos inducendo. Nec valet fingere sompnia quod vel a papa habuit licenciam plus ad ista quam ad conquestum regni de iure sibi debiti. Et sic de sompnio quo fingitur ipsum post restituere omnes ablatarios clericos, sicut nec restituit heredes Saxonum rebellantes; et revera hereticare ipsum finaliter, cum totum ius regni fuit ab ipso ad omnes reges medios successione hereditaria usque hodie derivatum, foret minis infectiva presumpcio. Infectiva dico, quia hereticaret reges clerum et populum interim succedentes; [332]sed dimissis destruccionibus Templariorum et ablacionibus privatis que interim contigerunt, recolamus de ablacionibus talibus que diebus nostris per illustrem regem Edwardum tercium erant facte. Nam temporalia domini Willelmi Bathman Norwycensis capta sunt in manus regis et tenta duodecim annis continuis pro contemptu. Et idem contigit de domino Johanne Gransoni Exoniensi, de fratre Thoma de Lyle, episcopo Heliensi, et sic de multis ablacionibus quas diebus nostris cognovimus. Ymmo Ricardus II. rex noster sicut avus suus practizat hoc annuatim in religiosis possessionatis de Francia; nec super isto consulunt curiam Romanam, quia ut constanter defendunt ista potestas directe pertinet ad coronam. Nec recolo quod temporalia mobilia ablata restituunt, cum contemptus vel forisfactura elemosinariorum regis requirit ut gravius puniantur, nisi quod rex misericorditer eos respicit, sicut in possessionem elemosinarum regni sui eos misericorditer introduxit.

I intend, therefore, to proceed in this way: first, to narrate the deed of the kings of England in this regard; second, to recite the opinions of doctors on the matter; and third, to object against them. As to the first, it is clear to anyone who reads the chronicles of our kingdom how William the Conqueror permanently altered many alms of the Saxon kings (abbeys, bishoprics and other endowments under the name of perpetual alms), now withdrawing them, now transferring them, and now bringing in foreigners in place of the former clergy. Nor is it any use to feign dreams that he had licence from the pope for these things any more than for the conquest of the kingdom owed him by right.[8] And so with the dream in which it is feigned that he afterwards restored all the clerics whose goods had been taken away, any more than he restored the heirs of the Saxons who rebelled; and truly, to pronounce him heretical at the last, since the whole right of the kingdom has been derived from him through all the intervening kings by hereditary succession down to today, would be an all too infectious presumption.[9] Infectious, I say, because it would pronounce heretical the kings, clergy and people who have succeeded in the meantime; [332]but, leaving aside the destructions of the Templars and the private takings-away that occurred in the meantime, let us recall such takings-away as were made in our own days by the illustrious king Edward III. For the temporal goods of the lord William Bateman of Norwich were taken into the king's hands and held for twelve continuous years for contempt.[10] And the same happened with the lord John Grandisson of Exeter, with brother Thomas de Lisle, bishop of Ely, and so with many takings-away which we have known in our days.[11] Indeed, Richard II our king, like his grandfather, puts this into practice every year upon the possessioner religious of France; nor do they consult the Roman curia on this, because, as they steadily maintain, this power belongs directly to the crown.[12] Nor do I recall that they restore movable temporal goods once taken away, since the contempt or forfeiture of the king's almsmen requires that they be punished more heavily, except in so far as the king regards them mercifully, just as he mercifully brought them into possession of the alms of his kingdom.

Notes

1. ***Pro cleri sui abusu elemosine vel contemptu***: ***abusu*** and ***contemptu*** are taken as parallel ablatives after ***pro***, the contempt being the clergy's (cf. ***pro contemptu***, 332.6). A in the margin: ***Materia de ablacione temporalium cleri***.
2. Jonah 3:5–10; Matt. 12:41. Decretum C. 23 q. 4 c. 22 ***Nabuchodonosor*** (Loserth; form ours). A in the margin: ***Nabuchodonosor salvatus est***.
3. ***In sepe conversionis*** (so the print, on the plate, and A A_1): taken as ***saepes***, "hedge, fence", the barrier at the abyss's edge; ***in spe conversionis***, "in hope of conversion", would give easier sense but has no witness.
4. ***Ista enim accusans obieccio***: the objection "accuses" those who make it, by what it reveals. A in the margin: ***Triplex instancia***.
5. ***Mortui vel divisi***: those who condemned the matter in 1377: Gregory XI, dead in March 1378, and his cardinals, divided by the Schism that opened that year.
6. The paragraph division at 330.30/31 falls inside one sentence, ***Tercia instancia dicit quod tam rex quam regnum / processit prospere***; the singular ***processit*** takes king and kingdom together. "Chapter 12": Loserth refers to p. 265 above.
7. The maxim ***Error cui non resistitur approbatur*** is a canon of the Decretum, D. 83 c. 3 (Innocent: ***Error, cui non resistitur, approbatur***). ***Sed*** brings the minor premiss. ***Altera istarum***, "one or the other of these": the affirmative or the negative answer to the doubt, as 331.13–16 explains.
8. ***Vel a papa***: ***vel*** is "even", "any more": no papal licence for the seizures is to be feigned, any more than for a conquest William claimed by right. ***Ablatarios clericos***: the clerics deprived.
9. 331.33: the print reads ***minis*** (so on the plate), which construes only as "infectious with threats"; read as ***nimis***, "all too" (our emendation). Print ***minis***; translated ***nimis***. ***Finaliter***: at the end of his life, as one who died a heretic (cf. 335.7–9).
10. William Bateman, bishop of Norwich: Loserth (citing Walsingham, ***Hist. Angl.*** I, 262) notes, after Matthew, that he was bishop for not quite eleven years (1344–55), often employed abroad in the king's favour, and that Wyclif may mean a single estate lost in the king's courts, not all his temporal goods.
11. John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter (A A_1 ***Oxoniensis***; B and the print ***Exoniensi***): Walsingham I, 309; Rolls of Parliament II, 245 (Loserth). Thomas de Lisle, bishop of Ely (A ***Hyle***): Walsingham I, 285 (Loserth). The modern forms of the names are ours.
12. The seizure of the alien priories' revenues in the French war; Loserth cites Rolls of Parliament III, 22b: the Commons' petition in Richard II's first parliament (1377) that alien religious be voided from the realm and their profits go to the war, granted with an ordinance for the alien priories. ***Practizare in***: "put into practice upon".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 328: ***CAP. XV.***
  - 329: ***III°*** (print 'Jone III° / et Matthei'; main lacks III° after Jone)
  - 330: ***non***
  - 330: ***fueris***
  - 330: ***locutus*** (whole word printed at line start; main dropped lo)
  - 330: ***in***
  - 330: ***regnum*** (print: regnum processit; regnum opens the line)
  - 331: ***primum*** [NW]
  - 331: ***hereticare*** [NW]
  - 331: ***hereticaret*** [NW]
  - 332: ***Willelmi*** (letterspaced name; main split into letters)
  - 332: ∅ (i is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ∅ (ll is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ∅ (e is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ∅ (l is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ∅ (m is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ∅ (i is part of Willelmi (pos 27))
  - 332: ***Bathman*** (letterspaced name; main split into letters)
  - 332: ∅ (a is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ∅ (t is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ∅ (h is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ∅ (m is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ∅ (a is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ∅ (n is part of Bathman (pos 34))
  - 332: ***Norwycensis*** (letterspaced name; main split into letters)
  - 332: ∅ (o is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))
  - 332: ∅ (r is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))
  - 332: ∅ (w is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))
  - 332: ∅ (y is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))

- **332: ∅ (c is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **332: ∅ (e is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **332: ∅ (n is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **332: ∅ (s is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **332: ∅ (i is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **332: ∅ (s is part of Norwycensis (pos 41))**
- **331: *est* (175b folio mark glued)**
- **331: *interim***

Part 2: A doctor's three conclusions would make the kings of England heretics

Loserth pp. 332.20–336.16

¶1 332.20–334.3
332.20 *Three conclusions laid down by a doctor: 1. a definition of heresy;*
332.25
2. denial of the King's right to deprive
333.1 *of temporalties;*
333.2
3. denial of such right both in past and future.
333.5 *In answer we suppose a) that clergy includes all men in orders;*
333.19 *b) that it is possible for the clergy to sin grossly,*
334.2 *as is evident of the false Pope and his supporters; c) that the English Kings believe they have the right thus denied.*
334.15 *On the doctor's supposition the Kings have acted wrongfully;*
334.28 *end contrary to the Catholic faith;*

[332]In ista materia est quidam doctor qui sui gracia misit mihi in scriptis tres conclusiones huic materie pertinentes. Prima, describendo heresim, dicit quod posicio sive assercio heretica est error periculosus, pertinaciter defensatus, directe repugnans catholice veritati. Secunda, non est possibile reges Anglie [333]legitime posse auferre simpliciter temporalia cleri sui. Tercia. Tercia, ii domini reges temporalia a clero suo nunquam legitime abstulerunt, sicut nec ceteris paribus poterunt in futurum. In ista materia suppono quod loquatur de clero communiter, ut includit quemcunque habentem caracterem sacerdotalis ordinis. Si autem loquatur laxius, tantum placet. Ex quo patet quod omnes sacerdotes conversantes in Anglia sub proteccione regis, sive seculares sive religiosi, possessionati vel exproprietarii, sunt clerus legius regis Anglie, sic enim loquuntur multa decreta, nunc de clerico re et nomine, nunc autem de clerico nudo nomine, ut XL[a] d. sub auctoritate Chrisostomi dicit Canon: Multi sunt sacerdotes et pauci sunt sacerdotes, multi in nomine, pauci in opere, quia non locus vel cathedra facit sanctum sacerdotem sed econtra. Abiecta itaque ista signacione difficile foret scire quis esset clericus vel sacerdos. Secundo suppono quod clericus tam in Anglia quam alibi posset quantumcunque enormiter peccare quocunque genere peccatorum; patet de episcopo Scarioth, de religioso Sergio et multis aliis sacerdotibus, de quibus scriptura sacra et cronice faciunt mencionem, ymmo cotidiana experiencia idem docet. Non enim habet clericus (in quantum huiusmodi) titulum sue confirmacionis a domino, sed ex testimonio sanctorum doctorum habemus quod racione dignitatis ordinis et dyabolice temptacionis plus aspere peccant communiter gravius quam vulgares, sicut oculata fide conspicimus [334]de pseudopapa et suis pseudocardinalibus qui ex cupidine fastus et questus, non autem ex cupidine meritorii profectus conturbant sanctam matrem ecclesiam.

On this matter there is a certain doctor who of his kindness sent me in writing three conclusions pertaining to this matter. The first, defining heresy, says that a heretical position or assertion is a dangerous error, pertinaciously defended, directly repugnant to catholic truth. The second: it is not possible that the kings of England [333]can lawfully take away the temporal goods of their clergy without qualification. The third: those lord kings never lawfully took away temporal goods from their clergy, as neither, other things being equal, will they be able to in the future.[1] In this matter I suppose that he speaks of the clergy in the common sense, as it includes whoever has the character of priestly order. But if he speaks more loosely, that pleases me as well. From this it is clear that all priests living in England under the king's protection, whether seculars or religious, possessioners or propertyless, are the liege clergy of the king of England. For so many decrees speak, now of a cleric in fact and in name, and now of a cleric in bare name, as the Canon says in dist. 40 under the authority of Chrysostom: "Many are priests and few are priests: many in name, few in deed; for it is not the place or the chair that makes the holy priest, but the reverse."[2] So, if this signification were thrown out, it would be hard to know who was a cleric or a priest.[3] Second, I suppose that a cleric, in England as elsewhere, could sin however enormously, in any kind of sin; this is clear from the bishop Iscariot,[4] from the religious Sergius[5] and from many other priests of whom holy scripture and the chronicles make mention; indeed, daily experience teaches the same. For a cleric (as such) does not have from the Lord a title to his confirmation [in grace];[6] but we have from the testimony of the holy doctors that, by reason of the dignity of order and of the devil's temptation, they commonly sin more harshly, more gravely than the common people, as we see by the faith of our eyes [334]in the

¶2 334.4–334.11

[334] **Tercio suppono facta regum Anglie superius memorata et perseveranciam regis et regni ad defendendum hanc potestatem tamquam legitimam et regis Anglie precipuam regaliam. Ex quo sequitur quod ipsi supponunt hoc regis privilegium non esse catholice veritati dissonum sed consonum, cum (ut dicunt) sit fundabile in scriptura in qua omnis veritas et non nisi veritas catholica est contenta.**

Third, I suppose the deeds of the kings of England recalled above, and the perseverance of the king and kingdom in defending this power as lawful and as the chief regality of the king of England. From this it follows that they suppose this privilege of the king to be not discordant with catholic truth but concordant, since (as they say) it can be founded in scripture, in which all truth, and nothing but catholic truth, is contained.

¶3 334.12–335.22

335.5 *and are therefore obstinate heretics who ought not to be prayed for.*
335.13 *It is a mere evasion to say that the deprivation was qualified;*
335.23 *or that the clergy still profit by them, since the righteous possess all things;*

[334] **Ex istis sic arguo: Reges Anglie sepe abstulerunt temporalia simpliciter a clero suo, ut patet ex supposicione tercia, et nec unquam abstulerunt sic legitime, nec potuerunt legitime sic auferre, ut patet ex secunda conclusione et tercia doctoris. Ergo in hoc fecerunt qualiter non potuerunt legitime facere. Ex quo sequitur ultra quod in hoc fecerunt qualiter non potuerunt meritorie vel de lege Dei facere, et cum omne opus humanum ex deliberacione sua precedens sit legitimum vel illegitimum, meritorium vel demeritorium, sequitur quod illegitime et demeritorie sic fecerunt, et ultra sequitur quod inciderunt ut sic in errorem periculosum, quia tam corporis quam anime dampnabiliter perditivum. Et supposito errore isto in facto, patet quod est pertinaciter defensatus, quia rex et regnum constanter defendunt hanc potestatem tamquam legitimam eciam usque ad mortem cum gladio si oportet. Et quod error iste sit directe contrarius catholice veritati, patet tripliciter ex datis. Primo, quia rex sic faciendo fecit quod non licuit nec licere potuit, ut sequitur ex datis. Secundo, quia iniuste** [335] **abstulit aliena contra mandata secunde tabule, et tercio, quia fecit ista non in caritate contra veritatem catholicam Apostoli, I°, Cor. XVI°, 14: Omnia vestra in caritate fiant. Totum antecedens est ab adversario concedendum. Ex quibus ultra colligitur quod reges Anglie in sic faciendo sunt heretici, et cum illud usque ad mortem defenderant, sequitur quod decesserunt heretici et dampnati; et revera religiosus possessionatus qui credit hec omnia vel remisse vel nullo modo oraret pro dictis regibus iam defunctis et cum ex titulo sic orandi tenet a rege suas elemosinas temporales. Nec valet dicere quod nunquam simpliciter abstulit rex temporalia clericorum, quia certum est quod abstulit ab eis tam mobilia quam immobilia sine hoc quod unquam eis restituit et talem ablacionem vocant scriptura et communitas ablacionem simpliciter, vel si vocetur ablacio solum secundum quid, quia solum a parte ecclesie, non contendo sed**

pseudo-pope and his pseudo-cardinals,[7] who out of desire for pomp and gain, but not out of desire for meritorious progress, throw holy mother church into confusion.

From these I argue thus.[8] The kings of England have often taken away temporal goods from their clergy without qualification, as is clear from the third supposition; and they never took them away so lawfully, nor could they lawfully so take them away, as is clear from the doctor's second and third conclusions. Therefore in this they acted as they could not lawfully act. From this it follows further that in this they acted as they could not act meritoriously or according to God's law; and since every human work that proceeds from its deliberation is lawful or unlawful, meritorious or demeritorious, it follows that they acted so unlawfully and demeritoriously; and further it follows that they fell, as such, into a dangerous error, because one damnably ruinous of body as well as soul. And given this error in the deed, it is clear that it is pertinaciously defended, because king and kingdom steadily defend this power as lawful, even to death with the sword if need be. And that this error is directly contrary to catholic truth is clear in three ways from what has been granted. First, because the king in so doing did what was not permitted and could not be permitted, as follows from what has been granted. Second, because he unjustly [335] **took away what belonged to others, against the commandments of the second table; and third, because he did these things not in charity, against the catholic truth of the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 16:14: "Let all your things be done in charity." The whole antecedent is to be granted by the opponent. From this it is further gathered that the kings of England in so doing are heretics; and since they defended it to death, it follows that they died heretics and damned; and truly a possessioner religious who believes all this would pray for the said kings, now dead, either slackly or not at all, and that although he holds his alms in temporal goods from the king on the title of so praying.[9] Nor**

scripturam et mundum in testes invoco quod tanta confiscacio qualis memoratur facta per reges Anglie fuit notabilis ablacio temporalium.

is it any use to say that the king never took away the clerics' temporal goods without qualification, because it is certain that he took from them movables as well as immovables without ever restoring them to them, and scripture and the community call such a taking-away a taking-away without qualification; or, if it is called a taking-away only in a certain respect, because only from a part of the church, I do not contend, but I invoke scripture and the world as witnesses that so great a confiscation as is recorded to have been made by the kings of England was a notable taking-away of temporal goods.

¶4 335.23–335.31

[335] Nec valet sompniare quod post ablacionem perceperunt fructum eorum ex titulo caritatis, qua omnia sunt iustis communia, quia multi amaro animo et cum murmure ferunt ablacionem huiusmodi, nec sunt in capitulo cum illis quibus ait Apostolus quod rapinam bonorum suorum cum gaudio susceperunt, ymmo quomodocunque dicatur, sequitur contra secundam conclusionem doctoris quod reges Anglie possunt in casu auferre simpliciter temporalia cleri sui.

Nor is it any use to dream that after the taking-away they received the fruit of them by the title of charity, by which all things are common to the just;[10] because many bear such a taking-away with a bitter mind and with murmuring, and are not of one chapter with those of whom the Apostle says that they "took with joy the being stripped of their own goods";[11] indeed, however it is put, it follows, against the doctor's second conclusion, that the kings of England can in a given case take away the temporal goods of their clergy without qualification.

¶5 336.1–336.16

336.1 *or that the clergy cease to be such by deserving punishment.*

[336] Nec valet dicere quod merendo talem ablacionem homo desinit esse clerus, tum quia hoc est contra primam supposicionem, cum caracter ordinis sit indelebilis, tum quia sic pauci vel nulli clerici possessionati docerent legitime quod gauderent privilegio vel possessione ex titulo clericatus, quod nimis preiudicaret ordini nostro. Nec est mihi verisimile quod doctor stabit in isto, cum conclusio sua tercia dicit quod nulli reges Anglie temporalia a clero suo unquam legitime abstulerunt, et cum aliquis ex dubio fuit pro aliquo tempore fidelis clericus regis et tamen postea decidens a clericatu meritorio et fidelitate regis meruit post ut per regem sua temporalia auferantur. Sic enim fuit de Scarioth quoad Christum et sic notum est quosdam clericos alienigenas promotos in Anglia coniunctos cum hostibus post regem Anglie defidasse.

Nor is it any use to say that by deserving such a taking-away a man ceases to be clergy: both because this is against the first supposition, since the character of order is indelible, and because in that way few or no possessioner clerics could lawfully show that they enjoyed a privilege or possession on the title of the clerical state, which would greatly prejudice our order.[12] Nor does it seem likely to me that the doctor will stand by this, since his third conclusion says that no kings of England ever lawfully took away temporal goods from their clergy; and since someone has doubtless been for some time a faithful cleric of the king, and yet afterwards, falling away from the meritorious clerical state and from fidelity to the king, deserved afterwards that his temporal goods be taken away by the king.[13] For so it was with Iscariot with regard to Christ; and so it is known that certain foreign clerics promoted in England, having joined with enemies, afterwards defied the king of England.[14]

Notes

1. 333.2: the established Latin reads *Tercia. Tercia, ii domini reges*; the print (on the plate) has *Tercia* once, at the head of the page, and it is translated once. *Ii* is the demonstrative, "those". A in the margin at 332.20: *Tres conclusiones*.

2. Decretum D. 40 c. 12, which Loserth gives as under the authority of the author of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 43 (form ours). The canon reads *multi nomine* and ends *facit sacerdotem sed sacerdos cathedram*, "makes the priest, but the priest the chair"; Wyclif's *sanctum ... sed econtra* compresses it.

3. ***Signacione***: the "signification" of *clerus* just set out (in fact and name, or in name only); it could also be the "marking" of the sacramental character (333.6–7). ***Communiter*** (333.5) is "in the common sense", against *laxius*.
4. Judas as "bishop": Acts 1:20, "his bishopric let another take."
5. Sergius: the renegade monk of medieval legend who instructed Muhammad (Higden, *Polychronicon* V.14; Wyclif cites Vincent and Higden for it at *De ver. s. script.* I, 250–51). A_1 in the margin adds "and John, pope XXIII, who was condemned at Constance as a heretic and the devil incarnate", a later reader's addition (1415).
6. ***Titulum sue confirmacionis a domino***: confirmation in grace, which would make him unable to sin; *domino* is taken as the Lord. ***Plus aspere ... gravius***: the print doubles the comparative, and both are kept.
7. The pseudo-pope is Clement VII (cf. 352.15–17, 15-g), elected in 1378 against Urban VI.
8. Loserth compares Hus, ***De ablacione bonorum temporalium a clericis*** (Opera, Nuremberg 1558, I, fol. 122^{v}). A in the margin: ***Prima racio***. The three marks of heresy that follow answer the doctor's first conclusion point by point.
9. ***Et cum ... tenet***: taken as concessive, "and that although". ***Elemosinas temporales*** here are alms consisting of temporal goods, held on the title of prayer, not the "temporary alms" of *elemosina temporalis*; rendered "alms in temporal goods".
10. ***Perceperunt fructum eorum***: the subject is the deprived clergy, said still to enjoy the goods' fruit under charity's title, by which all things belong to the just. A in the margin: ***Ficcio***.
11. Heb. 10:34, "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods"; Wyclif turns the second person into the third (***suorum ... susceperunt***). ***In capitulo***: "of one chapter", as of a religious house; it may simply mean "in one class".
12. ***Docerent legitime***: "could lawfully show", that is, prove their title in law. A in the margin: ***Ficcio***.
13. ***Ex dubio*** (so on the plate): taken as "doubtless", like ***absque dubio***; it could mean "conceivably". The second *cum* clause gives a case the doctor's third conclusion cannot cover.
14. ***Defidasse***: ***diffidare***, to renounce fealty, "defy" in the feudal sense.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 332: ***gracia*** (2 and D are margin numeral and alinea letter)
  - 333: ***futurum***
  - 334: ***profectus*** (print: torii profectus conturbant)
  - 334: ∅ (to is the English side-note (contrary to))
  - 335: ***abstulit*** (175d folio mark and E alinea letter are not text)
  - 335: ***tercio*** (3 is the margin argument numeral)
  - 335: ***I°*** (capital I with degree sign: I°, Cor.)
  - 336: ***dubio*** (print: ex dubio; 10 after it is the line number) [NW]
  - 334: ***pseudopapa***

Part 3: The condition of the first endowment: alms may be withdrawn for contempt

Loserth pp. 336.17–340.16

¶1 336.17–338.11

336.25 *These endowments were first made after the coming of Augustine.*
337.4 *and may have had conditions attached to them; such as forfeiture by contempt.*
337.14 *The customs of the realm show that such conditions were attached;*
337.22 *so our princes may on sufficient occasion withdraw alms.*
338.11 *Such a condition is reasonable,*
338.14 *for without it the King would damage his*

[336]**Ex istis secundo arguitur quod nedum potuit sed decuit eum sic dotasse ecclesiam, ut licite posset subtrahere elemosinas suas in casu quo earum abusus vergat ad detrimentum regni et subtraccionem evangelii; et scimus pro tempore antequam Britones et Saxones dotarunt ecclesiam vel enim fuit ecclesia nostra dotata, et interim tempore Saxonum ante adventum Augustini fuit fides Christi infideliter pretermissa, tunc isti principes primo dotantes ecclesiam nostram non erant moti nisi titulo misericordie donare plus vel minus nostre ecclesie ut nec cesar. Potuerunt ergo dedisse clero nostro quantum decreverint, adiciendo quamcunque condicionem honestam voluerint, sed potuerant cum donacione sua primeva adiecisse condicionem honestam quod elemosinarii non contempnant** [337]**insurgentes in regem ad sui populi detrimentum.**

From these it is argued, second, that it was not only possible for him but fitting that he should have so endowed the church that he could lawfully withdraw his alms in the case where their abuse tends to the detriment of the kingdom and the withdrawal of the gospel.[1] And we know, for the time before the Britons and Saxons endowed the church, for our church was either endowed, and in the meantime, in the time of the Saxons before the coming of Augustine, the faith of Christ was faithlessly let drop; then those princes who first endowed our church were moved by no title but that of mercy to give more or less to our church, as neither was Caesar.[2] They could therefore have given our clergy as much as they decided, adding whatever honest condition they wished; now they could have added, with their first donation, the honest condition that the

kingdom by giving endowments.
338.21 *If he had no power over the possessions of the clergy he would not be King of all England,*

Omnia ista suppono ex cronicis et tamquam proxima per se notis. Non enim tenebantur reges sub pena excommunicacionis dotare suam ecclesiam dotacione perpetua plus vel minus, ut patet ex dictis; tunc enim tenerentur sub pena dampnacionis dedisse clero suum totale dominium, cuius oppositum suppono. Et ex istis sic arguitur: Si secundum istam formam dotassent nostram ecclesiam, licite potuissent pro contemptu regis suam elemosinam subtraxisse, sed cum ista condicione potuerunt dotasse nostram ecclesiam, ergo potuerunt pro contemptu cleri datam elemosinam licite subtraxisse. Cum ergo illa condicio fuisset licita et honesta, consuetudoque regis et regni docent in facto condicionem illam fuisse adiectam, videtur nimis presumptuosa assercio quod principes nostri non potuerunt ab eis auferre temporalia quantumcunque deliquerint; ymmo cum absolute necessario potuerunt talem condicionem adicere, et iterum absolute necessario elemosinarii possent tantum delinquere, patet (ut sepe dixi) quod principes nostri absolute necessario potuerunt suas elemosinas subtrahere, periculo possibili imminente. Et per idem sequitur quod potuerunt cum possibilibus paribus subtrahere in futurum, quod sonat directe contra terciam conclusionem doctoris que dicit quod reges Anglie temporalia a clero suo nunquam legitime abstulerunt, sicut nec datis paribus legitime potuerunt in futurum. Et notate verba si, inquam, nec datis paribus potuerunt auferre legitime, tunc nec datis aliquibus paribus potuerunt auferre legitime, et per consequens in quantumcunque magnam [338] prodicionem regni nostri clerus possessionatus conspiraverit vel quantumcunque magna necessitas regno nostro contigerit, non liceret regi ad defensionem regni bona appropriata clero suo accipere; nec dubitat vel cecus logicus quin si liceret regi bona cleri in tali casu possibili qui tam sepe contigit, tunc poterit cum paribus sic auferre. Sed supponendo istam potenciam tamquam absolute necessariam, accedendoque ad licenciam et debitum, probo primo racionabilitatem condicionis superius recitate: Nam rex Anglie dotans ecclesiam suam nec debuit nec potuit ipsam dotare

almsmen should not show contempt [337] by rising against the king to the detriment of his people.[3] All these things I suppose from the chronicles, and as next to things known of themselves. For the kings were not bound under pain of excommunication to endow their church with a perpetual endowment, more or less, as is clear from what has been said; for then they would be bound under pain of damnation to have given the clergy their whole lordship, the opposite of which I suppose. And from these it is argued thus: if they had endowed our church according to this form, they could lawfully have withdrawn their alms for contempt of the king; now they could have endowed our church with this condition; therefore they could lawfully have withdrawn the alms given, for the clergy's contempt. Since, therefore, that condition would have been lawful and honest, and the custom of the king and kingdom shows that in fact that condition was added, the assertion seems too presumptuous that our princes could not take away the temporal goods from them however much they had offended. Indeed, since with absolute necessity they could add such a condition, and again with absolute necessity the almsmen could offend so much, it is clear (as I have often said) that our princes with absolute necessity could withdraw their alms, if a possible danger were imminent.[4] And by the same token it follows that they could, possible circumstances being equal, withdraw them in the future; which sounds directly against the doctor's third conclusion, which says that the kings of England never lawfully took away temporal goods from their clergy, as neither, given equal circumstances, could they lawfully in the future. And mark the words: if, I say, given equal circumstances they could not lawfully take away, then given any equal circumstances whatever they could not lawfully take away; and consequently, into however great a [338] treason against our kingdom the possessioner clergy should conspire, or however great a necessity should befall our kingdom, it would not be lawful for the king, for the defence of the kingdom, to take the goods appropriated to his clergy.[5] And not even a blind logician doubts that, if it were lawful for the king [to take] the goods of the clergy in such a possible case, which has so often happened, then he will be able, circumstances being equal, so to take them away.[6] But, supposing this power as absolutely necessary, and proceeding to what is permitted and what is owed, I prove first the reasonableness of the condition recited above.[7] For the king of England, in endowing his church, neither ought nor could endow it

¶2 338.12–340.16
339.1 *since a fourth part of the realm would be under the Pope,*
339.9 *who is said to be the only ruler the clergy should acknowledge.*
339.21 *So the royal power would be maimed.*
340.1 *Customs proving the King's rights,*
340.9 *acquiesced in by the clergy.*

[338]ad enervacionem vel deterioracionem regni sui. Cum omnis potestas sit a Deo qui non potest dare potenciam ad hunc finem, sed sic contingeret supposito quod rex absolute dotasset suam ecclesiam non subintelligendo condicionem illam, ergo oportuit condicionem illam subintelligi et per consequens, quando contemptus cleri accidit, rex capiendo temporalia in manus suas non facit clero illi iniuriam, cum condicio ex defectu cleri dissolvitur. Minor autem argumenti sic ostenditur: Si omnia illa bona quibus dotatur nostra ecclesia immediate et directe pertinerent ad papam, sic quod rex non habeat interesse in possessionibus vel personis, cum plus quam quarta pars regni sit devoluta ad manum mortuam, sequitur quod rex noster non sit rex tocius Anglie, cum plus quam quarta pars in manu mortua est decisa. Stat enim aliquid esse in [339]regno et non de illo, sed quomodo contingeret hoc planius quam quod omnia temporalia cleri Anglie non forent sub regis regimine sed pape, cum enim dicunt quod papa dominatur civiliter, nec est possibile quod due tam disparate persone dominentur ex equo simul civiliter super eodem, relinquitur eis dicere quod rex noster sit quoad omnia mortificata in regno nostro vel exclusus simpliciter vel pape subdominans. Sibi enim non licet (ut inquiunt) interponere de clero vel possessionibus suis quantumcunque deliquerint, nec regi licet subtrahere temporalia eorum, quantumcunque abusus vergat ad regni periculum, quia (ut inquiunt) exempti sunt a iurisdiccione regis, tam in corpore quam in bonis, et inmediate subiecti pape vel suis ballivis, collectoribus vel ministris. In cuius signum papa habet post mortes multorum prelatorum et abbatum in Anglia primos fructus secundum nephandum abusum infundabiliter presumptum et a regibus culpabiliter toleratum. Unde (ut alias dixi) quicunque pertinaciter dogmatizaverint istam sentenciam nituntur proditorie subvertere regnum nostrum. Oportet ergo de integritate regalie regis nostri quod habet potestatem ad confiscandum suas elemosinas pro contemptu, quia, cum religiosi possessionati non sunt confirmati sed peccabiles sicut vulgus, patet, cum plus elongatur a rege punire eos tam in personis quam in temporalibus, si rex non posset punire eos in temporalibus, cessaret quoad eos omnis regalis cohercio, et tunc sicut angeli non sunt subiecti seculariter regi Anglie nec boni nec mali, sic nec illi. Nam persona vel populus existens in regno et non subiecta legibus regis et regni, non dicitur esse de illo regno, ut patet de comitivis depopulatricibus [340]regnorum et de dominiis alienorum regum infra alia regna contentis. Sed ut meminerunt recencius iuris regis, optentum est privilegio laudabili regni nostri quod in mortibus

to the enervation or deterioration of his kingdom. Since all power is from God, who cannot give power for this end,[8] now so it would come about, supposing that the king had endowed his church absolutely, without that condition being understood as implied: therefore that condition had to be understood as implied; and consequently, when contempt on the clergy's part occurs, the king, in taking the temporal goods into his hands, does that clergy no wrong, since the condition is dissolved by the clergy's default. Now the minor of the argument is shown thus.[9] If all those goods with which our church is endowed belonged immediately and directly to the pope, so that the king had no interest in the possessions or the persons, then, since more than a fourth part of the kingdom has devolved to the dead hand, it follows that our king is not king of all England, since more than a fourth part is cut off in the dead hand.[10] For it can be that something is in a [339]kingdom and not of it; but how could this come about more plainly than if all the temporal goods of the clergy of England were not under the king's rule but the pope's? For since they say that the pope exercises civil lordship, and it is not possible that two persons so disparate should exercise civil lordship over the same thing equally and at once, it remains for them to say that our king, with regard to everything amortized in our kingdom, is either excluded without qualification or holds lordship under the pope.[11] For it is not lawful for him (as they say) to intervene concerning the clergy or their possessions, however much they have offended, nor is it lawful for the king to withdraw their temporal goods, however much the abuse tends to the kingdom's peril, because (as they say) they are exempt from the king's jurisdiction, in body as well as in goods, and immediately subject to the pope or to his bailiffs, collectors or ministers. In sign of which the pope has, after the deaths of many prelates and abbots in England, the first fruits, according to an abominable abuse presumed without foundation and culpably tolerated by the kings.[12] Hence (as I have said elsewhere) whoever pertinaciously dogmatize this teaching strive treasonably to subvert our kingdom.[13] It must therefore belong to the integrity of our king's regality that he has power to confiscate his alms for contempt; because, since the possessioner religious are not confirmed [in grace] but capable of sinning like the common people, it is clear (since to punish them in their persons is further removed from the king than in their temporal goods) that if the king could not punish them in their temporal goods, all royal coercion would cease with regard to them; and then, as the angels, neither the good

multorum sacerdotum qui de rege tenent in feodo temporalia cedant regi. Unde ex iure patronatus confert beneficia interim vacancia, et licenciato capitulo ad novam eleccionem presentato sibi electo approbat vel reprobat sicut placet. Unde cum rex preter istas regalias aufert sepe temporalia a capitulis eciam invitis, vel oportet dicere quod omnia ista licet sibi facere vel si non potest tunc cum facto foret hereticus, et per consequens illi ex vecordi taciturnitate et redempcione temporalium que capitaliter tenerent, de tanto heretici forent heresis sue participes. Cur ergo ex fundamento scripture sacre vel iuris canonici hoc non docent?

nor the bad, are not subject in a secular way to the king of England, so neither would they be.[14] For a person or a people existing in a kingdom and not subject to the laws of the king and kingdom is not said to be of that kingdom, as is clear of the companies that lay waste [340] kingdoms, and of the lordships of foreign kings contained within other kingdoms.[15] But, as those who more freshly remember the king's right [recall], it has been obtained by a laudable privilege of our kingdom that at the deaths of many priests who hold of the king in fee the temporal goods pass to the king. Hence by right of patronage he confers the benefices vacant in the meantime; and when the chapter has been licensed to a new election and the one elected has been presented to him, he approves or rejects him as he pleases.[16] Hence, since the king, besides these regalities, often takes temporal goods away from chapters even against their will, either one must say that all these things are lawful for him to do, or, if he cannot [lawfully do them], then with the deed he would be a heretic; and consequently those [chapters], by their faint-hearted silence and by the redemption of the temporal goods which they would hold [of him] as chief lord, would to that extent be heretics, partakers of his heresy.[17] Why then do they not teach this from a foundation in holy scripture or canon law?

Notes

1. A in the margin at 336.17: *Secunda racio*. Loserth compares Hus, *De ablacione bonorum temporalium*, fol. 121^{r}. *Eum* is the king of 335–336; *subtraccionem evangelii* is the withdrawal of the gospel's preaching.
2. The period does not construe as printed. *Scimus* is Loserth's correction (the manuscripts read *simus*, 336.21); *vel enim fuit ecclesia nostra dotata* (336.21–22) has no second member to *vel*, and *tunc* begins a new clause without a main verb for *scimus*. The side-note gives the sense intended: there was no endowment before Augustine's mission, and the first endowers gave out of mercy only. A word such as *nec* (*nec enim fuit*, "for our church was not endowed") may have been lost; the print is translated as it stands. *Ut nec cesar*: "as neither was Caesar [moved by any other title]", Constantine as the first endower.
3. *Contempnant* has no object; taken absolutely, with *insurgentes* giving the form the contempt takes. *Sed* brings the minor premiss. The apparatus notes that A omits *voluerint ... honestam* (336.29), an eye-skip.
4. *Absolute necessario potuerunt*: "it is absolutely necessary that they could", a necessary possibility, not a necessity of acting; Wyclif's point is that no hypothesis about the clergy can remove the power. A in the margin at 337.28: *Conclusio falsa*, the doctor's conclusion.
5. *Datis paribus*: the doctor's wording (15-b had *ceteris paribus*); Wyclif presses it to "given any equal circumstances whatever", so that no case, however grave, would permit a taking-away. *Quantumcunque magnam*: A A_1 *quantamcunque*; the manuscripts read *in quantum* (337.31).
6. *Liceret regi bona cleri*: the infinitive is understood from *accipere* in the preceding clause and is supplied in brackets.
7. *Licenciam et debitum*: Wyclif moves from power (*potencia*) to what is permitted and what is owed. A in the margin at 338.10: *Racio*. Loserth prints Hus's reuse: *Item rex Boemie dotans ecclesiam suam nec debuit ...*.
8. Cf. Rom. 13:1, "there is no power but from God"; a paraphrase, not a quotation.
9. *Minor*: the premiss *sic contingeret supposito ...* above, that an unconditional endowment would weaken the kingdom.
10. Hus repeats the argument of Bohemia: *sequitur quod rex noster non sit rex tocius Boemie, cum plus quam quarta pars pro clericis in manu mortua est decisa* (Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*, pp. 199–208; Evans's translation pp. 225–235). B reads *est vel decisa* (338.28).
11. *Subdominans*: "holding lordship under", the king as the pope's sub-lord. *Disparate*: B *desparate* (339.5).

12. ***Primos fructus***: the first year's revenues of a benefice reserved to the papacy (annates), claimed in England in the fourteenth century and complained of in the Good Parliament, 1376 (Rot. Parl. II, 338–39).
13. ***Sentenciam***: CONTEXTUAL; here the position taught, "teaching", not a judicial sentence.
14. ***Cum plus elongatur … tam in personis quam in temporalibus***: taken as a comparison, punishment in the person being further from the king's reach than punishment in goods; ***tam … quam*** may instead mean "in persons as much as in goods". B reads ***sicut Angli*** for ***sicut angeli*** (339.29). A in the margin at 339.19: ***Conclusio***.
15. ***Comitivis depopulatricibus***: the free companies of mercenaries; Loserth compares Walsingham, ***Historia Anglicana***, I, 302.
16. The king's right to the temporalities of vacant sees and abbeys, his presentation to benefices falling vacant meanwhile, and his licence to elect and assent to the one elected (cf. Constitutions of Clarendon, c. 12). B reads ***licento*** (340.7).
17. ***Redempcione temporalium***: the chapters' buying back of their seized goods, taken as complicity. ***Capitaliter tenerent***: hold of the king in chief. ***Si non potest***: the infinitive is understood ("cannot [lawfully]"). B reads ***de tanto heretico*** (340.14).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 336: ***et*** (176a folio mark follows)
  - 337: ***regis***
  - 337: ***imminente***
  - 338: ***bona*** (5 after it is the line number)
  - 338: ***sui***
  - 338: ∅ (of is the English side-note (possessions of); print: illa bona)
  - 338: ***cum***
  - 339: ***Anglie***
  - 339: ***forent***
  - 339: ***Oportet***
  - 339: ***cohercio*** [NW]
  - 339: ***regno*** (176b folio mark glued)
  - 338: ∅ (fragment of subintelligi; JOIN 116 subi + 117 n + 118 te + 119 lli + 120 gi -> subintelligi) [DELX]
  - 338: ***subintelligi*** (print: subintelligi (agent 13); scan cut it in five)
  - 338: ∅ (joined at 116)
  - 338: ∅ (joined at 116)
  - 338: ∅ (joined at 116)
  - 338: ∅ (joined at 116)

Part 4: The third argument: the king must take abused alms and restore them to the church

Loserth pp. 340.17–342.12

¶1 340.17–342.12
340.17 *Again, we assert that the King's duty is to take from false clergymen and restore to the Church.*
341.1 *It is objected that heresy does not come within the King's cognisance;*
341.12 *but the King is bound to guard against all dangers to the kingdom.*
341.23 *Confirmation: 1. The decretals say that abuse of a privilege forfeits it.*

[340] Tercio principaliter arguitur de lege Dei atque ecclesie quod rex debet in casu subtrahere suas elemosinas a nominetenus clericis et restituere eas sancte matri ecclesie. Nam hoc foret complementum iusticie, prodessens altrinsecus omniquaque; cum ergo ad regem maxime pertinet facere iusticiam in rebus subiectis suo dominio, sequitur quod ad regem pertinentissime spectat complementum talis iusticie. Antecedens patet ex hoc quod omnis sic pertinaciter abutens bonis ecclesie est hereticus (ut patet in fine XIII[i] cap.). Sed cum omnis hereticus iniuste occupans bona regni nostri est spoliandus, et bona restituenda veris dominis, videtur quod bona illa quibus rex tam principaliter dominatur, sunt per regem confiscanda et veris dominis restituenda, specialiter in tam pertinaci desidia spiritualis prepositi. Nec valet dicere quod ad regem non pertinet cognoscere

Third, it is argued principally from the law of God and of the church that the king ought, in a given case, to withdraw his alms from those who are clerics in name only and restore them to holy mother church.[1] For this would be the fulfilment of justice, profiting on both sides in every way;[2] since, therefore, it belongs most of all to the king to do justice in things subject to his lordship, it follows that the fulfilment of such justice belongs most properly to the king. The antecedent is clear from this, that everyone who so pertinaciously abuses the goods of the church is a heretic (as is clear at the end of chapter 13).[3] Now since every heretic unjustly occupying the goods of our kingdom is to be despoiled, and the goods are to be restored to their true lords, it seems that those goods over which the king so principally exercises lordship are to be confiscated by

342.4 *This forfeiture; must be enforced by the King.*

super heretica pravitate; quia [341] ad regem pertinet cognoscere quod elemosinarius suus vivat clericaliter, tum quia sub illa condicione sunt elemosine sibi date, tum eciam quia degenerando ab ista vita foret monstrum maxime proditorie faciens ad destruccionem regni, et per consequens incurrens contemptum regis gravissimum. Ideo idem foret cecare regem et regnum per istum fucum sophisticum et dicere illis quod non pertinet eis cognoscere quid foret saluti anime eorum et gubernacioni regni necessarium. Et revera quicunque hoc imposuerit regi nostro, imponit sibi implicite quod non sit habilis ad regnandum. Rex ergo tenetur scire per se vel suum executivum consilium quid vergeret ad sui ac regni maius periculum, quod indubie foret omissio corrigendi quia secundum beatum Gregorium et leges quotlibet: Qui emendare potest et negligit absque dubio participem delicti se ipsum constituit. Consideret ergo de cleri crimine rex vel suum consilium secundum racionem qua est ipsius regni cuius rex accepit gubernacula destructivum, sicut docet beatus Gregorius in Registro lib. XI°, cap. XXIX° (ut superius allegavi). Confirmatur tripliciter, primo per hoc quod iuxta decretum beati Gregorii positum XI^a^, q. III^a^, Privilegium: Privilegium omnino debet amittere qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate. Sed omnis clericus abutens elemosinis regis sibi permissa abutitur potestate, cum ergo illa dotacio sit privilegium, sequitur quod illud omnino debet amittere. Sed per quem nisi per regem privilegiantem? Illius enim est privilegium interpretari et defendere cuius est condere. Confirmatur ex illo Matthei, XIII° 12: Omni habenti dabitur et habundabit, [342] ab eo autem qui non habet et quod videtur habere auferetur ab eo. Cum ergo rex tenetur sic habundare ex titulo iusticie, videtur quod ab eo debet causari ablacio sui elemosinarii, supposito quod contingat eum videri habere elemosinas quas non habet; et propter talem abusum habitualem dixi dominos temporales posse auferre bona sua a clericis micius quam loquitur beatus Gregorius cum canone, quia ipsi dicunt confuse quod privilegium omnino debet amittere propter abusum. Ego autem specifico abusum pertinacem qui inducit pravitatem hereticam, et tunc nulli dubium debet elemosinator subtrahere patrimonium Crucifixi.

the king and restored to their true lords, especially in so pertinacious a sloth of the spiritual superior. Nor is it any use to say that it does not belong to the king to take cognizance of heretical depravity; because [341] it belongs to the king to take cognizance that his almsman lives as a cleric, both because the alms were given to him under that condition, and also because, degenerating from that life, he would be a monster acting most treasonably toward the destruction of the kingdom, and consequently falling into the gravest contempt of the king.[4] Therefore it would be the same thing to blind the king and kingdom with this sophistical disguise and to tell them that it does not belong to them to know what would be necessary for the salvation of their soul and for the government of the kingdom. And truly, whoever lays this on our king lays implicitly to his charge that he is not fit to reign. The king, therefore, is bound to know, by himself or through his executive council, what would tend to the greater danger of himself and the kingdom; and that without doubt would be the omission to correct, because according to blessed Gregory and any number of laws: "Whoever can amend and neglects to, without doubt makes himself a partaker of the offence."[5] Let the king, then, or his council consider the crime of the clergy according to the respect in which it is destructive of the very kingdom whose government the king has received, as blessed Gregory teaches in the Register, book 11, chapter 29 (as I alleged above).[6] This is confirmed in three ways. First by this, that according to the decree of blessed Gregory placed in [C.] 11 q. 3, *Privilegium*: "He ought to lose his privilege altogether who abuses the power permitted to him."[7] Now every cleric who abuses the king's alms abuses the power permitted to him; since, therefore, that endowment is a privilege, it follows that he ought to lose it altogether. But through whom, if not through the privileging king? For it belongs to him whose it is to make a privilege to interpret and defend it.[8] It is confirmed from that of Matthew 13:12: "To every one that hath shall be given, and he shall abound: [342] but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away."[9] Since, therefore, the king is bound so to abound by title of justice, it seems that the taking-away from his almsman ought to be caused by him, supposing it happens that the almsman seems to have alms which he does not have; and on account of such habitual abuse I have said that temporal lords can take away their goods from clerics, more mildly than blessed Gregory speaks with the canon, because they say indistinctly that a man ought to lose his privilege altogether for abuse.[10] But I specify pertinacious abuse, which brings in heretical

depravity; and then it is doubtful to no one [that] the almsgiver ought to withdraw the patrimony of the Crucified.

Notes

1. A in the margin at 340.19: *Tercia racio. Nominetenus clericis*: clerics "in name only", the *clericus nudo nomine* of 333.
2. *Prodessens* (340.21) is not a classical form; taken as a participle of *prodesse*, "profiting". B reads *omniquam* for *omniquaque*.
3. "Chapter 13": A reads *XXII*, corrected to *XIII*; A_1 *XXII* (340.26). The reference is to the close of chapter 13.
4. *Contemptum regis gravissimum*: the gravest contempt toward the king, the forfeiting condition of 337. B reads *detraccionem* for *destruccionem* (341.5). A in the margin at 340.32: *Ficcio*, of the objection.
5. No reference at the page foot. Gregory to Brunhild, *qui emendare potest et negligit, participem se procul dubio delicti constituit* (PL 77, *Registrum* lib. XI; Ivo cites it as lib. IX ep. 64). Decretum D. 86 c. 3, *Facientis proculdubio culpam habet*, is only a loose parallel, and it is John VIII's. B in the margin: *Nota quomodo rex secundum Gregorium habet interesse ad defectus clericorum corrigendos*; A: *Rex peccat, si non corrigit clericum elemosinis abutentem*. Loserth compares Hus, fol. 123.
6. Gregory, *Registrum* XI.29 in Wyclif's numbering, cited earlier in the treatise; the letter to Brunhild of n5 (PL 77, *Reg.* XI.69, 1170–71: *ne paucorum facinus multorum possit esse perditio; nam causa sunt ruinae populi sacerdotes mali*); PL's XI.29 is to Queen Bertha. *Ut superius allegavi* refers to n5's quotation. *Racionem*: "the respect in which", not the technical "aspect" against *substancia*.
7. Decretum C. 11 q. 3 c. 63 (form ours), which reads *privilegium omnino meretur amittere*, "deserves to lose"; Wyclif has *debet*, "ought". The first *Privilegium* is the canon's incipit. A in the margin at 341.28: *Triplex confirmacio*.
8. The legal maxim *eius est interpretari cuius est condere*. The brocard itself is not in the *Corpus iuris*; its roots are Codex 1.14.12.5 (*tam conditor quam interpres legum solus imperator*) and Gratian's dictum at C. 25 q. 1 §2, *ipsi namque soli canones valent interpretari qui ius condendi eos habent*.
9. Wyclif cites Matt. 13:12 but quotes Matt. 25:29 (Vulgate *ei autem qui non habet*; Wyclif *ab eo autem*), whose Douay–Rheims wording is given.
10. *Ablacio sui elemosinarii*: the taking-away from his almsman, an objective genitive of the one deprived. *Micius quam … Gregorius cum canone*: Wyclif's rule is milder, since he requires pertinacious abuse where the canon says *omnino* without distinction. B reads *clerum abusum* (342.6).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 341: *ad* (176c is the folio mark, I the alinea letter)
  - 341: *foret*
  - 341: *lib* (print: Registro lib. XI°) [NW]
  - 342: *elemosinarii*
  - 342: *videri*
  - 342: *propter* (5 after it is the line number)
  - 341: *XI^{a}, q. III^{a},* (output XI^, covers XI^{a}, q. III^{a}, (pos 170 absent); box on q. III^{a},) [-MARK]

Part 5: Correction as the king's spiritual alms, and the objection of defamation

Loserth pp. 342.13–348.23

¶1 342.13–348.23

342.13
2. By the same decretal the King loses his privilege of rule if he is slothful in correction.
343.8
3. The King is bound to see that his subjects are not deprived of spiritual aid.
344.1 *Double merit of alms; a) essential, from the charity of the giver; b)*

[342]Secundo confirmatur ex hoc quod rex (in quantum huiusmodi) habet privilegium concessum a Deo et acceptum a populo ad regnandum; si ergo abutitur sua potestate in desidia correccionis, que maxime spectaret ad regis officium, quis dubitat quin secundum legem premissam rex teneretur amittere regnum suum? Unde inter alia peccata regum videtur quod omissio correccionis et auctorizacio curati inhabilis sit peccatum periculosissimum a regibus absconditum, cum ut sic sunt reges socii defensorum. Et ad illud potest adduci illud dictum Christi Matthei XXI°, 43: Auferetur a vobis regnum et dabitur genti facienti fructus eius. Non enim

Second, it is confirmed from this, that the king (as such) has a privilege to reign, granted by God and accepted by the people; if, therefore, he abuses his power in sloth of correction, which would belong most of all to the king's office, who doubts that according to the law set out before, the king would be bound to lose his kingdom?[1] Hence among the other sins of kings it seems that the omission of correction and the authorizing of an unqualified curate is a most dangerous sin hidden from kings, since as such kings are partners of those defended.[2] And to this can be brought that saying of Christ, Matthew 21:43: "The kingdom shall be

accidental, from the fruit of the gift.
345.3 *Just rule is a more excellent privilege than so called miraculous powers.*
345.24 *The gift of alms is a less good than the suppression of abuses;*
346.4 *and so Augustine teaches.*
347.15 *Objection: 1. We have no right to speak ill of our neighbour.*
347.21 *Answer: We deal in general terms which apply only to those who deserve them.*

posset esse maior contemptus domini quam de suo patrimonio contra ipsum defendere hostem suum. Et ad hoc sunt multe concordancie legum (ut dixi in materia De Symonia); taliter enim meretur tam rex quam symoniacus ut ab eis tamquam ab hereticis dominus auferatur, ut loquitur propheta Osee V°, 6, sacerdotibus et regibus: In armentis suis vadent ad querendum dominum et non invenient: ablatus est ab eis. Talis ergo thesauri ablacio depauperaret regnum ad sui maximum detrimentum. [343]Unde solebam dicere quod ablacio quedam est utrimque bona, ut Marci II°, 20, dicit Christus quod auferetur a discipulis suis sponsus, quandoque tantum alterutrum bona (ut Osee V°), quandoque vero utrimque mala, ut quando criminosi spoliant sese reciproce, semper autem est ablacio passiva bona ablatario permanente in caritativa paciencia. Tercio confirmatur ex lege debiti elemosine spiritualis. Nam rex tenetur tam ex iure Dei quam iure regni servare quantum sufficit legiis suis iusticiam et debitum opus spiritualis misericordie (ut patet superius tractatu De Privilegiis), sed precipuum opus talis misericordie regi pertinens foret castigacio coactiva ad continuandum suas elemosinas; ergo illud debet impendere. Unde qui offenduntur maxime ad verbum de ablacione temporalium vendicant quod seculares defendant elemosinas suorum progenitorum in suo robore permanentes, quod non fit (iuxta dicta XIII° cap.) nisi dum ecclesia habet profectum ex modo elemosinandi, sic quod collata remaneant in racione privilegii vel elemosine, quod extinguitur dum elemosinarii collatis elemosinis abutuntur; quamvis enim remaneat pie donantis voluntas, cum donum corporale perdit racionem elemosine per abusum, et fuisset meritum donatoris extensius, supposito quod sui elemosinarii proficerent magis ecclesie, quia in ipsis elemosinantes magis proficerent. Sic enim secundum beatum Bernardum peccatum Petri Abellardi est adhuc incertum, antequam noscatur quod homines ex sua heresi seducentur. Unde solet dici communiter quod elemosina habet perfeccionem essencialem que attenditur penes fervorem [344]caritatis, secundum quam elemosinans miseretur, et perfeccionem accidentalem que capitur penes quantitatem fructus ex illa occasionata posterius. Ego autem credo quod aliud est genus elemosinandi in predestinatis et aliud in prescitis. Nam tota elemosina quam facit predestinatus limitat sibi gradum beatitudinis ad quem parcialiter proficiunt singule partes eius. Elemosina autem totalis presciti concurrit secundum se totam ad mitigandum penam perpetuam. Si domini temporales (ut elemosinati vendicant) tenentur continuare elemosinas patrum quorum sunt heredes, tunc tenentur ad omne inde sequens formaliter, quia aliter contra possibilitatem obligacionis divine forent ad

taken from you and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof."[3] For there could be no greater contempt of the Lord than to defend his enemy against him out of his own patrimony. And to this there are many concordances of the laws (as I said in the matter *On Simony*);[4] for in such a way the king as well as the simoniac deserves that the Lord be taken away from them as from heretics, as the prophet Hosea 5:6 says to priests and kings: "With their herds they shall go to seek the Lord, and shall not find him: he is withdrawn from them."[5] Such a taking-away of treasure, therefore, would impoverish the kingdom to its greatest detriment. [343]Hence I used to say that one kind of taking-away is good on both sides, as Christ says in Mark 2:20 that the bridegroom shall be taken away from his disciples; sometimes it is good on one side only (as in Hosea 5); but sometimes bad on both sides, as when criminals despoil one another; but passive taking-away is always good when the one from whom it is taken remains in charitable patience.[6] Third, it is confirmed from the law of the duty of spiritual alms. For the king is bound, by the law of God as well as by the law of the kingdom, to keep for his lieges, so far as suffices, justice and the due work of spiritual mercy (as is clear above in the treatise *On Privileges*);[7] now the chief work of such mercy belonging to the king would be coactive chastisement for the continuing of his alms; therefore he ought to bestow it.[8] Hence those who are most offended at talk of the taking-away of temporal goods claim that seculars should defend the alms of their forebears as remaining in their force; which does not happen (according to what was said in chapter 13) except while the church has profit from the manner of almsgiving, so that the things conferred remain in the character of a privilege or of alms; and this is extinguished when the almsmen abuse the alms conferred. For although the will of the one who piously gives remains, when the bodily gift loses the character of alms through abuse; and the giver's merit would have been more extensive, supposing his almsmen profited the church more, because in them the almsgivers would profit more.[9] For so, according to blessed Bernard, the sin of Peter Abelard is as yet uncertain, before it is known that men will be led astray by his heresy.[10] Hence it is commonly said that alms has an essential perfection, which is reckoned by the fervour of [344]charity according to which the almsgiver has mercy, and an accidental perfection, which is taken by the quantity of fruit afterwards occasioned by it.[11] But I believe that the kind of almsgiving in the predestinate is one thing and in the foreknown another. For the whole alms that a predestinate [person] gives assigns

contradictoria obligati, scilicet ad faciendum ipsas esse elemosinas et ad defendendum earum abusum in discolis, secundum quam racionem carent forma elemosine. Ergo cum reges Anglie tenentur servare elemosinas suorum progenitorum in sua perpetuitate, tenentur insuper ex lege spiritualis elemosine suos legios castigare, tenentur tercio ex obligacione qua tenentur facere legiis suis iusticiam et extinguere iniurias que vergunt periculosissime ad sui populi detrimentum; patet quod tenentur in casu bona sua ecclesie sancte restituere et a comtemptoribus Dei sui et regni auferre. Hoc enim fuit pactum dotacionis primeve. Ideo audenter assero, si cum istis paribus rex noster non habet potestatem ad faciendum in clero suo opus misericorditer castigandi, non habet sufficienciam super totali regno nostro politice dominandi, ymmo si bene attendimus ad scripturam sacram et dicta de privilegiis ecclesie, et sonat in privilegium regis quod habeat potenciam taliter clericos cohercendi, et clerici habent [345] privilegium eo quod habent talem prepositum cui sic meritorie possunt subdi. Illi ergo qui dicunt quod rex habet potestatem incomprehensibilem castigando leones et faciendo corporales sanaciones cum aliis que vocant miracula, laxarent porcionem sue potencie ad regulandum regnum suum in clero, cum hoc et eius actus foret excellencius et plus fundabile ex scriptura. Nonne foret excellencius castigare freneticos, peccatores et discolos scole Christi quam domare feras que non tantum nocent ecclesie? Nonne iterum foret opus maioris virtutis gignere virtutes in mente disciplinabili occasione castigacionis salubris, qua ablata ab ecclesia virtutes ab indomito subtrahuntur, quam inducere virtualiter corpoream sanitatem? Utrobique namque est rex nudum instrumentum Dei qui dans regi virtutem subautenticam principaliter operatur. Et sic (ut sepe dixi) rex nedum faceret opus maioris virtutis in castigando subditos quam faciendo quoscunque actus mirabiles corporales, sed eciam quam accumulando quotlibet temporalia cleri Christi, nam tales virtutes faciendi sanitates corporeas possunt inesse bestiis, terre nascentibus atque lapidibus sed non virtus correccionis salubris. Et iterum adieccio temporalium communiter non est ita propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis presentis corporee, sicut subtraccio abusi est propinqua ultime necessitati salvacionis perpetue tam corporis quam anime. Sicut enim est opus maioris misericordie auferre gladium a frenetico volente se ipsum occidere quam dare gladium persecuto ad defendendum se a volente eum occidere, quia peius foret hominem occidi sic a se ipso quam occidi ab alio, quia primum est dampnabile et secundum semper meritorium sive [346] iustum; et ad hoc sunt multe leges ecclesie, ut allegavi superius XI°

him a degree of blessedness, toward which each of its parts contributes in part. But the total alms of a foreknown [person] concurs as a whole to mitigating the perpetual punishment.[12] If temporal lords (as the almsmen claim) are bound to continue the alms of the fathers whose heirs they are, then they are bound to everything that follows from that formally; because otherwise, against the possibility of divine obligation, they would be obliged to contradictories, namely to making them be alms and to defending their abuse in the froward, in which respect they lack the form of alms.[13] Therefore, since the kings of England are bound to keep the alms of their forebears in their perpetuity, are bound further by the law of spiritual alms to chastise their lieges, and are bound, third, by the obligation by which they are bound to do justice to their lieges and to extinguish wrongs which tend most dangerously to the detriment of their people, it is clear that they are bound in a given case to restore their goods to holy church and to take them away from those who hold their God and the kingdom in contempt. For this was the compact of the first endowment. Therefore I boldly assert: if, these things being equal, our king does not have power to do in his clergy the work of mercifully chastising, he does not have sufficiency to exercise lordship politically over our whole kingdom.[14] Indeed, if we attend well to holy scripture and to what has been said of the privileges of the church, it both makes for the privilege of the king that he has power so to coerce clerics, and the clerics have [345] a privilege in that they have such a superior to whom they can thus meritoriously be subject. Those, therefore, who say that the king has an incomprehensible power in chastising lions and in performing bodily healings, with other things which they call miracles, should grant a portion of his power for regulating his kingdom in the clergy, since this and its act would be more excellent and more founded in scripture.[15] Would it not be more excellent to chastise the frenzied, the sinners and the froward of Christ's school than to tame wild beasts, which do not harm the church so much? Again, would it not be a work of greater power to beget virtues in a teachable mind by occasion of wholesome chastisement (for when that is taken away from the church, the virtues are withdrawn from the untamed) than to induce bodily health by power?[16] For in both cases the king is the bare instrument of God, who, giving the king a sub-authentic power, works as the principal [agent]. And so (as I have often said) the king would do a work of greater power in chastising his subjects not only than in doing any wondrous bodily acts whatever, but also than in heaping up any number of temporal goods for the clergy

cap. huius ex dictis Augustini positis XXIII[a], q. IV[a], Nimium, et Ipsa pietas, et Quid faciet; et illud patet V[ta], q. V[ta], ubi sub auctoritate Augustini scribitur: Non vos iudicetis malivolos esse, quando crimen alterius indicatis; magis quippe nocentes non indicando crimen estis, quam si fratres vestros quos indicando corrigere potestis tacendo crimen perire permittitis. Si enim frater tuus habet vulnus in corpore quod velit occultari, dum timet secari, nonne crudeliter a te siletur et misericorditer indicatur? Quanto ergo pocius debes manifestare ne deterius putrescat in corde? Et sequitur: Non omnis qui parcit amicus est, nec omnis qui verberat inimicus; meliora enim sunt vulnera amici quam fraudulenta oscula inimici; melius est cum severitate diligere quam cum lenitate decipere. Et sequitur ad propositum: Utilius esurienti panis tollitur, si de cibo securus negligat iusticiam, quam esurienti panis frangitur, ut iniusticie seductus acquiescat. Et qui freneticum ligat et qui litargicum excitat ambobus molestus ambos amat. Quis non potest amplius amare quam Deus, et tamen nos non solum docere suaviter, verum eciam salubriter terrere non cessat, ut docet Apostolus Hebreorum XII°. Fomentis lenibus quibus Deus omnes consolatur, sepe eciam mordacissimum medicamentum tribulaminis adiungit, exercet fame patriarchas, pios et religiosos, populum autem contumacem penis gravioribus agitat, non aufert ab apostolo stimulum carnis, tercio rogatus ut virtutem in infirmitate perficiat. Ex quotquot [347]dictis sanctorum exponencium fidem scripture patet quod de lege caritatis et spiritualis elemosine sub pena dampnabilis consensus tenetur prepositus subiectos corripere. Unde inter omnia peccata de quibus magis timeo in superioribus regni nostri, sunt ceca pietas, falsa misericordia et consentanea omissio, sive ex negligencia sive (quod maxime horrendum est), quando venditur consensus criminis et iniuste ac proditorie per patrimonium Christi defenditur eius hostis. Unde Augustinus epistola XXXVII[a] ad Macedonium: Misericordius opem nostram talibus subtrahimus quam impendimus. Non enim opem fert qui ad peccandum iuvat ac non pocius subvertit et opprimit. Sed contra dicta primo obicitur per hoc quod nemo debet defamare proximum et specialiter christos Dei. Illi autem qui illud obiciunt parum considerant quomodo mendax (in quantum huiusmodi) defamat se ipsum, et iterum quomodo ex verbis istis generalibus legis domini se putans defamatum indicat ut sic se esse legis Dei adversarium, et iterum parum considerat quomodo prophete veteris testamenti, Christus et leges ecclesie acutissime instant contra solum nomine sacerdotes; et racio est, quia in eorum subversione imminet maius periculum matri ecclesie. Et illud meminit decretum, LXXXIII[a] dist., ubi sic scribitur:

of Christ; for such powers of producing bodily healings can be in beasts, in things growing from the earth and in stones, but not the power of wholesome correction. And again, the addition of temporal goods is commonly not so near to the ultimate necessity of present bodily salvation as the withdrawal of what is abused is near to the ultimate necessity of perpetual salvation, of body as well as soul.[17] For just as it is a work of greater mercy to take away a sword from a frenzied man who wants to kill himself than to give a sword to a man pursued, to defend himself from one who wants to kill him, because it would be worse for a man to be killed thus by himself than to be killed by another, since the first is damnable and the second always meritorious or [346]just;[18] and to this there are many laws of the church, as I alleged above in chapter 11 of this [work] from the sayings of Augustine placed in [C.] 23 q. 4, *Nimium*, *Ipsa pietas* and *Quid faciet*.[19] And this is clear in [C.] 5 q. 5, where it is written under the authority of Augustine: "Do not judge yourselves to be malevolent when you point out another's crime; for you are rather guilty in not pointing out the crime than if you let your brothers, whom you could correct by pointing it out, perish by keeping silent about the crime. For if your brother has a wound in his body which he wants hidden while he fears the knife, is it not cruelly kept silent by you and mercifully pointed out? How much more, then, ought you to make it known, lest it fester worse in the heart?"[20] And it continues: "Not everyone who spares is a friend, nor everyone who strikes an enemy; for better are the wounds of a friend than the deceitful kisses of an enemy; it is better to love with severity than to deceive with gentleness."[21] And it continues, to the purpose: "It is more useful for bread to be taken from a hungry man, if, secure of his food, he neglects justice, than for bread to be broken for a hungry man so that, led astray, he acquiesces in injustice. And he who binds the frenzied man and he who rouses the lethargic man is troublesome to both and loves both. Who can love [us] more than God? And yet he does not cease not only to teach us gently but also to terrify us wholesomely," as the Apostle teaches, Hebrews 12.[22] "To the gentle poultices with which God consoles all he often adds also the most biting medicine of tribulation; he exercises with famine the patriarchs, pious and religious men, but harries the contumacious people with heavier punishments; he does not take away from the Apostle the sting of the flesh, though asked a third time, so that he may perfect power in infirmity."[23] From any number of [347]sayings of the saints expounding the faith of scripture it is clear that, by the law of charity and of spiritual alms, under pain of damnable

Nemo quippe in ecclesia amplius nocet quam qui perverse agens nomen vel ordinem sanctitatis vel sacerdotis habet. Delinquentem namque hunc redarguere nullus presumit, et in exemplum culpa [348] vehementer extenditur, quando peccator pro reverencia ordinis honoratur. Episcopus itaque qui talium crimina non corrigit magis dicendus est canis impudicus quam episcopus. Ista, inquam, iura sanctorum ideo incorporata sunt in canone, non ut palea perpetuo taceantur, sed ut ad laudem bonorum cum modestia detegantur. Et dico cum modestia, quia contingit hominem in dicendo veritatem modum excedere, ut notatur in decretis V^a^, q. V^a^, Qui ambulat, ubi solvendo apparenciam repugnancie in ista materia sic scribitur: Aliud est ex caritate aliorum crimina deferre, ut quos secreta ammonicione corrigere non possumus, convictos iudicis sentencia corripiat, atque aliud est insidiando falsa obicere vel insultando vera facile exprobare. Illud vero caritatis, hoc autem est impietatis officium. Unde Proverb. XII, 6, dicitur: Verba impiorum insidiantur sanguini, os iustorum liberat eos. Et infra: Qui quod novit loquitur iudex iusticie est, qui autem mentitur testis est fraudulentus. Oportet ergo accusatorem servare integritatem veritatis et rectitudinem intencionis. Ego autem preservo me a descensu ad singularia quiescens more philosophorum in communi sentencia.

consent, a superior is bound to rebuke his subjects. Hence among all the sins which I fear most in the superiors of our kingdom are blind piety, false mercy and consenting omission, whether from negligence or (what is most horrible) when consent to crime is sold, and Christ's enemy is unjustly and treasonably defended by means of Christ's patrimony. Hence Augustine, letter 37 to Macedonius: "We more mercifully withdraw our help from such men than bestow it. For he does not bring help who assists toward sinning, and does not rather overturn and suppress."[24] But against what has been said it is objected, by appeal to this, first: that no one ought to defame his neighbour, and especially the anointed of God.[25] But those who object this consider too little how a liar (as such) defames himself; and again how he who, from these general words of the Lord's law, thinks himself defamed shows himself, as such, to be an adversary of God's law; and again he considers too little how the prophets of the old testament, Christ and the laws of the church press most sharply against those who are priests in name only; and the reason is that in their subversion a greater danger threatens mother church.[26] And the decree mentions this, dist. 83, where it is written thus: "For no one in the church does more harm than he who, acting perversely, has the name or the order of holiness or of priest. For no one presumes to refute him when he offends, and the fault [348] is vehemently extended as an example when the sinner is honoured out of reverence for his order. So a bishop who does not correct the crimes of such men is rather to be called a shameless dog than a bishop."[27] These laws of the saints, I say, have been incorporated in the canon for this reason: not that they should be kept silent forever like chaff, but that they should be exposed with moderation to the praise of the good.[28] And I say "with moderation", because it happens that a man, in speaking the truth, exceeds measure, as is noted in the decrees, [C.] 5 q. 5, *Qui ambulat*, where, in resolving an apparent contradiction in this matter, it is written thus: "It is one thing out of charity to report the crimes of others, so that those whom we cannot correct by secret admonition the judge's sentence may rebuke when convicted; and another thing by lying in wait to object falsehoods, or by insulting to reproach readily with truths. The former is the office of charity, the latter of impiety."[29] Hence it is said in Proverbs 12:6: "The words of the wicked lie in wait for blood: the mouth of the just delivereth them." And below: "He that speaketh that which he knoweth is a judge of justice: but he that lieth, is a deceitful witness."[30] An accuser, therefore, must keep integrity of truth and rightness of intention. But I keep myself from descending

to particulars, resting, after the manner of the philosophers, in a general teaching.[31]

Notes

1. ***Secundum legem premissam***: the canon *Privilegium* of 341 (C. 11 q. 3), applied to the king's own privilege of rule.
2. ***Socii defensorum***: taken from *defensus*, "partners of those [they] defend", the unworthy curates; it could be from *defensor*, "fellows of the defenders". ***Auctorizacio***: the king's approving of a curate presented to him.
3. Matt. 21:43; the Vulgate reads *regnum Dei*, "the kingdom of God", and Wyclif's *regnum* lets it bear on the king's kingdom.
4. Wyclif's treatment of simony: perhaps ch. 13 above (295–96), simony as heresy from C.1 q.1; his *De simonia* is dated after this treatise by its editors.
5. Hos. 5:6; the Vulgate begins *In gregibus suis et in armentis suis*, "With their flocks and with their herds". Hos. 5:1 addresses the priests and the house of the king. ***Ablatus est***, Douay–Rheims "withdrawn", is the same verb as *auferatur* and *ablacio*, on which the following lines turn.
6. Mark 2:20, paraphrased. ***Ablatario***: the one from whom something is taken. ***Alterutrum***: good on one side only, as in Hosea, where the loss is the sinner's and the Lord's withdrawal just.
7. ***Tractatu De Privilegiis***: the discussion of privilege in chapters 8–11 of this work; the king's duty of justice to his lieges is at 218 (10-d), correction as the greater work of mercy at 237 (11-b). ***Lure regni*** is read ***iure***.
8. ***Ad continuandum suas elemosinas***: chastisement is the means by which the king's alms continue to be alms (as the next sentences explain), not a duty to keep paying them.
9. The period has no main clause: ***quamvis ... remaneat*** is followed by a *cum* clause and an *et* clause, and no apodosis comes. The sense is that the giver's will and merit survive though the gift ceases to be alms. ***Voluntas*** is lacking in A and B and added in A_1's margin (343.23); Loserth prints it, and it is translated. B reads ***tum donum***. Chapter 13: A in the text ***XXII***, corrected in the margin (343.18).
10. The idea that a heresiarch's sin grows with those it misleads, attributed to Bernard, but not found in his writings against Abelard; the same idea is told of Arius and credited to Augustine at 496.13–15. B reads *est adhuc meritum* (343.28).
11. A and B in the margin at 343.30: ***Nota de duplici perfeccione***. Loserth compares Hus, *l. c.*. The distinction is called common, not attributed.
12. ***Limitat***: "assigns", fixes for him a degree of blessedness. ***Concurrit***: B ***concurribilis*** (344.8).
13. ***Secundum quam racionem***: "in which respect", that is, as abused, they lack the form of alms. ***Formaliter***: Hus reads *formari* (344.12).
14. ***Politice***: Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *polelice* (344.29). ***Cum istis paribus***: "these things being equal", as at 337.
15. The powers popularly ascribed to the English king: healing by touch (the king's evil) and the taming of lions (cf. M. Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges*, 1924; for the lions, pp. 256–8). Loserth compares Hus, *l. c.* (345.3).
16. ***Virtus*** is both "power" and "virtue"; Wyclif plays on the two (***opus maioris virtutis gignere virtutes***). "Power" is used for the faculty, "virtues" for the moral habits. ***Virtualiter***: by power, not by bodily means.
17. ***Salvacio***: the same word for bodily safety and eternal salvation, kept as "salvation" in both to keep the pairing. B omits ***presentis ... salvacionis*** (345.25). B in the margin at 345.30: ***Nota non intelligo***, "Note: I do not understand"; it stands near this comparison and the next. Loserth compares Hus, fol. 133 (345.24).
18. The ***sicut*** clause has no answering ***sic***; the period runs on into ***et ad hoc***. ***Secundum semper meritorium***: to be killed by another (as the persecuted man may be) is always meritorious or just, against the damnable self-killing.
19. Decretum C. 23 q. 4 c. 37 *Nimium*, c. 24 *Ipsa pietas* and c. 23 *Quid faciet*; chapter 11 above. B reads *superius XX cap.* (346.2).
20. Decretum C. 5 q. 5 c. 1 (Loserth: *Decreti sec. pars, causa V, q. V, c. I et II*; form ours), from Augustine's *Regula* (Ep. 211). The Decretum reads ***malivolos, quoniam crimen***. ***Magis quippe nocentes ... quam si***: the comparison does not close as printed; Augustine's text reads ***magis quippe innocentes non estis, si***, "for you are not the more innocent if"; Gratian's manuscripts read ***nocentes estis*** and the Roman edition ***innocentes non estis***. Wyclif's sentence conflates the two. The print is translated.
21. Decretum C. 5 q. 5 c. 2, from Augustine, Ep. 93 to Vincentius, quoting Prov. 27:6 (Vulgate ***vulnera diligentis ... odientis***; Douay–Rheims "of a friend ... of an enemy", which Augustine's wording matches). B reads *cum securitate diligere* (346.16–17).
22. ***Quis non potest amplius amare quam Deus*** (346.22, so on the plate): as printed, "who cannot love more than God?", which does not fit the argument or the following ***nos***. We read ***nos*** for ***non*** (our emendation), the reading of the source: Augustine Ep. 93 and Decretum C. 5 q. 5 c. 2 both have ***Quis nos potest amplius amare quam Deus***. The print shows ***non*** with no apparatus, so the slip is the manuscripts' or Wyclif's; the emendation was approved. Heb. 12:6, "whom the Lord loveth he chastiseth", is the Apostle's teaching meant.
23. ***Tribulaminis***: the Decretum reads *tribulacionis* (346.27). ***In infirmitate***: the manuscripts ***in firmitate***, corrected by Loserth from the Decretum (346.31). S. 2 Cor. 12:7–9, "power is made perfect in infirmity". A in the margin at 346.24: ***De correccione per ablacionem nota bene***.
24. ***Non enim opem fert***: the manuscripts ***Num enim***, corrected by Loserth from Augustine (347.12). S. Augustine, letter to Macedonius (Loserth: *Aug. Opp.* tom. II, p. 532), which Wyclif numbers 37; Ep. 153 in the modern numbering (PL 33: ***misericordius opem nostram ... subtrahimus***). Loserth compares Hus at 347.4–11.
25. ***Christos Dei***: cf. Ps. 104:15, "Touch ye not my anointed". A in the margin at 347.17: ***Obieccio***; at 347.18: ***Responsio***.
26. ***Mendax ... defamat se ipsum***: the one who calls true words defamation defames himself. ***Se putans***: B ***se reputans*** (347.20). The verb shifts from ***considerant*** to ***considerat*** in the print; both are kept. A in the margin: ***83 dist.***

27. Decretum D. 83 c. 2 (Loserth: *Dec. I pars, dist. LXXXIII, c. II*; form ours). The Decretum reads *quoniam peccator* (348.1). B reads *Episcopus in quantum* (348.2), and in the margin: *Episcopus omittens subditos corrigere dicendus est canis impudicus*. A in the margin: *Nota decretum quantum nocet malus episcopus, papa etc.*
28. *Palea*: "chaff", perhaps with a play on the *paleae*, the later additions to the Decretum, though the canon just quoted (D. 83 c. 2) is not one. *Iura*: "laws", the body of law, not rights. A and B read *Ista itaque iura* (348.4).
29. Decretum C. 5 q. 5 c. 5, *Qui ambulat* (Loserth: *Dec. II pars, causa V, q. V, c. V*; form ours). C. *Sentencia*: CONTEXTUAL; here the judge's sentence. A in the margin at 348.9: *Accusator quomodo debet se habere*.
30. Prov. 12:6, where the Vulgate has the future *liberabit*, "shall deliver"; Wyclif's present is translated. Prov. 12:17: the Vulgate has *index iustitiae*, Douay–Rheims "sheweth forth justice"; Wyclif's *iudex*, "judge", is translated.
31. *In communi sentencia*: CONTEXTUAL; a teaching stated in general terms, against *singularia*, particular cases. A_1 adds *nomina* after *singularia* (348.22), "particular names"; A_1 alone, not adopted.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 342: *regnandum*
  - 342: *43* (print: Matthei XXI°, 43: Auferetur; voted Auferetur twice at 172-173)
  - 342: *detrimentum* (print detri- / mentum; main token holds the whole word)
  - 343: *est* (1 is the margin argument numeral)
  - 343: *II°*
  - 343: *lege*
  - 343: *legiis* [NW]
  - 344: *capitur* (p clear)
  - 344: *legiis* [NW]
  - 345: *Illi* (M is the alinea letter)
  - 346: *XXIII^{a}*
  - 346: *IV^{a}*
  - 346: *V^{ta}*
  - 346: *V^{ta}*
  - 347: *dictis* (177b folio mark and N alinea letter are not text)
  - 347: *legis*
  - 347: *LXXXIII^{a}*
  - 348: *V^{a}*
  - 348: *V^{a}*
  - 344: *posterius* (clear ri in print) [NW]
  - 346: *et*
  - 346: *perficiat*
  - 346.22: *non* in *Quis non potest* confirmed on the plate (n0383); translated as *nos* (note 22).

Part 6: May the king correct the clergy? the second and third objections

Loserth pp. 348.24–352.16

¶1 348.24–349.16
348.24 *Objection: 2. The clergy, as superior to the laity, should judge itself.*
349.1 *Answer: The assumption is false; all parts of the Church owe mutual help.*
349.17 *As to the pattern of the celestial hierarchy, it is already forsaken when the clergy are wicked.*

[348] Secundo obicitur per hoc quod oportet partes ecclesie habere suam iurisdiccionem et ordinem impermixtum; sed clerus est seculari parte superior, ideo supposito delicto debet corrigi per se ipsum. Confirmatur per hoc quod sic est in celesti ierarchia in qua oportet exemplari omne officium ecclesiastice ierarchie. [349] Ad illud sepe dixi quod falsum assumitur; oportet enim utrumque brachium corporis ecclesie iuvare reliquum, nec est in isto confusio, sed secundum Apostolum I^{a} Cor. XII° caritativa connexio. Ulterius sepe dictum est quod, sicut clerus stans in suo ordine est seculari superior, sic

Secondly it is objected, by appeal to this: that the parts of the church must have their own jurisdiction and order unmixed; now the clergy is superior to the secular part; therefore, supposing an offence, it ought to be corrected by itself. This is confirmed by the fact that so it is in the celestial hierarchy, on which every office of the ecclesiastical hierarchy must be modelled. [349] To that I have often said that a falsehood is assumed; for each arm of the body of the church must help the other, nor is there confusion in this, but, according to the Apostle, 1 Corinthians

nominetenus clericus degenerans est inter omnes viatores abieccior. Unde (ut sepe dixi) nobis stantibus in nostro ordine non debemus contemptibiliter esse subiecti principibus, unde glosa ordinaria super XCVI^{a} dist. dicitur quod episcopus est super imperatorem, non tamen si facit contra religionem, nam in illo casu posset a quocunque redargui, ut patet XL^{a} dist., Si papa, vel eciam si scisma faceret, XXIII^{a}, q. V, De Liguribus. Et plures sunt casus in quibus layci habent iurisdiccionem super clericos ut dixi; inquit XXIII, q. V^{a}, Principes.

12, a connexion in charity.[1] Further, it has often been said that, just as the clergy standing in its order is superior to the secular [part], so a cleric in name only who degenerates is the most abject among all wayfarers. Hence (as I have often said) while we stand in our order we ought not to be contemptibly subject to princes; hence in the ordinary gloss on distinction 96 it is said that the bishop is above the emperor,[2] yet not if he acts against religion, for in that case he could be refuted by anyone, as is clear in distinction 40, *Si papa*, or also if he should make a schism, Cause 23, question 5, *De Liguribus*.[3] And there are many cases in which lay people have jurisdiction over clerics, as I have said; so says Cause 23, question 5, *Principes*.[4]

¶2 349.17–350.11
350.12 *Objection: If the clergy cannot have dominion, neither can they serve Civilly.*
350.18 *This does not follow.*

[349]Unde miror quomodo quidam innituntur exemplo de celesti ierarchia, putando quod clerici non debent corrigi a laycis, nam stabilito ordine militantis ierarchie, sicut est in ierarchia celesti, procederet racio a similitudine quod clerici non forent subiecti laicis, sed si deficit eis virtus illuminandi et expurgandi, sic quod sint ceciores et criminosiores quam layci, quomodo staret in illis perturbantibus ordinem ecclesie exemplum ierarchie celestis? Ideo in defectu illorum stat quod pervertitur ordo ecclesiastice ierarchie; ordo dico non simpliciter sed ordo individuus qui foret in illis. Non enim est fas fideli credere quod datus clerus servabit ordinem superiorem in ecclesia quantumcunque peccaverit, cum primus angelus cum suis complicibus propter apostasiam ab ordine deiectus [350]est de ecclesia triumphante (ut notatur Is. XIV°). Viator ergo extra ordinem debet habere subsidium a fratre inferioris ordinis, cum pes iuvat oculum, eciam utroque servante integritatem corporis. Et ita videtur Lincolniensi quod angelus superioris ordinis illuminatur ab angelo inferioris ordinis, cum omnes beati spiritus sese iuvant reciproce, ymmo (ut alias dixi): Michael et omnes angeli inferioris ordinis confirmati pugnarunt contra draconem Luciferum et contra complices suos apostatantes, quare ergo non debet esse proporcionaliter in ecclesiastica ierarchia?

Hence I wonder how some rely on the example of the celestial hierarchy, thinking that clerics ought not to be corrected by lay people; for, once the order of the militant hierarchy is established as it is in the celestial hierarchy, the argument from likeness would proceed that clerics would not be subject to lay people; but if the power of illuminating and purging fails in them,[5] so that they are blinder and more criminal than lay people, how would the example of the celestial hierarchy hold in those who disturb the order of the church? Therefore, in their failure, it holds that the order of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is perverted: the order, I say, not without qualification, but the individual order that would be in them. For it is not right for a believer to believe that a given clergy will keep the superior order in the church however much it has sinned, since the first angel with his accomplices was thrown down from his order for apostasy [350]from the church triumphant (as is noted in Isaiah 14).[6] Therefore a wayfarer outside his order ought to have help from a brother of a lower order, since the foot helps the eye, each also preserving the integrity of the body. And so it seems to [the bishop of] Lincoln that an angel of a higher order is illuminated by an angel of a lower order,[7] since all the blessed spirits help one another reciprocally; indeed (as I have said elsewhere) Michael and all the angels of the lower order, confirmed [in grace], fought against the dragon Lucifer and against his apostate accomplices:[8] why then should it not be so, proportionally, in the ecclesiastical hierarchy?

¶3 350.12–351.19
351.4 *They are subject not as clergy, but as almsmen and liegemen.*
351.12

[350]Sed alias insteti per hoc quod nulla potestas punitiva civilis se extendit ad amplius quam potestas civiliter dominandi, sed non licet civili domino dominari civiliter super clerico, cum clericus cui foret licitum servire civiliter posset coloracius civiliter dominari. Sed hic

But elsewhere I raised the objection,[9] by appeal to this: that no civil punitive power extends further than the power of exercising lordship civilly; now it is not lawful for a civil lord to exercise lordship civilly over a cleric, since a cleric for whom it were lawful to serve civilly could with

3. The laity ought to act only in default of the spiritual authorities.

351.20 *Answer: True; but the King is not to wait for the Pope's action, for many reasons;*

sepe dixi quod de lege nature et de lege evangelii qua astringimur ad correpcionem fraternam debet rex Anglie corripere clerum suum, nec video quin stat clericum servire civiliter eo quod dominari civiliter dicit superbiam. Sed servire civiliter potest esse sine peccato. Nec oportet quod sic homo servit civiliter quod sit servus civilis, cum omnis dominus Anglie sub rege servit sibi civiliter, cum sit eius servitor tenens de rege in capite per servicia suo domino debita et consueta. Servus autem civilis est omnino expers libertatis civilis, et sic serviunt clerici regi libere, qui tenent de illo in capite; et sic videtur mihi quod rex noster habet super clerum suum legium quoad bona nature et bona fortune secundum quid [351]civile dominium. Si autem viverent vitam omnino exproprietariam, sicut vixerunt Christus et Baptista, non forent sic subiecti, et sic racione bonorum fortune et bonorum nature in casu quo contingat in eis abusus vel contemptus notabilis licet regi eos civiliter cohercere, non in quantum sacerdotes, sed in quantum regis elemosinarii vel homines eius legii contempnentes. Et sic regi suo in corpore et bonis multipliciter sunt subiecti. Econtra autem rex debet esse eis subiectus in hiis que sunt ad Deum, ut sit sic mutua connexio caritatis et ordinis utrobique. Tercio arguitur per hoc quod clerus nunquam debet castigari per laicum nisi in defectu spiritualis prepositi, et per consequens nunquam antequam papa defecerit, oportet ergo subditum corripi per diocesanum, secundo per metropolitanum, et si illi defecerint, tunc per papam. Et non est presumendum quod in hiis tribus signis ecclesia Christi deficiet.

more colour exercise civil lordship.[10] But here I have often said that by the law of nature and by the law of the gospel, by which we are bound to fraternal correction, the king of England ought to correct his clergy; nor do I see why it is not consistent that a cleric serve civilly, because to exercise lordship civilly implies pride. But to serve civilly can be without sin. Nor need a man serve civilly in such a way that he is a civil serf, since every lord of England under the king serves him civilly, being his servant holding of the king in chief by the services owed and customary to his lord. Now a civil serf is wholly without civil liberty; and so the clerics who hold of him in chief serve the king freely; and so it seems to me that our king has over his liege clergy, as to the goods of nature and the goods of fortune, in a certain respect [351]civil lordship.[11] But if they lived a wholly propertyless life, as Christ and the Baptist lived, they would not be so subject; and so, by reason of the goods of fortune and the goods of nature, in a case where notable abuse or contempt occurs in them, it is lawful for the king to coerce them civilly, not inasmuch as they are priests, but inasmuch as they are the king's almsmen or his liege men who hold him in contempt. And so they are subject to their king in body and goods in many ways. But conversely, the king ought to be subject to them in the things that pertain to God, so that there is thus a mutual connexion of charity and of order on both sides. Thirdly it is argued by appeal to this: that the clergy ought never to be chastised by a layman except in default of the spiritual superior, and consequently never before the pope has failed; therefore the subject must be corrected [first] by the diocesan, secondly by the metropolitan, and, if they have failed, then by the pope. And it is not to be presumed that at these three stages the church of Christ will fail.[12]

¶4 351.20–352.16

352.1
1. because the curia is venal;

352.4 *2, Pope and Cardinals are in league with our enemies; 3. they are blinded by avarice;*

352.8
4. they are too far away;

352.12
5. the Roman pontiff has no such jurisdiction in England.

[351]Hic dicitur quod assumptum est verum, quia (ut sepe dixi) clericus nunquam castigari debet per laicum nisi auctoritate ecclesie in defectu spiritualis prepositi et in casu quo clericus fuerit a fide devius. Unde posito de possibili quod omnes episcopi regni nostri deficiant in suis correccionibus post vel ante, racione cuius defectus invalescat peccatum ad regni periculum, regum autem est sub gravi periculo clerum suum corripere quoad corpus vel substanciam cleri, in quibus potestati regie est subiectus; quod si clerus devenit ad tantam profunditatem malicie, spiritualis prepositus omnimode est in causa. Nec est prudentis asserere quod rex expectaret correccionem cleri, quousque papa [352]super isto decreverit, propter multa. Primo quia stat quod in curia redempcio sit venalis, sic quod cum thesauris regni proditor defendat ibidem peccatum suum contra Deum, regem et

To this the answer is that the assumption is true, because (as I have often said) a cleric ought never to be chastised by a layman except by the authority of the church, in default of the spiritual superior, and in case the cleric has strayed from the faith. Hence, supposing as possible that all the bishops of our kingdom fail in their corrections, after or before, by reason of which failure sin grows strong to the peril of the kingdom, it is then for kings, under grave peril, to correct their clergy as to the body or substance of the clergy, in which it is subject to the royal power;[13] and if the clergy has come to such a depth of malice, the spiritual superior is in every way the cause.[14] Nor is it the part of a prudent man to assert that the king should wait for the correction of the clergy until the pope [352]has decreed on it, for many reasons. First, because it may be that in

regnum. Secundo quia stat quod papa et sui cardinales sint acceptores personarum coniuncti hostibus regni nostri. Tercio quia stat eos esse ignaros legis scripture cecatosque tradicionibus hominum propter questum. Quarto quia stat longitudinem et discrimina itineris esse tanta quod nec persone regni nostri haberent illuc securum accessum, nec rex et regnum expectarent tantundem propter regni periculum. Quinto quia Romanus pontifex non habet illam iurisdiccionem in Anglia, nisi vel ex lege Christi, quod limitatur de quanto dicit eis humilius et sanccius legem Christi, vel ex decreto cesaris, ut notatur XCVI[a] dist. Constantinus.

the curia redemption is for sale,[15] so that a traitor, with the treasures of the kingdom, may there defend his sin against God, king and kingdom.[16] Second, because it may be that the pope and his cardinals are respecters of persons, joined to the enemies of our kingdom. Third, because it may be that they are ignorant of the law of scripture and blinded by the traditions of men for gain. Fourth, because it may be that the length and dangers of the journey are so great that neither would the persons of our kingdom have safe access there, nor would king and kingdom wait so long, because of the peril of the kingdom. Fifth, because the Roman pontiff does not have that jurisdiction in England except either from the law of Christ, which is limited by how far he tells them the law of Christ more humbly and more holily,[17] or from the decree of Caesar, as is noted in distinction 96, *Constantinus*.[18]

Notes

1. 1 Cor. 12:12–27, the members of one body, which need one another (12:21 DR "the eye cannot say to the hand: I need not thy help"). *Caritativa connexio* is Wyclif's phrase, not a quotation.
2. The ordinary gloss on D. 96 c. 10 (*Duo sunt*), as Loserth refers it (modern form ours). C. *Glosa ordinaria ... dicitur* is printed without *in*: *glosa* is read as an ablative of place ("in the gloss"); see the Latin doubts.
3. D. 40 c. 6 (*Si papa*): Loserth gives no reference, ours; C. 23 q. 5 c. 43 (*De Liguribus*), editor (foot-note 13, *Cap. XLIII*; modern form ours).
4. C. 23 q. 5 c. 20 (*Principes*), editor (foot-note 15, *Cap. XX*; modern form ours). R. B in marg. at 349.11: *Quod prelati delinquentes a regibus sunt corrigendi, ut est dignum* ("that delinquent prelates are to be corrected by kings, as is fitting").
5. The hierarchic acts of purging and illuminating (and perfecting) of Pseudo-Dionysius, *Celestial Hierarchy* 3.2 (Eriugena's version, PL 122:1045B: *quosdam quidem purgari, quosdam vero purgare; et quosdam quidem illuminari, quosdam vero illuminare*). G. *Virtus* here is the power (faculty), not the moral virtue.
6. Isa. 14:12–15, the fall of Lucifer.
7. *Lincolniensis* is Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln; Loserth gives no place; not found in his letters (ed. Luard) or the opuscula in Brown's *Fasciculus* II.
8. Apoc. 12:7 (DR "Michael and his angels fought with the dragon"). Wyclif puts Michael among the angels "of the lower order" (the archangels); *confirmati* is "confirmed" in grace.
9. *Insteti* is first-person perfect of *instare*: Wyclif reports an objection he once raised himself.
10. *Coloracius*, the comparative adverb beside *color* (a plausible ground, as in "colour of title"): the cleric's claim to lordship would rest on a better colour than his claim to serve.
11. *Secundum quid* qualifies *civile dominium* across the page break: the king's civil lordship over the clergy is only in a certain respect, in their goods of nature and fortune.
12. *Signis*: the scholastic "stages" (*signa*, as of an order of priority), here the three grades of diocesan, metropolitan and pope.
13. After the long *posito ... periculum*, *regum autem est* gives the apodosis: *autem* resumes, rendered "then".
14. A A_1 lack *quod si clerus ... omnimode est* (351.28); Loserth prints it, and it is translated.
15. *Redempcio*: the buying off of a sentence for money; not the *redempcio temporalium* of the glossary. C. *Stat quod*, "it is consistent that", is rendered "it may be that" in all four reasons.
16. At 352.4 B reads *Deum et legem* (as it seems, "against God and the law"); the print is translated.
17. *Limitatur de quanto*: the pope's jurisdiction from the law of Christ reaches only so far as he teaches that law; "limit" in the restricting sense.
18. D. 96 c. 14 (*Constantinus*), the Donation of Constantine, a *palea*; c. 13, also a *palea*, begins *Constantinus imperator* too, so the incipit fits either. Loserth gives no reference here (modern form ours).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 349: *iuvare* (print: corporis ecclesie iuvare) [NW]
  - 349: *I[a]*
  - 349: *XCVI[a]*
  - 349: *XL[a]*
  - 349: *V[a]*
  - 350: *Lincolniensi*
  - 350: *per* (descender p)

- **350: *puni-* (first half of puni-/tiva (tiva is pos 84); Q is the alinea letter)**
- **350: *tiva* (second half of puni-/tiva)**
- **350: *dominari* (print domi- / nari; main token holds the whole word)**
- **350: *foret* (15 after it is the line number)**
- **350: ∅ (not is the English side-note (This does not follow); print: dominari. Sed)**
- **350: *legium* (30 after it is the line number) [NW]**
- **351: *Christus***
- **351: *defectu***
- **351: *spiritualis***
- **351: *diocesanum* [NW]**
- **351: *ut* (print: quia (ut sepe dixi))**
- **351: *defectu* (f clear)**
- **351: *fuerit***
- **352: *super***
- **352: *stat* (1 and R are margin numeral and alinea letter)**
- **352: *regni***
- **352: *XCVI*ª**

Part 7: The pope's binding and loosing, and the bishop of Rochester

Loserth pp. 352.17–356.16

¶1 352.17–354.19
352.27 *How far such jurisdiction can be trusted we may see in the case of Gregory XI.*
353.1 *who approved four cardinal heresies.*
353.7 *Many say it is of faith that the Pope can bind or loose as he will;*
353.13 *but this is a heresy.*
353.26 *Otherwise he might make the realm pay him all its revenue.*
354.2 *This is evident for 1. his predecessor did get 1000 marks from John;*
354.7
2. the supreme lordship of the world is claimed for him;
354.13 *3, any limitation of his powers would be fatal to the original claim.*
354.23 *Assertion of the bishop of Rochester.*

[352]**Sed quantum ad iurisdiccionem istam cesaream vel primatum, patet, cum regnum nostrum sit exemptum a iurisdiccione cesarea, quod nec iurisdiccio coactiva sui episcopi astringit nos nisi de quanto est fundabilis ex sacra scriptura. Sed volvat et revolvat adversarius fidem scripture et non inveniet iurisdiccionem talem. Sed quicunque sacerdos expressius docuerit legem Christi, Christo est in illo obediendum devocius, cum talis primatus introductus est ex ritu cesareo, sic quod, sive prepositus fuerit ydoneus sive non, populus fidelis Christo obediat. Si ergo nos Anglici gratis tantum obedimus papa nostro Urbano VIº, tamquam humili servo Christi, sicut scismatici obediunt Clementi propter dominium et potenciam secularem, quis dubitat quin ut sic habemus racionem meriti amplioris? Et possibilitatem omnium istorum quinque in Gregorio XI et suis complicibus oculata fide poterimus conspexisse. Dicitur enim quod ipse cum suis pseudocardinalibus dampnavit quatuor veritates** [353]**catholicas et approbavit quatuor hereses cardinales, sicut vidi notatum in quadam epistola maledicta ab homine, sed a nemine reprobata. Nec horreamus maledicionem huiusmodi, cum veritas ipsa est maledicta pendens in cruce (ut notat Apostolus Gall. III°, et exponit Ambrosius epistola XXXVIII^va). Nam a multis dicitur catholicum per eum quod eo ipso quo ipse vel alius papa Romanus pretendit se quovismodo solvere vel ligare, eo ipso sic solvit vel ligat, cum eius oppositum tamquam sceleratissimum sit dampnatum. Et audeo dicere quod a tempore prime fundacionis Romane ecclesie non**

But as to this caesarean jurisdiction or primacy, it is clear, since our kingdom is exempt from caesarean jurisdiction, that not even the coactive jurisdiction of his bishop binds us,[1] except in so far as it can be founded on holy scripture. But let the adversary turn and turn again the faith of scripture, and he will not find such jurisdiction. But whatever priest has more expressly taught the law of Christ, Christ is to be obeyed in him more devoutly, since such primacy was introduced from caesarean rite, so that, whether the superior be fit or not, the faithful people obey Christ. If therefore we English obey our pope Urban VI freely, only as a humble servant of Christ, while the schismatics obey Clement for the sake of lordship and secular power, who doubts that as such we have the ground of greater merit?[2] And we could have seen with our own eyes the possibility of all these five in Gregory XI and his accomplices.[3] For it is said that he with his pseudo-cardinals condemned four [353]**catholic truths and approved four cardinal heresies, as I saw noted in a certain letter, cursed by a man but reproved by no one.[4] Nor let us shudder at a curse of this kind, since the truth itself was cursed, hanging on the cross (as the Apostle notes, Galatians 3, and Ambrose expounds in letter 38).[5] For by many it is said to be catholic, on his authority, that by the very fact that he or another Roman pope claims in any way to loose or bind, by that very fact he so looses or binds, since its opposite has been condemned as most wicked.[6] And I dare say that from the time of the first foundation of**

fuit tam manifesta antichristiana heresis tam publice proclamata; nam nedum scriptura sacra sed leges papales testantur quod Petrus et omnes successores sui errare poterant, tam in execucione clavium quam eciam in via morum, quod si dictus Gregorius non potest, ipse blaspheme extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus. Nec video ad quid foret illud tamquam novus articulus fidei divulgandum nisi propter fastum et questum episcopo Scarioth adquirendum. Nam dato illo articulo ipse posset eciam invito Deo liberare omnes animas tam de purgatorio quam inferno, cum in tantam vesaniam posset incidere quod pretendat se ista facere, sicut loquuntur illi qui dicunt quod est Deus in terris. Et quantum ad questum, patet quod isto articulo catholicato posset faciliter perquirere omnia regna mundi, quia (da oppositum de regno Anglie) contra, si pretendit se ligare regem nostrum et regnum in partem salutaris penitencie, ut det perpetuo totum fructum regni nostri tenendo episcopo Romano in capite tamquam supremo domino seculari, tunc eo ipso sic ligantur; sed sic potest pretendere se ligare: ergo virtute illius potestatis clavium potest faciliter [354]acquirere regnum nostrum. Et idem est iudicium de omnibus aliis regnis mundi. Et possibilitas minoris patet tripliciter: Primo ex hoc quod taliter ligatus est rex Johannes cum regno (ut dicitur) quoad mille marcas, et idem iudicium est de toto. Secundo per hoc quod multi credunt papam debere dominari seculariter et capitaliter toti mundo, nec verti debet in dubium quin rex et regnum possent obligare se ad tantam elemosinam perpetuam. Sed cui si non pape qui potest absolucionem et dispensacionem super isto soli Romano pontifici reservare? Sic enim dicit se posse restringere potestates clavium de plenitudine potestatis. Tercio confirmatur per hoc quod ipse habet potestatem incomprehensibilem, cui non licet fines ponere, quia tunc formidandus esset, si excedit limites potestatis, et titubaret fides de potestate clavium, et manifeste sequeretur oppositum articuli noviter catholicati, scilicet quod non eo ipso quo pretendit se quovismodo solvere vel ligare, eo ipso sic solvit vel ligat.

the Roman church there has not been so manifest an antichristian heresy so publicly proclaimed; for not only holy scripture but the papal laws testify that Peter and all his successors could err, both in the exercise of the keys and also in the way of morals; and if the said Gregory cannot, he is blasphemously lifted up above all that is called God.[7] Nor do I see to what end that should be published as a new article of faith, except to acquire pomp and gain for the bishop Iscariot.[8] For, given that article, he could free all souls, even against God's will, both from purgatory and from hell, since he could fall into such madness as to claim to do these things, as those speak who say that he is God on earth. And as to gain, it is clear that, with this article declared catholic, he could easily acquire all the kingdoms of the world, because (suppose the opposite, in the case of the kingdom of England) against [it]: if he claims to bind our king and kingdom, as part of salutary penance, to give in perpetuity the whole fruit of our kingdom, holding of the Roman bishop in chief as supreme secular lord, then by that very fact they are so bound; now he can claim so to bind; therefore by virtue of that power of the keys he can easily [354]acquire our kingdom.[9] And the same judgment holds of all the other kingdoms of the world. And the possibility of the minor is clear in three ways. First, from the fact that King John was so bound with his kingdom (as it is said) to the amount of a thousand marks; and the same judgment holds of the whole.[10] Second, from the fact that many believe that the pope ought to exercise lordship secularly and as head over the whole world; nor should it be called in doubt that king and kingdom could oblige themselves to so great a perpetual alms. But to whom, if not to the pope, who can reserve absolution and dispensation in this matter to the Roman pontiff alone? For so he says he can restrict the powers of the keys from plenitude of power. Third, it is confirmed by the fact that he has an incomprehensible power, on which it is not lawful to set bounds; because then there would be cause to fear that he exceeds the limits of his power,[11] and faith about the power of the keys would waver, and the opposite of the newly declared catholic article would manifestly follow, namely that it is not by the very fact that he claims in any way to loose or bind that by that very fact he so looses or binds.

¶2 354.20–356.16
355.1 *The Pope's bull was directly opposed to English law,*
355.9

[354]In tales insanias inducuntur ignari episcopi et doctores facientes ydiotam credere quod potest tantum facere in ecclesia sicut Christus. Unde episcopus Roffensis dixit mihi in publico parlamento stomachante spiritu quod conclusiones mee sunt dampnate, sicut

Into such madnesses ignorant bishops and doctors are led, making the unlettered man believe that he can do as much in the church as Christ. Hence the bishop of Rochester said to me in open parliament, with an angry spirit, that my conclusions are condemned, as had been attested to

1. *in ordering the arrest of the King's subject without conviction of heresy;*

355.15

2. *IN asserting the authority of all charters;*

355.25

3. *above all in declaring that the King may not punish a clergyman however delinquent.*

356.1 *The King should enquire into this.*

testificatum est sibi de curia per instrumentum notarii. Et visum est multis quod fuit assercio indiscreta, primo quia vergebat ad curie Romane defamacionem, secundo quia implicabat regis nostri et regni scandalizacionem, et tercio quia ostendebat sui et fratrum suorum consentaneam suspicionem. Non enim tam signanter mitterent fratres eius sibi dictam dampnacionem, nisi applaudendo de facto cuius utraque pars foret auctor vel fautor, nec dubium quin stante iusticia dicte dampnacionis cum facto [355] regis et iure quod vendicat, rex et regnum forent expresse heretici, et sic iuxta leges ecclesie nedum exheredandi, sed a toto christianismo funditus destruendi. Nam hoc est hereticatum ut dampnatissimum quod aliqui domini temporales possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente. Unde videtur zelantes pro dampnacione ista intendere quod papa debet super regno nostro imperatorie civiliter dominari (ut sepe tetigi), primo quia procurarunt quod inconsulto rege vel suo consilio virtute bullarum papalium legius homo regis ubicunque in Anglia non convictus super pravitate heretica arrestetur et papali carceri mancipetur, et (ut videtur prudentibus) non posset esse evidencius signum capitalis civilis dominii pape super Angliam. Secundo quia dampnavit ex procuracione quorundam qui videntur esse de nostris quod alique carte humanitus adinvente sunt impossibiles, et per consequens catholicavit oppositum, et cum impossibile et necessarium dicantur condicionaliter et simpliciter (ut patet XXIII, q. IV[a], Due sunt) necessitates, sequitur cum veris quod catholicavit omnes cartas cleri Anglie de elemosina perpetua, et per consequens non foret necesse ad regem recurrere pro ratificacione cartarum huiusmodi, cum sint per superiorem dominum nedum confirmate sed catholicate. Et tercio potissime, quia vendicat quod non liceat regi punire clerum suum legium quantumcunque in regnum deliquerit nec subtrahere elemosinas cleri quantumcunque contempserit nisi petita ab eo licencia et obtenta, et cum hoc non habet ex lege Christi (sicut patet scrutanti), ab omnibus eius fautoribus relinquitur quod hoc habet a cesare. Unde vellem quod rex faceret diligenter inquiri a clero suo legio istas quatuor questiones: primo si [356] rex licite potest auferre temporalia a clero suo legio pro contemptu; secundo si rex dominatur capitaliter super regno Anglie et papa sic civiliter subdominans vel econtra; tercio si forme dampnacionum et factorum Romani pontificis hic recitate sint iuri divino consone, et si clericus regis qui vel expresse vel mutescendo consenserit videtur in contemptum regis et regni incidere; quarto autem queritur a plano parliamento regis, cum propter maiorem contemptum sit contemptor gravius puniendus, utrum defendens ista expresse vel tacite contra regem et

him from the curia by a notary's instrument.[12] And it seemed to many that it was an indiscreet assertion: first because it tended to the defamation of the Roman curia; second because it implicated our king and kingdom in scandal; and third because it showed a suspicion of collusion on his part and his brothers'. For his brothers would not so pointedly send him the said condemnation unless applauding a deed of which each party would be author or abettor; nor is there doubt that, if the justice of the said condemnation stands together with the deed [355] of the king and the right that he claims, king and kingdom would be expressly heretics,[13] and so, according to the laws of the church, not only to be disinherited but to be utterly destroyed from all Christendom. For this has been pronounced heretical as most damnable: that some temporal lords can take away temporal goods from a delinquent church.[14] Hence those zealous for that condemnation seem to maintain that the pope ought to exercise lordship over our kingdom imperially and civilly (as I have often touched on): first, because they procured that, without consulting the king or his council, by virtue of papal bulls a liege man of the king, anywhere in England, not convicted of heretical depravity, be arrested and committed to the papal prison; and (as it seems to prudent men) there could not be a more evident sign of the pope's chief civil lordship over England.[15] Second, because, at the procurement of certain men who seem to be of our own, he condemned [the proposition] that some charters humanly devised are impossible, and consequently [declared] the opposite catholic;[16] and since "impossible" and "necessary" are said, as necessities, conditionally and without qualification (as is clear in Cause 23, question 4, ***Due sunt***),[17] it follows, with true [premisses], that he declared catholic all the charters of the clergy of England concerning perpetual alms, and consequently it would not be necessary to have recourse to the king for the ratification of such charters, since they are by a superior lord not only confirmed but declared catholic.[18] And third, and most of all, because he claims that it is not lawful for the king to punish his liege clergy however much they offend against the kingdom, nor to withdraw the alms of the clergy however much it has shown contempt, unless leave has been asked of him and obtained; and since he does not have this from the law of Christ (as is clear to one who examines it), it is left to all his supporters [to say] that he has it from Caesar. Hence I would wish the king to have diligent inquiry made of his liege clergy on these four questions: first, whether [356] the king can lawfully take away temporal goods from his liege clergy for contempt; second, whether the king exercises lordship as head over

regnum debeat cum hoc participare elemosinis regni nostri. Videtur enim quod, si susurrones huiusmodi non expectant nisi subdole premittendo preambulam horam illis congruam, quando expulsis secularibus dominis possint dominari ex integro toti regno.

the kingdom of England, and the pope thus civilly holding lordship under [him], or conversely; third, whether the forms of the condemnations and of the deeds of the Roman pontiff recited here are consonant with divine law, and whether the king's cleric who has consented, either expressly or by keeping silent, seems to fall into contempt of the king and kingdom; and fourth, it is asked of the king's full parliament, since by reason of greater contempt the contemner is to be punished more gravely, whether one who defends these things expressly or tacitly against king and kingdom ought, with this, to share in the alms of our kingdom. For it seems that whisperers of this kind are waiting only for an hour suited to them, which they cunningly arrange beforehand as a preamble,[19] when, the secular lords being expelled, they could exercise lordship entirely over the whole kingdom.[20]

Notes

1. ***Sui episcopi***, "his bishop": most likely Caesar's, the Roman bishop whose primacy Wyclif has just derived from Caesar's decree (***Constantinus***, 352.16); the alternative is the realm's own bishop.
2. Urban VI was elected in April 1378, Clement VII in September 1378; England held to Urban.
3. "These five" are the five reasons of 351.31–352.16. T. At 352.32–33 B reads ***istorum et in Gregorio***; the print is translated.
4. The condemnation is Gregory XI's of Wyclif's conclusions (bulls of May 1377); the "four truths" and "four heresies", and the letter, are not identified; the article "newly catholicized" (353.25–27) is the contrary of Wyclif's condemned conclusion that the pope does not bind or loose merely by claiming to (***Fasciculi zizaniorum***, p. 252). C. ***Epistola maledicta ab homine***: the letter is "cursed by a man" (the pope's curse) and yet refuted by no one.
5. Gal. 3:13 (DR "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree"). Ambrose, "letter 38": Loserth gives no reference. Ep. 38 in the Maurist numbering (PL 16, to Simplicianus) does not treat Gal. 3:13; the letter that expounds it of the cross is Ep. 46 (to Sabinus) §13, ***Ille maledictum in cruce factus est, ut tu benedictus esses in Dei regno*** (PL 16:1149C); cf. the sermon appended to Ep. 21 (PL 16:1015A). Wyclif's number has not been matched.
6. ***Per eum***: the proposition is declared catholic "on his authority", i.e. by Gregory's condemnation of its opposite. R. The opposite is Wyclif's own conclusion condemned in 1377: ***Non est possibile, de potentia Dei absoluta, quod si papa vel alius praetendat se quovismodo solvere vel ligare, eo ipso solvit vel ligat*** (Walsingham, ***Hist. Angl.*** I, 355, no. 14; ***Fasc. ziz.*** 252).
7. 2 Thess. 2:4 (DR "is lifted up above all that is called God"); Wyclif has ***super*** for the Vulgate's ***supra***. The "papal laws" are not specified; those Wyclif quotes from the gloss at 04-e (n. 10) are D. 19 c. 9 (***Anastasius***) and D. 40 c. 6 (***Si papa***, ***nisi deprehendatur a fide devius***), and for Peter, C. 2 q. 7 c. 33 (***Paulus Petrum reprehendit***).
8. ***Episcopo Scarioth***: Judas's surname set against the pope as an epithet.
9. ***Da oppositum ... contra***: the disputant's "grant the opposite" (that the pope could not so acquire England), followed by the counter-argument, a syllogism whose minor (***sed sic potest pretendere***) is then proved "in three ways".
10. King John's surrender of England to Innocent III (1213), with an annual render of a thousand marks.
11. ***Tunc formidandus esset, si excedit***: impersonal, "it would be a thing to fear, whether he exceeds"; the doubt is the misgiving (***formido***) that would unsettle faith in the keys.
12. The bishop of Rochester was Thomas Brinton (1373–1389), a Benedictine; his "brothers" are then his fellow monks. The parliament is not identified (perhaps that of October 1377 or of Gloucester, 1378). T. A A_1 read ***stomachando***, to the same sense.
13. ***Stante iusticia ... cum facto regis et iure quod vendicat***: if the condemnation is just ***and*** the king's deed and claim stand, the king falls under it. The "deed" is not named here; the conclusion it falls under is no. 6 (n14).
14. One of Wyclif's conclusions condemned in 1377: ***Si Deus est, domini temporales possunt legitime ac meritorie auferre bona fortunae ab ecclesia delinquente*** (Walsingham, ***Hist. Angl.*** I, 354, no. 6; ***Fasc. ziz.*** 248).
15. Gregory XI's bulls of 1377 ordering Wyclif's arrest and custody(the bull to Oxford, ***Fasciculi zizaniorum***, pp. 242–4).
16. Another condemned conclusion: ***Chartae humanitus adinventae de haereditate civili perpetua sunt impossibiles*** (Walsingham, ***Hist. Angl.*** I, 354, no. 3).
17. Cause 23, question 4, ***Due sunt***: not a canon but Gratian's dictum after c. 23 (Friedberg), ***Augustinus: Duae sunt necessitates, simplex una ... altera conditionis***; the words are Boethius's (***Cons.*** V pr. 6), not Augustine's. Loserth gives no reference. C. ***Cum impossibile et necessarium dicantur condicionaliter et simpliciter ... necessitates***: the two modal terms are each said of necessity on supposition and of necessity without qualification, so that the condemnation of "impossible" makes the opposite necessary without qualification.
18. ***Sequitur cum veris***: "it follows, together with true [premisses]", the logician's "with other truths added".

19. ***Subdole premittendo preambulam horam illis congruam***: literally "cunningly sending ahead a preamble hour suited to them"; construed as preparing the moment beforehand.
20. The print reads ***Videtur enim quod, si susurrones …***, which leaves the *si*-clause without an apodosis; B omits *si* (356.13), and B's reading is translated. Print: "For it seems that, if whisperers of this kind are waiting …".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 353: *partem* (30 is the line number)
  - 354: *regno*
  - 354: *mille*
  - 354: *et* (V is the margin alinea letter) [NW]
  - 355: *consilio* [NW]
  - 355: *alique*
  - 355: *IV^{a}*
  - 355: *legium* [NW]
  - 355: *contempserit* (178c is the folio mark)
  - 353: *catholicas* (178a folio mark glued)
  - 355: *regis* (178b folio mark glued)
  - 353: *XXXVIII^{va}).* (superscript va) [-MARK]
  - 353: *III°,* (line-final; next line starts et, no verse) [-VERSE]

Part 8: The shield and triple veil of the curia; the death of Gregory XI

Loserth pp. 356.17–359.4

¶1 356.17–358.18

356.17 *Some of the clergy suggest that they have a right above all civil powers;*
357.10 *and their head is the Pope.*
357.14 *The court of Rome is a nest of mischievous foxes.*
357.27 *It has invented for itself a triple shelter:*
357.30
1. that it is above all human judgments;
358.3
2. that every Christian is bound to obey all commands of the Curia;
358.9
3. that the Curia has the right of ruling other churches.
358.19 *God in mercy has taken away Gregory XI;*
358.27 *and we trust he will be the last of these false pontiffs.*

[356]**Innuunt quidam quod habent potestatem ad hoc, quam potestatem vocant dominium, et cum illa immediate sit data a Christo qui dat singulis suis sacerdotibus affluenter, illa potestas est prior, principalior et extencior quam potestas iure hereditario carnali, conquestu vel titulo mundano seculari domino acquisita. Et ad hoc vadunt quotquot conclusiones quas false contra scripturam discipuli Antichristi innuunt ad perturbacionem regnorum et diminucionem religionis christiane, in tantum quod illi Antichristi discipuli sunt capitales inimici illis quibus videntur carnaliter affici, quia dyabolus et omnia membra sua, sicut in imitando sibi ipsis continue sese dampnificant, sic obsunt vere paci aliorum quibus videntur proficere. Allegant autem illud Apostoli Roman. VIII°, 32: Proprio filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum. Quomodo non cum ipso omnia nobis donavit? Et I^{a} Corinth. III°, 22** [357]**Omnia vestra sunt, et Marci X°, 29, dicit Christus quod quicunque reliquerit mundum et carnem propter nomen suum, accipiet cencies tantum. Et in hoc mundo sacerdos (inquiunt) et specialiter religiosus habet ius quod est dominium ad toti mundo seculariter dominandum, et sic Christus docuit eos mundum relinquere, ut secularius conversentur. Sed quesito si layci relinquentes cuncta pro Christo erunt eis participes, si unus excludens alium facit sibi iniuriam, cum aliis que concernunt civile dominium, paciuntur angustias. Ideo defendunt unum capitaneum quem papam nominant sub cuius umbra infideliter**

Some hint that they have power for this, which power they call lordship, and since it is given immediately by Christ, who gives to each of his priests abundantly, that power is prior, more principal and more extensive than the power acquired by a secular lord by carnal hereditary right, by conquest or by worldly title. And to this tend all the conclusions which the disciples of Antichrist, falsely, against scripture, hint at, to the disturbance of kingdoms and the diminution of the Christian religion, insomuch that those disciples of Antichrist are the chief enemies of those to whom they seem carnally attached, because the devil and all his members, just as in imitating [him] they continually harm themselves, so they hurt the true peace of others whom they seem to profit.[1] And they allege that [saying] of the Apostle, Romans 8:32: "His own Son he spared not, but delivered him up for us all. How hath he not with him given us all things?"[2] And 1 Corinthians 3:22: [357]**"All things are yours"; and in Mark 10:29 Christ says that whoever has left the world and the flesh for his name will receive a hundred times as much.[3] And in this world, they say, the priest, and especially the religious, has the right which is lordship, to exercise lordship over the whole world in secular fashion; and so Christ taught them to leave the world, that they might live more secularly. But when it is asked whether lay people who leave all things for Christ will be partakers with them, whether one who excludes**

sunt protecti. Et si obicitur quod curia Romana extinguit multos errores, dicitur quod de tanto est laudabilis et suis satrapis est parendum. Si autem vulpes parvule que demoliuntur particulares vineas habent inibi foveas in quibus convoluti criminibus callidius et constancius defendantur, quis dubitat quin nidus ille foret fons veneni ex cuius rivulis scateat toxica in fidelem ecclesiam militantem? Scutum autem et velamentum huius toxice videntur esse congregacio ista perversa et triplex velum quo mentes fidelium sunt cecate. Nam appellante pecunioso ad illam curiam, quid per mendacia, quid per mala exempla sceleris ibi capta et quid per tradiciones callidas tam de nostris quam de aliis inibi adinventas inductum est scutum infidelitatis ad membrum dyaboli contra regna et sanctam ecclesiam defendendam? Velum autem trimembre statuit inprimis principium quod non licet christiano dictum vel factum eorum discernere, cum sint dii subterranei quibus donata est potestas clavium par cum Christo, qui possunt scripturam sacram statuere, [358]corrigere et mutare, et cum solum convincerentur ex scriptura sacra et factis propriis, patet quod non restat in eos medium accusandi. Secunda pars veli consequenter adicit quod subdi illis tamquam capiti sancte matris ecclesie quomodocunque vixerint est cuilibet christiano de necessitate salutis, et per consequens implere quidquid preceperint, cum non stat (ut inquiunt) quod eorum aliquis sit dampnandus. Tercia pars veli dyaboli est ficta plenitudo potestatis qua exterrent mundum cum pretensa legacione et excommunicacione sic quod, si quidquam decreverint in altera ecclesia faciendum, eo ipso oportet ut fiat; et quia reservarunt sibi cum istis armis potestatem conferendi beneficia ecclesie et superiores ac graviores persone ecclesie extere appetunt symoniace fastum et commodum temporale, ideo propter multitudinem, propter famam et propter terrorem istorum satellitum exterriti sunt pauci simplices dicere veritatem.

another does him injury, with other things that concern civil lordship, they are in straits. Therefore they defend one captain whom they name pope, under whose shadow they are faithlessly protected. And if it is objected that the Roman curia extinguishes many errors, the answer is that in so far it is praiseworthy, and [in so far] its satraps are to be obeyed. But if the little foxes that destroy particular vineyards have there holes in which, wrapped in crimes, they are defended more cunningly and more steadily, who doubts that that nest would be a fountain of poison from whose streams venom gushes into the faithful church militant?[4] And the shield and covering of this venom seem to be that perverse congregation and the triple veil by which the minds of the faithful are blinded. For when a moneyed man appeals to that curia, what with lies, what with the evil examples of crime taken up there, and what with the cunning traditions devised there both by our people and by others, a shield of unbelief has been brought in to defend the member of the devil against kingdoms and holy church.[5] And the threefold veil establishes first the principle that it is not lawful for a Christian to judge their word or deed, since they are gods beneath the earth, to whom is given the power of the keys equal with Christ, who can establish holy scripture, [358]correct and change it;[6] and since they could be convicted only from holy scripture and their own deeds, it is clear that no means of accusing them remains. The second part of the veil consequently adds that to be subject to them as the head of holy mother church, however they have lived, is for every Christian of necessity of salvation,[7] and consequently to fulfil whatever they have commanded, since it is not possible (as they say) that any of them should be damned. The third part of the devil's veil is the feigned plenitude of power, by which they terrify the world with pretended legation and excommunication, so that, if they have decreed anything to be done in another church, by that very fact it must be done; and because with these arms they have reserved to themselves the power of conferring the benefices of the church, and the higher and weightier persons of the church abroad simoniacally covet pomp and temporal advantage, therefore, because of the multitude, because of the reputation and because of the terror of these satellites, the few simple men are frightened from speaking the truth.[8]

¶2 358.19–359.4

[358]Sed benedictus sponsus ecclesie qui occidit Gregorium XI. et dispersit suos complices quorum scelera per Urbanum VI. ecclesie sunt detecta, et qualitas veneni ex divisione eorum est quodammodo

But blessed be the bridegroom of the church, who killed Gregory XI and scattered his accomplices, whose crimes have been laid bare to the church by Urban VI, and the quality of the poison has been somewhat

mitigata. Et utinam placeret sponso ecclesie perficere quod quidam prenosticant et alii imprecantur, scilicet quod numerus undenarius infamis et sterilis, prevaricans in totum decalogum, imponat finem numero pseudoprepositorum dicencium: Hereditate, civilitate et gladio possideamus Dei sanctuarium et Christi patrimonium. Ipse, inquiunt, crucifixus est ligno et apostolus mundo, ut nos occidamus gladio et nobis rebelles crucifigamus in patibulo, quia quam necessaria, inquiunt, fuit in primitiva ecclesia potestas faciendi miracula, tam necessaria est hodie potestas corporalis acquirendi et defendendi temporalia. Scimus tamen quod una potestas infinitum excedit aliam, et quod vita exproprietaria est vita seculari perfeccior et quod tam necessaria erant temporalia clero in primitiva [359] ecclesia sicut modo et quod necessarior foret modo eorum subtraccio et suspensio rapine bonorum cum gaudio, quam tunc fuit, nec est illa ficta defensio fundabilis ex scriptura sacra.

mitigated by their division.[9] And would that it pleased the bridegroom of the church to accomplish what some foretell and others pray for: namely that the number eleven, infamous and sterile, transgressing the whole decalogue,[10] should put an end to the number of false superiors who say: "Let us possess by inheritance, civil standing and sword the sanctuary of God and the patrimony of Christ."[11] He, they say, was crucified on the wood, and the apostle to the world,[12] that we might kill with the sword and crucify on the gibbet those who rebel against us; because, they say, as necessary as was the power of working miracles in the primitive church, so necessary today is the bodily power of acquiring and defending temporal goods. Yet we know that the one power infinitely exceeds the other, and that the propertyless life is more perfect than the secular life, and that temporal goods were as necessary to the clergy in the primitive [359] church as now, and that their withdrawal, and the suspension of the plunder of goods with joy, would be more necessary now than it was then;[13] nor is that feigned defence founded on holy scripture.[14]

Notes

1. ***Sicut in imitando sibi ipsis continue sese dampnificant***: the object of ***imitando*** is not expressed; read as the members imitating the devil. Alternatively "in imitating one another".
2. Rom. 8:32. Wyclif departs from the Vulgate (***Qui etiam proprio Filio suo non pepercit … quomodo non etiam cum illo omnia nobis donavit?***; DR "He that spared not even his own Son …"), so his Latin is translated.
3. 1 Cor. 3:22 (DR "For all things are yours"); Mark 10:29–30 in paraphrase (DR "an hundred times as much").
4. Cant. 2:15 (DR "the little foxes that destroy the vines") joined to Matt. 8:20 (DR "The foxes have holes"). ***Toxica … scateat***: a neuter plural with a singular verb.
5. ***Quid per … quid per … et quid per … inductum est scutum***: read as the medieval "what with … what with", the clause then a statement; the print closes it with a question mark.
6. ***Dii subterranei***: literally "gods beneath the earth", the term for the gods of the underworld; the barb is kept. The relative ***qui possunt*** refers to them, not to Christ.
7. ***De necessitate salutis*** echoes Boniface VIII, ***Unam sanctam*** (***Extrav. comm.*** 1.8.1, form ours; Friedberg II, 1246), whose last sentence makes subjection to the Roman pontiff ***omnino … de necessitate salutis***.
8. ***Persone ecclesie extere***: ***extere*** is taken as "foreign", the churches abroad from Rome. ***Exterriti sunt pauci simplices dicere veritatem***: ***dicere*** read as the infinitive of what they are frightened from; alternatively "few simple men, terrified, tell the truth".
9. Gregory XI died on 27 March 1378; Urban VI's breach with the cardinals followed, and the Schism.
10. The number eleven as "transgressing" the ten of the decalogue, after Augustine, ***De civitate Dei*** 15.20. The barb is on Gregory XI.
11. Ps. 82:13 (DR "Let us possess the sanctuary of God for an inheritance"), expanded by ***civilitate et gladio*** and ***Christi patrimonium***.
12. Gal. 6:14 (DR "the world is crucified to me, and I to the world").
13. At 359.2 B reads ***suscepcio*** for ***suspensio***: "the acceptance of the plundering of goods with joy", after Heb. 10:34 (DR "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods"). The print construes and is translated.
14. After ***scriptura sacra*** (359.4) A adds a gloss in Czech, ***Lecz na kawczye horze v Prahy est fundata newyem***, which Loserth renders "Whether it is founded on the hill at Prague, I know not" (editor).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 356: ***illi***
  - 356: ***Corinth***
  - 356: ***III°***
  - 357: ***Christus***
  - 357: ***toxice*** [NW]
  - 357: ***factum***

- **358: *vixerint* [NW]**
- **358: *Gre-* (first half of Gre-/gorium (gorium is pos 136); Z is the alinea letter)**
- **358: *gorium* (second half of Gre-/gorium) [NW]**
- **357: ∅ (second half of infideli-tatis; neighbour 197 already infidelitatis) [DELX]**

Chapter 16

Part 1: The first argument for Silvester's endowment, and the form of the donation

Loserth pp. 359.6–363.12

¶1 359.6–359.13
359.6 *The doctors object:*
359.8
1. that Silvester did not sin at all in accepting endowment;
359.14 *for if it lawful to receive alms, they may be kept without sin.*

[359] **Post hec dubia respondendum est ad magistrales argucias quas doctores obiciunt contra dicta. Arguitur primo quod beatus Silvester, recipiendo dotacionem perpetuam ecclesie pro se et suis successoribus nullo modo peccavit, et libenter acceptarem argumenta ad istam partem, quia quamvis neutram partem asseram, pars tamen isti opposita est mihi credibilior.**

After these doubts, reply must be made to the masterly stratagems which the doctors raise as objections against what has been said. It is argued first that blessed Silvester, in receiving the perpetual endowment of the church for himself and his successors, in no way sinned; and I would gladly accept arguments for that side, because although I assert neither side, yet the side opposed to it is more credible to me.[1]

¶2 359.14–360.2
360.3 *Answer: This is a mere begging of the question.*
360.13 *Christ bade us not to be careful for the morrow;*
360.27 *What business have we with providing 1000 years in advance?*

[359] **Prima itaque racio sic formatur: quam licite recipiunt sancti elemosinas pro relevandis indigenciis presentis vite, tam licite ipsas elemosinas servant idem sancti distribuendas indigentibus in perpetuum. Non enim videtur racio diversitatis quin, si licet recipere elemosinas propter indigenciam propriam relevandam, a pari erit licitum ipsas elemosinas sic collatas propter indigenciam futuram perpetuo conservare; ergo si licet indigenti recipere elemosinas propter se relevandum et hoc absque peccato, a pari licet conservare elemosinas sic receptas in perpetuum ad usus pauperum absque peccato. Sed beatus Silvester in faciendo sibi licitum simpliciter nullo modo verisimiliter peccavit; ergo beatus Silvester in retinendo dotacionem** [360] **perpetuam ecclesie nullo modo verisimiliter peccavit.**

The first reason, then, is framed thus: as lawfully as the saints receive alms for relieving the needs of the present life, so lawfully do the same saints keep those alms to be distributed to the needy in perpetuity. For there seems to be no reason for a difference why, if it is lawful to receive alms in order to relieve one's own need, it will not by parity be lawful to keep in perpetuity the alms so conferred on account of future need; therefore if it is lawful for a needy man to receive alms in order to relieve himself, and this without sin, by parity it is lawful to keep alms so received in perpetuity for the uses of the poor without sin.[2] **Now blessed Silvester, in doing what was lawful to him without qualification, in all likelihood in no way sinned; therefore blessed Silvester, in retaining the** [360] **perpetual endowment of the church, in all likelihood in no way sinned.**[3]

¶3 360.3–362.27
361.1 *An act may be forbidden by a general precept as much as by a special prohibition.*
361.19 *The form of the gift to Silvester shews that it was tainted with worldliness,*
362.2 *and makes it impossible to free Silvester from blame.*
362.8 *His acceptance became the occasion of schism.*
362.28 *It is objected that men err also in their writings,*

[360] **Quantum ad istud argumentum, non oportet respondere ad formam, nec vidi probacionem assumpti, cum Christus recepit elemosinas temporales, sicut et apostoli ab ipso receperant pro temporali indigencia pauperum relevanda (ut patet Joh. VI°), et tamen non legitur apostolos recepisse elemosinas pro pauperibus perpetue conservandas. Et quantum ad illud brogardicum, ergo per idem vel questionem vagam que est ultimum refugium simplicis arguentis qua queritur que sit racio diversitatis, retorqueo utrumque in arguentem. Si Christus docuit nos in suis apostolis non solicitari in crastinum, quia sufficit diei malicia sua, Matthei VI°, 34, et non videtur racio, quare non preciperet eis providere de elemosinacione perpetua, per idem preciperet eis providere de elemosinacione perpetua; vel racio diversitatis confirmatur ex hoc quod tempore apostolorum**

As to this argument, there is no need to reply to its form; nor have I seen a proof of the assumption, since Christ received temporal alms, as the apostles too had received them from him, for relieving the temporal need of the poor (as is clear from John 6), and yet we do not read that the apostles received alms to be kept in perpetuity for the poor.[4] **And as to that brocard, "therefore, by the same token", or the vague question which is the last refuge of a simple arguer, in which it is asked what the reason for the difference is, I turn both back on the arguer.**[5] **If Christ taught us, in his apostles, not to be solicitous for the morrow, because sufficient for the day is its own evil (Matthew 6:34), and there seems to be no reason why he should not command them to provide for perpetual almsgiving, then by the same token he would command them to provide for perpetual**

fuerunt homines devociores et ad elemosinas prompciores et post avariores, ergo fuisset congruum quod ipsi obligassent suos heredes ad elemosinas perpetuas. Si dicatur quod voluntas Christi est racio diversitatis sufficiens, revera sic doctrina Christi exemplata future ecclesie est racio diversitatis, et forma sufficiens ad movendum nos clericos ritum gentilem deserere et omnem solicitudinem nostram inpresenciarum proicientes in ipso confidere. Non solicitemur ergo quomodo providebitur nunc ad mille annos Christi pauperibus de pabulo corporali, sed permittentes mortuos sepelire mortuos suos sequamur Christum attencius et sic christianis futuris ad mille annos magis proficimus, et ita (ut dixi superius) perpetua elemosinacio est dotanti inductivum blaspheme superbie et elemosinato fomentum mundane confidencie et vigilanter requirendi divinum [361] auxilium aversive desidie, et utrumque istorum per elemosinacionem temporalem excluditur. Et istam racionem assignant doctores, quare Deus non particulariter premunivit primos parentes, ut caveant de calliditate serpentis promissa eius fallacia detestando. Nam dixit illis illabendo generale principium, cui innitentes, prudenter confidendo in domino et consulendo ipsum in ambiguis, amplius meruissent, et sic negata penultima consequencia negatur assumptum sequens, scilicet quod beatus Silvester in faciendo sibi licitum simpliciter nullo modo verisimiliter peccavit. Nam omnis conversacio secularis est inseparabiliter cum peccato, sicut dicit fides scripture et Augustinus persepe commemorat; et cum multe conversaciones seculares sint licite ac meritorie, patet quod beatus Silvester in faciendo sibi licitum sepe peccavit, sicut de se confitetur beatus Evangelista qui fuit Silvestro sanccior. Unde notet homo formam dotacionis, XCVI[a] dist. Constantinus, quomodo imperator tribuit Silvestro potestatem, vigorem et honorificenciam imperialem, decernendo quod habeat primatum super quatuor sedes et princeps sacerdotibus tocius mundi existat. Consideret secundo quomodo tradidit beato Silvestro et successoribus suis Lateranense palacium, diadema et frigium, superhumerale, clamidem purpuream et tunicam coccineam cum aliis insigniis et potestatibus imperialibus, et breviter cum omnibus dignitatibus quas papa vendicat non fundabilibus ex scriptura, ut puta, quod equitet super equum candidum cuius frenum cesar tenuit et alias reverencias quas mundo cecati in ipsis preponderant sibi exhibuit. Nam illud [362] affeccione ceca quis tribuit quod in se reputat preciosum. Consideret ergo evangelicus attente ordinem predicte carte, et miror si excuset beatum Silvestrum ab omni elacione, ab omissione contemptus mundi et defectu informacionis imperatoris et populi. Unde exhinc irreligiose accepta fuit occasio faciendo scisma

almsgiving; or else the reason for the difference is confirmed from this, that in the time of the apostles men were more devout and readier to give alms, and afterwards more avaricious: therefore it would have been fitting that they should have bound their heirs to perpetual alms.[6] If it is said that the will of Christ is a sufficient reason for the difference, truly in this way the doctrine of Christ, set as an example to the future church, is the reason for the difference, and a sufficient form to move us clerics to desert the heathen rite and, casting all our care at present upon him, to trust in him.[7] Let us not, therefore, be solicitous how provision will be made now, a thousand years ahead, for the poor of Christ in bodily food; but, letting "the dead bury their dead", let us follow Christ more attentively, and so we profit the Christians of a thousand years to come the more. And so (as I said above) perpetual almsgiving is, to the endower, a thing that induces blasphemous pride, and to the almsman a kindling of worldly confidence and of a sloth averse to vigilantly seeking divine [361] help; and each of these is excluded by almsgiving from time to time.[8] And the doctors assign this reason why God did not forewarn our first parents in particular to beware of the craftiness of the serpent by detesting his promised deceit: for he spoke to them by flowing into them a general principle, leaning on which, prudently trusting in the Lord and consulting him in doubtful things, they would have merited more.[9] And so, the penultimate inference being denied, the assumption that follows is denied, namely that blessed Silvester, in doing what was lawful to him without qualification, in all likelihood in no way sinned. For every secular manner of life is inseparably joined with sin, as the faith of scripture says and Augustine very often recalls; and since many secular manners of life are lawful and meritorious, it is clear that blessed Silvester, in doing what was lawful to him, often sinned, as the blessed Evangelist, who was holier than Silvester, confesses of himself.[10] Hence let a man note the form of the endowment, Dist. 96, *Constantinus*: how the emperor granted to Silvester imperial power, vigour and honour, decreeing that he should have primacy over the four sees and should be prince over the priests of the whole world.[11] Let him consider, second, how he handed over to blessed Silvester and his successors the Lateran palace, the diadem and the phrygium, the superhumeral, the purple chlamys and the scarlet tunic, with the other imperial insignia and powers; in short, with all the dignities which the pope claims that cannot be grounded in scripture: for instance, that he should ride on a white horse whose bridle Caesar held; and he showed him other marks of reverence on which those blinded by

in ecclesia instinctu dyaboli, ut notat decretalis, XCV[a] dist., Olim, ex dicto Jeronimi. Et hec creditur racio, quare ecclesia orientalis remanens in sua pauperie detestata est monstruosam superbiam occidentalis ecclesie. Unde legitur quod ecclesia Grecorum misit domino Johanni pape XXII magnam epistolam ad exhortacionem suam qua suadebat eos sue coactive iurisdiccioni subici plenarie responsivam et in fine inseruisse talem clausulam: Potenciam tuam summam super tuos subditos firmiter credimus, superbiam tuam summam tollerare non possumus, avariciam tuam summam saciare non intendimus, dominus tecum, quia dominus nobiscum est. Consideret ergo procurator Romane ecclesie cum approbabili: beatus Augustinus fuit sciencior, religiosior et sanccior beato Silvestro; ipse autem asserit irrevocabiliter cum aliis sanctis eum sequentibus: si quid utile est, in scriptura sacra invenitur, et moneat ut fautores illius dotacionis dicentes quod fuit omnino sine peccato ipsam fundent clarius ex scriptura, quod nulli usque hodie potuerunt.

the world set great weight. For one grants with [362] blind affection what one reckons precious in itself. Let the evangelical man, therefore, consider attentively the order of the aforesaid charter, and I wonder whether it excuses blessed Silvester from all elation, from the omission of contempt of the world, and from a failure to instruct the emperor and the people.[12] Hence, from this, occasion was irreligiously taken for making schism in the church at the devil's instigation, as the decretal notes, Dist. 95, *Olim*, from a saying of Jerome.[13] And this is believed to be the reason why the eastern church, remaining in its poverty, has detested the monstrous pride of the western church. Hence we read that the church of the Greeks sent to the lord Pope John XXII a great letter in reply to his exhortation, by which he urged them to submit fully to his coactive jurisdiction, and that it inserted at the end such a clause as this: "Your supreme power over your subjects we firmly believe; your supreme pride we cannot bear; your supreme avarice we do not intend to satisfy. The Lord be with you, for the Lord is with us."[14] Let the proctor of the Roman church, therefore, consider [this] with an approvable [argument]: blessed Augustine was more learned, more religious and holier than blessed Silvester; now he asserts irrevocably, with other saints following him, "if anything is useful, it is found in holy scripture"; and let him urge that the abettors of that endowment, who say that it was altogether without sin, ground it more clearly from scripture, which no one has been able to do to this day.[15]

¶4 362.28–363.12
363.1 *but we accept the writings of David and Peter although they sinned.*

[362] Et si obicitur quod eque evidenter credendum est errori cuiuscunque hominis in scriptis sicut in factis, et sic periret testificacio ex scripturis. Sed quod falsum assumitur (ut beatus Augustinus declarat epistola VIII[a] ad Jeronynum), cum ex veritate scripture [363] credimus quod propheta David peccavit cum uxore Urie et quod Petrus peccavit tempore passionis et post ascensionem, tamen scripta eorum credimus esse summe autentica, et sic maiori probabilitate credimus scriptis famosorum doctorum quam nudis factis, tum quia communiter ex maiori deliberacione, ex minori temptacione et pro ulteriori explanacione scribunt personis gravibus nec posterius revocant. Sed alii multi sancti post et ante in sentenciam illam concordant, sed (ut reor) nec ex scriptura nec racione fundabitur quod beatus Silvester non peccavit recipiendo dotacionem cesaream.

And if it is objected that a man's error, whoever he is, is to be believed as evidently in his writings as in his deeds, and so testimony from writings would perish: but what is assumed is false (as blessed Augustine declares in the eighth letter to Jerome), since, although from the truth of scripture [363] we believe that the prophet David sinned with the wife of Urias, and that Peter sinned at the time of the passion and after the ascension, yet we believe their writings to be supremely authentic; and so we believe the writings of famous doctors with greater probability than their bare deeds, both because they commonly write from greater deliberation, under less temptation and for further explanation, to weighty persons, and do not afterwards retract.[16] Now many other saints, after and before, agree in that teaching; but (as I think) it will be grounded neither from scripture nor from reason that blessed Silvester did not sin in receiving the caesarean endowment.[17]

Notes

1. A has two marginal notes here: at 359.6, *Nota bene istam totam columpnam, quia ponuntur fundamenta pro dominacione civili cleri* ("mark this whole column well, for the foundations of the clergy's civil exercise of lordship are laid down in it"); at 359.15, *Prima racio. Nota argumenta pro dominacione cum solucionibus*. *Magistrales argucias*: the schoolmen's arguments, which Wyclif states before he answers them.
2. At 359.14 B reads *qui licite* for *quam licite*; at 359.15 A and A_1 omit *pro relevandis ... elemosinas*; at 359.20 Loserth reports the manuscripts as reading *quin a pari*, so the print's placing of the *si licet* clause is his. The sense is unchanged.
3. *Simpliciter* is taken with *licitum*, "lawful without qualification"; it can also qualify the whole clause ("in no way sinned, without qualification"). The answer (361.6–7) repeats the phrase and denies it. *Verisimiliter* qualifies *peccavit*: the argument claims only likelihood.
4. *Assumptum* is the minor premiss just stated (Silvester in no way sinned). B omits *cum* at 360.4–5 (*assumpti Christus*), which makes the next clause a fresh sentence. S. "John 6" is Wyclif's reference; he does not say which verse.
5. *Brogardicum* (360.9): so the manuscripts, for the schoolmen's *brocardicum*, a stock maxim of argument. R. B in the margin at 360.10: *Questio vaga que est ultimum refugium simplicis arguentis. Hic notatur.* C. *Utrumque* is the brocard and the vague question: Wyclif turns each against the arguer in the next two clauses.
6. Matthew 6:34, Vulgate *Nolite ergo solliciti esse in crastinum ... sufficit diei malitia sua* (DR "Be not therefore solicitous for to morrow ... Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof"); Wyclif gives the sense in reported speech. C. Both limbs are reductions: the first draws an absurd command by the arguer's own "by the same token"; the second shows the arguer's "reason for the difference" proving too much.
7. At 360.23–24 B reads *exemplativa* for *exemplata*. S. 1 Peter 5:7, Vulgate *omnem sollicitudinem vestram proicientes in eum* (DR "Casting all your care upon him"); Wyclif turns it to the first person and adds *in ipso confidere*.
8. Matthew 8:22 (DR "let the dead bury their dead"). C. *Requirendi* depends on *desidie*: the almsman's sloth is averse to seeking God's help. *Elemosinacio temporalis* is almsgiving from time to time, set against perpetual almsgiving.
9. *Promissa eius fallacia* is taken as the object of *detestando*, "his promised deceit" (the serpent's promise, Genesis 3:4–5); it could also be an ablative absolute, "once his deceit had been promised". *Illabendo*: God spoke by flowing a general principle into them, without a particular warning; Loserth's side-note gives the point. The "doctors" are not named.
10. The "penultimate inference" is the parity step of 359.18–23; the "assumption that follows" is the minor at 359.23–360.1. The "blessed Evangelist" is John, who confesses sin of himself in 1 John 1:8; Wyclif does not quote it.
11. Decretum, D. 96 c. 14 *Constantinus* (Loserth: *Decret. I pars, dist. XCVI, c. XIV*; the modern form is ours). Loserth notes that what follows is drawn from this decretal. The four sees are not named here. R. A in the margin at 361.19: *Nota formam dotacionis per Constantinum*.
12. At 362.3 B reads *minor* for *miror*. C. The subject of *excuset* is taken to be the charter's order; it could be the evangelical reader ("whether he can excuse").
13. Decretum, D. 95 c. 5 *Olim* (Loserth: *dist. XCV, cap. V*; the form is ours). Wyclif gives it as Jerome's; the passage is Jerome on Titus 1:5, as the canon's inscription says (*Item Ieronimus supra epistolam ad Titum*).
14. A and B in the margin at 362.15: *Nota epistolam Grecorum*. Loserth gives no source for the Greeks' letter to John XXII or its closing clause, and none has been found; the clause circulates later with *Diabolus tecum* for *dominus tecum*. C. *Responsivam* agrees with *epistolam*: the letter answered John's exhortation.
15. *Cum approbabili* (362.20) is the print, confirmed on the plate; the noun it qualifies is not expressed, and "[argument]" is supplied from the syllogism that follows. At 362.20 B reads *procreator* for *procurator*; at 362.21 A and A_1 omit *et sanccior*. S. Cf. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 2.42.63, *quidquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi damnatur; si utile est, ibi invenitur*; Wyclif compresses it. Loserth gives no reference.
16. *Sed quod falsum assumitur* (362.30) has no verb of answering; "[the answer is]" is supplied, and a word may have been lost. *VIII^{a}* is Loserth's; the manuscripts read *nona*. The print spells *Jeronynum*. S. Loserth refers to Augustine's *Opera*, vol. II; the letter is Ep. 82 to Jerome, identified by content: 82.3, no canonical author erred in writing; 82.5, rather believe that Peter denied Christ and David committed adultery and murder than that scripture lies (PL 33:277); Loserth's reference reads *Aug. Opp. II, pag. 45*. David and Urias: 2 Kings 11 (DR); Peter after the ascension: Galatians 2:11–14.
17. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): here "teaching", the position just quoted from Augustine that what is useful is found in scripture. *Dotacionem cesaream*: the endowment from Caesar.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 359: *CAP. XVI.*
  - 360: *VI°* (print: Matthei VI°, 34)
  - 360: *mille annos* (main token covers two printed words)
  - 361: *Et* (capital E; 179b is the folio mark)
  - 361: *XCVI^{a}* (C 1 are alinea letter and argument numeral)
  - 362: *affeccione*
  - 362: *XCV^{a}*
  - 362: *Et*
  - 362: *VIII^{a}*
  - 362: *quis*

- 363: *et* (David is in the English side-note (writings of David and Peter), not the Latin line)
- 361: *seculares* (secu-/lares; output holds both halves) [-MARK]

• 362.20: *cum approbabili:* read on the plate (n0399) as printed; 362.25 the plate has *sequentibus:* (colon) before the quotation.

Part 2: The second and third arguments: merit, venial sin and the temporal lords

Loserth pp. 363.13–365.6

¶1 363.13–364.6

363.13 *Objection: 2. Silvester did right in accepting a gift for the poor and an act cannot be both right and wrong.*
363.24 *Answer: The same act may be now right and now wrong.*
363.30 *Moreover we do not allow that Silvester did right.*
364.1 *and even if right on the whole, the act might be accompanied by sin.*
364.7 *Objection: 3. Silvester might receive a gift for himself without sin; why not for others?*
364.15 *Answer: Sin accompanies all active life;*
364.29 *and, although lords may rightly perform civil acts,*

[363]Secundo sic arguitur: Quidquid fuerit meritorium beato Silvestro, nullo modo fuit sibi demeritorium, cum iste denominaciones ex opposito distinguuntur, sed fuit meritorium beato Silvestro recipere temporalia distribuenda pauperibus in perpetuum, hoc idem nullo modo fuit sibi demeritorium. Hic dicitur quod theologus logicus ponit calumpniam in maiori, cum idem opus successive est prius meritorium, et post demeritorium vel econtra; et sic conversacio beati Silvestri que ante baptizacionem vel conversionem fuit sibi demeritoria postea fuit sibi meritoria. Sic enim dicimus motum difformem quoad tempus vel subiectum, licet maior pars eius quantitativa fuerit uniformis. Minor autem non probatur, sed sub verbis illis capit calumpniam, quia nimis onerosum foret tali sancto recipere tale perpetuum officium, sive in se sive in suis ministris; nec probatur minor ista per hoc quod relevare pauperes indigentes est simpliciter meritorium cuicunque, tum quia multi sunt quibus hoc non convenit, tum secundo quia multis infidelibus et ypocritis in hoc demerentibus hoc convenit, tum tercio quia hoc dato non exhinc sequitur quod meritorium fuerat beato Silvestro recipere elemosinas [364]distribuendas pauperibus in perpetuum. Sed finaliter, dato quod hoc fuit meritorium, sic quod nullo modo demeritorium beato Silvestro, non exhinc sequitur quod beatus Silvester nullo modo peccavit sic faciendo. Homo enim peccat venialiter merendo continue et non demerendo sed remissius promerendo.

Second, it is argued thus: whatever was meritorious for blessed Silvester was in no way demeritorious for him, since these denominations are distinguished as opposites; now it was meritorious for blessed Silvester to receive temporal goods to be distributed to the poor in perpetuity; [therefore] this same thing was in no way demeritorious for him.[1] To this the answer is that the theologian who is a logician lays a challenge against the major, since the same work is successively first meritorious and afterwards demeritorious, or conversely; and so the manner of life of blessed Silvester, which before his baptism or conversion was demeritorious for him, was afterwards meritorious for him.[2] For so we call a motion difform with respect to time or subject, although the greater quantitative part of it was uniform.[3] Now the minor is not proved, but under those words it is open to challenge, because it would be too burdensome for such a saint to receive such a perpetual office, whether in himself or in his ministers; nor is this minor proved by the fact that to relieve the needy poor is meritorious without qualification for anyone, both because there are many to whom this is not fitting, and secondly because it is fitting for many unbelievers and hypocrites who demerit in it, and thirdly because, granting this, it does not follow from it that it had been meritorious for blessed Silvester to receive alms [364]to be distributed to the poor in perpetuity. But finally, granted that this was meritorious, so that it was in no way demeritorious for blessed Silvester, it does not follow from this that blessed Silvester in no way sinned in so doing. For a man sins venially while meriting continually, not by demeriting but by meriting more remissly.[4]

¶2 364.7–365.6

365.2 *yet such acts may be damnable in a priest.*

[364]Tercio sic arguitur: Quicquid potuit Silvester papa licite et absque peccato in usum suum recipere, potuit sic recipere in usus aliorum; sic enim absque peccato recipiunt domini temporales predia, redditus et huiusmodi, tam sibi quam aliis, sed licite et absque peccato eciam veniali recepit Silvester temporalia privilegia pro se ipso; ergo sic fecit vel potuit pro aliis. Hic respondeo concedendo asumptum

Third, it is argued thus: whatever Pope Silvester could lawfully and without sin receive for his own use, he could so receive for the uses of others; for so the temporal lords receive estates, revenues and the like without sin, as much for themselves as for others; now Silvester received temporal privileges for himself lawfully and without even venial sin; therefore he did so, or could do so, for others.[5] To this I reply by granting

et conclusionem illatam, sed non credo aliquos sanctos asserere dominos temporales absque peccato recipere redditus temporales, cum vivens activam vitam peccat continue mortaliter vel venialiter; et sic non credo quod absque peccato veniali recepit Silvester temporalia privilegia pro se ipso. Credo tamen quod potuit taliter recepisse, cum potuit fuisse in puro statu innocencie cum toto suo genere, et sic iure status innocencie recepisse immediate a domino usum et dominium temporalium. Sed ulterius pro materia argumenti concedo, primo quod omnis predestinatus habet titulum et dominium super omnia temporalia privilegia cuiuscunque, cum pro tempore suo constituitur super omnia bona Dei; hoc tamen est impertinens doctori, cum post hanc vitam immediate a Deo ad usum poli recipitur tale dominium. Secundo notandum quod domini temporales recipiunt licite et meritorie pro se et heredibus suis in perpetuum civili titulo redditus et proventus, tam propriorum dominorum quam filiorum [365] nobilium subditorum quorum custodia est in manus dominorum capitalium devoluta, sed sicut non vivunt hanc vitam sine peccato, sic non exercent actus tales civiles sine veniali, illud tamen quod foret in domino seculari licitum et meritorium foret in sacerdote Christi dampnabile.

the assumption and the conclusion inferred; but I do not believe that any saints assert that temporal lords receive temporal revenues without sin, since one living the active life sins continually, mortally or venially; and so I do not believe that Silvester received temporal privileges for himself without venial sin. Yet I believe that he could have received them in such a way, since he could have been in the pure state of innocence with his whole kind, and so, by right of the state of innocence, have received immediately from the Lord the use and lordship of temporal goods.[6] But further, for the matter of the argument, I grant, first, that every predestinate person has title and lordship over all the temporal privileges of anyone whatever, since for his time he is set over all the goods of God; yet this is beside the point for the doctor, since such lordship is received immediately from God, after this life, for the use of heaven.[7] Second, it is to be noted that temporal lords receive lawfully and meritoriously, for themselves and their heirs in perpetuity, by civil title, revenues and profits, both their own as lords and those of noble sons, [365] their subjects, whose wardship has devolved into the hands of the chief lords; but as they do not live this life without sin, so they do not perform such civil acts without venial [sin]; yet what would be lawful and meritorious in a secular lord would be damnable in a priest of Christ.[8]

Notes

1. The print has no *ergo* before *hoc idem* (363.17), though the clause is the argument's conclusion; "[therefore]" is supplied, and a word may have been lost. R. A in the margin at 363.13: *Secunda racio*; at 363.18: *Responsio*.
2. *Theologus logicus*: one person, the theologian trained in logic, not two. *Ponit calumpniam in maiori*: "lays a challenge against the major", the disputant's formal objection to a premiss; *capit calumpniam* below, "is open to challenge". *Denominaciones* are the names "meritorious" and "demeritorious" given to the act.
3. *Motus difformis*: a motion not uniform in speed, a term of the natural philosophers. The point: a whole is called difform from a part of it, so the same act can bear opposite names at different times.
4. *Remissius promerendo*: meriting with less intensity, *remissio* being the opposite of *intensio*. The venial sin lies in the slackening, not in a demerit.
5. A in the margin at 364.7: *Tercia racio. Domini temporales continue vivunt vitam non sine peccato*; at 364.15: *Responsio*. C. *Redditus* is the print's spelling of *reditus*.
6. *Potuit taliter recepisse*: "could have received them in such a way", that is, without venial sin. *Ius* here is "right" (the right of the state of innocence), not "law".
7. *Constituitur super omnia bona Dei* echoes Matthew 24:47 (Vulgate *super omnia bona sua constituet eum*; DR "he shall place him over all his goods"). C. *Doctori*: the doctor who raised the argument. *Ad usum poli*: the use of heaven, cf. *ius poli*, "the law of heaven".
8. *Tam propriorum dominorum quam filiorum nobilium subditorum*: taken as the lords' own revenues and those of noble minors under wardship; *propriorum dominorum* could also be "of their own lordships", reading *dominorum* loosely. *Custodia* is wardship, which falls to the chief lord in feudal tenure.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 364: *papa* (E is the alinea letter)
  - 364: *licite*
  - 365: *licitum*
  - 365: *Christi*

Part 3: Civil lordship unfit for priests; who is vicar of Christ; the fourth argument

¶1 365.7–368.28
365.7 *Civil dominion is more inconsistent with priesthood than is fornication.*
365.21 *God gave Peter an evangelical dominion over all things but no civil dominion.*
366.6 *A man may be reputed Christ's vicar and yet be a devil, as is not incredible of Gregory XI.*
367.1 *Objection: 4. Silvester could not refuse Constantine's alms without mortal sin.*
367.10 *Answer: A man may so involve himself that he cannot excape sin.*
367.19 *Examples.*
368.15 *There is no evidence that Silvester would have sinned in refusing.*

[365] **Unde minus remotum est a sacerdocio Christi recipere a dominis temporalibus alternatum usum uxorum suarum secundum copulam carnalem (quod credidit Nicolaus dyaconus fuisse licitum), quam quod recipiant a seculari domino dominacionem civilem; utrumque enim istorum foret horribile, sed secundum horribilius, cum carnalis procreacio stat cum sacerdocio, non autem civilis dominacio. Ideo inniti ad dotacionem civilem cleri Christi non foret sui vel sacerdotum eius honoracio, sed detestanda turpacio, quia de clero qui prius fuit nude de sorte domini, faceret apostatam de sorte seculi. Ideo domini temporales dant clero titulo elemosine quidquid et quantumcunque voluerint et non deturpant eos dominacione civili. Tercio notandum quod Deus dedit beato Petro et toti generi suo secundum spiritualem imitacionem dominacionem evangelicam et usufructum super omnia bona mundi, non autem dominacionem vel usum civilem, quia illa proprie consummatur ab homine, prima autem donacio non consummatur ab aliquo preter dominum, cum solius Dei sit illa generacio; quamvis enim apostolus et alii sancti predicatores genuerunt filios Dei ex semine verbi sui, tamen primogenito iam mortuo tribuenda est generacio cuius semen suscitat frater iunior, de quanto participative dicitur ipse Christus. Sed circa talem genituram filialem vel sucessionem** [366] **vicariam non sit contencio, cum quotquot receperunt cum caritate consummata dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri; illos autem non constituit humana eleccio, cum ubicunque terrarum clericus vel laycus post ascensionem edificat ecclesiam sanctam cuius est membrum, ipse est tam Christi quam Petri vicarius. Et stat quod aliquis solempnitate, ritu et reputacione humana sit reputatus Christi vicarius, cum hoc quod sit horrendus dyabolus, ut non est incredibile de Gregorio XI. et multis ei similibus. Nam si maritavit Raymundum nepotem suum cum herede Bolonie mediantibus decimis et bonis pauperum ecclesie Anglicane, si sustentavit iuxta fastum seculi multas parentum suorum familias, si redemit dignam captivitatem fratris sui et fecerit occidi multa millia hominum pocius propter secularem questum quam propter salutem eorum per patrimonium crucifixi, si insuper catholicaverit quod secundum potestates clavium errare non poterit, nec finaliter fructuose penituerit, quis dubitat quin fuit perpetuus hereticus, nunquam caput vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie, quia secundum Augustinum in libello De Decem Cordis vir finaliter infidelis non est caput mulieris membri ecclesie? Hec autem non impono sibi, sicut faciunt superiores persone ecclesie, sed dico quod nec ipse nec alius est**

Hence it is less remote from the priesthood of Christ to receive from the temporal lords the alternate use of their wives in carnal union (which Nicholas the deacon believed to be lawful) than that [priests] should receive civil exercise of lordship from a secular lord; for each of these would be horrible, but the second more horrible, since carnal procreation is consistent with the priesthood, but civil exercise of lordship is not.[1] Therefore to lean towards a civil endowment of the clergy of Christ would be no honouring of him or of his priests, but a detestable defiling, because out of a clergy which before was barely of the Lord's lot it would make an apostate of the world's lot.[2] Therefore the temporal lords give to the clergy, by title of alms, whatever and however much they will, and do not defile them with civil exercise of lordship. Third, it is to be noted that God gave to blessed Peter and to his whole kind, according to spiritual imitation, evangelical exercise of lordship and usufruct over all the goods of the world, but not civil exercise of lordship or use; because the latter is properly consummated by man, but the first gift is not consummated by anyone except the Lord, since that generation belongs to God alone.[3] For although the apostle and other holy preachers begot sons of God from the seed of their word, yet the generation is to be attributed to the firstborn, now dead, whose seed the younger brother raises up, inasmuch as he himself is by participation called Christ.[4] But about such filial begetting or [366] **vicarial succession let there be no contention, since "as many as received" [him] with consummated charity, "he gave them power to be made the sons of God"; and those human election does not appoint, since wherever on earth a cleric or layman after the ascension builds up the holy church of which he is a member, he is the vicar as much of Christ as of Peter.[5] And it is consistent that someone should be reputed vicar of Christ by solemnity, rite and human repute, while he is a horrible devil, as is not incredible of Gregory XI and many like him. For if he married Raymond his nephew to the heiress of Boulogne by means of the tithes and goods of the poor of the English church; if he maintained, after the pomp of the world, many households of his kinsmen; if he redeemed the deserved captivity of his brother and caused many thousands of men to be killed, rather for secular gain than for their salvation, through the patrimony of the Crucified; if moreover he declared it catholic that, according to the powers of the keys, he could not err, and did not finally and fruitfully repent: who doubts that he was a perpetual heretic, never head or member**

Christi vel Petri vicarius nisi relinquens mundanum ritum imitetur eos in moribus, et sic stat quod pretensus Romanus pontifex sit caput membrorum dyaboli, et in hoc iacet periculum humane dotacionis perpetue, cum sepe occasione illius cadit distribucio fertilior bonorum pauperum super membra diaboli. [367] Quarto arguitur ponderancius propter gravedinem argumenti sic: Nullus obligatus sub pena peccati mortalis ad recipiendum temporalia pro se et suis successoribus in perpetuum in hoc peccat, sed Silvester fuit obligatus sub pena peccati mortalis sic recipere elemosinas a Constantino, ergo in hoc nullo modo peccavit. Hic dicitur quod utraque pars antecedentis capit calumpniam, nam multi sunt actus ad quorum obligacionem homines inducuntur, eciam sub pena peccati mortalis occasione precedencium peccatorum, quos actus faciendo peccant vel mortaliter vel venialiter. Sic enim peccatum illaqueat multos insolubiliter ad peccandum, et hinc (ut notat Augustinus) Psalmista rogat de necessitatibus liberari, sed quamvis homo sit in multis casibus necessitatus ad peccandum, tamen et poterit faciliter non peccare, et non a Deo sed a peccato capit necessitatem ut peccet, non tamen debet vel tenetur peccare. Ut autem ista sentencia palpabilius videatur, pono primum exemplum in quo quis sub pena mortalis teneatur reddere debitum uxori pro excusanda utriusque libidine, et in reddicione peccet mortaliter aut venialiter; nulli dubium quin casus sit possibilis et sepe accidens. Pono secundum exemplum in quo abbas teneatur sub pena mortalis recipere onus sue ecclesie ad regulandum religiose suum capitulum, ad dispensandum fideliter egenis elemosinas quas recipit ad hunc usum, et ad vivendum in se et suo capitulo inseculariter secundum regulam traditam a patrono. Et pono de [368] possibili quod electus ad illud officium peccet, inordinate aspirando ad honorem et cultum seculi et imprudenter dispensando bona pauperum; et patet contradictorium maioris assumpte. Pono tercium exemplum in quo quis tenetur accipere eukaristiam et eam indigne accipiat, et patet quod in faciendo illud quod debet facere peccat mortaliter propter defectum modi faciendi, sicut in maiori parte accidit in accipiendo ecclesiasticum beneficium. Sed longe aliud est dicere, Petrus obligatus sub pena mortalis recipere datum onus in hoc peccat, et in quantum recipit illud onus in tantum peccat; nam prior proposicio dicit in reduplicacionem concomitanciam et secunda dicit reduplicacionem causalem. Minor eciam argumenti est falsa, quia non est deducibile quod Deus vel scriptura sacra obligavit beatum Silvestrum sub pena mortalis recipere elemosinas secundum illam formam a cesare sed religiosius fecisset, informando cesarem quod caput ecclesie Christus in cuius virtute sanatus est aufugit honores

of holy mother church? because according to Augustine in the little book *On the Ten Strings*, a man who is finally an unbeliever is not the head of a woman who is a member of the church.[6] But I do not lay these things on him, as the higher persons of the church do; but I say that neither he nor anyone else is vicar of Christ or of Peter unless, leaving the worldly rite, he imitates them in conduct; and so it is consistent that a pretended Roman pontiff should be head of the members of the devil; and in this lies the danger of perpetual human endowment, since often, on occasion of it, the more fruitful distribution of the goods of the poor falls upon members of the devil.[7] [367] Fourth, it is argued more weightily, because of the gravity of the argument, thus: no one obliged under pain of mortal sin to receive temporal goods for himself and his successors in perpetuity sins in this; now Silvester was obliged under pain of mortal sin so to receive alms from Constantine; therefore in this he in no way sinned. To this the answer is that each part of the antecedent is open to challenge; for there are many acts to whose obligation men are brought, even under pain of mortal sin, on occasion of preceding sins, and in doing those acts they sin either mortally or venially. For so sin ensnares many insolubly to sinning; and hence (as Augustine notes) the Psalmist asks to be delivered from necessities; but although a man is in many cases necessitated to sin, yet he could also easily not sin, and he takes the necessity to sin not from God but from sin; yet he ought not, and is not bound, to sin.[8] And that this teaching may be seen more palpably, I put a first example, in which someone is bound under pain of mortal [sin] to render the debt to his wife to excuse the lust of both, and in the rendering sins mortally or venially; no one doubts that the case is possible and often happens.[9] I put a second example, in which an abbot is bound under pain of mortal [sin] to take up the charge of his church: to rule his chapter religiously, to dispense faithfully to the needy the alms which he receives for this use, and to live, in himself and in his chapter, unworldly, according to the rule handed down by the patron. And I put [368] as possible that the one elected to that office sins, by aspiring inordinately to the honour and worship of the world and by dispensing the goods of the poor imprudently; and the contradictory of the major assumed is clear.[10] I put a third example, in which someone is bound to receive the eucharist and receives it unworthily; and it is clear that in doing what he ought to do he sins mortally through a defect in the manner of doing it, as happens for the most part in receiving an ecclesiastical benefice. But it is far different to say, "Peter, obliged under pain of mortal [sin] to receive the charge

mundanos et proprietatem civilem. Ideo superioribus sacerdotibus suis non incumbit tam grave officium ministrandi pauperibus, sed inferioribus dyaconis et laycis quibus incumbit abiectum sed in gradu suo meritorium ministerium, nec alium primatum docuit Christus apostolos suos appetere nisi ex veritate prima sequentem maioritatem quoad Deum racione humilioris ministerii (ut docetur Luce XXII°).

given, sins in this", and "in so far as he receives that charge, so far he sins"; for the former proposition states concomitance in the reduplication, and the second states a causal reduplication.[11] The minor of the argument, too, is false, because it cannot be deduced that God or holy scripture obliged blessed Silvester under pain of mortal [sin] to receive alms from Caesar in that form; but he would have done more religiously by informing Caesar that the head of the church, Christ, in whose power he had been healed, fled worldly honours and civil property.[12] Therefore so heavy an office of ministering to the poor does not fall on his higher priests, but on the lower deacons and on lay people, on whom falls a ministry abject but meritorious in its degree; nor did Christ teach his apostles to seek any other primacy than the greatness with respect to God which follows, from the first truth, by reason of the humbler ministry (as is taught in Luke 22[:26]).[13]

Notes

1. A in the margin at 365.7: *Contra dominacionem cleri*. T. At 365.11 A and A_1 read *utrumque inquam* for *utrumque enim*. C. The subject of *recipiant* is not expressed; "[priests]" is supplied from *sacerdocio*. S. Nicholas the deacon (Acts 6:5), to whom the Nicolaites were traced; the story that he offered his wife to others is told by Augustine, *De haeresibus* 5 (*permisisse fertur, ut ea qui vellet uteretur*); Wyclif's *alternatum usum uxorum* is looser.
2. At 365.14 A and A_1 read *civilis ditacio*, "civil enrichment"; the print is translated. C. The pun is on *clerus* and *sors*, "lot": the clergy are those whose lot is the Lord; the saying is Jerome's, Ep. 52.5 to Nepotian (*vel quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia ipse Dominus sors ... Clericorum est*).
3. The manuscripts read *usumfructum* (365.23); Loserth prints *usufructum*; the sense is the same. R. A in the margin at 365.21: *Nota clerus habet dominacionem evangelicam a Christo super omnibus rebus mundi*. C. *Illa* is civil exercise of lordship, *prima donacio* the evangelical gift.
4. The figure is the levirate law (Deuteronomy 25:5–6): Christ is the firstborn, now dead, and the preacher the younger brother who raises up seed in his name; the begetting by the word recalls 1 Corinthians 4:15. *De quanto participative dicitur ipse Christus* is taken of the younger brother; it could also mean "of which [generation] Christ himself is called [father] by participation".
5. John 1:12, Vulgate *Quotquot autem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri* (DR "But as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God"); Wyclif omits *eum* ("[him]" supplied) and adds *cum caritate consummata*.
6. A in the margin at 366.6: *Nota de papa*; at 366.22: *Augustinus*. The particulars against Gregory XI (his nephew Raymond's marriage, his brother's ransom, the killings) are in part confirmed: the print's *Bolonie* (366.17) is Boulogne: Raymond de Turenne, Gregory's nephew, married Marie de Boulogne in October 1375, so it is Boulogne, not Bologna; Gregory's brother Roger de Beaufort was taken prisoner in September 1370 and the pope worked repeatedly for his release. The killings are not checked. C. *Dignam captivitatem*: "deserved captivity", taking *dignam* as "merited". T. At 366.21 A reads *num caput*, A_1 *non caput*; the print's *nunquam* is translated. S. Augustine, Sermo 9 (*De decem chordis*) (Loserth: *Opp.* tom. V, p. 50); cf. 1 Corinthians 11:3, "the head of the woman is the man".
7. *Sicut faciunt superiores persone ecclesie*: Wyclif does not accuse in the manner of the prelates who accuse others; he states a condition. *Romanus pontifex* is kept as "Roman pontiff", apart from *papa*. R. A in the margin at 366.26: *Quarta racio. Nota quis est vicarius Christi vel Petri*.
8. Psalm 24:17, *de necessitatibus meis erue me* (DR "deliver me from my necessities"). Loserth refers to Augustine, *De natura et gratia* 66, and *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*. T. At 367.13 B reads *hic ut notat*. R. B in the margin at 367.7: *Multi sunt actus quos obligamur perficere sub magna pena, quos implendo peccamus mortaliter*.
9. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): "teaching", the position just stated, not a judicial sentence. *Reddere debitum*: the conjugal debt (1 Corinthians 7:3, DR "Let the husband render the debt to his wife"). T. At 367.22 A reads *libine* for *libidine*.
10. *Patronus*: here the founder who gave the rule, not the patron of a benefice; the glossary's "patron" is kept. *Contradictorium maioris*: the major ("no one obliged ... sins in this") is contradicted by the case.
11. At 368.13 A reads *reduplicacione sive reduplicative*; the print's *in reduplicacionem concomitanciam* does not construe cleanly and is translated as if *in reduplicacione*. C. "Sins in this" asserts only that the sin goes along with the act; the reduplicative "in so far as ... so far" makes the act the cause of the sin.
12. Constantine's healing (from leprosy, at his baptism by Silvester) is the Silvester legend, told in the donation's charter itself (*ab omni me leprae squalore mundatum*, PL 8:573C). S. Christ's flight from worldly honour: John 6:15 (DR "fled again into the mountains"). T. At 368.21 B reads *mundanos in proprietatem*.

13. Luke 22:26 (DR "he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger: and he that is the leader, as he that serveth"); the deacons: Acts 6:1–6. C. *Ex veritate prima*: from the first truth, God; it is taken with *sequentem*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 365: *licitum* (print: licitum),)
  - 365: *utrumque enim* (main token covers two printed words)
  - 365: *cum*
  - 365: *imitacionem* [NW]
  - 366: *aliquis* [NW]
  - 367: *in*
  - 367: *mortaliter* [NW]
  - 367: *venialiter* (print veni- / aliter; main token holds the whole word)
  - 367: ∅ (aliter is the tail of veni-aliter (pos 77); print: aliter. Sic)
  - 367: *secundum* (30 is the line number)
  - 368: *dinate* (second half of inor-/dinate (pos 7)) [NW]
  - 368: *Christus*
  - 368: *XXII°* (print: Luce XXII°).)

Part 4: Leonard against Silvester; the fifth argument: perpetual alms and the colleges

Loserth pp. 368.29–372.1

¶1 368.29–370.14

369.1 *St. Leonard's example is better than Silvester's.*

369.15 *The doctor argues that Silvester was bound to accept restitution from Constantine.*

369.24 *This implies imperfect restitution on Constantine's part,*

369.29 *and a duty in the Pope to bear civil sway.*

370.15 *Objection: 5. If perpetual alms are wrong our colleges ought to be dissolved.*

370.30 *Answer: An act may be good, yet touched with venial sin.*

[368]Si, inquam, cum talibus exhortacionibus evangelicis securius procurasset Silvester pro futura ecclesia, tunc verisimilius plus profuisset utrique parti, sicut beatus Leonardus plus profuit regi Francie retrahendo ipsum ab affeccione mundana per hoc quod renuit officium [369]presulatus, quam fecisset in retinendo illud officium procurando a rege dimidium regni sui. Ideo fecit conformius ad evangelium et (sicut credo) utilius utrique parti ecclesie, quam fecit beatus Silvester recipiendo illam cartam a cesare, sicut innuit cronica de voce angeli dicentis quod in die illius dotacionis diffusum est venenum in ecclesia sancta Dei. Nec est carta cesaris magis credibilis quam ista cronica, ymmo evidencius est ex fide scripture et lege ecclesie quod Nabuchodonosor qui destruxit synagogam et sacerdotes Jerusalem sit salvatus, quam quod Constantinus salvabitur, quia primum asserit decretum cum Augustino ex testimonio scripture, sed secundum relinquitur insuasum. Sed arguit doctor quod Silvester tenebatur de necessitate salutis recipere dotacionem predictam a cesare eo quod spolians christianos bonis suis tenebatur eis restituere. Sed si evidencia ista procederet, moveret primo credere quod Constantinus propter defectum plene satisfaccionis fuit dampnabilis, secundo cum beatus Silvester debuit sub pena mortalis restitucionem illam recipere, sequitur quod totum imperium principaliter debebatur Romano pontifici, et per idem, extincto quolibet seculari capitali domino cuiuslibet regni, episcopus debet esse eius civilis

If, I say, with such evangelical exhortations Silvester had provided more securely for the future church, then in all likelihood he would have profited both parties more, as blessed Leonard profited the king of France more by drawing him back from worldly affection through refusing the office [369]of prelacy than he would have done by retaining that office and procuring from the king half of his kingdom.[1] Therefore he acted more in conformity with the gospel and (as I believe) more usefully for both parts of the church than blessed Silvester acted in receiving that charter from Caesar, as the chronicle hints concerning the voice of the angel saying that on the day of that endowment poison was poured into the holy church of God.[2] Nor is Caesar's charter more credible than that chronicle; indeed it is more evident, from the faith of scripture and the law of the church, that Nabuchodonosor, who destroyed the synagogue and the priests of Jerusalem, was saved, than that Constantine will be saved; because the decree, with Augustine, asserts the first from the testimony of scripture, but the second is left without any to urge it.[3] But the doctor argues that Silvester was bound, of necessity of salvation, to receive the aforesaid endowment from Caesar, on the ground that [Caesar], having despoiled Christians of their goods, was bound to restore [them] to them.[4] But if that evidence held, it would move [one], first, to believe that Constantine, through defect of full satisfaction, was damnable; second, since blessed

dominus capitalis, ut deductum est et improbatum priori capitulo. Tercio sequitur quod Christo et cuilibet eius vicario debetur principaliter dominacio secularis, cum aliter posset cesar renunciasse toti civilitati et distribuisse bona pauperibus, sicut fecerunt sanctus Thomas apostolus et sanctus Laurencius; nam dato opposito non oportuit quod cesar resignasset Silvestro imperium, et per consequens non oportuit sub pena mortalis beatum Silvestrum illam dotacionem a cesare recepisse. [370] Unde ego credo quod meritorius fuisset utrique parti quod distributa fuissent bona pauperibus, et ordinatum per laycos ministerium continuum in subsidium egenorum; tunc enim posset clerus stare in suo gradu vivendo exproprietarie sicut primo, et ablata confederacione, assecuracione et occupacione cum mundo cresceret undique fructus cleri. Nec est credendum quod ad satisfaccionem tyranni requiritur ut det clero dominacionem civilem, sed oportet quod satisfaciens capitali domino iuvet suam ecclesiam, aliis ut egentibus conferendo, et superhabundantibus vel abutentibus subtrahendo. Sic enim dicitur Nabuchodonosor ex maiori evidencia quam nostrum cesarem meruisse.

Silvester ought under pain of mortal [sin] to receive that restitution, it follows that the whole empire was owed principally to the Roman pontiff, and by the same token, when any secular chief lord of any kingdom is extinct, the bishop ought to be its civil chief lord, as was deduced and disproved in the previous chapter. Third, it follows that secular exercise of lordship is owed principally to Christ and to each vicar of his, since otherwise Caesar could have renounced all civil standing and distributed his goods to the poor, as Saint Thomas the apostle and Saint Laurence did; for, the opposite being granted, it was not necessary that Caesar should resign the empire to Silvester, and consequently it was not necessary under pain of mortal [sin] that blessed Silvester should have received that endowment from Caesar.[5] [370] Hence I believe that it would have been more meritorious for both parties that the goods had been distributed to the poor, and a continual ministry ordained by lay people in aid of the needy; for then the clergy could stand in its degree, living without property as at first, and, with alliance, assurance and occupation with the world taken away, the fruit of the clergy would grow on every side. Nor is it to be believed that, for the satisfaction of a tyrant, it is required that he give the clergy civil exercise of lordship; but it is needful that one making satisfaction to the chief lord should help his church, by conferring on others as being needy, and by withdrawing from those who have superabundance or abuse [it]. For so Nabuchodonosor is said, on greater evidence than our Caesar, to have merited.[6]

¶2 370.15–370.29

[370] Quinto arguitur per deducens ad familiare inconveniens scilicet: Si beatus Silvester peccavit in recipiendo dotacionem ecclesie in perpetuum, sequitur a pari quod collegia nostre universitatis verisimiliter peccarent in recipiendo temporalia pro sustentacione perpetua pauperum clericorum; et ita sequitur quod tam clerici domini Wyntoniensis quam alii collegiati tenentur non perpetuari, et per consequens monere patronos ad dissolvendum privilegia perpetua, ut est de privilegiis perpetuis concessis universitati nostre a rege, et sic de cantariis et aliis elemosinis perpetuis. Revocetur, inquit, ista heresis, cum extingueret devocionem populi, elemosinas perpetuas clericorum, et per consequens cederet ad detrimentum maximum pauperibus in futurum.

Fifth, it is argued by appeal to [an argument] leading to a familiar absurdity, namely: if blessed Silvester sinned in receiving the endowment of the church in perpetuity, it follows by parity that the colleges of our university would in all likelihood sin in receiving temporal goods for the perpetual sustenance of poor clerics; and so it follows that both the clerics of the lord of Winchester and other collegiates are bound not to be perpetuated, and consequently [are bound] to urge the patrons to dissolve perpetual privileges, as is the case with the perpetual privileges granted to our university by the king; and so with chantries and other perpetual alms.[7] "Let this heresy be revoked," he says, "since it would extinguish the devotion of the people, the perpetual alms of the clerics, and consequently would turn to the greatest detriment of the poor in future."[8]

¶3 370.30–372.1
371.1 *Example of Archbishop Islip and his college,*
371.19 *dissolved by Archbishop Langham.*
371.25 *I should be glad to see all appropriations and endowments come to an end.*
372.1
1. The clergy would then live as Christ ordered.

[370]Hic dico primo quod consequencia non procedit, cum homo potest facere nedum bonum de genere, sed bene moraliter et tamen cum hoc et in hoc peccare venialiter, ut ista pars habet dicere in familiariori [371]exemplo. Nam dominus Symon Hyslep archiepiscopus Cantuariensis fundavit unum collegium in Oxonia plus pia intencione, ut evidencius creditur quam de fundacione cuiuscunque abbathie in Anglia, et ordinavit quod in ea sub forma laudabili studeant ad utilitatem ecclesie pure clerici seculares, quod et factum est. Et cum ipso mortuo symoniace cum commentis mendacii eversum est tam pii patroni propositum et illis expulsis pauci alii non egentes sed diviciis affluentes irregulariter introducti contra decretum captum ex dictis beati Jeronimi, positum XII[a] q. II: Gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere, ignominia sacerdotis est propriis studere diviciis. Et cum pretextu illius fuci sophistici episcopus et suum capitulum sunt una persona a qua non licet alienare bona illius ecclesie, ista persona vendicat bona illius collegii proprietarie possidere. Unde consulendum videtur domino Wyntoniensi ut caveat hanc cautelam. Credo autem quod dictus Symon peccavit fundando dictum collegium, sed non tantum quantum Antisymon qui ipsum dissolverat, sed ut credo nunquam fuit ecclesia appropriata in Anglia vel possessio in perpetuam elemosinam mortificata quin appropriacio sapuit peccatum altrinsecus. Ulterius pro materia argumenti affectarem, si Deus decreverit quod non foret in regno nostro talis ecclesiarum appropriacio vel reddituum temporalium mortificacio, sed quod totus clerus vivendo pure exproprietarie de decimis, oblacionibus et privatis elemosinis sit contentus; quamvis enim illud non dixerim per modum conclusionis, sed per viam condicionis et [372]imprecacionis, tamen eius racionabilitas suaderi potest tripliciter.

To this I say, first, that the inference does not hold, since a man can do not only what is good in its kind but what is morally good, and yet with this and in this sin venially, as this party has to say in a more familiar [371]example.[9] For lord Simon Islep, archbishop of Canterbury, founded a college in Oxford with a more pious intention (as is more evidently believed) than [is believed] of the foundation of any abbey in England, and he ordained that in it purely secular clerics should study, under a laudable form, for the utility of the church; which was also done. And when he was dead, the purpose of so pious a patron was overthrown simoniacally with the devices of a lie, and, those [clerics] being expelled, a few others, not needy but abounding in riches, [were] irregularly brought in, against the decree taken from the sayings of blessed Jerome, placed in [Causa] 12, q. 2: "It is the glory of a bishop to provide for the wealth of the poor; it is the shame of a priest to study his own riches."[10] And since, under pretext of that sophistical paint, the bishop and his chapter are one person, from whom it is not lawful to alienate the goods of that church, that person claims to possess the goods of that college as property. Hence it seems that the lord of Winchester should be counselled to beware of this wile.[11] Now I believe that the said Simon sinned in founding the said college, but not so much as the Anti-Simon who dissolved it; but, as I believe, never was a church appropriated in England, or a possession amortized in perpetual alms, but that the appropriation savoured of sin on both sides. Further, for the matter of the argument, I would desire that God should decree that there should not be in our kingdom such appropriation of churches or amortization of temporal revenues, but that the whole clergy, living purely without property, should be content with tithes, offerings and private alms; for although I would not say this by way of conclusion, but by way of condition and [372]prayer, yet its reasonableness can be urged in three ways.[12]

Notes

1. A in the margin at 368.29: *Nota defectus beati Silvestri*. C. *Inquam* resumes the counterfactual of the preceding part: Silvester should have taught Constantine from the gospel instead of taking his charter. S. St Leonard of Noblac, who in his legend refused the bishopric the king of France meant to give him (*Legenda aurea* cap. 155: *ei episcopatum donaret. Quod ille renuit*); the half of the kingdom is Wyclif's counterfactual, not in the legend.
2. The subject of *Ideo fecit* is Leonard. S. The angel's voice at the donation (*diffusum est venenum in ecclesia sancta Dei*): the *cronica* is Higden, *Polychronicon* IV.26 (Rolls ed. V, 130: *Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei*, the voice there the devil's), which Wyclif cites by name in *De potestate pape* c. 6, there as an angel's voice (*effusum*); Loserth gives no source here. Early Dante commentators give it in the same form (Jacopo della Lana: *diffusum*).

3. Nebuchadnezzar's repentance: Daniel 4:31–34 (DR 4:34 "I, Nabuchodonosor, do now praise, and magnify, and glorify the King of heaven"). The decree that, with Augustine, asserts his salvation is probably Gratian, *Decretum* C.23 q.4 c.22, from Augustine: *Nabuchodonosor penitenciam meruit fructuosam*; Loserth does not identify it. A in the margin at 369.10: *Salvacio Nabuchodonosor*. C. *Insuasum*: "not urged", i.e. no authority recommends it; *evidencius est* "it is more evident" is not the glossary's noun *evidencia*.
4. *Doctor*: the opponent whose arguments this chapter answers, unnamed here. *Spolians christianos*: Constantine, as persecutor before his conversion; "[Caesar]" and "[them]" are supplied.
5. The second and third consequences show the cost of the opponent's premiss: if Silvester was bound to take the empire as restitution, temporal lordship belongs of right to the pope and to every bishop, which chapter 15 disproved. *Sub pena mortalis*: "[sin]" supplied, as throughout. S. Thomas the apostle giving King Gundaforus's money to the poor is told in the *Acts of Thomas* and the Latin *Passio Thomae* (e.g. Orderic Vitalis, *Hist. eccl.* II, PL 188:158A–160B, *egenis abundanter donare*); Laurence distributing the treasure of the Roman church to the poor in Ambrose, *De officiis* 2.28.
6. At 370.3 B lacks *continuum*; at 370.6 B reads *et assecuracione*; at 370.11–12 B reads *ab utentibus trahendo*. C. *Meritorius* is the neuter comparative, "more meritorious". *Capitali domino*: God as chief lord, to whom the tyrant owes satisfaction (so Nebuchadnezzar). *Aliis ut egentibus*: *ut* is taken as "as being"; the construal is uncertain.
7. A in the margin at 370.15: *Quinta racio*. C. *Arguitur per deducens*: the noun is not expressed; "[an argument]" is supplied. *Inconveniens* (CONTEXTUAL) is here the absurd consequence of a premiss. R. The lord of Winchester is William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, whose scholars he was already maintaining in Oxford (by 1376) before founding New College by charter in November 1379 (VCH Oxon. iii, 144). T. At 370.22 B reads *tenentur velle non perpetuari*, "are bound to will not to be perpetuated"; at 370.24–25 B reads *nostri a rege*.
8. *Elemosinas perpetuas clericorum* stands in apposition to *devocionem populi*: the devotion is its perpetual alms; the print has nothing between them. T. Loserth reports *extigueret* in the manuscript at 370.26 and prints *extingueret*.
9. A in the margin at 370.30: *Responsio*. C. *Bonum de genere*: an act good in its kind, as against one done well morally. *Ista pars*: taken as "this party", the objector's side, who must grant the example; it could be "this part [of the answer]".
10. Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1366), founded Canterbury Hall, Oxford; his successor Simon Langham (the "Anti-Simon" below) expelled its secular clerks and brought in monks; Wyclif had been its warden (the identity was once disputed; Lechler argues for it, I, 295–305). Loserth refers to Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif* I, 294, 303 (the pages agree with Lechler's account). C. *Et cum ipso mortuo* is read as "and when he was dead", with *eversum est* and *introducti [sunt]* as main verbs; taken as a causal clause the sentence would lack its main clause. T. At 371.10 B reads *irregulari introducti*. S. Gratian, *Decretum* C.12 q.2 c.71 (Loserth: "Decreti II pars, causa XII, q. II, cap. LXXI"; the modern form is ours), from Jerome.
11. *Fucus*: paint, cosmetic. The "one person" is the corporation sole of bishop and chapter, whose goods cannot be alienated; the college, once annexed, is claimed under it.
12. *Antisymon* plays on Islip's name and on *symoniace* above. *Affectarem, si Deus decreverit*: a wish, "I would desire that God should decree"; *imprecacio* is prayer, not curse. The sentence runs on into the next part. R. A in the margin at 371.25: *Conclusio. Contra dotacionem*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 369: *presulatus* (180b folio mark and H alinea letter are not text)
  - 369: *defectum* (2 is the margin argument numeral)
  - 370: *arguitur*
  - 370: *cum*
  - 370: *in*
  - 371: *XII*ª
  - 371: *foret*
  - 372: *imprecacionis*
  - 371: *exemplo* (180c folio mark glued)
  - 371: *et*

Part 5: The case against appropriation; the sixth argument: the captive knight; Ambrose on the church's gold

Loserth pp. 372.2–376.28

¶1 372.2–375.2

372.7
2. The excessive number of clergy would be lessened.
372.27
3. There would be less worldliness and simony among the clergy and

[372]Primo per hoc quod ecclesia cleri vixit sic exproprietarie ex ordinacione Christi et apostolorum usque ad dotacionem cesaream; sed et usque hodie in plus religiosis clericis remanet illa vita, et illam conversacionem declaravi superius esse plus autenticam, plus meritoriam et securam. Secundo ex hoc quod stat minando destruccionem regni superhabundare multitudinem clericorum, ut docet Apostolus I, Cor. XII°, in exemplo de corpore humano, quod

First, by this: that the church of the clergy lived thus without property by the ordinance of Christ and the apostles up to the caesarean endowment; and even to this day that life remains in the more religious clerics, and I declared above that this manner of life is more authentic, more meritorious and more secure. Second, from this: that it is the case, to the threat of the destruction of the kingdom, that the multitude of clerics

less fighting among the laity.
373.5
4. The laity would be more careful in giving alms,
373.8
5. and the alms would be better distributed.
373.17
6. The earth would be more fruitful.
373.32 *Evil of appropriations,*
374.1 *which injure both universities and parishes,*
374.12 *so that the numbers at Oxford have fallen greatly.*
375.3 *Objection: 6. Why may not ecclesiastics accept what they may buy?*
375.10 *Example.*
375.21 *Answer: In the case supposed the college ought to give, not to buy;*

foret nimis monstruosum, si totum, medietas vel tercia foret oculus. Cum ergo omne utile ad regimen rei publice secundum Augustinum, II° De Doctrina Christiana, in fine, sit reperibile in scriptura, videtur quod in scriptura fundabilis sit regula secundum quam in populo proporcionaliter sit de clero, nec inveniet homo regulam reccius directivam quam ministrando clero secundum formam quam ecclesia primitiva instituit, et limitando eis officium quod tunc gessit. Ergo hoc foret conveniens racioni. Si enim in veteri testamento, quando sacerdotes et Levite onerati erant importabiliter cum disposicionibus bestiarum ad victimas, limitati sunt ad istam porcionem triplicem (ut dixi superius XIII° cap.), multo magis in tempore legis gracie, quando clerus alleviatus ab oneribus legis debet esse pauperior, et populus ad relevandum est prompcior. Tercio arguitur ex precavicione inconvenientis multiplicis quod taliter tolleretur; primo, inquam, non aspiraret tanta multitudo ad sacerdocium plus propter affeccionem ad seculum quam ad sacerdotale ministerium. Secundo non foret tanta mercacio symoniaca nec tanta contencio et vulpina confederacio sicut modo, et ista conturbant regna plurimum. Tercio brachium seculare non tantum necessitaretur pugnare [373] pro bonis fortune ut modo, tum quia ex uno latere universitas temporalis dominii saciaret, tum eciam quia clerus vivens apostolice eorum tyrannidem mitigaret. Quarto quia seculares sic magis disponerentur ad magis ordinate imperciendum elemosinas magis dignis et plus paterent discolorum latebre que hodie in vestimentis ovium sunt occulte. Quinto quia elemosine limitate clero ad distribuendum pauperibus forent in manu layca equius distribute. Notet, inquam, speculator primo bona regni devoluta ad manum mortuam, notet secundo subtraccionem partis eorum proporcionalem numero et vite procuratorum pauperum et notet tercio quomodo residuum est expensum. Dicitur enim quod fratres peregrini et alii egentes tantam elemosinam recipiunt de exteris ut de illis. Sexto quia secularibus occupantibus illa bona iam incarcerata tamquam suis (ut convenit) foret terra magis fructifera, plus habundans bestiis et aliis bonis fortune et ad defensionem regni ac augmentum exercitus christiani amplius populosa. Sic enim contigit ante dictam dotacionem, et racio probabilis sumpta ex facto cum eius circumstanciis contestatur. Deus enim non fundit aquam pluvie differenter per gurgites sed guttatim et roride facit ad nutrimentum terre nascencium pluviam distillare, docens nos per hoc indubie omnia genera bonorum nostrorum sine personarum accepcione prudenter dispergere, et sic (si non fallor) ista expropriacio excitaret devocionem populi, prepararet ad elemosinas perpetuas cleri Christi, et per consequens cederet in

superabounds, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Corinthians 12, in the example of the human body, that it would be too monstrous if the whole, the half or the third were an eye.[1] Since, therefore, everything useful for the government of the commonwealth is, according to Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* II, at the end, to be found in scripture, it seems that a rule can be founded in scripture according to which there should be clergy in proportion among the people; nor will a man find a rule more rightly directive than by ministering to the clergy according to the form which the primitive church instituted, and by assigning them the office which it then bore.[2] Therefore this would be agreeable to reason. For if in the old testament, when the priests and Levites were burdened unbearably with the handling of beasts for victims, they were limited to that threefold portion (as I said above, chapter 13), much more in the time of the law of grace, when the clergy, relieved of the burdens of the law, ought to be poorer, and the people is readier to relieve [them].[3] Third, it is argued from the forestalling of manifold troubles, which would in this way be removed. First, I say, so great a multitude would not aspire to the priesthood more from affection for the world than for the priestly ministry. Second, there would not be so much simoniac traffic, nor so much contention and fox-like alliance, as now; and these disturb kingdoms very greatly. Third, the secular arm would not be so much necessitated to fight [373] for the goods of fortune as now, both because on the one side the totality of temporal lordship would satisfy [it], and also because a clergy living apostolically would mitigate their tyranny.[4] Fourth, because seculars would thus be more disposed to bestow alms in a more ordered way on the more worthy, and the hiding-places of the froward, which today are hidden "in the clothing of sheep", would lie more open. Fifth, because the alms assigned to the clergy for distribution to the poor would be distributed more equitably in a lay hand. Let the watchman note, I say, first, the goods of the kingdom devolved to the dead hand; let him note, second, the withdrawal of a part of them proportional to the number and the life of the proctors of the poor; and let him note, third, how the residue is spent. For it is said that the pilgrim friars and other needy people receive as much alms from outsiders as from them.[5] Sixth, because, if seculars occupied those goods now imprisoned as their own (as is fitting), the land would be more fruitful, more abounding in beasts and other goods of fortune, and more populous for the defence of the kingdom and the increase of the christian army. For so it happened before the said endowment, and a probable reason, taken from the fact

relevaminis pauperum notabile incrementum. Unde quod ecclesie et redditus regni sic sunt appropriata collegiis, error appropriacionis ecclesiarum abbathiis illud fecit; ex hinc enim tollebantur rectores et eorum clerici qui augerent [374]universitates et clerimoniam regni nostri, eo quod vel divise sunt ecclesie vel cognatis et familiaribus patronorum clericorum infideliter distribute, sic quod nisi Deus reliquisset nobis semen in fundacione collegiorum ex licencia regum Anglie quoad clerimoniam quasi Sodoma fuissemus; melius tamen foret quod quilibet collegiatus aptus ad regimen animarum haberet ecclesiam que iam appropriatur monasterio cui pastum spiritualem et sacramenta debite ministraret. Tunc enim prosperaretur regnum in corporalibus et spiritualibus et cresceret universitas nostra tam numero quam virtute; in cuius signum ante catheclismum appropriacionis huiusmodi erant in Oxonia sexaginta milia scolarium, ubi hodie non sunt tria. Universitas eciam plus crescit hodie per presbiteros mobiliter conducticios, quam crescit per perpetuas cantarias, nec oporteret habere tot privilegia a rege nisi quia ob defectum sacerdotum et supplantacionem privilegiorum laycorum per clericos layci eis propter sensacionem iniurie oppido sunt infesti. Olim autem non fuit sentencia ista heretica ante dotacionem ecclesie, quando in ea floruerunt catholice veritates. Ymmo (si non fallor) sonaret ad emendacionem ecclesie et ad stabilimentum regni et ad profectum cuiuscunque membri ecclesie tam vivi quam mortui quod proviso cuilibet clerico secundum ordinem suum de necessario [375] nutrimento et tegumento ista conclusio sit paulative et provide practizata.

with its circumstances, bears witness to it. For God does not pour out the rain-water unevenly in torrents, but makes the rain distil drop by drop and as dew for the nourishment of what springs from the earth, teaching us by this beyond doubt to disperse all kinds of our goods prudently, without respect of persons; and so (if I am not mistaken) this renunciation of property would rouse the devotion of the people, would prepare [it] for perpetual alms to the clergy of Christ, and consequently would turn to a notable increase in the relief of the poor.[6] Hence, that the churches and revenues of the kingdom are thus appropriated to colleges, the error of the appropriation of churches to abbeys has done it; for by this the rectors and their clerics were taken away who would increase [374]the universities and the learning of our kingdom, because the churches were either divided or faithlessly distributed to the kinsmen and household of clerical patrons; so that, unless God had left us seed in the foundation of colleges by licence of the kings of England, we should have been as Sodom as to learning. Yet it would be better that every collegiate apt for the rule of souls should have a church which is now appropriated to a monastery, and should duly minister to it spiritual food and the sacraments.[7] For then the kingdom would prosper in bodily and spiritual things, and our university would grow both in number and in virtue; in sign of which, before the cataclysm of such appropriation there were sixty thousand scholars in Oxford, where today there are not three.[8] The university also grows more today through presbyters hired at will than it grows through perpetual chantries; nor would it need to have so many privileges from the king, were it not that, because of the default of priests and the supplanting of the privileges of laymen by clerics, laymen are exceedingly hostile to them through their feeling of the injury. And formerly, before the endowment of the church, when catholic truths flourished in it, this teaching was not heretical. Indeed (if I am not mistaken) it would make for the amendment of the church, and for the establishment of the kingdom, and for the profit of every member of the church, living as well as dead, that, provision being made for every cleric according to his order of necessary [375]nourishment and covering, this conclusion should be put into practice gradually and providently.[9]

¶2 375.3–375.20

[375]Sexto arguitur, sumendo quod principes et domini temporales licite et absque peccato vendunt terras et tenementa sua viris ecclesiasticis et suis successoribus in perpetuum, ergo a forciori conferrent eis temporalia in perpetuum; et assumptum probatur,

Sixth, it is argued, assuming that princes and temporal lords lawfully and without sin sell their lands and tenements to churchmen and their successors in perpetuity: therefore, with stronger reason, they would confer temporal goods on them in perpetuity. And the assumption is

ponendo quod aliquis dominus secularis sit constitutus in extrema necessitate, sicut sunt milites nostri capti ab hostibus in partibus transmarinis, nec habeat dictus dominus unde se ipsum redimat nisi alienando in perpetuum suum manerium, et cum hoc suppono quod nullus sit qui velit emere dictum manerium nisi collegium nostrum vel aliud ei simile, tunc datum collegium tenetur relevare dictum militem in extrema necessitate positum, et hoc sub pena peccati mortalis; sed non potest ipsum relevare nisi emat ab eo manerium, ergo tenetur in casu sub pena peccati mortalis emere a dicto milite pro perpetuo suum manerium.

proved by supposing that some secular lord is set in extreme necessity, as are our knights captured by enemies in parts overseas, and that the said lord has nothing with which to redeem himself except by alienating his manor in perpetuity; and with this I suppose that there is no one who will buy the said manor except our college or another like it: then the given college is bound to relieve the said knight, placed in extreme necessity, and this under pain of mortal sin; now it cannot relieve him unless it buys the manor from him; therefore in the case it is bound, under pain of mortal sin, to buy his manor from the said knight in perpetuity.[10]

¶3 375.21–375.34

[375] Iste casus foret michi nimis difficilis, nec video colorem quomodo foret possibilis nisi forte dictum collegium fuerit per dominum huius seculi vinculis insolubilibus mammone iniquitatis adeo cathenatum quod ex induracione necessario dampnabili non possit dictum militem misericorditer relevare, sed necesse habeat eum de hereditate paterna dampnabiliter spoliare. Sed nec casum illum libenter admitterem nec aliud relevamen militis omnino excluderem; tale enim collegium si foret esset summe dyabolicum, quia (ut innuitur) non posset per elemosinam sed non nisi per sacrilegium dictum militem relevare, et revera Deus non posset salvare tale collegium de sua potencia absoluta.

This case would be too difficult for me, nor do I see any colour how it would be possible, unless perhaps the said college had been so chained by the lord of this world with the indissoluble bonds of the mammon of iniquity that, from a hardening necessarily damnable, it could not mercifully relieve the said knight, but must needs damnably despoil him of his paternal inheritance. But I would neither willingly admit that case nor altogether exclude other relief for the knight; for such a college, if it existed, would be supremely diabolical, because (as is implied) it could not relieve the said knight by alms but only by sacrilege; and truly God could not save such a college by his absolute power.[11]

¶4 376.1–376.25
376.1 *and a college so buying ought to be suppressed.*
376.7 *Judgment of Ambrose.*
376.26 *These words show that the King may use church treasure to redeem captives,*

[376] Debet ergo miles ire ad dominum terre et narrare sibi condiciones talis collegii, et totum regnum teneretur collegium tale venenosum expellere et cum bonis que talis legio occuparet, si fuerit elemosina, militem relevare. Et patet quod hoc fieri posset legaliter ex dicto beati Ambrosii posito in decretis XII^{a}, q. II^{a}, Aurum. Aurum, inquit, habet ecclesia non ut servet sed ut eroget et subveniat in necessitatibus. Quid est opus custodire quod nihil adiuvat? An ignoramus quantum auri atque argenti de templo domini Assirii sustulerunt? Nonne melius conflat sacerdos propter alimoniam pauperum, si aliqua subsidia desunt, quam si sacrilegus contaminat et asportat hostis? Nonne dicturus est dominus: Cur passus es tot inopes fame mori? Et certe habebas aurum, unde ministrasses alimoniam. Cur tot captivi in commercium ducti nec redempti ab hoste occisi sunt? Melius fuerat ut vasa vivencium servares quam metallorum; hiis non posset responsum deferri. Quid enim diceres: Timui ne templo Dei ornatus deesset? Aurum, inquit, sacramenta non querunt, neque auro placent que auro non emuntur. Ornatus sacrorum est redempcio captivorum, et vere sunt illa vasa preciosa que redimunt animas a morte. Ille verus est thesaurus domini qui operatur quod sanguis eius operatus est.

The knight ought therefore to go to the lord of the land and tell him the conditions of such a college; and the whole kingdom would be bound to expel such a poisonous college and, with the goods which such a legion would occupy, if they are alms, to relieve the knight.[12] And it is clear that this could be done lawfully, from the saying of blessed Ambrose placed in the decrees, [Causa] 12, q. 2, ***Aurum***: "The church has gold," he says, "not to keep but to lay out, and to bring help in necessities. What need is there to guard what is of no help? Are we ignorant how much gold and silver the Assyrians carried off from the temple of the Lord? Does not a priest do better to melt it down for the sustenance of the poor, if other supplies are lacking, than that a sacrilegious enemy should defile and carry it off? Will not the Lord say: Why did you suffer so many needy to die of hunger? And certainly you had gold, with which you might have ministered sustenance. Why were so many captives led away into trade and, not redeemed, slain by the enemy? It had been better that you kept the vessels of the living than those of metals. To these things no answer could be brought. For what would you say: I feared lest the temple of

God should lack its adornment? The sacraments," he says, "do not seek gold, nor do things please by gold which are not bought with gold. The adornment of sacred things is the redemption of captives; and truly those are precious vessels which redeem souls from death. That is the true treasure of the Lord which works what his blood has worked."[13]

¶5 376.26–376.28

[376] Ex istis verbis huius doctoris sanctissimi et decreti videtur, primo quod regi licet in tempore necessitatis multiplicis auferre nedum iocalia cleri sui superflua sed

From these words of this most holy doctor and of the decree it seems, first, that it is lawful for the king, in a time of manifold necessity, to take away not only the superfluous jewels of his clergy but

Notes

1. ***Stat minando destruccionem regni superhabundare multitudinem clericorum***: the ablative gerund is taken as "to the threat of", i.e. the superabundance threatens the kingdom; the construal is uncertain. S. 1 Corinthians 12:17 (DR "If the whole body were the eye, where would be the hearing?"); the half and the third are Wyclif's.
2. Augustine, ***De doctrina christiana*** 2.42.63, that whatever is useful elsewhere is found in scripture (the wording matches; ***regimen rei publice*** is Wyclif's gloss); A in the margin at 372.13: ***Augustinus***. T. At 372.19 B reads ***limitando eque***. C. ***Limitando eis officium***: "assigning" (an office), but ***limitati sunt*** below is "limited", to a portion (the glossary).
3. The threefold portion of the priests and Levites (tithes, first-fruits and offerings; cf. Numbers 18) is the subject of chapter 13 (so A, corrected in the margin from ***XXII***). T. At 372.26 B reads ***populus*** (OCR ***populua***).
4. At 372.27 B reads ***Tercio confirmatur ex***. C. ***Inconveniens*** (CONTEXTUAL) here leans to its other sense: troubles in affairs, not an absurdity in argument. ***Universitas temporalis dominii***: the whole of temporal lordship, once in lay hands, would satisfy the secular arm, which would no longer need to fight for church goods.
5. Matthew 7:15 (DR "who come to you in the clothing of sheep"). C. ***Proporcionalem numero et vite procuratorum pauperum***: the part withdrawn for the poor should answer to the number and the manner of life of those who administer it. ***Fratres peregrini***: taken of the wandering friars. ***De illis***: from the possessioners themselves. R. A in the margin at 373.23: ***Nota***.
6. ***Differenter***: "unevenly" (in different measures to different places), against ***guttatim***; the word is doubtful in context. ***Sine personarum accepcione***: the scriptural phrase "without respect of persons" (Romans 2:11). ***Prepararet***: the object, "[it]", is the people.
7. ***Clerimonia***: learning, the lettered state of the clergy (cf. Middle English "clergy" in that sense). ***Patronorum clericorum***: taken as "clerical patrons" (religious houses and prelates holding advowsons); it could be "the kinsmen and household clerics of the patrons". S. Isaiah 1:9 (DR "Except the Lord of hosts had left us seed, we had been as Sodom"); cf. Romans 9:29. R. B in the margin at 374.4: ***Approbat ut videtur collegium universitatum***. T. At 374.6–7 B reads ***quod quibus collegiatus***; at 374.8 ***que tam appropriatur***.
8. At 374.14 B reads ***sexaginta sex millia***. R. A in the margin: ***Sexaginta millia scolarium fuerunt Oxonie, vide supra***. S. Loserth compares Richard FitzRalph, ***Defensio curatorum***: thirty thousand students at Oxford in his time, not six thousand now (Brown, ***Fasciculus*** II, 473; Goldast, ***Monarchia*** II). C. ***Non sunt tria***: "not three", presumably three thousand; the print gives the bare numeral.
9. ***Mobiliter conducticios***: hired priests removable at will, against the perpetual chantry priest. T. At 374.23 A and A_1 lack the words from ***et*** to ***ecclesie***, apparently ***et ad stabilimentum ... membri ecclesie***. S. ***Nutrimento et tegumento*** recalls 1 Timothy 6:8 (DR "having food and wherewith to be covered").
10. A in the margin at 375.3: ***Sexta racio***; at 375.9: ***Casus***. T. At 375.5 B reads ***et per tenementa***. C. ***Datum collegium***: the college posited in the case. ***Sed non potest*** brings the minor premiss.
11. ***Colorem*** (glossary: ***color***): a plausible ground, not a pretext. ***Dominum huius seculi***: the devil (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:4, DR "the god of this world"); ***mammone iniquitatis***: Luke 16:9 (DR "the mammon of iniquity"). ***De sua potencia absoluta***: God's absolute power, as against his ordained power. R. A in the margin at 375.21: ***Responsio***.
12. ***Legio***: the print's word, "legion", apparently a play on ***collegium*** and on the "Legion" of Mark 5:9; taken as it stands. ***Si fuerit elemosina***: if the goods are alms (and so the poor's).
13. Ambrose, ***De officiis*** 2.28 (Loserth: "lib. II, De Officiis, c. XXVIII"), as received in Gratian, ***Decretum*** C.12 q.2 c.70 (Loserth: "Decreti sec. pars, causa XII, q. II, cap. LXX"; the modern form is ours). R. A in the margin at 376.5: ***Ambrosius***; at 376.7: ***Aurum habet ecclesia***; B in the margin at 376.16: ***Pro redempcione captivorum exponenda sunt vasa ecclesie***. T. At 376.15 B reads ***aurum aurum***; at 376.17 A reads ***Melius fuerant***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 372: ***Primo***
  - 372: ∅ (print has exproprietarie once; it is already pos 14, pos 15 duplicates it)
  - 372: ***II°***
  - 372: ***populo*** (15 after it is the line number) [NW]
  - 372: ∅ (plicis is the tail of multi-/plicis, already whole at pos 197; print: plicis quod taliter)
  - 372: ***Tercio*** (e at the edge is the margin alinea letter)

- 373: ***pro*** **(180d folio mark and L alinea letter are not text)**
- 373: ***elemosine*** **(the following 5. is the side-note numeral)**
- 373: ***enim*** **(print has Dici-/tur enim quod; 3 in margin is a numeral)**
- 373: ***foret***
- 373: ***Christi***
- 374: **∅)**
- 374: ***appropriacionis***
- 375: ***foret***
- 375: ***forte*** **(clear f) [NW]**
- 375: ***vinculis*** **(English side-note "give" glued)**
- 376: ***XII^{a}***
- 376: ***II^{a}***
- 376: ***sed ut*** **(print: servet / sed ut eroget; main lacks sed ut)**
- 376: ***ministrasses*** **(15 is the line number)**
- 376: ***in***
- 376: ***superflua***
- 372: ***XII°,*** **[-VERSE]**
- 374: ***universitates*** **(print: universitates whole on line 1 (agent 9); the scan split it uni | uersitates)**

Part 6: Church treasure for the kingdom's need; the seventh argument: lordship held by a community

Loserth pp. 376.29–380.30

¶1 376.29–377.20
377.1 or to defend the realm,
377.5 or to avoid oppressive taxation.
377.14 Now the clergy prey upon the poor.

[376]et calices et preciosa tumbarum et ecclesie ornamenta, ut puta, si aliunde vel oportunius regnum non sufficit redimere captivos qui in defensione regni [377]legitime militarunt; et pro iterata defensione regni necessarii sunt. Secundo, si regnum pro sua defensione necessaria non habeat aliunde vel congruencius unde militantibus pro defensione regni ministraret stipendia. Et tercio, si vulgus per taxas gubernacioni regni necessarias ad nimiam pauperiem sit reductus. Racio beati Ambrosii stat in isto: Melius est quod regnum religiose defendatur per propria quam quod in penam peccati sui depredetur de hiis que inutiliter et avare retinuit a gente sacrilega aliena. Sic enim Nabugodonosor ex peccato sacerdotum fecit templum in Jerusalem spoliari (ut patet Regum XX. et Daniel V°), sed quid propter superbiam qua plus timemus hostes cognoscere nostram egenciam, quam Deum offendere per nostram arroganciam, et quid per evidencias sophisticas et partem quam facit clerus potentibus lamentabiliter pauperes sunt predati? Et ista creditur una causa quare thesaurus ecclesie et cleri Francie fuit per nostros in Angliam transportatus, sed Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum.

also the chalices and the precious things of tombs and the ornaments of the church: as for instance if the kingdom is not able, from elsewhere or more opportunely, to redeem captives who have [377]lawfully served as soldiers in the defence of the kingdom, and are necessary for its renewed defence.[1] Second, if the kingdom has not, from elsewhere or more fittingly, the means for its necessary defence with which to minister wages to those serving as soldiers for the defence of the kingdom. And third, if the common people have been reduced to excessive poverty by taxes necessary for the government of the kingdom. The reason of blessed Ambrose stands in this: it is better that the kingdom be defended religiously with its own [goods] than that, in punishment of its sin, it be plundered by a sacrilegious foreign people of the things which it kept back uselessly and avariciously.[2] For so Nabugodonosor, by reason of the sin of the priests, had the temple in Jerusalem despoiled (as is clear from Kings 20 and Daniel 5); but why, through pride, by which we fear more that enemies should know our need than to offend God by our arrogance, and why, through sophistical evidences and the side which the clergy takes with the powerful, have the poor been lamentably plundered?[3] And this is believed to be one reason why the treasure of the church and of the clergy of France was carried by our men into England; but "Happy is he whom others' dangers make wary."[4]

¶2 377.21–378.4
378.5 *Objection: 7. Men may transfer their rights to other men; why not to a society?*
378.16 *Answer: They may, to a civil society that has the right to hold property, but not to a clerical community.*

[377]Et patet quod dictum collegium debet dare dicto pauperi militi elemosinam de bonis pauperum ad hoc datis, non autem ad hereditarie conquirendum dominium seculare, quia sic posset clerus conquirere omnia regna mundi, cum (ut inquiunt) possunt infinite adquirere, sed nichil alienare vel perdere, et sic videretur quod talis adquisicio omnium regnorum mundi foret monstrum abhominabile Antichristi, de quo Daniel IX°, 27: Erit in templo abhominacio desolacionis; cui dicto Christus alludit Matthei XXIV, 15: Cum, inquit, videritis abhominacionem desolacionis que [378]dicta est a Daniele propheta stantem in loco sancto, velut dicitur Marci XIII, 14, stantem ubi non debet: qui legit, inquit, intelligat. Sed credo quod non veniet desolacio ad hunc gradum.

And it is clear that the said college ought to give the said poor knight alms from the goods of the poor given for this, but not in order to acquire secular lordship hereditarily; because so the clergy could acquire all the kingdoms of the world, since (as they say) they can acquire without limit, but alienate or lose nothing; and so it would seem that such an acquisition of all the kingdoms of the world would be an abominable monster of Antichrist, of which Daniel 9:27: "There shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation"; to which saying Christ alludes, Matthew 24:15: "When," he says, "you shall see the abomination of desolation, which [378]was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place", as it is said in Mark 13:14, "standing where it ought not": "he that readeth," he says, "let him understand." But I believe that the desolation will not come to this degree.[5]

¶3 378.5–378.15

[378]Septimo principaliter sic arguitur: Domini temporales libere transferunt ius quod habent ad sua dominabilia nunc in certam communitatem et nunc in unam personam, quia translacio iuris temporalis est libertatis creature, nolentis uti vel esse particeps alterius talis iuris, sed in certam personam transferunt absque peccato sua dominia, ergo per idem possunt absque peccato in communitate transferre iura huiusmodi. Sed translato iure in communitatem pro suo perpetuo consequitur tam perseverans dominacio, ergo stat communitatem habere perpetuo tale dominium.

Seventh, principally, it is argued thus: temporal lords freely transfer the right which they have to the things they hold in lordship, now to a certain community and now to one person, because the transfer of a temporal right belongs to the freedom of a creature unwilling to use, or to be partaker of, another such right; now they transfer their lordships to a certain person without sin; therefore by the same token they can without sin transfer such rights to a community. Now when the right has been transferred to a community for its perpetuity, so lasting an exercise of lordship follows; therefore it is consistent that a community should have such lordship in perpetuity.[6]

¶4 378.16–380.5
379.3 *Hugh of St. Victor*
379.28 *declares that secular power must rest in secular hands.*
380.6 *Falseness of the rule that the clergy may not part with their endowments.*
380.12 *Example of Paul and Augustine.*
380.17 *All orders could exist as well without endowment and may therefore relinquish it.*

[378]Hic dico, primo quod conclusio deducta est concedenda de communitate civili que est capax civilis dominii, ut patet de multis communitatibus civium que licite civiliter dominantur. Sed procul hoc ad inferendum quod clerico (in quantum huiusmodi) licet dominari civiliter, et multo periculosius foret communitatem cleri dominari civiliter, cum error ille vix foret extinguibilis, sed tamquam cancer serperet ampliandoque procederet, quousque magnam partem regnorum inficeret. Satis ergo est nobis habere usum moderatum temporalium pro nostris propriis necessitatibus et aliorum pauperum relevandis vel extincta eorum dominacione civili vel in manus capitalis domini derelicta, ut notat Hugo libro secundo De Sacramentis, parte secunda, cap. III° et VII°. Layci, inquit, quia terrena et terrene vite necessaria tractant, pars corporis Christi sinistra sunt. Clerici vero, [379]quoniam ea que ad spiritualem vitam pertinent dispensant quasi

To this I say, first, that the conclusion deduced is to be granted of a civil community which is capable of civil lordship, as is clear of many communities of citizens which lawfully exercise civil lordship. But this is far from inferring that it is lawful for a cleric (as such) to exercise civil lordship; and it would be much more dangerous for a community of clergy to exercise civil lordship, since that error would scarcely be extinguishable, but would creep like a cancer and advance by spreading, until it infected a great part of the kingdoms. It is enough for us, therefore, to have a moderate use of temporal goods for our own necessities and for relieving those of other poor people, their civil exercise of lordship being either extinguished or left in the hands of the chief lord, as Hugh notes in the second book *On the Sacraments*, part two, chapters 3 and 7.[7] "Laymen," he says, "because they handle earthly

dextera pars sunt corporis Christi. Et post interpretando utrumque terminum sic infert: Clericus nisi Deum et ea que ad Deum spectant habere non debet, cui statutum est decimis et oblacionibus que Deo offeruntur sustentari. Laicis vero christianis fidelibus terrena possidere conceditur, sed clericis spiritualia committuntur, sicut fuit in veteri testamento. Et cap. VII° declarat quomodo quedam ecclesie Christi devocione fidelium conceduntur salvo iure terrene potestatis, ne fiat confusio, cum nihil inordinatum approbare potest Deus. Unde quandoque concedunt principes terreni nudum usum ecclesie, et quandoque usum et potestatem exercende iusticie, quod clericus per ecclesiasticas personas aut individua clericalia exercere non potest. Potest tamen habere personas laycas ministros ad illud officium, sic tamen, inquit, ut id ipsum quod potestatem habet a principe terreno se habere cognoscat et ipsas possessiones nunquam ita a regia potestate elongari posse intelligat, quin si racio postulaverit aut necessitas, illi ipse possessiones debeant in necessitate obsequium, quia, sicut regia potestas patrocinium quod debet alteri alienare non debet, sic ipsa possessio eciam ab ecclesiasticis personis obtenta obsequium quod regie potestati pro patrocinio debetur iure negare non potest. Iste profundus doctor non admitteret quod clericus haberet in se civilitatem, nec emeret vel caperet in se sive papa sive alius summum dominium seculare, sed regens laycos et dominaciones suas spiritualiter recipere posset titulo elemosine fructum possessionis vel potestatis terrene, sic tamen quod seculare dominium [380] remaneat aput dominum secularem. Ulterius sicut doctor concedit quod est de libertate dominorum secularium quod possunt transferre ius et possessiones in alios, sic concederet evidencius hoc de clero, cum laico sit magis cognata secularis possessio.

things and the necessaries of earthly life, are the left part of the body of Christ. But clerics, [379] since they dispense the things which pertain to the spiritual life, are as it were the right part of the body of Christ." And afterwards, interpreting each term, he infers thus: "A cleric ought to have nothing but God and the things that belong to God, he for whom it is appointed to be sustained by the tithes and offerings which are offered to God. But to lay christian faithful it is granted to possess earthly things, whereas to clerics spiritual things are committed, as it was in the old testament." And in chapter 7 he declares how certain things are granted to the churches of Christ by the devotion of the faithful, saving the right of the earthly power, lest there be confusion, since God can approve nothing disordered. Hence earthly princes sometimes grant the church the bare use, and sometimes the use and the power of exercising justice, which a cleric cannot exercise through ecclesiastical persons or clerical individuals. He can, however, have lay persons as ministers for that office; yet so, he says, "that he acknowledge that he has that very power which he has from the earthly prince, and understand that those possessions can never be so removed from the royal power that, if reason or necessity should demand, those possessions do not owe service in necessity; because, as the royal power ought not to alienate the patronage which it owes to another, so that possession, even when obtained by ecclesiastical persons, cannot by right deny the service which is owed to the royal power for its patronage."[8] This profound doctor would not admit that a cleric should have civil standing in himself, nor that either pope or anyone else should buy or take into himself supreme secular lordship; but [one] ruling laymen and their exercises of lordship spiritually could receive, by title of alms, the fruit of a possession or of earthly power, yet so that secular lordship [380] remains with the secular lord.[9] Further, as the doctor grants that it belongs to the freedom of secular lords that they can transfer right and possessions to others, so he would grant this more evidently of the clergy, since secular possession is more akin to a layman.

¶5 380.6–380.16

[380] Item, non dubium quin clero potest nocere terrenorum habicio, si ergo non liceret sibi tunc ipsa relinquere, ipse foret contra legem Dei ipsis diabolice copulatus; Christus enim precepit suis apostolis mundana relinquere. Paulus cum potuit habuisse vite necessaria de Corinthiis, non usus fuit illa potestate, sed et Augustinus rogavit cives suos recipere possessiones quas sibi donaverant. Quare ergo non

Again, there is no doubt that the having of earthly things can harm the clergy; if, then, it were not lawful for it to relinquish them, it would be diabolically coupled to them against the law of God; for Christ commanded his apostles to relinquish worldly things. Paul, although he could have had the necessaries of life from the Corinthians, did not use that power; and Augustine also asked his citizens to take back the possessions which they had given him. Why then could not the pope,

potuit papa et quilibet alius cleri dotatus capitaneus sic fecisse; illi enim utilius procurarunt pro genere cleri postero quam Silvester.

and every other endowed captain of the clergy, have done the same? For they provided more usefully for the later generations of the clergy than Silvester.[10]

¶6 380.17–380.30

[380]Item, non ex dotacione cesarea constituitur novus ordo cleri qui sine dotacione huiusmodi non fuisset; quilibet ergo ordo cleri potuit fuisse sine dotacione huiusmodi cum tanta religiositate ordinis sicut modo. Ex quo sequitur quod dotacio talis quecunque est ordini cleri impertinens; aliter enim in spoliacionibus domorum religiosarum et in conquestibus terrarum destruerentur proporcionaliter possessionatorum ordines, et sic variarentur ordines illi proporcionaliter, ut dotacio variatur, quod dementis est dicere. Sicut ergo in prima dotacione sua potuit religiosus possessiones oblatas relinquere, sic modo post possessionem, quod si generaliter voluntarie fieret, maneret idem ordo perfeccior quam est modo.

Again, it is not by the caesarean endowment that a new order of clergy is constituted, which without such endowment would not have existed; every order of clergy, therefore, could have existed without such endowment, with as great religiousness of the order as now. From which it follows that any such endowment whatever is not pertinent to the order of the clergy; for otherwise, in the despoiling of religious houses and in conquests of lands, the orders of the possessioners would be destroyed proportionally, and so those orders would vary proportionally as the endowment varies, which it is madness to say. As, therefore, at his first endowment a religious could relinquish the possessions offered, so [he can] now after possession; and if this were done generally and voluntarily, the same order would remain more perfect than it is now.[11]

Notes

1. At 377.1 B reads *illata defensione*. C. The subject of *necessarii sunt* is the captives: the kingdom needs them for its defence again.
2. At 377.5–6 B reads *regni necessitas*. C. *Racio beati Ambrosii*: Wyclif's statement of the reasoning in the passage just quoted, not a quotation. *Per propria*: "with its own [goods]", the church treasure within the kingdom, against plunder by a foreign enemy.
3. "Kings 20" is Wyclif's reference: 4 Kings 20:17 (DR "all that is in thy house ... shall be carried into Babylon") is the prophecy, 4 Kings 24:13 the spoiling; Daniel 5:2 (DR "the vessels of gold and silver, which Nabuchodonosor, his father, had brought away out of the temple"). Which verses he meant is our inference. C. *Quid ... quid*: "why", introducing a rhetorical question. *Partem quam facit clerus potentibus*: the side the clergy takes in favour of the powerful.
4. The French church treasure taken by English armies in the French war; Wyclif names no occasion. S. A proverbial verse (Loserth: *vulgo iactatus versus*), comparing Plautus, *Feliciter sapit qui alieno periculo sapit*.
5. *Ut inquiunt*: the claim of the endowed themselves, that what passes into mortmain can grow without limit but never be alienated. S. Daniel 9:27 (DR "there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation"); Matthew 24:15, where the Vulgate has *Cum ergo* and Wyclif omits *ergo* and adds *inquit*; Mark 13:14 (DR "standing where it ought not (he that readeth let him understand)").
6. A in the margin at 378.5: *Septima racio*. T. At 378.13 B reads *translacio*. C. *Dominabilia*: the things over which they have lordship. *Ius* is the subjective right. *Tam perseverans* has no correlative; the sense is presumably "as lasting [as the community]", which does not die.
7. A in the margin at 378.15: *Responsio*; at 378.28: *Hugo*. C. *In quantum huiusmodi*: "as such", i.e. as cleric. *Vel extincta ... vel ... derelicta*: the clergy's civil exercise of lordship is either extinguished or left to the chief lord, the use remaining.
8. Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* 2.2.3 and 2.2.7 (Loserth: Migne ed., pp. 417 and 420, "with some words changed"; Hugh reads *Laici ergo Christiani qui*, and *partem Dei* for *ea que ad Deum*, *agnoscat* for *cognoscat*). C. Wyclif quotes chapter 3, paraphrases chapter 7 (*declarat quomodo*), and returns to quotation at *sic tamen, inquit*; the bounds given to the quotation are our reading. *Individua clericalia*: "clerical individuals", clerics acting singly; the sense is uncertain. Hugh reads *judicia saecularia* here (PL 176, 420), so the print's words may be a corruption in Wyclif's copy or text. T. At 379.15 B reads *personas ac individua*. R. A in the margin at 379.8: *Contra dominacionem civilem cleri*; B in the margin at 379.19: *Nota, tantum elongantur temporalia data clericis a brachio seculari*.
9. *Profundus doctor*: Hugh. The subject of *regens* and *posset* is the cleric, unexpressed ("[one]"); *dominaciones suas*: the laymen's exercises of lordship. R. A in the margin at 380.1: *Nota*.
10. At 380.6–7 B reads *terrenorum non abicio*; the print's *habicio* is translated. S. Christ's command: cf. Luke 14:33 (DR "every one of you that doth not renounce all that he possesseth cannot be my disciple"). Paul: 1 Corinthians 9:12 (DR "Nevertheless, we have not used this power"). Augustine's offer to give the church's possessions over to the people, who never would take them, is told by Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 23 (PL 32:53); c. 24 adds a deed of gift he sent back. C. *Illi enim*: Paul and Augustine.
11. At 380.25 A reads *proporcionabiter*. C. The argument is that endowment is accidental to an order: what came without changing the order can go without changing it. *Sic modo*: "[he can]" supplied.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **377: *per***
  - **377: *pauperi* (181c folio mark glued)**
  - **377: *15* (print: Matthei XXIV, 15: (main token 1 covers 15))**
  - **378: *iuris***
  - **378: *civili* [NW]**
  - **379: *quoniam* (alinea Q and 181c folio mark glued; italic)**
  - **379: *a* (181d folio mark glued; italic a)**
  - **379: *dominium* (do- here, minium at top of p.380; main token holds whole word)**
  - **380: *remaneat* (p.380 l.1 reads minium remaneat; minium folded into p.379 pos 232)**
  - **380: ∅ (inserted run is the end of p.379 already in the main scan; p.380 begins minium remaneat aput)**
  - **380: *fuisset***
  - **380: *fuisse***
  - **378: ∅ (second half of tempo-rales; neighbour 36 already temporales) [DELX]**
  - **378: *que* (glued bold 4 is margin numeral) [-MARK]**

Part 7: The pope may give up lordship; the eighth argument: buying blessedness; the king's inquiry into the clergy's alms

Loserth pp. 380.31–384.33

¶1 380.31–381.26

380.31 *So may the Pope,* 381.5 *and should, if he thinks the Church will be the better for his action.* 381.11 *The Church left Christ's privilege for Caesar's; it has now the right to leave Caesar's.* 381.27 *We make so bad use of alms that patrons should withdraw them and restore them to the true Church.*

[380] **Item, iuxta tacta papa videns dissensionem oriri ex occupacione civilis dominii, et sibi ac clero suo per seculares posse procurari subsidium in casu quo illis dominacionem illam relinqueret, non foret plenus et** [381] **perfectus dominus eorum nisi posset ad relevamen sui et sui generis de suis subsidium procurare, ut tactum est de milite captivo, sed papa est utilius, plenius et perfeccius dominus patrimonii Crucifixi quam alius secularis: ergo licet sibi in casu sic facere; ymmo si credit vel credere debet verisimiliter quod status ille foret sibi et toti suo generi perfeccior, securior atque tranquillior, videtur quod sub pena peccati gravis debet sic facere, nam sic utilius possiderentur a sancta matre ecclesia. Item, religio quam Christus instituit de nolendo possidere pecuniam fuit perfeccior, solempnior et obligacior quam privilegiacio cesarea, ergo cum ad dispensacionem unius non apostoli licuit religionem priorem deserere, et licet privilegium secundum relinquere. Sic enim ex causa potest celebrari divorcium inter virum et uxorem; ymmo (ut fingitur) licet clero separare animam a corpore in quocunque, qui dominacioni sue restiterit; et sic hoc luciferinum vinculum foret forcius quam vinculum gracie vel nature, et tunc indubie Deus malus superat Deum bonum. Dicunt enim quod verbum nedum humanitatem assumptam sed totam ecclesiam potest dimittere, sed clerus possessionatus non potest dominacionem deserere, sed abrasio capillorum nostrorum testatur quod non debet esse tam fortis nexus inter nos et bona fortune.**

Again, according to what has been touched on, a pope who saw dissension arising from the occupation of civil lordship, and [saw] that help could be procured for himself and his clergy through seculars in case he relinquished that exercise of lordship to them, would not be full and [381] **perfect lord of those [goods] unless he could procure help out of his own for the relief of himself and of his kind, as was touched on concerning the captive knight; now the pope is more usefully, more fully and more perfectly lord of the patrimony of the Crucified than any other secular: therefore it is lawful for him in that case to do so.**[1] **Indeed, if he believes, or ought in likelihood to believe, that that state would be more perfect, more secure and more tranquil for himself and for his whole kind, it seems that he ought to do so under pain of grave sin; for so they would be more usefully possessed by holy mother church. Again, the religion which Christ instituted, of not willing to possess money, was more perfect, more solemn and more binding than the caesarean privileging; therefore, since at the dispensation of one who was not an apostle it was lawful to desert the prior religion, it is lawful also to relinquish the second privilege.**[2] **For so, for cause, a divorce can be celebrated between husband and wife; indeed (as is feigned) it is lawful for the clergy to separate the soul from the body in anyone at all who has resisted its exercise of lordship; and so this luciferian bond would be stronger than the bond of grace or of nature, and then undoubtedly the evil God overcomes the good God. For**

they say that the Word can let go not only the humanity assumed but the whole church, but that the possessioner clergy cannot desert its exercise of lordship; but the shaving of our hair testifies that there ought not to be so strong a tie between us and the goods of fortune.[3]

¶2 381.27–382.7
382.8 *Objection: 8. It is good to give temporal gifts for spiritual, and the more is given the more is received.*
382.15 *Answer: The rich man should use his wealth so as to obtain blessedness;*
382.24 *but this does not mean that he is to give up his duties to the clergy.*

[381] Ex quibus videtur quod propter ingratitudines secundum quas volumus de dominorum elemosinis in secularitate superare ipsos dominos et propter hereses quas in materia de dominio nostro defendimus, ex una parte abutentes elemosinis et ex alia parte subtrahentes debitum de spiritualibus elemosinis rependendis, videtur quod patroni elemosinarum debent ipsas a nobis subtrahere et vere ecclesie Christi restituere, cum totus finis laudabilis sit eversus, et [382] specialiter si peccamus subdole pretermisso ordine correpcionis evangelice inconsultis episcopis, ut aput nominetenus papam et cardinales, inimicos regni nostri precipuos, leges regni nostri et regaliam regis tamquam hereticam condempnamus. Iste enim videretur contemptus notabilis indiscreti doctoris cum suis complicibus.

From which it seems that, because of the ingratitudes by which we wish, out of the lords' alms, to surpass the lords themselves in worldliness, and because of the heresies which we defend in the matter of our lordship (abusing the alms on the one side, and on the other withholding what is owed by way of spiritual alms to be repaid), it seems that the patrons of the alms ought to withdraw them from us and restore them to the true church of Christ, since the whole praiseworthy end has been overthrown; and [382] especially if we sin craftily, passing over the order of evangelical correction, without consulting the bishops, as when before one who is pope in name only, and the cardinals, the chief enemies of our kingdom, we condemn the laws of our kingdom and the king's regality as heretical. For this would seem a notable contempt on the part of an indiscreet doctor with his accomplices.[4]

¶3 382.8–382.13

[382] Octavo et ultimo arguitur per hoc quod cuilibet domino temporali non solum est licitum sed meritorium emere hereditatem et bona eterna pro bonis temporalibus, et cum maius bonum temporale sit dignius maius bono spirituali, sequitur quod amplius et diucius dotans ecclesiam intensius meretur beatitudinem.

Eighth and last, it is argued by appeal to this: that for any temporal lord it is not only lawful but meritorious to buy the inheritance and eternal goods for temporal goods; and since a greater temporal good is more worthy of a greater spiritual good, it follows that the one who endows the church more amply and for longer merits blessedness more intensely.[5]

¶4 382.15–382.16

[382] Ad istud argumentum dixi superius quod quilibet dives seculi tenetur sub pena peccati mortalis emere

To this argument I said above that every rich man of the world is bound, under pain of mortal sin, to buy

¶5 382.17–383.34
383.14 *A King may see that it is his duty to reign rather than to enter into religion.*

[382] sibi beatitudinem per suas divicias, non quod cuilibet beatificando sit precium illud necessarium sed quod habens terrenam potestatem atque divicias utatur eis ad utilitatem ecclesie, et sic episcopi et religiosi possessionati tenentur precipue emere sibi beatitudinem per dispensacionem prudentem elemosinarum dandarum pauperibus. Verumptamen non oportet ut altera pars ecclesie vendat vel emat regnum illud civiliter, nec quod dominus secularis det dominacionem suam clericis, sed quod caveat ut faciat elemosinam suam in abscondito cum nesciencia manus sinistre quid faciat dextera, non dampnificando proximum dando sibi occasionem relinquendi perfeccionem suam primevam, nec ut onerosus factus subditis iniuste detineat eis debitum, que omnia fiunt hodie occasione

blessedness for himself by his riches: not that this price is necessary for everyone who is to be blessed, but that one who has earthly power and riches should use them for the profit of the church; and so bishops and possessioner religious are especially bound to buy blessedness for themselves by the prudent dispensing of alms to be given to the poor.[6] Nevertheless, it is not needful that one part of the church sell, or the other buy, that kingdom civilly, nor that a secular lord give his exercise of lordship to clerics; but that he take care to do his alms in secret, his left hand not knowing what his right hand doth, not damaging his neighbour by giving him occasion to relinquish his first perfection, nor so that [the neighbour], made burdensome to his subjects, unjustly

dotacionis perpetue. Nam exhinc prelati dicuntur sompniferi vel ignari, subditis in equis, familia et exaccionibus onerosi. Unde non est credendum quod cesar proporcionaliter ad quantitatem bonorum que dicitur dedisse ecclesie [383]cleri sic meruit, tum quia magnitudo elemosine ex dictis non taliter mensuratur, tum eciam quia iuxta adversarios non fuit nisi nimis stricta restitucio alieni. Sed quomodocunque sit de istis, verisimile est quia Cesar cecatus tumebat superbia, et sic tam elemosinantes quam elemosinati peccant communiter, sicut quilibet viator sciens vel probabiliter credens quod religio vel conversacio alia sibi faciliter adquiribilis esset sibi melior, et tamen quiescit torpide in vita quam reputat sibi minus meritoriam vel minus utilem sancte matri ecclesie, ut sic peccat; et ad arbitrandum hoc requiritur mentis purgacio, status et circumstanciarum discrecio sed omnino scripture sacre consulcio. Contingit enim quod rex vel alius seculi potentatus videns obstinaciam cleri et populi tantum invalescere in contemptu Christi et sue ecclesie quod foret sibi ex tali supposicione meritorius conversari seculariter, ut per gladium datum sibi a Deo coherceat potenter adversarios legis Christi, quam foret sibi istum statum deserere et vitam exproprietariam clerici vel heremite assumere. Vita tamen communis exproprietaria, nec in magna terrenorum affluencia nec in magna eorum carencia, videtur communiter illustratis securior, ut docet Solomon Prov. XXX°, 8, aliis autem illustratis eminencius est vita arcior vel in cura alcior, debite proficienti perfeccior; quod si propter ypocrisim vel primatum status talis appetitur, nullus est periculosior, quia Sapiencie VI[a], 6, dicitur: Districtum iudicium hiis qui presunt fiet; a talibus enim archiservis Deus requiret striccius compotum talenti traditi et fructum ministerii, et patet de primatibus utriusque partis ecclesie, sicut inferius ostendetur de regibus. Unde videtur mihi quod rex Anglie annuatim vel per vices congruas faceret diligenter et perfecte inquiri

withhold from them what is owed; all of which things happen today by occasion of perpetual endowment.[7] For hence prelates are called sleepy or ignorant, burdensome to their subjects in horses, household and exactions. Hence it is not to be believed that Caesar, in proportion to the quantity of goods which he is said to have given to the church [383]of the clergy, merited thus: both because the greatness of an alms, from what has been said, is not measured in that way, and also because, according to the adversaries, it was nothing but an all too strict restitution of what was another's.[8] But however it may be with these things, it is likely that Caesar, blinded, swelled with pride; and so both the almsgivers and the almsmen commonly sin, as does any wayfarer who knows, or probably believes, that another religion or manner of life, easily acquirable by him, would be better for him, and yet rests torpidly in a life which he reckons less meritorious for him, or less useful to holy mother church: as such he sins. And to judge this there is required purification of the mind, discernment of state and circumstances, but above all consultation of holy scripture.[9] For it happens that a king, or another potentate of the world, seeing the obstinacy of clergy and people grow so strong in contempt of Christ and of his church that it would be more meritorious for him, on such a supposition, to live as a secular, so that by the sword given him by God he may powerfully coerce the adversaries of the law of Christ, than it would be for him to desert that state and take up the propertyless life of a cleric or a hermit.[10] Yet the common propertyless life, neither in great affluence of earthly things nor in great want of them, seems safer for those commonly enlightened, as Solomon teaches, Proverbs 30:8; but for others, more eminently enlightened, the stricter life, or the one higher in cure [of souls], is more perfect for one who duly makes progress.[11] But if such a state is sought for hypocrisy or for primacy, none is more perilous, for in Wisdom 6:6 it is said: "A strict judgment shall be for them that bear rule"; for from such arch-servants God will more strictly require an account of the talent handed over and the fruit of the ministry; and this is clear of the primates of both parts of the church, as will be shown below concerning kings. Hence it seems to me that the king of England should, every year or at fitting intervals, cause diligent and perfect inquiry to be made[12]

¶6 384.1–384.33
384.1 *The King should enquire into Church property; how got and how*

[384]quantum de bonis regni, qua condicione et quando sit in omnibus et singulis cleri sui ad manum mortuam devolutum. Secundo quod notetur numerus, qualitas et armatura spiritualis cleri qui occupat

how much of the goods of the kingdom, on what condition and when [each] has devolved to the dead hand in each and every [holding] of his clergy. Second, that the number, quality and spiritual armour of the

used, and correct what is wrong.
384.21 *The clergy have no exemption from such an enquiry.*

ista bona, et tercio quod faciat inquiri si in quantitate vel qualitate cleri in comparacione ad has elemosinas sit defectus, quem inventum faciat omnimode celeriter emendari. Probatur huius racionabilitas in exemplo: Nam supposito quod rex dedisset capitaneo cum suo exercitu thesaurum regni notabilem ad hostes corporaliter debellandum, nonne in monstracione exercitus sui ydonea faceret similia inquiri proporcionabiliter ad thesaurum pugnatoribus ministratum? Cum ergo pugna spiritualis milicie sit quoad causam clarior, quoad regem et regnum utilior et quoad exigenciam iudicis preponderancior, quomodo non per locum a maiori faceret fidelis rex illud diligencius inquiri? Non restat fideli admittenti principia fidei medium excusandi. Illius enim est ydoneitatem militum suorum inquirere cuius est stipendium reddere. Nec valet fingere exempcionem vel privilegium ad tollendum illud stante rata solucione stipendii; nec mirum si regnum nostrum habeat consuetudinem (cum hoc quod non sit legi scripture contraria), eciam aliam quam habent alia regna mundi, quia alio modo et alio pondere stipendii conduxit rex clerum Anglie quam cleri in regnis aliis sunt conducti. Unde cum maximus contemptus quoad Deum et hominem et specialiter quoad periculum regni staret in fraude illius milicie, videtur quod rex et regnum debent de istis eo magis diligenter inquirere et proporcionaliter ad defectum in quantitate vel qualitate de stipendio deficienti subtrahere.

clergy which occupies those goods be noted; and third, that he cause inquiry to be made whether there is a defect in the quantity or quality of the clergy in comparison with these alms, and, when it is found, cause it to be amended speedily in every way.[13] The reasonableness of this is proved by an example. For supposing that the king had given a captain with his army a notable treasure of the kingdom for overcoming enemies bodily, would he not, at a fitting muster of his army, cause like things to be inquired into in proportion to the treasure supplied to the fighters? Since, then, the fight of the spiritual soldiery is clearer as to its cause, more useful as to king and kingdom, and weightier as to the demand of the judge, how would a faithful king not, by the topic from the greater, cause it to be inquired into more diligently? There remains to a faithful man who admits the principles of the faith no means of excusing [himself]. For it belongs to him whose part it is to pay the wage to inquire into the fitness of his soldiers.[14] Nor is it valid to feign an exemption or privilege to do away with this, while the fixed payment of the wage stands; nor is it a wonder if our kingdom has a custom (provided that it is not contrary to the law of scripture) other even than other kingdoms of the world have, because the king hired the clergy of England in another manner and with another weight of wage than the clergies in other kingdoms have been hired. Hence, since the greatest contempt as to God and man, and especially as to the peril of the kingdom, would lie in fraud in that soldiery, it seems that king and kingdom ought to inquire into these things all the more diligently, and, in proportion to the defect in quantity or quality, to withdraw [part] of the wage from the one who falls short.[15]

Notes

1. ***Eorum***: the goods held, as ***patrimonii Crucifixi*** shows. The comparison is the captive knight of the sixth argument (375), who may alienate his manor to redeem himself: so the pope, as full lord, may give up the exercise of lordship to the seculars for the relief of himself and his clergy (***sui generis***, "his kind"). T. At 381.5 B reads ***quod alius***; the print's ***quam alius*** is translated.
2. ***Religio***: the rule of life Christ instituted for the apostles, not a religious order. ***Unius non apostoli***: Wyclif names no one; the caesarean privilege points to Silvester, who accepted Constantine's endowment (our inference). ***Privilegium secundum***: the caesarean privilege, second after Christ's rule. ***Et licet***: "it is lawful also".
3. ***Ut fingitur***: the possessioners' claim as Wyclif reports it: the clergy may put to death (***separare animam a corpore***) whoever resists its lordship, yet may never give that lordship up, though for cause even marriage is dissolved. ***Luciferinum vinculum***: the clergy's bond to its lordship. ***Verbum***: the Word, who on their view can let go (***dimittere***) even the humanity he assumed. R. ***Deus malus ... Deum bonum***: the two gods of the Manichees. ***Abrasio capillorum***: the clerical tonsure.
4. A in the margin at 381.27: ***Conclusio. De ablacione. Aput nominetenus papam et cardinales ... condempnamus***: presumably the delation to the curia of Wyclif's conclusions on the king's right over clerical temporalities, condemned in Gregory XI's bulls of 1377 (cf. 329.25–28, 15-a; ***Fasciculi zizaniorum***, p. 248). C. ***Debitum de spiritualibus elemosinis rependendis***: the prayers owed to the founders in return. ***Ordo correpcionis evangelice***: the order of correction in Matthew 18:15–17. ***Contemptus ... indiscreti doctoris***: the genitive is taken as subjective, the contempt the doctor shows; an objective genitive (contempt of the doctor) is possible.
5. A in the margin at 382.8: ***Octava racio***. C. ***Dignius maius bono spirituali***: ***dignus*** takes the ablative, so "more worthy of a greater spiritual good", though ***maius*** stands where ***maiore*** is expected. ***Hereditatem***: the heavenly inheritance.
6. A in the margin at 382.15: ***Responsio. Dotacio***. C. The sentence begun in ¶4 runs on here. ***Cuilibet beatificando***: everyone who is to be blessed; the poor are blessed without that price.

7. Matthew 6:3–4 (DR "let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth. That thy alms may be in secret"), in Wyclif's words. C. *Altera pars ecclesie*: clergy or laity; *regnum illud*: the kingdom of heaven, the blessedness just named. *Proximum*: the cleric endowed, whom the gift leads to leave his first perfection, apostolic poverty. The subject of *nec ut … detineat* is taken to be this same neighbour, as the burdensome prelates of the next sentence suggest; it may instead be the lord.
8. *Sompniferi*: literally "sleep-bringing"; "sleepy" is taken as the sense. *Cesar*: Constantine, the giver of the caesarean endowment. *Ecclesie [p. 383] cleri*: "the church of the clergy", the clergy's part of the church; the two words stand either side of the page break. *Iuxta adversarios*: on their view the temporal goods were already the church's, so Constantine's gift was only a restitution, and a narrow one, of what was another's. R. A in the margin at 383.5: *Conclusio*.
9. At 383.10 B omits *vel minus utilem*. C. *Religio* here is a religious order. *Ut sic peccat*: "as such he sins", closing the comparison. *Sed omnino*: "but above all".
10. The period gives *rex* no verb of its own: *videns* runs into the result clause *quod foret sibi … meritorius*, where *meritorius* is the neuter comparative answered by *quam foret*. The English keeps the break. *Conversari seculariter*: "to live as a secular", that is, to stay king.
11. Proverbs 30:8 (DR "Give me neither beggary, nor riches: give me only the necessaries of life"). C. *Communiter illustratis* is set against *aliis … eminencius illustratis*: those enlightened in the common measure, and others enlightened more eminently; *eminencius* could instead go with *perfeccior*. *In cura alcior*: higher in the cure of souls.
12. Wisdom 6:6, where the Vulgate has *iudicium durissimum* (DR "a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule"); Wyclif's *Districtum* is translated "strict", and Loserth notes the Vulgate's reading. The talent: cf. Matthew 25:14–30. T. At 383.31 Loserth's note reads "Codd.: ut post de primatibus" without a lemma, apparently the manuscripts' *ut post* for *et patet*; the print is translated. R. A in the margin at 383.33: *Nota consilium*.
13. *In omnibus et singulis cleri sui*: the noun is understood; "[holding]" is supplied, and *sit … devolutum* has the goods of each as its subject. *Armatura spiritualis*: the clergy's arms in the figure that follows. R. A in the margin at 384.9: *Exemplum*; A and B in the margin at 384.14: *Prima ficcio*, and at 384.31: *Secunda ficcio*, the first two of the fictions answered below.
14. *Milicia*, *milites*: the clergy as the king's paid army in spiritual warfare, the Pauline figure, so "soldiery" and "soldiers"; the captive knight of 381.2 belongs to the estate. C. *Monstracio*: the muster of an army. *Quoad exigenciam iudicis preponderancior*: *iudicis* is taken with *exigenciam*, the judge being God.
15. *Stante rata solucione stipendii*: "while the fixed payment of the wage stands", so long as the clergy draws it. *Conducere*: "to hire", as soldiers are hired. *De stipendio deficienti subtrahere*: "to withdraw [part] of the wage from the one who falls short"; *deficienti* is dative.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 381: *verisimiliter*
  - 381: *foret*
  - 381: *Christus*
  - 381: *fuit*
  - 381: *perfeccior*
  - 381: *hereses* (English side-note "draw" glued)
  - 381: *quas* (30 is the line number)
  - 381: *Christi*
  - 382: *seculi*
  - 382: *mortalis* (clear li) [NW]
  - 382: *nesciencia* (italic) [NW]
  - 383: *cleri* (alinea T and 182a folio mark glued)
  - 383: *Cesar* (clear C)
  - 383: *VI*ª
  - 383: *iudicium* (italic)
  - 384: *mortuam devolutum* (print mor-/tuam devolutum.; main token mordevolutum covers both words, p.384 pos 17 is Secundo)

Part 8: The fictions that shield the clergy's alms from withdrawal

Loserth pp. 384.34–387.31

¶1 384.34–385.5

385.7 *It is vain to plead that the gifts were made without conditions.*
385.15 *Vain too is the fiction that all true taking away is from like by like;*

[384]Nec cadit excusacio quod nemo luet defectum alterius, quia oppositum est fides catholica, specialiter [385]quando unus omissione vel commissione participat peccato alterius; si enim prepositus spiritualis exercitus vel capit stipendium pro militibus quos non habet vel pro indignis quos debet corrigere, quomodo non est dignum elemosinam proporcionalem ab illo subtrahere?

Nor does the excuse hold that no one will pay for another's defect, for the opposite is the catholic faith, especially [385]when one shares by omission or commission in another's sin; for if the superior of the spiritual army takes a wage either for soldiers whom he does not have, or for unworthy

ones whom he ought to correct, how is it not fitting to withdraw a proportional alms from him?[1]

¶2 385.7–386.14
386.15 *or that every gift or withdrawal of gifts needs the Pope's sanction.*

[385]Nec valet infidelis ficcio qua dicitur quod absque condicione fuit facta collacio, quomodocunque religiosus voluerit donatum expendere, quia hoc accusaret patronos ex blasphemia et extingueret spem de suo spirituali suffragio; ideo non minus propter mortuorum suffragium quam vivorum subsidium debet fieri diligens inquisicio in hac parte; tunc enim haberemus pauciores milites, sed potenciores contra dyabolum. Nec valet infundabilis ficcio qua dicitur quod nemo aufert quicquam simpliciter ab alio nisi auferat a quolibet sibi simili in natura, quia tunc nemo posset quicquam auferre ab alio, cum omne ablatum ab impio tribuitur iusto. Sic enim iusti tulerunt spolia impiorum et omni habenti dabitur, ab eo autem qui non habet et quod videtur habere auferetur; et sic de modis loquendi scripture, sanctorum doctorum et legis ecclesie. Nam XXXVII[a] epistola Augustini ad Macedonium dicitur quod non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum, et idem ponitur in canone, XIV[a], q. VI. Si res. Ista tria nesciverunt sompniare quod non est ablacio nisi iusta, nec quod est iusta ablacio nisi fuerit auctorizata a pontifice Romano. Nam omnem ablacionem vel collacionem sicut et omnem [386]operacionem quoad eius substanciam oportet auctorizari a Deo; et cum omnis talis operacio non est sic secundum quid sed operacio simpliciter, eo quod aliter nulla creatura foret simpliciter activa, sicut Commentator recitat quosdam dicere, quos dicit non habere cerebrum dispositum ad philosophandum, sequitur cum veris quod stat esse ablacionem simpliciter cum hoc quod non a papa fuerit approbata. Si ergo ablacio vel alia talis iniusta operacio non dependet ex approbacione divina quoad mores quin sit simpliciter ablacio et alterius generis operacio, quomodo blasphematur quod nulla est ablacio simpliciter nisi papa decreverit? Sic enim extolleretur super omne quod dicitur Deus.

Nor is the faithless fiction valid by which it is said that the conferral was made without condition, in whatever way the religious might wish to spend what was given; for this would charge the patrons with blasphemy and would extinguish hope of their spiritual suffrage. Therefore, no less for the sake of the suffrage of the dead than for the support of the living, diligent inquiry ought to be made in this matter; for then we should have fewer soldiers, but more powerful against the devil.[2] Nor is the groundless fiction valid by which it is said that no one takes anything away from another without qualification unless he takes it away from every one like him in nature; for then no one could take anything away from another, since everything taken away from the impious is bestowed on the just. For so "the just took the spoils of the wicked", and "to every one that hath shall be given ... but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away"; and so with the manners of speaking of scripture, of the holy doctors and of the law of the church.[3] For in the thirty-seventh letter of Augustine, to Macedonius, it is said that the sin is not forgiven unless what was taken away is restored; and the same is laid down in the canon, [Causa] 14, q. 6, *Si res*. These three did not know how to dream that there is no taking-away except a just one, nor that there is a just taking-away unless it has been authorized by the Roman pontiff.[4] For every taking-away or conferral, as also every [386]operation, must as to its substance be authorized by God; and since every such operation is not thus [an operation] in a certain respect but an operation without qualification (because otherwise no creature would be active without qualification, as the Commentator reports certain men to say, who, he says, do not have a brain disposed to philosophizing), it follows, together with truths [already granted], that there can be a taking-away without qualification although it has not been approved by the pope.[5] If, then, a taking-away or another such unjust operation does not depend on divine approval as to morals for its being without qualification a taking-away and an operation of another kind, how is it blasphemously said that there is no taking-away without qualification unless the pope has decreed it? For so he would be exalted above all that is called God.[6]

¶3 386.15–386.33

[386]Nec minus blasphemum est dicere quod nulla est iusta ablacio, collacio vel alia operacio ecclesie nisi auctorizetur ab ipso,

Nor is it less blasphemous to say that there is no just taking-away, conferral or other operation of the church unless it is authorized by him;

quia antequam ipse habuerit primatum huiusmodi erant multe operaciones ecclesie satis iuste, sicut operacio sua est iusta ex pura acceptacione divina. Ymmo pro tempore mortis sue, sicut et ipso superstite ignorante sunt multe ablaciones, collaciones et operaciones elemosinarie satis iuste, sicut patet de dotacione ecclesie Anglicane, que non emanavit ex eius auctoritate, sicut nec percepcio elemosine cesaree vel elemosina Anglie cesari non subiecte. Aliter enim non faceret Anglicus elemosinam clero suo nisi ostensa ad hoc auctoritate papali singularissima; quod non est fingendum, cum tempus et infinite alie circumstancie variarent operacionem elemosine. Et sic cum auctorizacio generalis non sufficit, frustraretur ex defectu auctoritatis papalis et ignorancia revocacionis licencie prioris omnis elemosina facienda egenis.

for before he had such primacy there were many operations of the church quite just, just as his own operation is just from God's pure acceptance. Indeed, for the time of his death, as also while he survives without his knowing, there are many takings-away, conferrals and almsgiving operations quite just, as is clear of the endowment of the English church, which did not issue from his authority, as neither did the receiving of the caesarean alms, or the alms of England, which is not subject to Caesar.[7] For otherwise an Englishman would not give alms to his clergy unless a most singular papal authority were shown for it; which is not to be feigned, since the time and infinite other circumstances would vary the work of alms. And so, since a general authorization does not suffice, every alms to be given to the needy would be frustrated for lack of papal authority and through ignorance of the revocation of a prior licence.

¶4 386.34–387.31
387.11 *If this were true the laity might withdraw all gifts that had not been sanctioned by the Pope, while the clergy would be out of all control.*

[386]Ex istis demum colligitur quod ficticia subdola recentissima qua maior pars nostrorum sacerdotum [387]dotatorum fingit infideliter quod, cum papa dominatur civiliter et capitaliter super singulos reges terre, non licet eis auferre quicquam a clero, iudicare de cleri conversacione vel cleri officio, nec ipsum corripere vel iuvare nisi ex eius auctoritate previe requisita. Sic enim extolleretur super Petrum et omnem Christi vicarium, cum Petro ignorante et non approbante nisi forte confuse, sicut benevolus approbat omne bonum, Paulus nuda auctoritate Christi fecit magnum profectum ecclesie (sicut patet Act. IX° et infra). Secundo fingens hoc dogma nephandum daret occasionem populo laicali subtrahere beneficienciam suam egenis, tam clericis quam laicis, eo quod non expresse docetur satis singularis papalis auctoritas vel interim revocacio auctoritatis ostense, ut tangitur in destruccione proxime ficcionis. Tercio tolleretur omnis regalia et primatus secularis principum terrenorum, cum non liceret seculari iudicare de nequicia clerici sibi iniuriantis quantumcunque notorie nec exterrere clerum freneticum ab attemptato facinore, et multo magis non liceret seculari domino amerciare clericum vel eius familiam insolentem nisi prius consulto papa ad hoc licenciante, quia aliter liceret auferre a clero per viam multacionis temporalia sua mobilia et in foro civili iniuste occupata, papa qui est capitalis dominus inconsulto. Talia deliramenta nedum ex scriptura sacra infundabilia sed sibi contraria que hodie plus solito sunt emuncta dabunt finem, si Deus voluerit, ne post istum virum sterilem succedat alius tyrannice sic blasphemans, sed Danielis IX°, 27, dicitur quod abhominacio desolacionis perseverabit usque in finem.

From these things, finally, it is gathered that the most recent crafty fiction, by which the greater part of our [387]endowed priests faithlessly feign that, since the pope exercises lordship civilly and as head over every king of the earth, it is not lawful for them to take anything away from the clergy, to judge of the clergy's manner of life or the clergy's office, nor to rebuke or help it except with his authority first sought, [is groundless].[8] For so he would be exalted above Peter and every vicar of Christ, since, with Peter ignorant and not approving (unless perhaps indistinctly, as a well-wisher approves every good), Paul by the bare authority of Christ made great progress for the church (as is clear in Acts 9 and following).[9] Second, one who feigns this abominable dogma would give occasion to the lay people to withdraw their beneficence from the needy, clerics as well as lay, because a sufficiently singular papal authority is not expressly taught, or a revocation in the meantime of the authority shown, as is touched on in the demolition of the last fiction.[10] Third, all the regality and secular primacy of earthly princes would be taken away, since it would not be lawful for a secular to judge of the wickedness of a cleric injuring him, however notoriously, nor to frighten a frenzied clergy off from a misdeed attempted; and much more it would not be lawful for a secular lord to amerce a cleric or his insolent household unless the pope had first been consulted and licensed it, because otherwise it would be lawful, without consulting the pope, who is chief lord, to take away from the clergy by way of fine its movable temporal goods, and those unjustly occupied, in the civil court.[11] Such ravings, not only groundless in holy scripture but contrary to it, which today are put about more than usual, will make an

end, if God wills, so that after this barren man another may not succeed blaspheming thus tyrannically; but in Daniel 9:27 it is said that "the abomination of desolation shall continue even to the end".[12]

Notes

1. *Nemo luet defectum alterius*: cf. Ezekiel 18:20. G. *Prepositus*, "superior", is the head of the clerical army in the figure of 384; *milites*, "soldiers", as there (glossary: *milicia; milites*, the Pauline figure).

2. A and B in the margin at 385.7: *Tercia ficcio*. T. At 385.8 Loserth reports *quandocunque* ("whenever") in the manuscripts; his *quomodocunque* is translated. C. *Collacio*: the conferral of the gift by the founder. *Accusaret patronos ex blasphemia*: the patrons gave for the suffrages, and the fiction makes them give for nothing. *Mortuorum suffragium*: the suffrage owed to dead founders.

3. A and B in the margin at 385.15: *Quarta ficcio*; A: *Nota ficticias pro dominacione cleri*. C. *Auferat quolibet sibi simili in natura*: on the fiction, a true taking-away removes the thing from every one of the same nature as the loser, so that what passes to another man is not taken away at all; Wyclif's reply turns on that. S. Wisdom 10:19; Matthew 25:29 (DR), where Wyclif omits *et abundabit* and *ab eo*.

4. Augustine's letter to Macedonius, numbered 37 by Wyclif, is Ep. 153.6.20 in the modern numbering, identified by content (*non remittitur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum*); Wyclif's number, which he uses throughout, matches no known numbering, and Gratian has *LIV*; Loserth refers back to his p. 304. The canon is Decretum C.14 q.6 c.1 (*Si res aliena*); Loserth's form is "Decr. II pars, causa XIV, q. VI, cap. I", the modern form ours. R. A in the margin at 385.23: *Augustinus*; B: *Nota Augustinum quod non dimittitur peccatum nisi restituatur etc.* C. *Ista tria*: scripture, the holy doctors and the law of the church.

5. *Commentator*: Averroes, reporting those who deny that creatures act, *In Metaph.* IX comm. 7 (*qui recipiunt huiusmodi, non habent cerebrum habile naturaliter ad bonum*); Wyclif paraphrases. C. *Sequitur cum veris*: "it follows, together with truths [already granted]". *Stat esse ... cum hoc quod non*: "there can be ... although not". R. A in the margin at 385.29: *Stat esse ablacionem iustam preter hoc quod papa ipsam approbaret*.

6. 2 Thessalonians 2:4, where the Vulgate has *extollitur supra omne* (DR "is lifted up above all that is called God"); Wyclif's conditional is translated. C. *Quin sit*: injustice does not keep a taking-away from being one. *Blasphematur quod*: an impersonal passive, "how is it blasphemously said that".

7. A and B in the margin at 386.15: *Quinta ficcio*. T. At 386.17 B omits *ipse ... operacio sua*. C. *Pro tempore mortis sue*: the vacancy after a pope's death; *ipso superstite ignorante*: while he lives but knows nothing of the act. *Elemosina cesarea*: Constantine's endowment, received without papal authority; *elemosina Anglie cesari non subiecte*: England was never under the emperor, so its alms owe nothing to Caesar's.

8. The print gives *ficticia* no verb: after the long *quod* clause the period passes to *Sic enim*. "[is groundless]" is supplied from the closing *infundabilia* (our supplement); a word may be lost, or the period is broken off. R. A in the margin at 386.34: *Nota*; A and B: *Sexta ficcio*.

9. Acts 9:19–30, Paul's preaching after his conversion. C. *Confuse*: Peter approved, if at all, only as anyone approves all good in general, without knowledge of the act.

10. At 387.15 A and A_1 omit *ostense*. C. *Proxime ficcionis*: the fifth fiction (386.15–33), where the want of a singular authority and the unknown revocation of a licence were argued. *Docetur*: is taught, i.e. made known to the giver.

11. *Amerciare*: to amerce, fine at the court's mercy; *multacio*, "fine". *Temporalia sua mobilia et ... iniuste occupata* is taken as two objects, the clergy's movables and what it holds unjustly, with *in foro civili* naming the court; "goods unjustly occupied in the civil court" is also possible.

12. Daniel 9:27, where the Vulgate has *et usque ad consummationem et finem perseverabit desolatio* (DR "and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation, and to the end"); Wyclif's words are translated. C. *Emuncta*: literally "wiped, blown out"; "put about" is a guess at the sense. *Dabunt finem*: the ravings, by their excess, will bring the matter to an end. *Istum virum sterilem* is not named.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **385: *quando* (alinea X and 182c folio mark glued)**
  - **385: *XXXVII^{a}***
  - **385: *XIV^{a}***
  - **387: *occasionem populo* (print: daret occa-/sionem populo laicali; main token occaH and line 11 starts laicah, so sionem populo has no main token; whole word plus populo given here)**
  - **387: *laicali***
  - **387: *auctoritatis* (15 is the line number) [NW]**
  - **387: *proxime* (3 is a margin argument numeral)**
  - **386: ∅ (duplicate: iusta already at 107) [DELX]**

Chapter 17

Part 1: The first argument answered: the church before the incarnation

Loserth pp. 388.2–390.11

¶1 388.2–388.6
388.2 *We must go through the ten arguments given in Chap. V. with our opponent's answer.*
388.11
1. Our opponent denies our right to conclude from his premisses that the O. T. fathers will not be saved.
388.20 *Answer: On his own nominalist theories it must be so.*

[388] **Pro ulteriori declaracione christiane fidei de quiditate ac unitate sancte matris ecclesie discurrendum est per illas decem raciunculas quas feci superius in fine V^i capituli de ista materia, et recitabo responsiones cuiusdam doctoris, ut veritas fidei concertacione scolastica magis appareat.**

For the further declaration of the Christian faith on the quiddity and unity of holy mother church, we must run through those ten little arguments which I made above, at the end of the fifth chapter, on this matter; and I will recite the replies of a certain doctor, so that the truth of the faith may appear the more by scholastic disputation.[1]

¶2 388.7–388.10

[388] **Assumpsi autem in primo argumento quod, si ante incarnacionem Christi non fuit ecclesia et extra ecclesiam catholicam non est salus, tunc nullus patrum veteris testamenti salvabitur.**

Now in the first argument I assumed that, if before the incarnation of Christ there was no church, and outside the catholic church there is no salvation, then none of the fathers of the old testament will be saved.[2]

¶3 388.11–390.11
389.5 *Augustine did not say that the Church existed before it was the Church;*

[388] **Hic negatur consequencia, cum antecedens sit verum et consequens falsum, vel, inquit, ante incarnacionem erat ecclesia catholica. Hic insto primo contra falsitatem impositam consequenti, et quia est argumentum ad hominem, suppono primo quod nihil est quod fuit ante hoc instans quod est presens, et erit post illud nisi quod est in illo eodem instanti. Patet supposicio scole dicenti quod nichil est nisi quod est in hoc instanti temporis quod est presens, et tunc arguo sic contra concessum, scilicet quod aliquis patrum veteris testamenti salvabitur. Si sic, tunc vel qui est aliquis patrum veteris testamenti salvabitur, vel qui erit aliquis patrum veteris testamenti salvabitur; consequens falsum secundum istam scolam, quia nec est nec erit aliquis patrum veteris testamenti, cum non sit vetus testamentum nec reincipiet in die iudicii vel ante. Nec est verisimile quod vetus testamentum sit novum testamentum de quo scriptura facit distinccionem cum lege veteri, quia tunc non foret distinccio inter vetus testamentum et novum** [389] **per descripciones eorum congruas exprimenda, sed omnia cerimonialia et legalia veteris testamenti essent pro tempore legis gracie ab ecclesia observanda, consequens contra sanctos doctores tractantes de cessacione legalium. Et quantum ad conclusionem ex fundacione Augustini, scilicet quod**

Here the inference is denied, since the antecedent is true and the consequent false; or else, he says, before the incarnation there was a catholic church.[3] Here I object first against the falsity imposed on the consequent; and since it is an argument ad hominem, I suppose first that nothing is, of what was before this instant which is present and will be after it, except what is in that same instant. The supposition is clear for the school which says that nothing is except what is in this instant of time which is present; and then I argue thus against what was granted, namely that some one of the fathers of the old testament will be saved. If so, then either one who is some one of the fathers of the old testament will be saved, or one who will be some one of the fathers of the old testament will be saved: a consequent false according to that school, since there neither is nor will be any of the fathers of the old testament, since the old testament is not, nor will it begin again on the day of judgment or before.[4] Nor is it likely that the old testament is the new testament, which scripture distinguishes from the old law; for then there would be no distinction between the old testament and the new [389] **to be expressed by their fitting definitions, but all the ceremonial and legal [precepts] of**

ecclesia fuit antequam fuit ecclesia, patet quod iste sanctus horruit sic sophisticari in fide de sancta ecclesia, nec sequitur ex textu suo, III, De Doctrina Christiana VI°, supradicta sentencia. Nam iste est textus Augustini: Qui crediderunt ex quibus facta est prima ecclesia Jerosolimitana, satis ostenderunt quanta utilitas fuerit eo modo sub pedagogo custodiri. Modo non sequitur, ex illis facta est prima ecclesia Jerosolimitana, ergo nec ante illos nec ante incarnacionem fuit ecclesia Jerosolimitana, et multo magis non sequitur quod ante illos non fuit ecclesia. Unde logice dicitur quod ex illis facta est particulariter ecclesia catholica que fuit a principio mundi et fuit continue per generacionem membrorum suorum usque ad finem mundi, et facta est in magno anno mundi. Sed pertinencius sensui huius sancti dicitur quod intendit ex illis factam primam Jerosolimitanam particularem ecclesiam sub nomine Jerosolimitane ecclesie, quamvis ante fuerit ecclesia tam pro tempore legis veteris quam nove. Iste autem sanctus fuit mirabiliter subtilis logicus, relinquens nobis ex verbis suis diversa puncta logicalia capienda. Unde utramque istarum responsionum approbo, cum inutile est scole dare responsionem que non valet. Et conformiter dicitur ad illud Augustini, I Retraccionum cap. XIII°, [390] ubi sic loquitur: quod dixi, ea est nostris temporibus christiana religio quam cognoscere ac sequi securissima ac certissima salus est; secundum hoc nomen dictum est, non secundum ipsam rem cuius hoc nomen est. Nam res ipsa que nunc christiana religio nuncupatur, erat et aput antiquos nec defuit ab inicio generis humani, quousque ipse Christus veniret in carne. Unde vera religio que iam erat cepit appellari christiana. Et sequitur exposicio: Hec est nostris temporibus religio christiana, non quia prioribus temporibus non fuit, sed quia posterioribus hoc nomen accepit.

the old testament would have to be observed by the church for the time of the law of grace: a consequent against the holy doctors who treat of the cessation of the legal [precepts].[5] And as to the conclusion drawn from Augustine's foundation, namely that the church was before it was the church, it is clear that this saint shrank from playing the sophist thus in the faith concerning holy church; nor does the aforesaid teaching follow from his text, *De doctrina christiana* III, 6. For this is Augustine's text: "Those who believed, of whom the first church of Jerusalem was made, showed well enough how great a benefit it was to be kept in that way under a pedagogue."[6] Now it does not follow: "Of them the first church of Jerusalem was made; therefore neither before them nor before the incarnation was there a church of Jerusalem"; and much more it does not follow that before them there was no church. Hence it is said logically that of them was made, in part, the catholic church, which was from the beginning of the world and was continuously, through the generation of its members, up to the end of the world, and was made in the great year of the world.[7] But more pertinently to the sense of this saint it is said that he means that of them was made the first particular church of Jerusalem, under the name of the church of Jerusalem, although before that there was a church, as much for the time of the old law as of the new. And this saint was a wonderfully subtle logician, leaving us in his words diverse logical points to be grasped. Hence I approve both of these replies, since it is useless for the school to give a reply which is not valid. And in the same way the answer is given to that [passage] of Augustine, *Retractations* I, chapter 13, [390] where he speaks thus: "What I said, 'This is in our times the Christian religion, which to know and follow is the most secure and most certain salvation', was said according to this name, not according to the thing itself whose name this is. For the very thing which is now called the Christian religion was also among the ancients, nor was it lacking from the beginning of the human race until Christ himself came in the flesh; whence the true religion, which already was, began to be called Christian." And the explanation follows: "This is in our times the Christian religion, not because it was not in earlier times, but because in later times it received this name."[8]

Notes

1. At 388.4 Loserth prints *V^i* (the fifth chapter) where the manuscripts have *XV*; his correction is translated. At 388.6 A and A, read *contricacione* for *concertacione*. S. The ten arguments: Loserth compares p. 112.18. C. *Cuiusdam doctoris*: the opponent is not named.
2. At 388.7 B omits *autem*.

3. A in the margin at 388.11: *Prima responsio*; at 388.18: *Ante Christi incarnacionem fuit ecclesia; hoc probatur continue*. C. The doctor's reply is double: deny the inference (true antecedent, false consequent), or deny the antecedent, since there was a catholic church before the incarnation. *Falsitatem impositam consequenti*: his claim that the consequent is false, that is, that some of the fathers will be saved.
4. *Argumentum ad hominem*: an argument from the opponent's own premisses, here the school's teaching that only what is in the present instant exists (Loserth's side-note: "his own nominalist theories"). On that teaching the fathers neither are nor will be, so neither disjunct of *qui est ... vel qui erit* holds. T. At 388.19 B reads *quod est prius*.
5. The escape that the old testament simply is the new is refused, since then the ceremonial and legal precepts of the old law would bind the church still. *Legalia*: the precepts of the Mosaic law.
6. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.6.10 (PL 34, 68–69; Loserth: *Opp.* III.1, p. 48); Wyclif quotes it exactly but for *Qui* for *Sed qui*; the pedagogue is Galatians 3:24. T. At 389.5–6 B reads *ex fundamento*. At 389.12 the manuscripts read *inutilitas*, which Loserth corrected to *utilitas* from Augustine's text; his correction is translated. R. Loserth's side-note: "Augustine did not say that the Church existed before it was the Church".
7. *Particulariter*: "in part", the church of Jerusalem being a part of the catholic church. *Fuit continue ... usque ad finem mundi*: the past tense (read on the plate) though the span runs to the end of the world. *Magnus annus mundi*: the whole course of the world's time. T. At 389.22 A and A_1 read *huiusmodi sancti*.
8. Augustine, *Retractationes* 1.13.3 (PL 32, 603–604; Loserth: *Opp.* I, p. 19), on his *De vera religione* 10.19. T. At 389.31 A reads *II* in the text, corrected to *I* in its margin, and the manuscripts give *cap. XII*, which Loserth corrected to *XIII*; his reference is translated. R. B in the margin: *Christiana religio est securissima*. C. *Dicitur ad illud*: the objection drawn from this passage is answered as the last was, by the name and the thing.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 388: *CAP. XVII.*
  - 388: ∅ (go is the English side-note (We must go))
  - 388: *doctoris* (clear ri) [NW]
  - 389: *per* (alinea A and 183a folio mark glued)
  - 389: ∅ (inserted run is p.388 text; p.389 begins per descripciones)
  - 389: *fuit*
  - 389: *fuit*
  - 389: *Jerosolimitanam* (capital J as printed)
  - 388: ∅ (duplicate: capituli already at 26) [DELX]
  - 388: *V*^{i} (print: in fine V^{i} capituli (agent 13))
  - 388: ∅ (scan split; capituli at 27)
  - 388: *capituli* (print: capituli)

Part 2: The church was from the beginning of the world

Loserth pp. 390.12–394.23

¶1 390.12–394.23
390.12 *but he teaches that a) the Christian religion is best and safest; b) it lasts through both testaments;*
390.17 *c) it existed from the beginning of the world.*
390.23 *The Christian religion is another name for the Church.*
391.17 *The name is accidental; the essential is that the Church is joined to her head,*
391.25 *and cannot cease to be, except by falling away from him.*

[390] Ex istis dictis notari possunt notabilia. Primo quia christiana religio secundum formam quam ipse instituit est perfectissima et securissima; secundo quod ipsa durat per tempus utriusque testamenti, licet ante incarnacionem non sit vocata christiana religio, et tercio sequitur quod ecclesia fuit a mundi inicio, ut dicit Crisostomus et decretum Augustini, positum XXXII^{a} q. IV^{a}. Recurrat. Et hoc debet attendere doctor allegans hoc dictum Augustini, non enim hic loquitur de ecclesia sub nomine ecclesie, sed loquitur de religione christiana, dicens quod fuit a mundi inicio. Ecclesiam ergo vocat sub nomine religionis que hodie dicitur christiana. Et patet quod non sequitur: si ante incarnacionem non vocabatur christiana religio, ergo ante incarnacionem non fuit ecclesia vel christiana religio, quin pocius sequitur quod a mundi inicio fuit ecclesia; quia notum est quod nunquam fuit religio fidelium

From these sayings notable points can be noted. First, that the Christian religion, according to the form which he himself instituted, is most perfect and most secure; second, that it lasts through the time of both testaments, although before the incarnation it was not called the Christian religion; and third, it follows that the church was from the beginning of the world, as Chrysostom says, and the decree of Augustine, placed at [Causa] 32, q. 4, [the canon] *Recurrat*.[1] And the doctor who alleges this saying of Augustine ought to attend to this: for here he is not speaking of the church under the name of church, but speaks of the Christian religion, saying that it was from the beginning of the world. He therefore calls the church by the name of the religion which today is called Christian. And it is clear that it does not follow: if before the incarnation it was not called the Christian religion, therefore before the incarnation

392.1 *The name of "Church" used throughout the O. T.*
392.15 *Parable of the labourers in the vineyard,*
393.1 *The Church does not exist only for the eleventh hour.*
393.33 *The Church which existed in the first ages as militant is now triumphant,*
394.10 *In denying the previous existence of the Church we reject an article of the Creed.*

predestinatorum nisi quando fuit ecclesia. Ideo sicut a mundi inicio fuit illa religio, sic a mundi inicio fuit ecclesia; et ad hoc sunt quotlibet testimonia sanctorum. Nam Augustinus (ut allegavi [391] superius) sic scribit super Psalmo CXLII°: Ecclesia que est mulier antiqua, civitas Dei et corpus Christi, habet inicium ab Abel, sicut mala civitas a Caym. Unde in libro De Questionibus veteris et nove legis q. IIIa declarat quomodo fides ecclesie successit per ordinem in electis. Ab inicio, inquit, genus est christianorum, priores ergo homines quotquot fidem habuerunt unius Dei iure christiani dicendi sunt. Unde sicut non sequitur: per tempus veteris testamenti non fuit vocata religio christiana, ergo tunc non fuit religio, ita non sequitur: tunc non fuit vocata ecclesia christiana, ergo tunc non fuit ecclesia. Sicut ecclesia Romana, cum sit universalis ecclesia, diu fuit ecclesia, antequam fuit ecclesia Romana, quia quemcunque locum mundi incoluerit semper manet ecclesia, cum fides et predestinacio non dependent a loco corporeo. Ideo oportet notare quomodo accidit ecclesie denominacio a loco et denominacio a natura creata sub nomine tali, sed per se inest sibi denominacio a capite, quod nunc est Christus, Deus et homo; fuit autem caput ecclesie antequam fuit homo. Ideo foret nephandum sophisma concedere quod tunc non fuit ecclesia, licet ecclesia fuerit tunc per locum a simili quod ecclesia Romana vel christiana fuit, quando ipsa non fuit Romana vel vocata christiana. Oportet enim distinguere inter per se et per accidens. Ecclesia enim non potest desinere esse ecclesia, sicut nec aliqua creatura potest desinere esse membrum Christi mistici (ut declarat Augustinus III°, De Doctrina Christiana XXXII°). Unde quod ecclesia vocata est sub nomine ecclesie pro tempore veteris testamenti, patet scrutanti [392] scripturas tam in libris legalibus quam prophetalibus, in libris historialibus et sapiencialibus. Unde frequencius (si non fallor) fit mencio in lege veteri de matre nostra sub nomine ecclesie quam in nova. Unde quia liber Psalmorum est valde autenticus, quia a domino allegatus et communius in ore presbyteri exclamatus, notaremus illud Psalmi XXI[a], 26. Aput te laus mea in ecclesia magna, et Psalmo XXXIV°, 18, dicitur: Confitebor tibi in ecclesia magna, et Psalmo CXLIX°, 1: Laus eius in ecclesia sanctorum. Et sic exponit Augustinus maiorem partem Psalmorum, dictam de ecclesia vel in persona ecclesie, sicut loquuntur libri alii veteris testamenti. Unde beatus Gregorius, Omelia XIX[a], exponens illud Matthei XX, 1: Simile est regnum celorum homini patrifamilias qui exiit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam, declarat quomode paterfamilias est conditor noster qui in magna domo sua regit singula, sed specialiter suam ecclesiam. Ipse, inquit, habet vineam, scilicet

there was not the church or the Christian religion; rather it follows that the church was from the beginning of the world; for it is known that there was never a religion of the faithful predestinate except when there was the church.[2] Therefore, just as that religion was from the beginning of the world, so the church was from the beginning of the world; and to this there are any number of testimonies of the saints. For Augustine (as I alleged [391] above) writes thus on Psalm 142: "The church, which is the ancient woman, the city of God and the body of Christ, has its beginning from Abel, as the evil city from Cain." Hence in the book *Of Questions of the Old and New Law*, q. 3, he declares how the faith of the church came down in order in the elect: "From the beginning," he says, "there is the race of Christians; therefore the earlier men, as many as had faith in one God, are rightly to be called Christians."[3] Hence, just as it does not follow: through the time of the old testament the religion was not called Christian, therefore then there was no religion, so it does not follow: then it was not called the Christian church, therefore then there was no church. Just as the Roman church, since it is the universal church, was the church long before it was the Roman church; for whatever place of the world it has inhabited, it always remains the church, since faith and predestination do not depend on a bodily place. Therefore one must note how naming from a place, and naming from a created nature under such a name, are accidental to the church; but naming from its head belongs to it of itself, the head which is now Christ, God and man; and he was head of the church before he was man.[4] Therefore it would be an abominable sophism to grant that then there was no church, although the church existed then, by the topic from likeness, in that the Roman or Christian church existed when it was not Roman or called Christian.[5] For one must distinguish between of itself and by accident. For the church cannot cease to be the church, as neither can any creature cease to be a member of the mystical Christ (as Augustine declares, *De doctrina christiana* III, 32).[6] Hence that the church was called by the name of church for the time of the old testament is clear to one who searches [392] the scriptures, as well in the books of the law as in the prophetic, in the historical and in the sapiential books. Hence (if I am not mistaken) mention is made more frequently in the old law of our mother under the name of church than in the new. Hence, since the book of Psalms is very authentic, because alleged by the Lord and more commonly cried out in the mouth of the presbyter, we should note that of Psalm 21:26: "With thee is my praise in a great church"; and in Psalm 34:18 it is said: "I will give thanks to

universam ecclesiam que ab Abel iusto usque ad ultimum electum qui in fine mundi nasciturus est quot sanctos protulit tot palmites misit. Et post prosequitur quomodo dicta ecclesia mane hora tercia, sexta, nona et undecima habuit cultores vinee ecclesie quos vocavit et excitavit ad colendum ecclesiam et vicia extirpandum. Illas autem quinque horas limitat iste sanctus papa per quinque etates mundi. Modo non dubium vel ceco logico, si vinea dicti patrisfamilias sit ad sensum misticum sancta ecclesia [393]que ab Abel iusto usque ad novissimum electum sic fructificavit, tunc illa est extencior in etate quam pro hora undecima. Sequitur enim: Deus habet illam ecclesiam, ergo illa est ecclesia, et sequitur: Ab Abel iusto usque ad novissimum electum illa taliter germinavit, ergo per tantumdem temporis ipsa fuit. Et eandem sentenciam dicunt Augustinus, Crisostomus et decretum ex fide scripture (ut ostendi superius); et revera abbreviare etatem sancte matris ecclesie quod non fuit in veteri testamento foret presumptuosus error et periculosus merito revocandus; quod ego statim facerem, si (quod absit) illam assercionem temerariam presumpsissem. Nec valet dicere quod ecclesia fuit per istas quatuor etates ante incarnacionem, sed tunc non fuit ecclesia, primo quia tam literaliter quam mistice vocatur ecclesia pro tempore veteris testamenti, sicut patet in parabolis Christi quibus vocavit fideles ad nupcias et ad laborandum in vinea (ut patet Mat. XXII° et Mat. XX°), et secundum peritos linguarum ecclesia dicitur convocacio fidelium, synagoga autem congregacio fidelium. Ideo prius dicta est ecclesia, antequam fuerat vocata synagoga. Et quoad sensum literalem, patet quod sepe vocata est ecclesia pro tempore veteris testamenti. Similiter, si ecclesia fuit in prima etate mundi, tunc vel illud quod est ecclesia vel illud quod fuit ecclesia. Primum negabitur et dato secundo oportet cum veris dicere quod illa adequata ecclesia que fuit in prima etate mundi fuit in illa etate ecclesia, et cum illa etas lapsa est per multa millia annorum ante incarnacionem Christi, sequitur quod per tantum temporis ante incarnacionem fuit ecclesia; quod ego credo esse de fide ecclesie. Similiter modo est ecclesia triumphans que fuit in prima etate mundi, [394]et cum nulla sit ecclesia triumphans nisi que prius fuit militans (ut declarabitur inferius), sequitur quod illa ecclesia triumphans que fuit pro prima etate mundi fuit tunc ecclesia militans. Non enim est fas dicere quod nunc non sit ecclesia triumphans nec erit ante diem resurreccionis finalis, nec fas est dicere quod solum Christus vel alia persona humana, si iam sit beata in corpore et anima, sit modo ecclesia triumphans. Ex istis videtur mihi quod post hereses de trinitate et incarnacione non fuit heresis periculosior quam pertinaciter defendere quod per totum

thee in a great church"; and in Psalm 149:1: "his praise in the church of the saints."[7] And so Augustine expounds the greater part of the Psalms as said of the church or in the person of the church, as the other books of the old testament speak. Hence blessed Gregory, Homily 19, expounding that of Matthew 20:1, "The kingdom of heaven is like to an householder, who went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard," declares how the householder is our maker, who in his great house rules each thing, but especially his church. "He has," he says, "a vineyard, namely the universal church, which, from Abel the just to the last elect who is to be born at the end of the world, put forth as many branches as it brought forth saints." And afterwards he goes on to show how the said church, in the morning, at the third, sixth, ninth and eleventh hour, had dressers of the vineyard of the church, whom he called and stirred up to dress the church and to root out vices. And this holy pope assigns those five hours to the five ages of the world.[8] Now it is not doubtful even to a blind logician: if the vineyard of the said householder is, in the mystical sense, the holy church [393]which thus bore fruit from Abel the just to the last elect, then it is more extended in age than for the eleventh hour. For it follows: God has that church, therefore it is the church; and it follows: from Abel the just to the last elect it so budded, therefore it existed for just so much time.[9] And Augustine, Chrysostom and the decree state the same teaching from the faith of scripture (as I showed above); and in truth, to cut short the age of holy mother church, [saying] that it was not in the old testament, would be a presumptuous and dangerous error, deservedly to be retracted; which I would do at once if (God forbid) I had presumed that rash assertion.[10] Nor does it avail to say that the church existed through those four ages before the incarnation, but then it was not the church: first, because both literally and mystically it is called church for the time of the old testament, as is clear in the parables of Christ in which he called the faithful to the wedding and to labour in the vineyard (as is clear in Matthew 22 and Matthew 20); and according to those skilled in languages *ecclesia* means a convocation of the faithful, but *synagoga* a congregation of the faithful. Therefore it was called church before it had been called synagogue.[11] And as to the literal sense, it is clear that it was often called church for the time of the old testament. Likewise, if the church was in the first age of the world, then [it was] either that which is the church or that which was the church. The first will be denied; and the second being granted, one must say with the truth that that adequate church which was in the first age of the world was in that

tempus veteris testamenti non fuit ecclesia sancta catholica; tunc enim deficeret fidelibus tam viantibus quam triumphantibus solempnis articulus fidei, immediate sequens post articulum de spiritu sancto, quod est contra fidem scripture, contra sanctos doctores et iura ecclesie, que dicunt concorditer quod fidelis debet credere in spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam. Ideo tam clerici quam laici debent constanter consurgere ad istum articulum defendum, scilicet quod ecclesia sancta catholica fuit a mundi principio cuius pars triumphans est spiritus celestis (ut dixi superius).

age the church; and since that age passed away many thousands of years before the incarnation of Christ, it follows that for so much time before the incarnation there was the church; which I believe to be of the faith of the church.[12] Likewise, there is now the church triumphant which was in the first age of the world, [394] and since there is no church triumphant except one that was first militant (as will be declared below), it follows that that church triumphant which was for the first age of the world was then the church militant. For it is not right to say that now there is no church triumphant, nor will be before the day of the final resurrection; nor is it right to say that only Christ, or another human person if he is already blessed in body and soul, is now the church triumphant.[13] From these it seems to me that after the heresies about the Trinity and the incarnation there has been no more dangerous heresy than to defend pertinaciously that through the whole time of the old testament there was no holy catholic church; for then the faithful, both those on the road and those triumphant, would lack a solemn article of faith, immediately following after the article on the Holy Spirit; which is against the faith of scripture, against the holy doctors and the laws of the church, which say with one accord that the faithful man ought to believe "in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic church." Therefore both clerics and laymen ought to rise up steadfastly to defend this article, namely that the holy catholic church was from the beginning of the world, whose triumphant part is the heavenly spirits (as I said above).[14]

Notes

1. Augustine's text placed in the Decretum: Loserth gives *Decret.* C. 32 q. 4 c. 2, the canon *Recurrat nunc animus vester ad Abraham* (Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 11), whose §3 has the mother that bore Abel, Enoch, Noah and Abraham bearing all good Christians (Friedberg). The Chrysostom passage is not identified by Loserth and is untraced. C. *Ipse instituit*: "he" is Christ, the founder named in the religion's title. *Recurrat* is the canon's incipit, by which Wyclif cites it. R. A in the margin at 390.20: *Ecclesia incepit habere nomen ecclesie in novo testamento, sed utique ipsa prius fuit*.
2. At 390.26 B reads *vel fuit*. At 390.28 A and A_1 omit *quia notum est ... fuit ecclesia*; the print is translated. C. *Doctor allegans*: the opponent of 17-a, who cited Augustine's *De vera religione* against Wyclif; Wyclif's point is that Augustine speaks of the thing under another name.
3. Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 142.3 (PL 37, 1846; Loserth: *Opp.* IV.2, p. 1589), paraphrased: Augustine has *Haec autem mulier, antiqua est civitas Dei ... initium habet ab ipso Abel, sicut mala civitas a Cain*; and *De questionibus veteris et novi testamenti* q. 3 (PL 35, 2219; Loserth: *Opp.* III, Appendix, p. 44), reworded by Wyclif (Augustine's text: *ab initio genus est Christianorum*), a work printed among Augustine's and now ascribed to Ambrosiaster (Souter, CSEL 50, q. 3.4, p. 28). C. *Successit per ordinem*: "came down in order", that is, passed in succession from one generation of the elect to the next.
4. B in the margin at 391.17: *Denominacio accidit ecclesie tripliciter*. C. Three namings: from a place ("Roman"), from a created nature ("Christian", from the incarnate Christ), and from the head. Only the last belongs to the church *per se*; and since Christ was head before he was man, the church existed before it was called Christian. *Fuit autem*: continuative *autem*, "and".
5. *Licet* here concedes nothing against Wyclif: the clause adds that the topic from likeness also shows the church existed then, since the Roman church existed before it was Roman. An alternative is to take *licet* as "while" (the sophism being to grant non-existence while the analogy shows existence); the sense is the same.
6. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.32, on Tyconius's second rule, *de Domini corpore bipartito* (PL 34, 82); Augustine's point is the mixed church, so it supports Wyclif only loosely. C. *Aliqua creatura ... membrum*: any creature that is a member; on Wyclif's terms a member is one of the predestinate, who cannot cease to be one (Loserth's side-note adds "except by falling away from him").

7. A in the margin at 392.4: *Ecclesia vocata est sub nomine ecclesie pro tempore veteris testamenti*; B in the margin at 392.6: *Frequenter in lege veteri fit mencio de ecclesia sub nomine ecclesie*. T. At 392.6 B reads *communicus*. At 392.12–13 the manuscripts read *ecclesia*; Loserth corrected to *ecclesie*. S. Psalms in Vulgate numbering; the quotations agree with the Vulgate. C. *Domino allegatus*: cited by the Lord himself in the gospels.
8. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in evangelia* 1.19 (PL 76, 1154–1155; Loserth: *Opp.* I, p. 1510), quoted nearly verbatim. In Gregory the five hours run from Adam to Noah, Noah to Abraham, Abraham to Moses, Moses to the coming of the Lord, and from the coming to the end of the world. T. At 392.20 B reads *que Abel iusto*; at 392.23 B reads *quomodo dunca (sic) ecclesia*. *Quomode* is the print's misprint for *quomodo*, "how". R. A in the margin: *Ecclesia sunt omnes electi qui sunt et palmites in Christo qui est vitis*. G. *Limitat*: "assigns" (glossary: *limitare*).
9. At 393.2 A reads *extensior*. C. *Quam pro hora undecima*: than if it existed only for the eleventh hour, Gregory's age from the incarnation to the end; that is, the church is older than the new testament.
10. At 393.12–13 B reads *presumpsisse*. A in the margin: *Ficcio*. C. *Quod non fuit*: an object clause in apposition to *abbreviare*, "to cut short ... by saying that it was not"; hence the bracket.
11. The "four ages" are Gregory's first four hours, before the incarnation. The etymology (*ecclesia* convocation, *synagoga* congregation) is Augustine's, *Enarr. in Ps.* 81.1 (PL 37:1047: *convocari autem magis est utentium ratione*), taken over by Isidore, *Etym.* VIII.1.7–8; the point is that a convocation, of rational beings called, is prior to a congregation. T. At 393.21 A reads *congregacio fidelium*, and A_1 adds *Iudeorum*.
12. *Illud quod est ... illud quod fuit*: the dilemma is whether the church in the first age is what is now the church or what was then the church. *Adequata ecclesia*: the church taken as a whole and exactly, as it then was. *Cum veris*: "with the truth", or "with those who hold the truth".
13. At 394.4 A reads *Non enim fas*. C. The last clause excludes the view that the church triumphant began only with the risen Christ (or with a saint assumed body and soul) and will be complete only at the resurrection.
14. A in the margin at 394.10: *Conclusio*. S. The Apostles' Creed, *Credo in Spiritum sanctum, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*, where the article on the church follows that on the Spirit. T. *Defendum*, as printed, is a misprint for *defendendum*, "to defend". *Spiritus celestis*: plural, "the heavenly spirits" (*celestis* for *celestes*). C. *Viantibus ... triumphantibus*: the faithful on the road and those already in the homeland.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 390: *incarnacionem*
  - 390: *IV^{a}*
  - 390: *ergo*
  - 390: *allegavi* (alle- here, gavi at top of p.391 with 183b folio mark; main token holds whole word, p.391 pos 0 is superius))
  - 391: *fidem* (italic)
  - 391: *III°*
  - 392: *scripturas*
  - 392: *in*
  - 392: *legalibus*
  - 392: *XXI^{a}*
  - 392: *1* (verse number, short old-style 1)
  - 392: *XIX^{a}*
  - 392: *quomode* (print reads quomode) [NW]
  - 393: *que* (alinea C and 183c folio mark glued)
  - 393: *literalem* (clear e) [NW]
  - 393: *testamenti* (2 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 393: *triumphans*
  - 393: *in*
  - 393: *prima*
  - 394: *defendum* (print reads defendum) [NW]

Part 3: The seven women of Isaiah, and three ways of being Christian

Loserth pp. 394.24–398.26

¶1 394.24–398.1
395.23 *St. Paul's example teaches us that we must enlighten our brethren.*

[394]Unde in De Questionibus veteris et nove legis cap. XLVII°, Augustinus exponens illud Isaie IV°, 1: Apprehendent septem mulieres virum unum in die illa dicentes: Panem nostrum comedemus

Hence in *Of Questions of the Old and New Law*, chapter 47, Augustine, expounding that of Isaiah 4:1, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying: We will eat our own bread, and wear our own

396.9 *The whole body of the blest and their bliss are perfected by mutual aid,*
396.15 *and each through the head is sensible of the help or default of others.*
397.1 *The O. T. Church had faith and hope: Christ brought charity.*
397.26 *Men may be called Christians in three ways;*
398.1 *a) in figure, as the O. T. Saints;*
398.8 *b) in fact, as those who live in the time of grace;*
398.12 *c) in fruit, as all members of the Church after the day of judgment.*
398.17
2. *We said that by our opponent's definition Christ was not a part of the Church.*

et vestimentis nostris operiemur: tantummodo invocetur nomen tuum super nos, aufer obprobrium nostrum, primo dicit quod propheta loquitur de die gracie et muliere septemplici, scilicet ecclesia que est mulier [395] fortis, de qua Prov. XXXI°: Per septem mulieres, inquit, septem ecclesias dico esse significatas que quamvis una sit tamen septiformis dicitur, ut unum corpus septemplici numero constat membrorum: Non solum, inquit, nos sed eciam superni cives ecclesie membra sunt cuius caput est Christus. Sive ergo una sive septem dicantur ecclesie, non discrepat, quia tota universitas ecclesiarum que est septem ecclesie propter septem dona spiritus sancti et simul omnes unum corpus sunt Christi ex quo omnia in celis et in terra habent originem. Unde in hac militante ecclesia omnium ecclesiarum facta est mencio, quia cum huic sacramentum creatoris predicatur, eciam celestibus insinuatur doctrina. Inferioribus enim cum insinuatur necesse est ut audiant et superni. Unde Apostolus Ephesiorum III°: Michi autem omnium sanctorum minimo data est gracia in gentibus evangelizare investigabiles divicias gracie Christi et illuminare omnes, que sit dispensacio sacramenti absconditi a seculis in Deo qui omnia creavit, ut innotescat principibus et potestatibus in celestibus per ecclesiam multiformis sapiencia Dei. Ecce quod iste sanctus apostolus in thabernaculo hoc mortali positus illuminavit cives ierarchie celestis et indubie expurgavit Petrum ac perfecit sanctam matrem ecclesiam, sicut quilibet christianus debet facere et specialiter ierarchia ecclesie militantis. Non enim est distinccio primatuum quoad illud, sed quodcunque membrum ecclesie secundum datum sibi lumen intelligencie tenetur communicare tres actus ierarchicos membris singulis matris sue; sicut enim lux corporalis illuminat intellectum, sic membra Christi viancia [396] illuminant beatos in patria, dum faciunt eos cognoscere noticia in proprio genere fructus lucis. Unde non est credendum quod in triumphante ecclesia remanent sordes peccati purgandi (ut docetur Ephesiorum VI°), sed purgacio est expulsionis sordium continuacio, sic quod intellectus et affectus civium illuminantur et purgantur per obiectivam presentacionem docium suorum concivium. Et ex istis sequitur quod multitudo civium beatorum sicut et plena eorum beatitudo per actus suos coalternos perficitur, ymmo cum verbum sit in medio omnium membrorum suorum omnibus diebus usque ad consummacionem seculi, non dubium quin cives celestes vident in ipso et audiunt quicquid conservi sui faciunt ad edificacionem ecclesie. Sic enim unum membrum corporis sentit iuvamentum et nocumentum alterius virtute sensus capitis. Hec ergo septiplex ecclesia alloquitur sponsum Christum qui est vir, de quo Jeremie

apparel: only let us be called by thy name, take away our reproach," says first that the prophet speaks of the day of grace and of the sevenfold woman, namely the church, which is the valiant woman [395] of whom Proverbs 31 [speaks]: "By the seven women," he says, "I say that seven churches are signified, which, though it is one, is yet called sevenfold, as one body consists of a sevenfold number of members."[1] "Not only we," he says, "but also the citizens above are members of the church, whose head is Christ. Whether therefore the churches are called one or seven, it makes no difference, because the whole totality of the churches, which is seven churches on account of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and all together are one body of Christ, from whom all things in heaven and on earth have their origin. Hence in this militant church mention is made of all the churches, because when the mystery of the creator is preached to it, the teaching is conveyed to the heavenly ones too. For when it is conveyed to the lower, it is necessary that those above hear it too."[2] Hence the Apostle, Ephesians 3: "To me, the least of all the saints, is given grace to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of the grace of Christ, and to enlighten all men, what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God who created all things, that the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the princes and powers in heavenly places through the church."[3] See that this holy apostle, placed in this mortal tabernacle, enlightened the citizens of the heavenly hierarchy, and without doubt purged Peter and perfected holy mother church, as every Christian ought to do, and especially the hierarchy of the church militant. For there is no distinction of primacies as regards that; but every member of the church, according to the light of understanding given to it, is bound to communicate the three hierarchical acts to the several members of its mother; for as bodily light illuminates the understanding, so the members of Christ on the way [396] illuminate the blessed in the homeland, while they make them know, by a knowledge in its own kind, the fruits of light.[4] Hence it is not to be believed that in the triumphant church there remain stains of sin to be purged (as is taught in Ephesians 6); but purgation is the continuation of the expulsion of stains, such that the intellect and affection of the citizens are illuminated and purged by the objective presentation of the dowries of their fellow citizens.[5] And from these it follows that the multitude of the blessed citizens, as also their full blessedness, is perfected by their mutual acts; indeed, since the Word is in the midst of all his members all days, even to the consummation of the world, there is no doubt that the

XXXI°, 22, scribitur quod femina circumdabit virum; ipsum autem apprehendit modo novo in sponsum, quando accepit sacramenta tamquam cartas sue redempcionis in effluxu sanguinis et aque in sui latere dormientis in cruce (ut notat Apostolus Ephes. VI°). Et sic hec septiplex ecclesia ante incarnacionem rogat salvatorem, factum hominem, ut auferat obprobrium sue sterilitatis. Panem, inquiunt, nostrum comedemus, quia in verbis legis que in fidem unius Dei instruunt convivemus, nam Hebreorum X°, 38, scribitur: Iustus ex fide vivit, et vestimentis nostris operiemur, quia ex fide creacionis et spe recreacionis cognoscimur quales sumus. Et isto modo loquitur Apostolus, Galat. III°, 27: Omnes qui in Christo baptizati estis Christum induistis. Membra enim Christi non sunt nuda virtutibus, sed induunt armaturam suam saltem in spe, imitando ipsum imperfecte, si [397]sunt de suo exercitu. Sic ergo panem et vestimenta habuerunt patres veteris testamenti, sed sicut non in solo pane vivit homo (ut dicitur Matthei IV°, 4), sic spes confunderet relinquereturque tota vita obprobriosa et sterilis nisi caritas consummans ut potus et edulium data fuerit per dominum Jesum Christum; aliter enim non deleretur peccatum humani generis, nec procrearetur operacio vitalis digna beatitudine, sed remaneret in singulis viatoribus sempiternum obprobrium ut dampnatis. Aufer, inquiunt, obprobrium nostrum, quia remanebimus perpetuo tamquam abortivi vel colobon, nisi tu dans vestem nupcialem et domicilium fueris incarnatus. Nam victus et vestitus non sufficiunt homini sine ultimo stabili tegumento quod est caritas patrie non excidens, data per dominum Jesum Christum. Invocetur ergo super nos nomen Christi, ut dicamur actualiter christiani. Unde istam deprecacionem dicit Augustinus redundare in ecclesiam triumphantem; quamquam, inquit, spirituales sint et celestes potencie, obprobrio tamen subiacent, si a creatore suo fuerint aliene et nec membra erunt corporis que caput suum non cognoscentes oberrant. Vult dicere quod toti ecclesie beatitudo deficeret nisi Christus merito sue passionis redempcionem hominis consummasset. Sed hic videtur dubium: Si patres veteris testamenti fuerant christiani, et videtur Augustinum in ista sentencia contradicere sibi ipsi. Sed notandum quod homines possunt dici tripliciter christiani, scilicet in figura, in effectu et in fructu. In figura vero dicti sunt omnes sancti legis veteris christiani. Si enim dieta dicitur sana propter sanitatem futuram cuius [398]est effectiva, quanto magis patriarche dicuntur pro suo

heavenly citizens see in him and hear whatever their fellow servants do for the edification of the church. For thus one member of the body feels the help and the harm of another by virtue of the sense of the head.[6] This sevenfold church therefore addresses Christ the bridegroom, who is the man of whom it is written in Jeremiah 31:22 that "a woman shall compass a man"; and she took hold of him in a new way as bridegroom when she received the sacraments as the charters of her redemption, in the outflow of blood and water in the side of him sleeping on the cross (as the Apostle notes, Ephesians 6).[7] And so this sevenfold church before the incarnation asks the saviour, made man, to take away the reproach of her barrenness. "We will eat our own bread," they say, because we shall live together on the words of the law which instruct us in the faith of one God; for in Hebrews 10:38 it is written: "The just liveth by faith"; "and wear our own apparel," because by faith in the creation and hope of the re-creation we are known for what we are. And in this way the Apostle speaks, Galatians 3:27: "All you who have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ." For the members of Christ are not naked of virtues, but put on his armour, at least in hope, imitating him imperfectly, if [397]they are of his army.[8] Thus therefore the fathers of the old testament had bread and clothing; but as "not in bread alone doth man live" (as is said in Matthew 4:4), so hope would be confounded, and the whole of life would be left reproachful and barren, unless consummating charity, as drink and food, had been given through the Lord Jesus Christ; for otherwise the sin of the human race would not be blotted out, nor would a vital activity worthy of blessedness be brought forth, but an everlasting reproach would remain in each wayfarer, as in the damned. "Take away," they say, "our reproach," because we shall remain forever as abortive or maimed, unless you, giving the wedding garment and dwelling, have become incarnate. For food and clothing do not suffice for man without the last stable covering, which is the charity of the homeland that does not fall away, given through the Lord Jesus Christ. Let the name of Christ therefore be called upon us, that we may be called Christians in act.[9] Hence Augustine says that this petition redounds to the church triumphant: "although," he says, "they are spiritual and heavenly powers, they are yet subject to reproach if they are estranged from their creator; and they will not be members of the body who wander astray, not knowing their head." He means that blessedness would be lacking to the whole church unless Christ, by the merit of his passion, had consummated the redemption of man.[10] But here a doubt appears: whether the fathers of the old testament were

Christians; and Augustine seems in this teaching to contradict himself. But it must be noted that men can be called Christians in three ways, namely in figure, in effect and in fruit. In figure, indeed, all the saints of the old law were called Christians. For if a diet is called healthy on account of the future health of which [398]it is productive, how much more are the patriarchs called[11]

¶2 398.2–398.12

[398]tempore christiani, cum Christus eos denominat membra sua? Christus enim manet in eternum secundum naturam divinam et creatus est a principio mundi nedum in causis secundis communibus, sed in materiali essencia singulari; non tamen assumpsit illam ypostatice, antequam assumens animam fuit homo. In actu autem secundum nomen expressum Christi dicebantur tempore gracie populi christiani et talem nominis denominacionem invocant patres legis veteris super illos; quod et habuerunt, antequam ducti sunt cum Christo ad celum. Sed post diem iudicii habebunt

Christians for their time, since Christ names them his members? For Christ abides forever according to the divine nature, and was created from the beginning of the world, not only in the common secondary causes but in the singular material essence; yet he did not assume it hypostatically before he was man, assuming a soul.[12] But in act, by the express name of Christ, the Christian peoples were so called in the time of grace; and the fathers of the old law invoke such a naming upon themselves; which they also had before they were led with Christ to heaven. But after the day of judgement[13]

¶3 398.13–398.16

[398]omnia membra sancte ecclesie nomen christiani in fructu perpetuo. Et patet in parte quod non obstantibus istis declarativis sentenciis remanet prima raciuncula non soluta.

all the members of holy church will have the name of Christian in perpetual fruit. And it is clear in part that, notwithstanding these declaratory teachings, the first little argument remains unsolved.[14]

¶4 398.17–398.26

[398]Secunda responsio ad secundam raciunculam negat consequenciam; sed videtur, si nulla sit ecclesia nisi multitudo christianorum, sed Christus non est christianus, tunc Christus non est pars vel membrum ecclesie. Concedit itaque quod Christus Deus noster est christianus, nec sequitur, inquit, si a Christo dicitur quilibet christianus, quod Christus ille non sit christianus: sic a creatore dicitur quelibet creatura, Christus est creator et sic ab eo dicitur quelibet creatura et tamen ipsemet est creatura, ut ego assero.

The second reply, to the second little argument, denies the inference; but it seems [to hold]: if there is no church except a multitude of Christians, now Christ is not a Christian, then Christ is not a part or member of the church. He therefore grants that Christ our God is a Christian; nor does it follow, he says, if every Christian is named from Christ, that that Christ is not a Christian: so every creature is named from the creator; Christ is the creator, and so every creature is named from him, and yet he himself is a creature, as I assert.[15]

Notes

1. *De questionibus veteris et novi testamenti*, ascribed to Augustine (Loserth: *Quaestiones ex veteri test.* cap. 47, *Opp.* III, Appendix, p. 60; PL 35:2247–48). Isaiah 4:1 as the Vulgate; Proverbs 31:10, the valiant woman. R. A and B in the margin at 394.25–26: *Apprehendent septem mulieres virum de ecclesia intelligitur*. T. At 395.2 the manuscripts read *signa...as*; Loserth corrected to *significatas* from Augustine's text; his correction is translated.
2. We take the quotation to run from *Non solum* to *superni*; *Unde Apostolus* is Wyclif's own. *Tota universitas ... et simul omnes unum corpus sunt*: the sentence changes construction midway (the singular subject takes a plural verb with *omnes*); translated as it stands. R. A in the margin: *Que sunt septem ecclesie designate per septem mulieres et que sunt septem membra quibus corpus constituitur*.
3. Ephesians 3:8–10. Wyclif omits *hec* ("this grace"), adds *gracie* ("of the grace of Christ") and reads *principibus*, "princes", for the Vulgate's *principatibus*, "principalities"; his Latin is translated.

4. ***Expurgavit Petrum***: Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch (Galatians 2:11–14). The three hierarchical acts are purging, illuminating and perfecting, the Dionysian triad of *The Celestial Hierarchy* 3.2 (PL 122:1045B). ***Fructus lucis***: Ephesians 5:9, "the fruit of the light". R. A in the margin at 395.31: ***Sicut enim lux corporalis illuminat intellectum, sic membra Christi viancia illuminant beatos in patria***; B: ***Viatores illuminant beatos in patria***. G. ***Viancia***: "on the way" (glossary: ***viare; vians***).
5. "Ephesians 6" is Wyclif's reference; the church "not having spot or wrinkle" is Ephesians 5:27 in the Clementine numbering. C. ***Docium*** is taken as ***dotium***, the "dowries" (***dotes***) of the blessed, the gifts of glory; "of the learned" (***doctium***) would also construe, less well.
6. At 396.9 B omits ***Et***. S. ***Omnibus diebus usque ad consummacionem seculi***: Matthew 28:20, joined to the Word "in the midst" of his members. C. ***Coalternos***: "mutual", acts given and received among the citizens.
7. At 396.19 the manuscripts read ***Jer. XXI***; Loserth corrected to ***XXXI***; his correction is translated. S. The blood and water: John 19:34. "Ephesians 6" is Wyclif's reference; the church as bride is Ephesians 5:25–32. C. ***Cartas***: "charters", the legal deeds of her redemption; the sleeping Christ answers to Adam, from whose side Eve was taken.
8. Hebrews 10:38: Wyclif reads ***Iustus ex fide vivit*** for the Vulgate's ***Iustus autem meus ex fide vivit*** (DR "But my just man liveth by faith"); Galatians 3:27: ***Omnes qui*** for ***Quicumque enim*** (DR "For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ"). His Latin is translated in both. G. ***Ex fide*** is here governed by the verb ("liveth by faith"; "by faith in the creation"), not the formula. C. ***Convivemus***: "we shall live together on", from ***convivere***; ***in fidem***: "in the faith".
9. A in the margin at 397.11: ***Passio Christi perfecit nos et omnia***. C. ***Colobon***: Greek κολοβόν, "maimed, cut short". ***Caritas patrie non excidens***: 1 Corinthians 13:8, "Charity never falleth away". ***Actualiter***: "in act", the second of the three ways named below.
10. The same work of Pseudo-Augustine, cap. 47 (Loserth: ***l. c.***). R. A in the margin at 397.18: ***Augustinus***. C. ***Que ... oberrant***: the feminine relative agrees with ***potencie***.
11. A and B in the margin at 397.26: ***Dubium***; A at 397.29: ***Nota quod homines dicuntur tripliciter christiani***. C. ***Si ... fuerant***: indirect question, "whether". The diet is the stock example of an analogical name: called healthy as productive of health.
12. B in the margin at 398.4: ***Christus fuit creatus a principio mundi***. C. Christ's body was "created" from the beginning in its matter, but united hypostatically only at the incarnation.
13. At 398.9 B reads ***docebantur***. C. ***Super illos***: literally "upon them"; taken as reflexive, after Isaiah's ***super nos***. ***Ducti sunt cum Christo ad celum***: at the ascension. R. A in the margin: ***Utrum patres veteris testamenti fuerant christiani***.
14. ***Prima raciuncula***: the first of the opponent's arguments set out at the head of the chapter (17-a); Wyclif judges it unanswered by the doctor's own glosses.
15. A in the margin at 398.17: ***Secunda responsio***; at 398.31: ***Cristus non est cristianus***. S. Loserth compares p. 112.30. C. ***Sed videtur ... sed Christus non est christianus***: the first ***sed*** introduces the argument the reply must meet, the second its minor premiss. ***Ut ego assero*** is the doctor's own first person.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 394: ***I*** (print: Isaie IV°, 1: Appre-; short old-style 1, main lacks it)
  - 395: ***fortis*** (alinea E and 183d folio mark glued)
  - 395: ***intelligencie*** (30 is the line number) [NW]
  - 396: ***beatorum*** (alinea F glued)
  - 396: ***perficitur***
  - 396: ***iuvamentum*** (print reads iuvamentum) [NW]
  - 396: ***Christum***
  - 397: ***sunt*** (alinea F and 184a folio mark glued)
  - 397: ***fuerant***
  - 398: ***suo*** (print: pro / suo tempore christiani; main lacks suo)
  - 398: ***populi*** [NW]
  - 398: ∅ (that is the English side-note (We said that))
  - 395: ***III°*** (italic, degree sign) [-MARK]

Part 4: Christ is not a Christian

Loserth pp. 398.27–402.24

¶1 398.27–400.14
398.27 *He tries to prove that Christ is a christian,* 399.4 *but by a parallel which does not hold.* 400.15 *The doctor gives three reasons why Christ was a christian,*

[398]Hic primo notandum quod, si locus a simili (quantumcunque fuerit similitudo insufficiens) valeat ad probandum intentum, periret omnis consequencia et foret omne signabile concedendum, eo quod omnes creature sunt similiores ad invicem, quam natura divina est similis nature create. Ideo necesse est [399]arguentem vel respondentem per locum a simili docere sufficienciam similitudinis

Here it must first be noted that, if the topic from likeness (however insufficient the likeness may be) availed to prove what is intended, every inference would perish and everything signifiable would have to be granted, since all creatures are more like one another than the divine nature is like created nature. Therefore it is necessary [399]for one arguing

400.24 *none of which are valid.*

quantum attinet ad propositum. Secundo notandum quod Christus est simul creator et creatura, nec posset esse ista nisi esset simul duarum naturarum utraque, sic quod secundum naturam divinam est creator et secundum humanitatem est creatura; correspondenter ad propositum, si ipse simul esset Christus et christianus, tunc essent due nature, secundum quarum unam esset Cristus et secundum aliam christianus, sed nec secundum deitatem est Christus pars ecclesie; cum secundum illam non potest parcialiter quicquam componere, nec secundum humanitatem est ipse christianus sed caput omnium christianorum dicente Augustino super Johannem, Sermone CXXIII°, quod super petram que erat Christus fundata est ecclesia; a qua petra Petrus figurans ecclesiam nomen accepit: Non enim a Petro petra sed Petrus a petra, sicut non Christus a christiano sed christianus a Christo vocatur. Sed modo secundum istam ficticiam a christiano et Petro eque dicitur Christus, sicut econtra, cum verbum Dei sit christianus, ut false fingitur. Ulterius declaratur tam per grammaticos quam doctores ex testimonio scripture quod multi erant Christi in veteri testamento, quia reges, sacerdotes et prophete qui crismate erant uncti. Illud autem gratanter accepto cum modificacione tamen quod intelligatur de unccione spirituali qua anima ungitur gracia predestinacionis; solum enim membrum Christi unitum gracia predestinacionis et omne huiusmodi est proprie christianus. Non enim unccio corporalis [400] facit per se christianum, eo quod tunc utraque barba Aaron scilicet superior et inferior foret cum suis partibus christianus. Nec sequitur quod Jesus Christus sit christianus, licet Deus unxit illum oleo leticie pre consortibus suis (ut dicitur Psalmo XLIV°, 8), quia non est membrum Christi, sed caput tocius ecclesie. Unde vere dicitur quod Christus est nomen appellativum, autonomatice conveniens Jesu nostro; ideo propter illam spiritualem unccionem derivatam a Jesu nostro dicimur Christiani et non Jesuani. Omnes enim convenimus cum eo in unccione secundum graciam predestinacionis a qua veste dicimur christiani, non autem sumus sic Christo conformiter salvatores, ideo non dicimur Jesuani.

or answering by the topic from likeness to show the sufficiency of the likeness as far as concerns the matter in hand.[1] Second, it must be noted that Christ is at once creator and creature, nor could he be these unless he were at once of both natures, so that according to the divine nature he is creator and according to the humanity he is creature. Correspondingly to the matter in hand: if he were at once Christ and Christian, then there would be two natures, according to one of which he would be Christ and according to the other Christian; but neither according to the Godhead is Christ part of the church, since according to it he cannot compose anything as a part; nor according to the humanity is he a Christian, but head of all Christians,[2] as Augustine says on John, Sermon 123, that upon the rock which was Christ the church is founded, from which rock Peter, figuring the church, took his name: "For not from Peter the rock, but Peter from the rock; as not Christ from the Christian, but the Christian is called from Christ."[3] But now, according to this fiction, Christ is named from the Christian and from Peter equally as conversely, since the Word of God is a Christian, as is falsely feigned. Further, it is declared as well by grammarians as by doctors, from the testimony of scripture, that there were many christs in the old testament, namely kings, priests and prophets, who were anointed with chrism. And that I gladly accept, with this qualification however: that it be understood of the spiritual anointing by which the soul is anointed with the grace of predestination; for only a member of Christ united by the grace of predestination, and every such, is properly a Christian.[4] For bodily anointing [400] does not of itself make a Christian, since then both beards of Aaron, namely the upper and the lower, would with their parts be a Christian. Nor does it follow that Jesus Christ is a Christian, although God anointed him "with the oil of gladness above his fellows" (as is said in Psalm 44:8), because he is not a member of Christ but head of the whole church.[5] Hence it is truly said that "Christ" is an appellative name, belonging by antonomasia to our Jesus; therefore on account of that spiritual anointing derived from our Jesus we are called Christians and not Jesuans. For we all agree with him in the anointing according to the grace of predestination, from which garment we are called Christians; but we are not in that way saviours in conformity with Christ, therefore we are not called Jesuans.[6]

¶2 400.15–400.23

[400] Arguit tamen doctor tripliciter quod dominus Jesus Christus fuit vere christianus. Primo quia christianus dicitur quasi crismate unctus; quod spiritualiter automatice sibi competit. Secundo per

Yet the doctor argues in three ways that the Lord Jesus Christ was truly a Christian. First, because "Christian" is said as if "anointed with chrism", which belongs to him spiritually by antonomasia. Second, by this, that

hoc quod christianus dicitur quasi observans legem Christi, quod iterum Jesu nostro summe competit; et tercio per hoc quod Remus et Romulus dicuntur Romani, Israel Israelita, et Arrius Arrianus; quare ergo non dicetur Jesus, principium nostre secte vel generis, christianus?

"Christian" is said as if "one observing the law of Christ", which again belongs supremely to our Jesus; and third, by this, that Remus and Romulus are called Romans, Israel an Israelite, and Arius an Arian: why then shall not Jesus, the beginning of our sect or race, be called a Christian?[7]

¶3 400.24–402.4
402.5 *Our opponent contradicts himself;*

[400]Ad primum patet quod non plus sequitur quam si lapis dicitur quasi ledens pedem, et gladius ledit pedem, ergo gladius ille est lapis: Non enim omnis interpretacio est diffinicio. Et per hoc tollitur secunda argucia; nam tota trinitas et angeli, ymmo quelibet substancia creata observat legem Christi, et tamen non pocius quam apostema unctum crismate prescitus dicitur christianus. Quoad tercium dicitur quod, admisso [401]isto triplici assumpto, quod tamen non probatur, non exinde sequitur per locum a simili quod Jesus principium secte nostre sit christianus, quia in dictis generibus fuit unum principium ante predictos, sed non potest esse homo prior dignitate prius principians genus nostrum, quam fuit dominus Jesus Christus; nam fuit ante Jacob unus vir clarius videns Deum, fuit ante Romulum unus homo principium generis Romanorum, et fuit ante Arrium unus heresiarcha qui pertinaciter asseruit Jesum nostrum fuisse solummodo creaturam, ut patet de dyabolo et principibus sacerdotum. Sed fundamentum aliud ecclesie vel generis christiani nemo potest ponere preter id quod positum est Christus Jesus. Ideo secundum Augustinum super Johannem, Omelia ultima, non a christiano dicitur Christus sed econtra; aliquid enim oportet nomen christiani addere super Christum, sicut oportet residuum domus presupponere fundamentum. Unde (si non fallor) non habetur testimonium a sanctis doctoribus quod Jesus Christus fuerat christianus. Non enim sequitur hoc ex sensu Crisostomi, Omelia LII[a] Operis Imperfecti, dicentis quod ex hoc dicitur aliquis christianus, quod servat iusticiam, nam intencio sua est dicere quod solum membrum Christi, sive militans sive triumphans, est proprie christianus; aliter enim diceret quod trinitas et omne membrum dyaboli, ymmo quelibet creatura foret christianus, cum omne tale modo suo servat iusticiam. Nam de qualibet creatura iustum est quod se habeat ut Deus ipsam decreverit se habere. Nec sequitur: Porphirius dicit quod genus quandoque sumitur pro generacionis [402]principio et quandoque pro ipsa generacione, ergo Christus Deus noster est christianus. Sed colorate infertur quod Jesus Christus noster sit genus christianorum, quia illius generacionis principium.

To the first it is clear that it follows no more than if "stone" (*lapis*) is said as if "hurting the foot" (*ledens pedem*), and a sword hurts the foot, therefore that sword is a stone: for not every interpretation is a definition.[8] And by this the second quibble is removed; for the whole Trinity and the angels, indeed every created substance, observes the law of Christ, and yet is no more called a Christian than one foreknown, an abscess anointed with chrism, is called a Christian.[9] As to the third, the answer is that, granting [401]this threefold assumption, which however is not proved, it does not follow from it by the topic from likeness that Jesus, the beginning of our sect, is a Christian; because in the said races there was one beginning before those named, but there cannot be a man prior in dignity, beginning our race earlier, than was the Lord Jesus Christ. For there was before Jacob one man seeing God more clearly; there was before Romulus one man who was the beginning of the race of the Romans; and there was before Arius one heresiarch who pertinaciously asserted that our Jesus was only a creature, as is clear of the devil and of the chief priests.[10] But other foundation of the church or of the Christian race no man can lay, but that which is laid: Christ Jesus. Therefore, according to Augustine on John, the last homily, Christ is not named from the Christian but conversely; for the name of Christian must add something over Christ, as the rest of a house must presuppose the foundation.[11] Hence (if I am not mistaken) no testimony is had from the holy doctors that Jesus Christ was a Christian. For this does not follow from the sense of Chrysostom, Homily 52 of the *Unfinished Work*, saying that someone is called a Christian from this, that he keeps justice; for his intention is to say that only a member of Christ, whether militant or triumphant, is properly a Christian; for otherwise he would say that the Trinity and every member of the devil, indeed every creature, would be a Christian, since every such thing keeps justice in its own way. For of every creature it is just that it should be as God has decreed it to be.[12] Nor does it follow: Porphyry says that genus is sometimes taken for the beginning [402]of generation and sometimes for the generation itself, therefore Christ our

God is a Christian. But it is inferred with colour that our Jesus Christ is the genus of Christians, because [he is] the beginning of that generation.[13]

¶4 402.5–402.24

[402] Sed finaliter colligitur ex dictis quomodo ista sentencia obviat sibi ipsi. Nam respondendo ad primum articulum dicitur conclusionaliter quod vel ante incarnacionem erat ecclesia catholica, et adiungitur una alia conclusio gloriosa, scilicet quod ista ecclesia que incepit in morte Christi per effluxum sanguinis et aque a corpore eius diu fuit ante incarnacionem Christi, sed nunquam ante dictam incarnacionem fuit ipsa ecclesia, sed synagoga. Mirantur logici quo sensu diceretur ista conclusio tamquam logica, cum ista ecclesia cepit esse, antequam fuit synagoga, et per consequens, antequam fuit ecclesia. Ista ergo ecclesia non cepit hora mortis Christi, cum ante incarnacionem fuit synagoga; nec potest hoc pertinenter verificari de aggregato ex talibus personis et forma a qua denominatur ecclesia, quia illud nec fuit ante incarnacionem nec fuit synagoga nec incepit per dictum effluxum, cum pro tunc secundum istam opinionem non fuit Christus, eo quod ex fide scripture Johannis XX° Christus tunc fuit mortuus.

But finally it is gathered from what has been said how this teaching goes against itself. For in replying to the first article it is said by way of conclusion: "or else before the incarnation there was a catholic church"; and another glorious conclusion is joined to it, namely that this church which began in the death of Christ, through the outflow of blood and water from his body, existed long before the incarnation of Christ, but never before the said incarnation was it the church, but the synagogue.[14] Logicians wonder in what sense this conclusion would be called logical, since this church began to be before it was the synagogue and, consequently, before it was the church. This church therefore did not begin at the hour of Christ's death, since before the incarnation it was the synagogue; nor can this be verified pertinently of the aggregate of such persons and the form from which it is named church, because that neither existed before the incarnation, nor was the synagogue, nor began through the said outflow, since at that time, according to this opinion, Christ was not, because, from the faith of scripture, John 20, Christ was then dead.[15]

Notes

1. ***Omne signabile***: whatever can be signified, every proposition whatever; if any likeness sufficed, anything could be proved of anything. ***Intentum***: the conclusion one maintains. T. At 399.1–2 B reads ***simili dicere*** for ***simili docere***.
2. At 399.12 B reads ***Christus vel pars*** and ***ut secundum***. C. The parallel the doctor drew (17-c ¶4): as Christ is at once creator and creature, so at once Christ and Christian. Wyclif answers that creator and creature answer to two natures, but there is no nature by which Christ would be a Christian: not the Godhead, which cannot be a part, nor the humanity, by which he is head.
3. Wyclif cites "on John, Sermon 123"; Loserth notes that the manuscripts give ***serm. CXXIII***, and refers it to Sermon 270 (***alias*** 13; ***Opp.*** V.1, p. 415). The words ***Non enim a Petro petra ... a Christo vocatur*** stand in Augustine's ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 124.5 (PL 35; verbatim), the "last homily" cited at 401.15. ***Petra erat Christus***: 1 Corinthians 10:4. R. A in the margin at 399.15: ***Augustinus***.
4. B in the margin at 399.24: ***Nota quod solum predestinatus est proprie christianus***; at 399.26: ***Nota proprie christianus***; A at 399.31 as B at 399.24. T. At 399.27 B omits ***modificacione*** and ***tamen***. S. "Grammarians": the derivation of ***Christus*** from ***chrisma***, as in Isidore, ***Etymologiae*** 7.2.2: ***Christus namque a chrismate est appellatus***. C. ***Ficticia***: the doctor's feigned ground that the Word is a Christian; on it, Christ would be named from the Christian as much as the reverse.
5. The beard of Aaron: Psalm 132:2. Psalm 44:8, where Wyclif puts the Vulgate's second person (***unxit te***) in the third (***unxit illum***). T. At 400.4 B reads ***unxerit***. C. ***Utraque barba ... superior et inferior***: the upper and lower beard, moustache and chin; ***cum suis partibus***, every hair of it.
6. At 400.8 the manuscripts read ***autonomastice***; Loserth prints ***autonomatice***. R. A and B in the margin at 400.7: ***Christus est nomen appellacionem*** (sic); B at 400.10: ***Nota bene quare dicuntur Christiani et non Jesuani***. C. "Jesus" names the saviour, "Christ" the anointed: the members share his anointing, not his saving office. ***A qua veste***: the anointing figured as a garment, as with the apparel of Isaiah 4:1 in 17-c.
7. ***Automatice***, as printed (read on the plate), is taken as the print's form of ***autonomatice***, "by antonomasia" (400.8); "automatically" makes no sense here. T. At 400.20 B reads ***summo competit***. C. ***Quasi***: the etymological "as if", which ¶3 calls an interpretation, not a definition.
8. ***Lapis quasi ledens pedem***: the etymology in Isidore, ***Etymologiae*** 16.3.1: ***Lapis autem dictus, quod laedat pedem***. R. A and B in the margin at 400.26: ***Triplex responsio***; B: ***Christus non est christianus***; A at 400.31: ***Arguitur quod Christus sit christianus et solvitur***.
9. B in the margin: ***Prescitus non est christianus***. G. ***Prescitus***: one God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). C. ***Non pocius quam***: "no more than": a foreknown man anointed with chrism is an abscess anointed, and no Christian.

10. ***Vir videns Deum*: the interpretation of the name Israel in Jerome, *De nominibus hebraicis*; before Jacob there was a man who saw God more clearly. The "heresiarch" before Arius is the devil, with the chief priests who held Jesus a mere man. Each of the doctor's examples thus has a beginning before the eponym; Christ has none before him.**
11. 1 Corinthians 3:11: Wyclif adds *ecclesie vel generis christiani* and omits *quod est* before *Christus Jesus*; his Latin is translated. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 124 (Loserth: *In Joh. Ev.* cap. 21, *Tract.* CXXIV, *Opp.* III.2, p. 822). T. At 401.18–20 B omits *Unde ... fuerat christianus*. R. A in the margin at 401.14: *Augustinus*.
12. *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 52 (Loserth: p. CCXVIII), printed among Chrysostom's works (PG 56:611–946) and not his: an Arian work of the fifth century. R. A in the margin at 401.21: *Crisostomus*; at 401.25: *Qui est proprie christianus*. C. *Servat iusticiam*: every creature "keeps justice" in that it is as God decreed; so the definition, taken at large, would make every creature Christian.
13. Porphyry, *Isagoge* 2, on the senses of *genus*: the collection related to one origin, and the principle of each one's generation (Boethius' translation, PL 64:88C). C. *Genus* is race, kind and logical genus at once: Christ may be called the *genus* (origin) of Christians, as Porphyry's second sense (the principle of generation) allows, but not therefore a Christian. *Colorate*: "with colour", with a plausible ground (glossary: *color*), the inference being sound as far as it goes. T. At 402.3 B omits *Jesus*.
14. A in the margin at 402.5: *Nota quando incepit ecclesia. Prima responsio*. C. *Vel ante incarnacionem*: the doctor's alternative reply quoted at 388.11 (17-a). *Gloriosa* is ironic. *Obviat sibi ipsi*: "goes against itself" (Loserth's side-note: "contradicts himself").
15. The argument: if the church began at the cross yet existed before as synagogue, then its beginning to be preceded its being synagogue and church, so the cross cannot be its beginning; nor can the "church" be the aggregate of the persons plus the form that names them church, for that aggregate began at no outflow, since on the doctor's own opinion (only what is in the present instant is) Christ, then dead, was not. S. "John 20" is Wyclif's reference; the death and the outflow are John 19:33–34.
How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **400: *automatice* (auto- here, matice next line; main token holds whole word)**
  - **400: *admisso* (ad- here, misso at top of p.401 with 184c folio mark; main token holds whole word, p.401 pos 0 is isto)**
  - **401: *Christus***
  - **401: *Christum***
  - **401: *Christus***
  - **401: *LII*[a]**
  - **401: *Christi***
  - **402: *Christi***
  - **402: *per* (15 is the line number)**
  - **400: ∅ (second half of christi-anus; neighbour 128 already christianus) [DELX]**

Part 5: Christians before the incarnation, and one faith in many believers

Loserth pp. 402.25–406.33

¶1 402.25–404.26
402.25 *and according to his definition there were Christians before the Incarnation.*
403.10 *Other absurd conclusions.*
403.25 *Application of his definition to the three days;*
404.6 *during which time, it leads us to believe, the Church ceased to exist.*
404.27
3. We are accused of attacking mere faults of expression;

[402]**Item, iuxta hec dicta sacerdotes, prophete et reges legis veteris erant Christi ut Israel, Aaron, David, et per consequens, Israelite, Aaronite et domus David fuerant christiani, quia discipuli Christi servantes iusticiam, et ita secundum omnem descripcionem quam doctor dat de christiano, sequitur quod ante incarnacionem fuerant christiani. Et in confirmacionem illius sic scribit mihi: Qui, inquit, observant legem Christi omnes dicuntur christiani, prout notat beatus Augustinus, Epistola XLII[a], [403]allegans Apostolum Romanorum XI[a] dicentem quod non omnes qui ex Israel sunt sunt Israelite; pocius, inquit Augustinus, christiani sunt non qui secundum Ismael filii sunt carnis, sed secundum Isaac filii sunt promissionis ad spirituale ministerium pertinentes. Ex isto processu Augustini bene notato sequitur quod patres veteris testamenti fuerant christiani et membra ecclesie; quod negatur. Omnes, inquit, viventes secundum legem Christi sunt filii Abrahe et veri christiani.**

Again, according to these sayings the priests, prophets and kings of the old law were christs, as Israel, Aaron, David; and consequently the Israelites, the Aaronites and the house of David had been Christians, because [they were] disciples of Christ keeping justice; and so, according to every definition which the doctor gives of a Christian, it follows that before the incarnation there had been Christians.[1] And in confirmation of this he writes to me thus: "All who keep the law of Christ," he says, "are called Christians, as blessed Augustine notes, Letter 42, [403]alleging the Apostle, Romans 11, who says that not all who are of Israel are Israelites. Rather," says Augustine, "those are Christians who are sons of the flesh not according to Ishmael, but sons of the promise according to Isaac, belonging to the spiritual ministry."[2] From this argument of Augustine, well noted, it follows that the fathers of the old testament had been

Ex qua conclusione patet quod per tempus veteris testamenti fuerant christiani, vel secundo quod modo nulli sunt filii Abrahe, vel quod in sancto triduo beata virgo non fuerat christiana, quia tunc non fuit ita quod ipsa observat legem Christi, cum tunc fuit ita quod non est Christus. Unde finaliter videtur inconsequenter dictum quod fuit ecclesia catholica cuius beata virgo fuit pars pro triduo mortis Christi, primo quia, posito quod loquamur pro illo triduo, ex tibi dubio sola virgo est persona fidelis superstes, et cum ipsa non sit christiana ex tibi dubio, non est multitudo omnium christianorum. Similiter, per totam vitam Christi corpoream ante mortem non fiebat ecclesia (ut dicitur), quia solum pro tempore fluxus sanguinis et aque de suo latere, quod fuit post mortem Christi. Similiter, posito quod loquamur pro dicto triduo et arguamus a diffinicione ad diffinitum: Omnis ecclesia catholica est universalis multitudo omnium christianorum habencium ex integro rectam et eandem fidem, per Christum et suos apostolos promulgatam et postea a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declaratam, sed nunc est ecclesia catholica cuius mater domini est pars, ergo nunc est universalis multitudo omnium christianorum, habencium ex integro rectam et eandem fidem per Christum et suos apostolos [404]promulgatam et postea a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declaratam; consequens falsum pro dicto triduo, ergo antecedens. Sed minor fuit tunc vera ut datur; ergo cum tunc fuit dicta consequencia, ut suppono, relinquitur quod tunc fuit maior falsa, que est descripcio universalis ecclesie, ut fingitur perpetuo permansura. Quod autem consequens fuit tunc falsum, patet quia dato per impossibile quod tunc fuit multitudo omnium christianorum habencium ex integro rectam et eandem fidem per Christum et suos apostolos promulgatam, adhuc non fuit tunc verum quod illa fides sit postea a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declarata. Sequitur enim illa fides a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declarata; ergo nec post nec ante nec unquam est a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declarata; si (inquam) sufficeret quod fides illa erit a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declarata tunc sequitur cum veris quod diu ante mortem Christi fuit ecclesia catholica; quod negatur. Sed male, cum tunc fuit christiana religio, eo quod tunc fuit abbas secundum regulam apostolicam, regens suum capitulum de electis apostolis. Ipsi enim observarunt tunc melius quam nos facimus religionem christianam, et ex nomine talis religionis dicto primo Retractacionum, capitulo XXII°, infertur vere res et nomen ecclesie.

Christians and members of the church; which is denied. "All," he says, "who live according to the law of Christ are sons of Abraham and true Christians." From which conclusion it is clear that through the time of the old testament there had been Christians; or, second, that now none are sons of Abraham; or that in the holy three days the blessed Virgin had not been a Christian, because it was not then so that she keeps the law of Christ, since it was then so that Christ is not.[3] Hence, finally, it seems inconsistently said that there was a catholic church of which the blessed Virgin was part for the three days of Christ's death. First, because, supposing that we speak for that triduum, on your own doubt the Virgin alone is the faithful person surviving; and since on your own doubt she is not a Christian, there is no multitude of all Christians.[4] Likewise, through the whole bodily life of Christ before his death the church was not coming to be (as is said), because [it came to be] only for the time of the flowing of blood and water from his side, which was after the death of Christ. Likewise, supposing that we speak for the said triduum, and argue from the definition to the thing defined: Every catholic church is the universal multitude of all Christians having wholly the right and same faith, promulgated by Christ and his apostles and afterwards declared by the holy fathers in general councils; now there is at this time a catholic church of which the mother of the Lord is part; therefore there is at this time the universal multitude of all Christians having wholly the right and same faith, promulgated by Christ and his apostles [404]and afterwards declared by the holy fathers in general councils. The consequent is false for the said triduum; therefore [so is] the antecedent.[5] Now the minor was then true, as is granted; therefore, since the said inference then held, as I suppose, it remains that the major was then false, which is the definition of the universal church, feigned to be going to remain for ever. And that the consequent was then false is clear, because, granted *per impossibile* that there was then a multitude of all Christians having wholly the right and same faith promulgated by Christ and his apostles, still it was not then true that that faith is afterwards declared by the holy fathers in general councils. For it follows: that faith [is not] declared by the holy fathers in general councils; therefore neither after nor before nor ever is it declared by the holy fathers in general councils.[6] If (I say) it sufficed that that faith will be declared by the holy fathers in general councils, then it follows, with true [premisses], that long before the death of Christ there was a catholic church; which is denied. But wrongly, since there was then the Christian religion, in that there was then an abbot according to the

¶2 404.27–406.11
405.1 *but our opponent's error is serious,*
405.15 *since he confuses faith with the thing believed.*
406.12 *The terms "genus" and "species" are not applicable to faith.*
406.25 *The subject in which faith exists is the body of the Church.*

[404] In tercio argumento fert doctor graviter quod dixi descripcionis sue particulas congregatas inculte. Fateor, inquit, quod inculte, sed malo inculto sermone et absque dictamine scribere veritates quam sub fuco verborum politorum tradere falsitates. Sed constat quod descripcio data est rethorica et diffusa, [405] nec solum falsitatem implicans sed errorem contrarium fidei christiane; et revera descripcionem sic diffusam et falsam non excusat color rethoricus quin sit a catholicis condempnata; descripcio autem ecclesie catholice est condicionis opposite, dum recte breviter et plane dicitur quod ecclesia catholica est universitas predestinatorum. Sed quoad materiam argumenti dicitur quod ubique assumit falsum incomprobatum, cum aliquam unam fidem qua creditur habent omnes christiani. Unam, inquit, tam genere quam specie sed non numero (ut allegatur de Augustino XIII° De Trinitate VI° et VII°), et eadem est fides que creditur aput omnes. Et placet de ista responsione: exhinc enim feci argumentum ad hominem, quia credidi doctorem posuisse ut olim quod non fuisset species vel aliquod universale nisi terminus vel conceptus; non quia credidi hoc esse verum, cum scio ex fide scripture quod una est fides que creditur, et fides qua creditur in quolibet christiano; aliter enim impertinenter diceret Apostolus Ephes. IV°, 5. Unus dominus, una fides. Et illud expresse dicit Augustinus XIII° De Trinitate, II° cap° X. Fides (inquam), scilicet que creditur, communis est sicut dici potest omnibus hominibus facies humana communis; nam hoc ita dicitur, ut tamen singuli suas habeant. Ex una sane doctrina impressam fidem credencium cordibus singulorum qui hoc idem credunt, verissime dicimus; sed aliud sunt ea que creduntur, aliud fides qua creduntur. Illa quippe in rebus sunt que vel esse vel fuisse vel futura esse dicuntur, hec autem in animo credentis est, ei tantum conspicua cuius est, quamvis sit in [406] aliis non ipsa sed similis. Non enim una est numero sed genere propter similitudinem, tamen et nullam diversitatem magis unam dicimus esse quam multas. Nam duos homines simillimos cum videmus, unam faciem habere dicimus, facilius itaque dicitur multas animas fuisse singulas utique singulorum, de quibus legitur in actibus Apostolorum quod eis fuerit anima una, quoniam, ubi dixit Apostolus: Una fides, tot eas quisquam audet dicere quot fideles. Et tamen qui dixit: O

apostolic rule, ruling his chapter of chosen apostles. For they then kept the Christian religion better than we do; and from the name of such a religion, spoken of in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 22, the thing and the name of the church are truly inferred.[7]

In the third argument the doctor takes it hard that I said the parts of his definition were gathered together uncouthly.[8] "I confess," he says, "that [they were gathered] uncouthly; but I prefer to write truths in uncouth speech and without the art of composition, than to hand down falsehoods under the paint of polished words." But it is evident that the definition given is rhetorical and diffuse, [405] implying not only falsehood but an error contrary to the Christian faith; and in truth rhetorical colour does not excuse a definition so diffuse and false from being condemned by catholics.[9] But the definition of the catholic church is of the opposite condition, when it is said rightly, briefly and plainly that the catholic church is the whole body of the predestinate. But as to the matter of the argument, it is said that everywhere it assumes a falsehood unproved, since [it takes it that] all Christians have some one faith by which it is believed. "One," he says, "in genus as well as in species, but not in number (as is alleged from Augustine, *On the Trinity* 13, [chapters] 6 and 7); and the faith which is believed is the same among all."[10] And I am pleased with this reply; for from this I made an argument to the man, because I believed that the doctor had held, as once he did, that there was no species or any universal except a term or a concept; not because I believed this to be true, since I know from the faith of scripture that one is the faith which is believed, and [one] the faith by which it is believed in every Christian; for otherwise the Apostle would say irrelevantly, Ephesians 4:5: "One Lord, one faith."[11] And Augustine says this expressly, *On the Trinity* 13, chapter 2: "Faith (I say), namely that which is believed, is common, as the human face can be said to be common to all men; for this is so said that yet each has his own. We say most truly that from one doctrine faith is impressed on the hearts of each of the believers who believe this same thing; but the things which are believed are one thing, the faith by which they are believed another. For those are in things which are said either to be or to have been or to be going to be; but this is in the mind of the believer, visible only to him whose it is, although it is in [406] others, not itself but like it.[12] For it is one not in number but in genus; yet because of the likeness and the absence of any difference we say that it is one rather than many.[13] For when we see two men very alike, we say that they

mulier magna est fides tua, et alteri: Modice fidei quare dubitasti? suam cuique esse signat.

have one face. So it is more easily said that there were many souls, each surely the soul of each, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles that they had one soul, than that anyone dare say, where the Apostle said 'one faith', that there are as many [faiths] as faithful.[14] And yet he who said, 'O woman, great is thy faith', and to another, 'O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?', signifies that each has his own."[15]

¶3 406.12–406.33

[406] Ex istis notare potest logicus quod Augustinus loquitur de fide que est multitudo habituum credendi ab uno principio infusorum et nec de genere nec de specie logico, quia illud universale non recipit predicaciones huiusmodi peregrinas; nam ad species tales accidencium non est motus, sed ad partes quantitativas generis quod est multitudo dissimilium qualitatum sed nulla earum. Patet secundo quod fides que creditur est veritas de presenti, de preterito vel futuro et non subiective in credente, et per consequens, omnia que fuerunt vel erunt sunt pro suo tempore; aliter enim non diceret Augustinus quod ea que creduntur sunt in rebus sicut articuli preteriti et futuri. Et gaudeo tercio quod magistra et mater nostra scriptura habet testes conformes sanctis doctoribus, eius eminenciam attestantes, sic tamen quod dicant consequenter illam unam fidem habere unum subiectum quod est corpus ecclesie, et tunc oportet dicere quod illud corpus dispergitur inter patres veteris testamenti tam Hebreos quam gentiles et non artare ipsum ad tempus post mortem Christi et gentem vulgari nomine christianam.

From these things the logician can note that Augustine speaks of faith which is a multitude of habits of believing infused from one principle, and not of a logical genus or species, because that universal does not receive foreign predications of this kind; for there is no motion to such species of accidents, but to the quantitative parts of the genus, which is a multitude of unlike qualities but none of them.[16] It is clear, second, that the faith which is believed is truth about the present, about the past or the future, and is not in the believer as in its subject; and consequently all things that were or will be are, for their time; for otherwise Augustine would not say that the things which are believed are in things, as the articles past and future.[17] And I rejoice, third, that our mistress and mother, scripture, has witnesses agreeing with the holy doctors, attesting her eminence; yet so that they should say consistently that that one faith has one subject, which is the body of the church; and then one must say that that body is dispersed among the fathers of the old testament, Hebrews as well as gentiles, and not confine it to the time after the death of Christ and to the people called Christian by the common name.[18]

Notes

1. A in the margin at 402.25: *Secunda responsio*. C. *Hec dicta*: the doctor's grant (17-d ¶1) that the kings, priests and prophets of the old testament, anointed with chrism, were christs. *Servantes iusticiam* takes up the doctor's definition of a Christian as one who keeps justice (17-d ¶3).
2. Loserth refers *Epistola XLII* to Augustine's letter to Asellicus (*Opp.* II, p. 734), which is Letter 196 in the modern numbering (PL 33). Wyclif paraphrases §12, with *ministerium* for Augustine's *mysterium*; the print's word is translated. The Apostle: the words are Romans 9:6 (DR "For all are not Israelites that are of Israel"), given here in indirect speech; Loserth's note at 403.1 reads *In codd. Rom. IX*, against the printed *XI*ª. Sons of the promise according to Isaac: Galatians 4:28. C. *Ad spirituale ministerium pertinentes* is taken with the sons of the promise.
3. A in the margin at 403.15: *Tercia responsio*. C. *Quod negatur*: denied by the doctor. The present tenses *observat* and *non est* are kept: Wyclif presses the doctor's own position, that only what is now is, so that while Christ lay dead it was true that Christ is not, and no one kept the law of a Christ who is not.
4. *Ex tibi dubio*, twice, is taken as "on your own doubt", the doubt the doctor raised about the three days; *ex tibi dato*, "on what you grant", would give the same argument. The doctor's definition makes the church a multitude of all Christians: one surviving believer is no multitude, and on his ground she is no Christian either. R. A in the margin at 403.31: *Quedam diffinicio ecclesie*.
5. The definition is the doctor's definition of the catholic church, set out in 17-a. Wyclif argues "from the definition to the thing defined": the minor is the doctor's grant that the Virgin was part of the church during the three days. *Diffinicio* and *descripcio* are both "definition" here. T. At 404.3 B omits *triduo*; at 404.4 B reads *data consequencia* for *dicta consequencia*; at 404.12 the manuscripts spell *consiliis*, as throughout.
6. The sentence will not construe as printed: "that faith declared by the holy fathers" has no verb, and the inference needs a negative. "[Is not]" (*non est*) is supplied (our emendation); the print has nothing lost here. A and A_1 omit *Sequitur ... declarata* (404.13) and *si ... declarata* (404.16). C. On the doctor's view that only the present is, a faith not now declared is never declared; and if a future declaration were enough, the church existed before the death of Christ.

7. ***Religio***: the Christian religion, here in the sense of a religious order, with Christ as abbot under the apostolic rule and the apostles as his chapter; the jibe is at the private religions (glossary: *religio privata*). S. *Retractationes* I: Loserth refers to *Opp.* I, p. 29, and to *De ecclesia* p. 113.14. The passage on the thing now called the Christian religion existing among the ancients from the beginning of the human race is *Retractationes* 1.13.3 (PL 32, 603): *res ipsa quae nunc christiana religio nuncupatur, erat apud antiquos*. Wyclif's "chapter 22" matches no numbering of the *Retractationes* (the chapter is 13). T. At 404.18–19 B reads *quod domini ante* for *quod diu ante*.
8. A in the margin at 404.27: *Tercia responsio*. T. At 404.28 B reads *districcionis* for *descripcionis*. C. *Absque dictamine*: without the *ars dictaminis*, the art of formal composition and letter-writing.
9. *Color rethoricus*: the colours of rhetoric, its figures; the glossary *color* is a plausible ground, and here the figure is denied that force. T. At 405.4 B reads *condempta*. R. A in the margin at 405.6: *Ecclesia quid est?*
10. *Cum aliquam unam fidem ... habent omnes christiani* gives the doctor's charge: the argument supposes that all Christians have one faith by which it is believed. He answers that this faith is one in genus and species but not in number. T. At 405.7 B reads *Sed conclusio ad* for *Sed quoad*. S. *De Trinitate* 13: see note 12.
11. A in the margin at 405.13: *Nota de universali reali*. C. *Argumentum ad hominem*: an argument from the opponent's own position. Wyclif had assumed the doctor still held that a species or universal is only a term or concept, on which "one faith in species" would be no faith in things; he himself holds the universal real. *Una est fides que creditur, et fides qua creditur* is taken as "one ... and [one]": the faith believed, and the faith by which it is believed, each one in every Christian.
12. Augustine, *De Trinitate* 13.2.5 (Loserth: *Opp.* VIII, p. 932 at 405.12, p. 929 at 405.22; the modern reference is ours, *De Trin.* 13.2.5 in PL 42, where Wyclif's quotation is loose). T. At 405.25 the manuscripts omit *suas*; Loserth supplies it from Augustine's text. At 405.26 B reads *expressam* for *impressam*. R. A in the margin at 405.21: *Augustinus*; A and B at 405.28: *Fides duplex*.
13. As printed, the comma stands after *propter similitudinem*, leaving *nullam diversitatem* without a governing word; the clause is construed as in Augustine's text, *genere; propter similitudinem tamen et nullam diversitatem*. *Genere* is rendered "in genus" to keep the term Wyclif takes up in ¶3.
14. *Quoniam* (406.8) will not construe after *facilius*; it is rendered as *quam*, "than", Augustine's reading (*De Trinitate* 13.2.5, PL 42; our emendation). At 406.7 B reads *de quibus loquitur*, Augustine *legimus*; B has *eis fuit*; at 406.8–9 B reads *tot eas quisque audet dicere, quot fides*. S. Acts 4:32 (DR "had but one heart and one soul"); Ephesians 4:5.
15. Matthew 15:28 and 14:31, in the Douay-Rheims.
16. *Infusorum*: "infused", the print's word, of habits infused from one principle. The argument: "great" and "little" faith (note 15) are predications no logical genus or species admits, and faith is increased (Luke 17:5) by gaining quantitative parts of a collective genus, the many habits of all believers, which is none of its members.
17. *Non subiective in credente*: the faith believed does not inhere in the believer as an accident in its subject. Against the doctor's view that only the present is, Wyclif reads Augustine's *in rebus ... que vel esse vel fuisse vel futura esse dicuntur* as granting being to past and future, each for its time. T. At 406.19 B reads *fides est que*; at 406.23–24 B reads *que credantur*.
18. *Consequenter*: consistently with themselves. The one faith has one subject, the body of the church; if so, that body includes the fathers of the old testament, Hebrew and gentile, and is not confined to the time after Christ's death or to those called Christian by the common name.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 402: *fuerant*
  - 402: *XLII^{a}*
  - 403: *Romanorum*
  - 403: *XI^{a}*
  - 403: *multitudo* (2 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 404: *falsum*
  - 405: *nec* (alinea L and 185a folio mark glued)
  - 405: *descripcionem*
  - 405: *II°*
  - 405: *futura* (30 is the line number; italic)
  - 406: *loquitur* (loqui- here, tur next line; main token holds whole word)
  - 406: *principio* (clear ri) [NW]
  - 406: *specie* (1 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 406: ∅ (cre-/ditur: main pos 148 already holds creditur, so this second-half token is empty (hyphen convention))

Part 6: Defective faith, and three ways of being of the church

Loserth pp. 407.1–410.29

¶1 407.1–408.25
407.1 *Further, our opponent says that the mass of Christians do not hold the faith defectively.*
407.9 *Answer: Sin makes faith defective.*
407.16 *How we believe is the question;*
407.25 *as to what is believed the devils are at one with the blessed.*
408.12 *Faith is the act of believing, or the disposition to believe.*
408.28 *Three senses of Church: a) all who are nominally Christians,*

[407] **Ulterius asseritur falsum esse quod defective et corrupte habet multitudo christianorum fidem Christi, eo quod multitudo christianorum habet in fide quidquid est ei necessarium ad salutem credere. Sed constat quod imprudenter ex causa particulari falsum inducitur, nam iuxta sic asserentem prescitus dum est in mortali habet habitum fidei sicut et quilibet falsus christianus. Et credo quod nullus dubitat quin defective et corrupte quilibet talis habet fidem Christi defective, quia peccabiliter, sicut et habuerunt apostoli qui rogaverunt ut Christus adaugeat eis fidem Luce XVII°, 5. Si enim Petro non deficeret gradus fidei, Christus exprobrando non ei diceret Matthei XIV°, 31: Modice fidei quare dubitasti? Et corrupte habent fidem qui irretiti peccatis mortalibus corrumpunt bonos mores et ex informitate fidei finaliter corrumpuntur, nam secundum Apostolum Iª. Cor. V°, 6, modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit. Ideo oportet doctorem consequenter dicere quod aliqua multitudo christianorum habet fidem valde defective et corrupte sicut homines opinionis sue. Nec moveat evidencia doctoris: si eandem fidem habent boni christiani et mali singuli, sequitur quod mali christiani eque perfectam et integram fidem habeant ut boni. Nam pertinens est hic loqui limitate de fide qua creditur, quia de fide que creditur eque perfectam fidem habent demones et creature singule ut beate. Ideo Augustinus loquitur de genere fidei que est tota multitudo habituum fidei in corpore ecclesie. Illud autem genus fidei habet unam partem quantitativam, perfectam in uno et in alio imperfectam, sicut genus motus localis habet in celo** [408] **unam partem quantitativam uniformem quoad subiectum et tempus, sed aliam partem quantitativam utrimque difformem. In patria autem sunt singuli fidei uniformis, cum ibi evacuabitur imperfectum. Si enim eundem habitum fidei in numero omnino simpliciter habet quilibet christianus, sequitur quod ille habitus eque perfecte denominaret subiectum suum credere ut alius quicunque. Omnis enim qualitas denominat subiectum suum primum secundum sui ultimum, quia variacio disposicionis variaret gradum habitus et sic ipsum habitum. Et ista est sentencia Augustini, non quod idem in numero scilicet actus vel habitus fidei sit formaliter in diversis personis, quia tunc quelibet illarum personarum foret fides quelibet. Fides enim non est nisi personam credere vel disponi ad credendum. Sed fides que creditur est veritas a credentibus aliena. Et sic quamvis infidelis eciam dyabolus credat veritatem fidei catholice, verumptamen secundum partem est infidelis et racione mortalis habet fidem corruptam et informem. Nec refert quoad illam informitatem, sive fides acquisita**

Further, it is asserted to be false that the multitude of Christians holds the faith of Christ defectively and corruptly, in that the multitude of Christians has in faith whatever it is necessary for it to believe for salvation.[1] But it is evident that the falsehood is imprudently induced from a particular case; for according to the one who so asserts, a foreknown man, while he is in mortal [sin], has the habit of faith, as does any false Christian. And I believe that no one doubts that every such man has the faith of Christ defectively and corruptly. Defectively, because in a way liable to sin, as the apostles too had it, who asked that Christ increase faith in them, Luke 17:5. For if Peter lacked no degree of faith, Christ would not say to him in reproach, Matthew 14:31: "O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?"[2] And they have faith corruptly who, ensnared in mortal sins, corrupt good morals, and from the unformedness of faith are finally corrupted; for according to the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 5:6, "a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump."[3] Therefore the doctor must consistently say that some multitude of Christians has faith very defectively and corruptly, as [do] the men of his opinion. Nor let the doctor's evidence move [anyone]: if good Christians and bad each have the same faith, it follows that bad Christians have as perfect and entire a faith as the good.[4] For it is pertinent here to speak, with limitation, of the faith by which it is believed; because, as to the faith which is believed, demons and every single creature have as perfect a faith as the blessed. Therefore Augustine speaks of the genus of faith, which is the whole multitude of habits of faith in the body of the church. Now that genus of faith has one quantitative part perfect in one and in another imperfect, as the genus of local motion has in the heaven [408] **one quantitative part uniform as to subject and time, but another quantitative part difform in both.[5] But in the homeland each is of uniform faith, since there the imperfect shall be done away.[6] For if every Christian has altogether, without qualification, the same habit of faith in number, it follows that that habit would name its subject as believing equally perfectly as any other. For every quality names its first subject according to its utmost [degree], because a variation of the disposition would vary the degree of the habit, and so the habit itself.[7] And this is the teaching of Augustine: not that the same in number, namely an act or habit of faith, is formally in diverse persons, because then each of those persons would be each faith. For faith is nothing but a person's believing, or being disposed to believe. But the faith which is believed is a truth other than the believers.[8]**

fuerit sive infusa, ut loquitur decretalis in Clementinis De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, capitulo Firmiter, dicens quod regulariter fides infunditur in baptismo; quod ego credo de omni predestinato rite baptizato.

And so, although an unbeliever, even the devil, believes the truth of the catholic faith, nevertheless he is in part an unbeliever, and by reason of mortal [sin] has a faith corrupt and unformed. Nor does it matter, as to that unformedness, whether the faith was acquired or infused, as the decretal in the Clementines, *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*, chapter *Firmiter*, speaks, saying that as a rule faith is infused in baptism; which I believe of every predestinate person duly baptized.[9]

¶2 408.26–409.1
409.4 *b) all who are in present righteousness,*
409.15 *c) all the predestinate. In this last sense the Church is an article of belief.*
409.20 *A man may be in or out of the Church, according to the sense in which the word is used.*

[408] Et si queratur quando regulariter incidit quis in infidelitatem et quando remanet fidelis filius ecclesie, dicitur quod tripliciter dicitur quis esse de ecclesia, sicut tripliciter dicitur esse ecclesia preter ecclesiam nuncupativam. Aliqua enim est convocacio fidelium secundum quid vel ad tempus vel nude secundum [409] presentem iusticiam, et taliter sunt presciti de ecclesia

And if it is asked when, as a rule, someone falls into unbelief and when he remains a faithful son of the church, the answer is that someone is said in three ways to be of the church, as the church is said in three ways to be, besides the church in name only. For there is a convocation of the faithful in a certain respect, either for a time or barely according to [409] present justice; and in this way the foreknown are of the church[10]

¶3 409.2–410.2
410.3 *In the first two senses the foreknown may be members of the Church,*
410.12 *but in the third sense all the predestinate are members, and only they.*

[409] pro tempore quo sunt in gracia. Illa autem ecclesia non est corpus Christi nec ecclesia sancta catholica nec pars eius. Secundo modo sumitur ecclesia mixtim pro predestinatis et prescitis dum sunt in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam; et ista ecclesia communicat in parte sed non in toto cum ecclesia sancta Dei. Et ista ecclesia vocatur mixtim granum et palea, frumentum et zizannia, nec non et regnum celorum de quinque fatuis virginibus et quinque prudentibus (ut patet in parabolis evangelicis); et istam ecclesiam vocavit Tyconius erronee corpus domini bipartitum (ut patet III° De Doctrina Christiana XXXII°); non enim sunt presciti corpus domini vel pars eius. Sed tercio modo sumitur ecclesia pro convocacione predestinatorum, sive sint in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam sive non. Et isto modo ecclesia est articulus fidei, de quo loquitur Apostolus Ephes. VI°. Et sic nullus prescitus est de sancta ecclesia, licet sit in illa. Correspondenter potest intelligi tripliciter personam esse de ecclesia. Primo modo nude secundum presentem iusticiam, ut presciti sunt de ecclesia primo modo dicta; secundo modo predestinati sive presciti dum sunt ad tempus in gracia sunt de ecclesia secundo modo dicta, differenter tamen et equivoce presciti et predestinati, ut patet ex varietate tituli predestinacionis et presciencie et ex diversitate corporis Christi et corporis dyaboli. Sed tercio modo omnes predestinati, et solum tales sunt de sancta matre ecclesia, differenter tamen quando sunt in mortali cum sola predestinacionis gracia et quando cum illa sunt in gracia secundum presentem

for the time in which they are in grace. And that church is not the body of Christ, nor the holy catholic church, nor a part of it.[11] In the second way the church is taken for the predestinate and the foreknown mixedly, while they are in grace according to present justice; and this church shares in part but not in whole with the holy church of God. And this church is called, mixedly, grain and chaff, wheat and cockle, and also the kingdom of heaven, of the five foolish virgins and five wise (as is clear in the gospel parables); and this church Tyconius erroneously called the bipartite body of the Lord (as is clear, *On Christian Doctrine* 3, [chapter] 32); for the foreknown are not the body of the Lord, or part of it.[12] But in the third way the church is taken for the convocation of the predestinate, whether they be in grace according to present justice or not. And in this way the church is an article of faith, of which the Apostle speaks, Ephesians 6. And so no foreknown man is of the holy church, though he be in it.[13] Correspondingly, it can be understood in three ways that a person is of the church. In the first way, barely according to present justice, as the foreknown are of the church said in the first way. In the second way, the predestinate or the foreknown, while for a time they are in grace, are of the church said in the second way; yet differently and equivocally, the foreknown and the predestinate, as is clear from the variety of the title of predestination and of foreknowledge, and from the diversity of the body of Christ and the body of the devil.[14] But in the third way all the predestinate, and only such, are of holy mother church; differently,

iusticiam; tunc [410]enim sunt continuati corpori Christi secundum humidum fluens et secundum humidum naturale.

however, when they are in mortal [sin] with the grace of predestination alone, and when with it they are in grace according to present justice; for then [410]they are joined continuously to the body of Christ according to the flowing moisture and according to the natural moisture.[15]

¶4 410.3–410.29

[410]Istis premissis dicitur quod omnis prescitus nunquam est de ecclesia tercio modo dicta; est autem de ecclesia primo et secundo modo dicta, quando splendet in eo lumen gracie et pro quocunque mortali veniente est extra triplicem ecclesiam, licet habuerit tantam fidem infusam, ut montes transferat; nam fides omnino informis, sive infusa sive adquisita, non sufficit constituere personam, ut sit de ecclesia, quia cum illa fide stat hominem dampnari perpetuo; fides autem cum gracia predestinacionis constituit hominem membrum ecclesie sive sit in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, sive ad tempus iniustus fuerit vel eciam infidelis. Generacio enim qua talis fit filius salvat eum, ne possit cum datis paribus peccare peccato finalis impenitencie ut prescitus, et sic nemo potest desinere esse membrum sancte ecclesie tercio modo dicte quia tunc desineret esse predestinatus; incipit autem esse membrum illius ecclesie secundum disparem racionem, nunc quando incipit esse et nunc quando incipit esse iustus (ut notat Augustinus super Johannis Omelia XLIX[a]). De prima autem ecclesia nunc cadunt et nunc incorporantur presciti, secundum quod accenditur vel extinguitur in eis scintilla gracie; de secunda vero ecclesia cadunt predestinati casu secundum quid, sed presciti quandoque cadunt simpliciter, illa autem ecclesia desinet esse ad diem iudicii, cum tunc desinet esse commixtio grani cum palea.

These things premised, the answer is that every foreknown man is never of the church said in the third way; but he is of the church said in the first and second way when the light of grace shines in him; and for whatever mortal [sin] comes upon him he is outside the threefold church, although he had so much infused faith that he could remove mountains.[16] For faith altogether unformed, whether infused or acquired, does not suffice to constitute a person so that he be of the church, because with that faith it stands that a man be damned perpetually; but faith with the grace of predestination constitutes a man a member of the church, whether he be in grace according to present justice, or be for a time unjust, or even an unbeliever.[17] For the generation by which such a one becomes a son saves him, so that he cannot, all else being equal, sin with the sin of final impenitence as the foreknown man does; and so no one can cease to be a member of holy church said in the third way, because then he would cease to be predestinate. But he begins to be a member of that church on a different ground, at one time when he begins to be and at another when he begins to be just (as Augustine notes on John, Homily 49).[18] And from the first church the foreknown now fall away and now are incorporated, according as the spark of grace is kindled or quenched in them; but from the second church the predestinate fall with a fall in a certain respect, whereas the foreknown sometimes fall without qualification; and that church will cease to be at the day of judgement, since then the commingling of grain with chaff will cease to be.[19]

Notes

1. B in the margin at 407.1: *Nota quomodo quidam habent fidem defective et corrupte*; A: *Nota qui sunt qui habent fidem corruptam et qui defectivam*. C. The doctor denies Wyclif's claim that the multitude of Christians holds the faith defectively and corruptly; the multitude, he says, holds all that is necessary to salvation.
2. *Prescitus*: one whom God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). C. *Ex causa particulari*: from a particular case, what holds of some Christians being induced of the whole multitude. *Defective, quia peccabiliter* opens the first of two explanations (the second at *Et corrupte*): faith is held defectively in that it can fail through sin, as the apostles' did. S. Luke 17:5, paraphrased (DR "Increase our faith"); Matthew 14:31.
3. 1 Corinthians 5:6. *Corrumpunt bonos mores* echoes 1 Corinthians 15:33 (*corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia mala*). C. *Informitas fidei*: the state of faith not formed by charity (glossary: *fides formata / informis*).
4. At 407.22 A and A_1 read *homines opitus* (sic), and B omits *sue*. C. *Sicut homines opinionis sue* is taken as "as [do] the men of his opinion", the multitude of whom has faith defectively. The doctor's evidence follows in the conditional: if good and bad have the same faith, the bad have as perfect a faith as the good.

5. A in the margin at 407.27: *Nota*. T. At 407.32 A and A_1 read *habet in celo habet partem*. C. *Pars quantitativa*: a part by extent, not by kind. The motion of the heavens is uniform in one part, as to its moving body and its time, and difform (*utrimque*, in both respects) in another; so the one genus of faith is perfect in some believers and imperfect in others.
6. 1 Corinthians 13:10 (DR "that which is in part shall be done away"); Wyclif has *imperfectum* for the Vulgate's *quod ex parte est*. R. B in the margin at 407.11: *Inferius nota quod in patria sunt singuli fidei uniformis; ergo sequitur ut videtur quod fides manebit in patria*: an early reader draws the consequence that faith remains in the homeland.
7. *Denominat subiectum suum primum secundum sui ultimum*: a quality names its subject by its utmost degree, so one habit in all would make all believe equally. *Variaret* (variation of disposition varies the degree, and so the habit) is why the habit cannot be one in number in many.
8. *Sentencia* here is the teaching Augustine holds, not a judicial sentence (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL). *Quelibet illarum personarum foret fides quelibet*: since faith is a person's believing, one faith in number in many persons would make each person every faith. T. At 408.15 A and A_1 read *foret quelibet*, without *fides*. R. B in the margin at 408.13: *Nota*; A and B: *Quid est fides*. *A credentibus aliena*: other than the believers, outside them.
9. Loserth: "Not in Clementinis, but in Decr. Greg. IX, lib. I, tit. I, cap. I", that is, *Firmiter credimus*, X 1.1.1 (modern form ours). The teaching that faith and the virtues are infused in baptism stands in the Clementine *Fidei catholicae*, Clem. 1.1.un. (Friedberg: *virtutes ac informans gratia infunduntur quoad habitum*), which bears the same title *De summa Trinitate et fide catholica*; *Firmiter* itself says only that baptism duly given profits to salvation. C. *Regulariter*: as a rule, in the ordinary course.
10. A in the margin at 408.26: *Questio*; B at 408.29: *Solucio*; A and B: *Nota quod tripliciter dicitur quis de ecclesia sicut tripliciter dicitur (A: capitur) ecclesia*. S. Loserth compares *De civili dominio*, p. 288. C. *Ecclesia nuncupativa*: the church in name only, set aside before the three senses. The sentence runs on into ¶3 (*pro tempore quo sunt in gracia*).
11. At 409.4 A and A_1 omit *modo* (*Secundo modo*). C. The first church is the convocation of the faithful in a certain respect, the foreknown counted in it only while they are in grace.
12. Grain and chaff: Matthew 3:12; wheat and cockle: Matthew 13:24–30; the ten virgins: Matthew 25:1–13. Tyconius's second rule, *de Domini corpore bipartito*, in Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.32.45, where Augustine prefers to call the body "true and mixed" (PL 34): *non ita debuit appellari*, which answers Wyclif's *erronee*.
13. Wyclif cites Ephesians 6; Loserth refers to Ephesians 5:30–32. C. *De ecclesia / in illa*: the foreknown may be *in* the church without being *of* it. R. A and B in the margin at 409.20: *Tripliciter aliquis est de ecclesia*.
14. *Equivoce*: the foreknown and the predestinate belong to the second church in different senses, because their titles differ (predestination, foreknowledge) and they are members of different bodies, of Christ and of the devil.
15. *Humidum fluens* and *humidum naturale*: the physicians' flowing and radical moisture (glossary: *humidum radicale / fluens*); *naturale* here stands for the radical moisture. C. In grace the predestinate are joined to Christ's body by both moistures; in mortal sin, by predestination alone.
16. 1 Corinthians 13:2 (DR "so that I could remove mountains"). R. A in the margin at 410.3: *Nota*. C. *Omnis prescitus nunquam est*: the quantifier order is kept; no foreknown man is ever of the third church. *Pro quocunque mortali veniente*: at the coming of any mortal sin.
17. At 410.10 B omits *sufficit ... dampnari*; at 410.13 B omits *sit*. R. A in the margin at 410.11: *Fides cum gracia predestinacionis constituunt hominem membrum ecclesie*. C. *Cum illa fide stat*: it is consistent with that faith that a man be damned.
18. *Generacio ... salvat eum*: 1 John 5:18 (DR "the generation of God preserveth him"). Augustine "on John, Homily 49": *Tract. in Ioh.* 49.27 on John 11:51–52, *nam neque oves ejus, nec filii Dei adhuc erant, qui nondum crediderant* (PL 35:1758; Loserth gives no reference), paraphrased. C. *Cum datis paribus*: all else being equal. *Secundum disparem racionem*: on a different ground, once by being (predestination, which makes him a member before he is just) and again by becoming just.
19. A in the margin at 410.13: *Nota quod diversimode aliqui cadunt de ecclesia*. C. *Casu secundum quid*: the predestinate fall from the mixed church only in a certain respect, for a time; the foreknown may fall from it without qualification, finally.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 407: *Christi* (10 is the line number)
  - 407: *Christus*
  - 407: *Iª*
  - 409: *presentem* (alinea O and 185c folio mark glued)
  - 409: *esse* (1 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 410: *iniustus* (clear ni) [NW]
  - 410: *XLIXª*
  - 409: *secundo* (se-/cundo; output holds both halves) [-MARK]

Part 7: The councils of Christ and the apostles

Loserth pp. 410.30–412.14

¶1 410.30–412.14
410.30
4. My opponent says

[410]Ad quartum argumentum respondetur quadrupliciter pro declaracione huius quod nec apostoli nec [411]alii fideles erant de

To the fourth argument, [made] to declare this, that neither the apostles nor [411]the other faithful were of the church before the faith was

411.4 *that there were general councils in which Christ conferred with his apostles.*

ecclesia, antequam fides fuit a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declarata. Et suppono quamlibet istarum responsionum validam, cum aliter nimis superflue globarentur. Prima responsio et secundum partem validissimam dicit quod ante mortem Christi fuit doctrina fidei nostre per Christum et suos apostolos sufficienter divulgata et declarata per sanctos patres (supple per Christum et apostolos) ante mortem Christi in conciliis generalibus celebratis, et quod ista concilia ante mortem Christi habita inter Christum et apostolos cum suis discipulis de hiis que pertinent ad fidem fuerunt generalia. Patet per descripcionem concilii generalis positam in glosa Johannis XVII[a] dist. cap. Generalia, ubi dicitur quod illud est generale concilium quod a papa vel eius legato aut locum eius tenente cum omnibus episcopis celebratur. Cum ergo Matthei X° dicitur quod Christus convocavit discipulos suos et, exponens eis fidem, dedit eis privilegia et multiplices potestates, videtur quod ipse celebravit tunc concilium generale; et idem patet Matthei XV° et Marci VI° et sepe ante mortem Christi, ubi loquitur discipulos convocasse. Istud autem dictum est in parte catholicum, cum tota trinitas eterno consilio decrevit decursum ecclesie consuluitque patriarchis, prophetis et capiti ecclesie domino Jesu Christo, secundum quem cursum procederet sancta mater ecclesia. Verumptamen non oportet omnes episcopos ad tale concilium congregari, nec facit per se multitudo personarum consulencium ad generalitatem concilii, cum generalissimum quia principium omnibus aliis sit concilium increatum. Verumptamen in conciliis apostolorum et aliis conciliis generalibus quoad multitudinem episcoporum quatuor apostolorum [412]concilia tenuerunt primatum, et post quatuor concilia principalia, de quibus XVI[a] dist. Omnibus, et quatuor fuerunt sollempnes sinodi (ut patet XVI. dist. Omnibus). Omnibus tamen istis hoc imperfeccionis fuit quod unusquisque tamquam ignarus consulendo quesivit ab alio. Non sic autem in concilio increato nec in concilio quod Christus cum apostolis celebravit; ipse enim omnisciens non consuluit eos in sibi ambiguis sed per se diffinivit et auctorizavit quid foret ecclesie faciendum; quod pape non potest competere. Ideo concilia posterius solempnizata non possunt nisi equivoce dici concilia vel generalia aut decreta, inter illa tamen quatuor concilia apostolorum racionabiliter habent preeminenciam dignitatis.

declared by the holy fathers in general councils, the reply is fourfold.[1] And I suppose each of these replies valid, since otherwise they would be heaped up too superfluously. The first reply, and in its most valid part, says that before the death of Christ the doctrine of our faith was sufficiently spread abroad by Christ and his apostles, and declared by holy fathers (supply: by Christ and the apostles) before the death of Christ in general councils celebrated; and that those councils held before the death of Christ between Christ and the apostles with their disciples, about the things which pertain to faith, were general.[2] It is clear by the definition of a general council set down in the gloss of John on Distinction 17, chapter *Generalia*, where it is said that that is a general council which is celebrated by the pope, or his legate, or one holding his place, with all the bishops.[3] Since therefore in Matthew 10 it is said that Christ called together his disciples and, expounding the faith to them, gave them privileges and manifold powers, it seems that he then celebrated a general council; and the same is clear in Matthew 15 and Mark 6, and often before the death of Christ, where it speaks of his having called the disciples together.[4] And this saying is in part catholic, since the whole Trinity by eternal counsel decreed the course of the church, and took counsel for the patriarchs, the prophets and the head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ, [as to] the course according to which holy mother church should proceed. Nevertheless it is not necessary that all the bishops be gathered to such a council; nor does the multitude of persons taking counsel of itself contribute to the generality of a council, since the most general, because it is the principle for all the others, is the uncreated council.[5] Nevertheless, among the councils of the apostles and the other councils general as to the multitude of bishops, four councils of the apostles [412]held the primacy, and after [them] four principal councils, of which Distinction 16, *Omnibus*; and there were four solemn synods (as is clear, Distinction 16, *Omnibus*).[6] Yet all these had this much of imperfection, that each, as one ignorant, inquired of another by taking counsel. But it is not so in the uncreated council, nor in the council which Christ celebrated with the apostles; for he, all-knowing, did not consult them in things doubtful to himself, but of himself defined and authorized what was to be done by the church; which cannot belong to a pope.[7] Therefore councils solemnized later can only equivocally be called councils, or general, or decrees; among them, however, the four councils of the apostles reasonably have the pre-eminence of dignity.[8]

Notes

1. A in the margin at 410.30: *Quarta responsio*. C. *Pro declaracione huius quod ...* is taken with the argument: Wyclif's fourth argument drew from the doctor's definition (a faith "afterwards declared by the holy fathers in general councils", 17-e ¶1) that neither the apostles nor the other faithful were of the church before such councils; the doctor answers it in four ways. It could instead be taken with *respondetur*: the doctor replies "in order to explain" that point.
2. *Suppono quamlibet ... validam*: ironic; four replies would be heaped up needlessly unless each stood. *Secundum partem validissimam*: "in its most valid part", agreeing with *partem*; it may be read as "the first and in part the most valid". T. At 411.5 A and A_1 read *validiss.ma* (so the foot of the page; the form is unclear). R. A in the margin at 411.12: *Nota de conciliis generalibus*.
3. The *glosa Johannis*: the ordinary gloss of Johannes Teutonicus on the Decretum, at D. 17: *Generalia* is Gratian's opening dictum of D. 17, *Generalia concilia* (Friedberg I, 50), and the gloss there, signed *Ioan.*, defines *Universale est quod a Papa, vel eius legato cum omnibus episcopis statuitur*; *aut locum eius tenente* is not in the printed gloss. T. At 411.22 B reads *ubi legitur*. R. A in the margin at 411.16: *Quid est concilium generale?*; B: *Generale concilium quid sit nota*.
4. Matthew 10:1; Matthew 15:32; Mark 6:7: in each Christ calls the disciples together; the references are paraphrased, not quoted.
5. *Consilio ... consuluit*: the play on *concilium* and *consilium*, council and counsel, runs through the passage. *Consuluit* with the dative is taken as "took counsel for", provided for. *Facit ad* is "contributes to".
6. Loserth: "Dist. XV vel XVI. *Omnibus* non extat"; the four councils received like the four gospels are in D. 15 c. 2, *Sicut sancti evangelii* (PL 187; Friedberg: *Sicut sancti euangelii quatuor libros, sic quatuor concilia suscipere et venerari me fateor*). D. 17 opens with Gratian's dictum *Generalia concilia*, so Wyclif's "chapter *Generalia*" is loose. T. At 412.2 B reads *XV*. R. B in the margin at 412.2: *Quatuor consilia apostolorum et quatuor fuerunt solempnes sinodi, ut patet XVI. dist. Omnibus*, the same words as the parenthesis of the text. C. *Quoad multitudinem episcoporum* is taken with *generalibus*: general in the number of bishops present.
7. *Quod pape non potest competere*: no pope can define of himself, as the all-knowing Christ did; so a pope's council can only consult. T. At 412.10 B omits *potest*.
8. *Equivoce*: later councils are called councils, general, and their acts decrees, in another sense than the council of Christ with the apostles. The four councils of the apostles are not named; the councils of Acts are presumably meant.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 411: *alii* (alinea P and 185d folio mark glued)
  - 411: *XVII^{a}*
  - 411: *illud* (15 is the line number; italic)
  - 412: *XVI^{a}*
  - 412: *Christus*

Part 8: The church did not begin at Christ's death; the church as one successive person

Loserth pp. 412.15–415.7

¶1 412.15–415.7

412.18 *This is true but the error lies in asserting that the Church began at the death of Christ.*
412.29 *The Church cannot have begun in the three days.*
413.5 *My opponent says that his definition does not apply to the Church in the three days.*
413.11 *This is an early desertion of a definition which, he declares, will stand for ever.*
413.21
5. My opponent urges that the whole may continue while the parts vary.

[412]Sed videamus fel commixtum cum mellis dulcedine. In morte (inquit) Christi cepit esse ecclesia, a qua morte sacramenta sumpserunt efficaciam. Patet ex dictis in prima responsione et secunda quomodo error iste nedum tolleret honorem sancte matris ecclesie ex sua antiquitate fundata in fide scripture, sed innuit interempcionem meriti matris nostre et tollit fidem patrum veteris testamenti dehonorando sanctam matrem ecclesiam. Item manifeste responsio obviat sibi ipsi, quia ante mortem Christi fuit ita quod est multitudo omnium christianorum habencium ex integro rectam et eandem fidem per Christum et suos apostolos promulgatam et a sanctis patribus in conciliis generalibus declaratam, ut declaratur in responsione. Ideo ante mortem Christi fuit ita quod est ecclesia. Non enim incepit ecclesia in triduo, quando dicitur [413]Christum non esse, nec sapit incarcerantibus presens tempus quod a morte Christi sacramenta sumpserunt suam originem, sicut patet querendo

But let us see the gall mixed with the sweetness of honey. "At the death of Christ," he says, "the church began to be, from which death the sacraments took their efficacy."[1] It is clear from what was said in the first reply and the second how this error not only would take away the honour of holy mother church from her antiquity, founded in the faith of scripture, but implies the destruction of the merit of our mother, and takes away the faith of the fathers of the old testament by dishonouring holy mother church.[2] Again, the reply manifestly contradicts itself; for before the death of Christ it was so that there is a multitude of all Christians having, entire, the right and same faith, promulgated by Christ and his apostles and declared by holy fathers in general councils, as is declared in the reply. Therefore before the death of Christ it was so that there is a church.[3] For the church did not begin in the three days, when Christ is said [413]not to be; nor does it make sense to those who imprison

414.4 *The Church does not consist of successive parts,* 414.16 *since it loses none, but goes on increasing till it has gathered in all the elect,*

que sacramenta et quando sumpserunt a dicta morte originem. Nec valet alia responsio qua dicitur quod descripcio predicta ecclesie non compeciit ecclesie in sancto triduo, tum quia tunc descripcio non valeret que tam cito deficeret in floribus ecclesie primitive, tum secundo quia iuxta declarata descripcio ecclesie compeciit christianis ante mortem Christi et per idem in sancto triduo. Non ergo deserenda est tam cito dicta descripcio, cum in fine adicitur quod stabit non obstantibus meis obiectibus in eternum. Sed revera fingere descripcionem per quam excluderetur a racione ecclesie tam sanctum apostolorum collegium cum suo abbate pro toto tempore sue viacionis videtur presumpcio, cum presciti dicuntur esse de sancta matre ecclesia et in principio mundi ante creacionem hominis sicut et lapsis ambobus parentibus fuit ecclesia (ut patet Encheridion LXIV°). Ulterius respondendo ad quintam raciunculam dicitur quod sicut continue manet eadem species hominum non obstante quod individua variarentur, sic manet continue eadem universalis ecclesia non obstante quod membra alia generentur et alia corrumpantur. Sic (inquit) manebit idem homo in numero non obstante quod partes equales alie generentur et alie corrumpantur. Quare rogo non sic erit de corpore Christi mistico quod est ecclesia? Et revera illud est bene dictum dummodo consequenter. Oportet enim ecclesiam catholicam esse unam personam sponsam et non formaliter speciem vel universale quod sit multorum singularium, sed [414]est una persona successiva a principio mundi usque ad diem iudicii, et post habebit illa persona omnia eius membra, simul perpetuo beata et illius persone nunc una pars est militans et nunc alia, sed sicut nulla pars est reliqua, sic tota illa ecclesia non est pars eius aliqua sed una totalis et gloriosa incommunicabilis persona. Non enim capit ingenium humanum quod iste pauce persone militantes quas falsarius vocat universalem ecclesiam sint alie persone coniunctim vel divisim, ymmo ad alietatem cuiuscunque simplicis persone sequitur alietas multitudinis que ipsam personam caruerit a multitudine que ipsam personam tamquam partem habuerit. Ideo illa ecclesia catholica que durat a principio usque in finem mundi non est persone vel multitudo fidelium que nunc est secundum se totam, sed illa multitudo est pars illius ecclesie catholice que est in magno tempore et semper post diem iudicii, sed in nullo instanti temporis est per totum ante novissimum electum nec in aliqua parte talis temporis, et talis ecclesia augeri potest sed non minui, non quod eadem multitudo predestinatorum in numero sit nunc plures homines et nunc pauciores, sed quod idem commune ad sanctam totalem ecclesiam militantem sit nunc maius et nunc minus, sicut loquitur scriptura Act. VI° de crescente numero

the present time that the sacraments took their origin from the death of Christ, as is clear by asking which sacraments took their origin from the said death, and when.[4] Nor is the other reply of any avail, by which it is said that the aforesaid definition of the church did not apply to the church in the holy three days: both because then a definition would not be valid which would fail so soon in the flowers of the primitive church, and secondly because, according to what has been declared, the definition of the church applied to Christians before the death of Christ, and by the same token in the holy three days. Therefore the said definition is not to be deserted so soon, since at its end it is added that it will stand for ever notwithstanding my objections.[5] But truly, to feign a definition by which so holy a college of the apostles, with its abbot, would be excluded from the account of the church for the whole time of its wayfaring seems presumption, since the foreknown are said to be of holy mother church; and in the beginning of the world, before the creation of man, as also when both parents had fallen, there was a church (as is clear, *Enchiridion* 64).[6] Further, in reply to the fifth little argument, the answer is that, as the same species of men remains continuously notwithstanding that the individuals vary, so the same universal church remains continuously notwithstanding that some members are generated and others corrupted. So (he says) the same man in number will remain, notwithstanding that equal parts are, some generated and others corrupted. Why, I ask, will it not be so with the mystical body of Christ, which is the church?[7] And truly that is well said, provided [it is said] consistently. For the catholic church must be one person, a bride, and not formally a species or universal which is of many singulars; but it [414]is one successive person from the beginning of the world to the day of judgement, and afterwards that person will have all her members together, perpetually blessed; and of that person now one part is militant and now another; but as no part is the remaining [part], so that whole church is not any part of itself, but one total and glorious incommunicable person.[8] For human wit does not grasp that these few militant persons, whom the falsifier calls the universal church, should be other persons, jointly or severally; indeed, upon the otherness of any single person there follows the otherness of a multitude which lacked that person from a multitude which had that person as a part.[9] Therefore that catholic church which lasts from the beginning to the end of the world is not, as to its whole self, the persons or the multitude of the faithful that now is; but that multitude is a part of that catholic church, which is in the great time and always after the day of

discipulorum. Sicut ergo idem tempus in numero non maioratur vel minoratur, sic nec eadem ecclesia in numero nisi accipiendo ecclesiam communiter pro capite et quacunque multitudine totali membrorum suorum. Sic enim maioratur ecclesia, ut homo stante unitate capitis ut anime. Sed ista veritas necessitat ad ponendum quod omnia que fuerunt vel erunt sunt pro suo tempore causancia unum integrum, cuius pars est pro parte temporis totalis [415]ipsum integrum mensurantis. Et sic concedi potest quod ista nunc sunt, demonstrando omnia que fuerunt vel erunt, intelligendo parcialiter collective. Sed coloracius quoad logicam concedi potest quod hoc totum existens ista est nunc sed non ista, quia tunc infinita instancia forent simul in eodem instanti (de qua logica patet alibi).

judgement, but at no instant of time is it wholly [present] before the last elect, nor in any part of such time.[10] And such a church can be increased but not diminished: not that the same multitude of the predestinate in number is now more men and now fewer, but that the same common [term] for the holy total church militant is now greater and now less, as scripture speaks in Acts 6 of the number of the disciples increasing.[11] As therefore the same time in number is not made greater or less, so neither is the same church in number, except by taking the church commonly for the head and any total multitude whatever of its members. For so the church is made greater, as a man is, the unity of the head standing, as [that] of the soul.[12] But this truth necessitates positing that all things which have been or will be are, for their time, causing one integral whole, of which a part is for a part of the total time [415]measuring that integral whole. And so it can be granted that these now are, pointing to all things that have been or will be, understanding [it] partially and collectively. But with more colour as regards logic it can be granted that this whole, existing as these things, is now, but not these things; for then infinite instants would be together in the same instant (of which logic it is clear elsewhere).[13]

Notes

1. ***Fel … cum mellis dulcedine***: the gall in the doctor's first reply to the fourth argument (17-g), whose honey Wyclif had granted ("this saying is in part catholic"). ***Inquit***: the doctor. R. A in the margin at 412.15: ***Contra hoc quod dicitur quod ecclesia incepit post mortem Christi***.
2. ***Ex dictis in prima responsione et secunda***: taken as what was said in answering the doctor's replies to the first and second arguments, where Wyclif argued that the church was before the incarnation (17-a to 17-c); it may instead mean the first reply to the fourth argument and the second reply that follows. ***Fundata*** agrees with ***antiquitate***. T. At 412.19 B omits ***honorem***; at 412.20–21 A and A_1 read ***sed innuitur*** ("but is implied"); the print ***innuit*** is translated.
3. ***Fuit ita quod est***: "it was so that there is", Wyclif's tensed idiom: before Christ's death the proposition "there is a multitude having the faith declared in councils" was true, so by the doctor's own definition "there is a church" was true then. ***Ut declaratur in responsione***: the doctor's first reply (17-g) set general councils of Christ and the apostles before his death.
4. ***In triduo***: the three days of Christ's death, when Christ "is said not to be" (soul and body being parted). ***Nec sapit incarcerantibus presens tempus***: taken as "nor does it make sense to those who imprison the present time", that is, those who confine what is to the present instant (cf. the ***argumentum ad hominem***, 17-a): on their teaching a past death can be the origin of nothing. T. At 413.1 Loserth notes ***incarcerantibus***: "so the manuscripts".
5. ***Compeciit***: perfect of ***competo***, "applied to". ***Cum in fine adicitur***: the doctor's definition closed with the claim that it would stand for ever against Wyclif's objections; ***obiectibus*** is the print's form.
6. ***Cum suo abbate***: Christ, as abbot of the apostolic college. ***Sue viacionis*** may refer to the college or to its abbot; on either reading the time meant is Christ's life before his death. ***Cum presciti dicuntur …***: the doctor counts the foreknown of the church (18-a), yet his definition shuts out the apostles. S. Augustine, ***Enchiridion***; Wyclif's ch. 64, which Loserth corrects to 57: the church in the holy angels is chs. 56–57 (PL 40; ***Haec in sanctis Angelis beata persistit***). S. At 413.21 Loserth compares p. 114.13. R. B in the margin at 413.17: ***Ante lapsum primorum parentum erat ecclesia***.
7. A in the margin at 413.20: ***Quinta responsio***. T. At 413.23 B omits ***individua … quod***. C. ***Partes equales alie generentur et alie corrumpantur***: in nourishment equal parts are gained and lost, and the man stays the same in number.
8. ***Dummodo consequenter***: "provided [it is said] consistently", that is, followed through; Wyclif accepts the comparison and turns it. ***Persona successiva***: a person whose being is spread through time. ***Sicut nulla pars est reliqua***: no part is another part, and the whole is none of its parts. R. A in the margin at 413.30: ***Ecclesia quid est?***; B: ***Ecclesia est una persona successiva***.
9. ***Falsarius***: "the falsifier", the opponent. The argument: a multitude with one person more or fewer is another multitude, so the few now militant cannot stay "the same universal church" while members come and go. ***Simplicis persone***: a single person.

10. ***Non est persone vel multitudo*: the plural *persone* beside the singular *est* is taken as "the persons"; the print may be faulty here (*persona*?). *In magno tempore*: the whole span of the world's time (cf. 17-a, *magnus annus mundi*). *Ante novissimum electum*: before the last of the elect [has come]. T. At 414.18 B reads *sed in illo instanti*, and at 414.19–20 *vero in aliqua*; the print is translated.**

11. ***Idem commune ad sanctam totalem ecclesiam militantem*: taken as the same common [term] answering to the whole holy church militant, which now covers more men and now fewer. T. At 414.23 A and A$_1$ read *secundum quod idem*. S. Acts 6:1 (DR "the number of the disciples increasing").**

12. **The whole of time is not greater or less, though its present part changes. *Communiter*: the church taken as the head with whatever total multitude of members, as a man grows while the unity of the soul stands; *capitis ut anime*: the head being as the soul.**

13. ***Causancia unum integrum*: "causing", that is, making up one integral whole, each thing a part for its part of the total time. *Parcialiter collective*: "these now are" holds of the whole taken collectively, each part for its part of the time. *Hoc totum existens ista est nunc sed non ista*: the whole that is these things is now; the things severally are not, or infinite instants would coincide. *Coloracius*: comparative of *colorate*, "with more colour", on a more plausible ground (glossary: *color*, *colorare*). *De qua logica patet alibi*: the place is not identified. T. At 415.2 B reads *ista autem sunt*.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **412: ∅ (dulce-/dine.: main pos 105 already holds dulcedine., so this second-half token is empty (hyphen convention))**
  - **412: *Christi***
  - **412: *fundata* (clear f)**
  - **412: *fide* (clear fi)**
  - **412: *meriti* (clear ri)**
  - **412: *incepit* (clear in) [NW]**
  - **412: *triduo***
  - **413: *Christi***
  - **413: *variarentur* (clear ri)**
  - **413: *Christi***
  - **414: *alietas* (print reads alietas) [NW]**
  - **414: *iudicii***
  - **415: *ipsum* (alinea Q and 186b folio mark glued)**

Chapter 18

Part 1: The foreknown, the predestinate in error, and the two churches

Loserth pp. 415.9–418.1

¶1 415.9–418.1
415.9
6. Our opponent says a) the foreknown when baptized are members of the Church, b) the predestinate erring from the faith are not members, c) as neither were the Saints, while in error.
416.1 *He alleges the authority of St. Thomas,*
416.6 *but St. Thomas was using "Church" in our second sense (see p. 409).*
416.21 *Authorities to show that the predestinate are members even when in error.*
417.12 *My opponent says a) there is a difference in nature between the Church militant and triumphant; b) they differ infinitely in essencial perfection; c) they do not form one Church.*
417.24 *But a) since both are the Church, they are alike in nature; b) those who now make up the militant will be the triumphant Church.*
418.1 *c) the Saints testify that the body of Christ is made up of the Church militant, dormant, and triumphant.*

[415] **Ulterius restat approbando veritatem et reprobando falsitatem transcurrere per responsiones ad alias quinque raciunculas que supersunt. Prima autem responsio dicit, primo quod omnes presciti renati baptismate sunt membra sancte ecclesie catholice; secundo dicit quod nulli predestinati errantes a recta fide sunt membra sancte matris ecclesie, et tercio dicit quod nec Petrus nec Paulus nec David nec aliquis alius pro tempore pro quo deviat a recta fide est pars ecclesie catholice. Ista est venenosa triplicitas: prima tamen suadetur est sentencia sancti Thome super III° Sentenciarum dist. XIII[a], q. II[a], dicentis quod, sicut in corpore naturali membra uniuntur et sunt unum per colligacionem quandam nervorum et iuncturarum, ut fiant unum continuacione, sic (inquit) in corpore Christi mistico omnes qui colligati sunt ad invicem per fidem rectam sunt unum in corpore ecclesie; et sic infidelis non pertinet ad unionem corporis ecclesie quod est unum simpliciter, nec paganorum, hereticorum et separatorum ab ecclesia est Christus proprie** [416] **caput nisi in potencia. Ista autem verba non faciunt pro supradicta sentencia, cum solum predestinati colligati sunt per fidem rectam, eo quod omnes alii continue peccato indelebili peccant mortaliter, et sic sunt perpetuo heretici qui soli simpliciter separantur a corpore Christi mistico. Sed quod dicitur sanctum Thomam in solucione ad tercium argumentum plane dicere quod presciti existentes in gracia sunt vera membra ecclesie, sicut manus abscindenda est membrum, quousque fuerit actualiter abscisa, dicitur quod hoc debet intelligi de ecclesia secundo modo dicta, ut includit granum et paleam; que ecclesia secundum Augustinum III° De Doctrina Christiana XXXII° non est corpus domini nec eciam corpus domini bipertitum, et sic presciti baptizati habent secundum presentem iusticiam incorporacionem in illa mixta ecclesia et quandam adnascenciam cum vera ecclesia, sicut habet stercus in venis miseraicis, sed nunquam sunt pars corporis Christi; et ista est sentencia Augustini epistola XXXII[a] ad Bonifacium. Quantum ad secundum errorem, patet quod capit instanciam de omnibus predestinatis a fide errantibus qui quamvis a fide ad tempus devient, Deus tamen ex eleccione predestinacionis eos semper eque diligit. Et hinc dicit Christus Johannis X, 16: Alias oves**

Further, it remains, approving the truth and reproving the falsehood, to run through the replies to the other five little arguments that are left.[1] And the first reply says, first, that all the foreknown reborn by baptism are members of the holy catholic church; second, it says that no predestinate erring from right faith are members of holy mother church; and third, it says that neither Peter nor Paul nor David nor any other, for the time for which he deviates from right faith, is part of the catholic church.[2] This is a venomous threefold: the first, however, is urged [because it] is the teaching of St Thomas on the third [book] of the *Sentences*, distinction 13, question 2, who says that "as in a natural body the members are united and are one by a certain binding together of sinews and joints, so that they become one by continuity, so," he says, "in the mystical body of Christ all who are bound together with one another by right faith are one in the body of the church; and so an unbeliever does not belong to the union of the body of the church, which is one without qualification; nor is Christ properly the [416] **head of pagans, heretics and those separated from the church, except in potency."[3] But these words do not tell for the aforesaid teaching, since only the predestinate are bound together by right faith, because all the others continually sin mortally by an indelible sin, and so are perpetually heretics, who alone are separated without qualification from the mystical body of Christ.[4] But as to its being said that St Thomas, in the solution to the third argument, plainly says that the foreknown existing in grace are true members of the church, as a hand that is to be cut off is a member until it has actually been cut off: the answer is that this must be understood of the church said in the second way, as it includes grain and chaff;[5] which church, according to Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* 3.32, is not the body of the Lord, nor even the bipartite body of the Lord; and so the baptized foreknown have, according to present justice, incorporation in that mixed church and a certain growing-on with the true church, as dung has in the mesaraic veins; but they are never part of the body of Christ. And this is the teaching of Augustine, Letter 32 to Boniface.[6] As to the second error, it**

habeo que non sunt ex hoc ovili et vocem meam audient. Super quo textu notat Augustinus super Johan. Omelia XLV[a] quomodo Christus dicit se habere oves de gentibus adhuc convertendis; hec, inquit, secundum [417] predestinationem dicta sunt. Ideo (ut dixi superius) ponit Ricardus de Sancto Victore tres gradus membrorum ecclesie. Quamvis autem predestinati deficiunt a fide et gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, habent tamen fidem infusam secundum graciam predestinacionis. Si ergo secundum doctorem prescitus existens in mortali secundum fidem infusam sit membrum sancte matris ecclesie, licet omne peccatum mortale concommunicetur infidelitas, multo magis omnis predestinatus foret membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Ad aliam raciunculam primo dicitur quod non est eadem racio ecclesie militantis et ecclesie triumphantis; secundo dicitur quod ecclesia triumphans infinitum distat in perfeccione essenciali ab ecclesia militante; tercio dicitur quod nullo modo est una ecclesia ex hiis, cum tantum differunt sicut substancia et accidens que non sunt unum aliquo modo. Et ista dicitur esse sentencia Augustini, Epistola XXXII[a], ad Bonifacium, ubi distinguens inter ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem ponit ecclesiam triumphantem esse sine macula vel ruga, triumphans autem est immunis ab omni culpa. Isti tres errores sunt manifestiores prioribus, quia equus cecus continue profundius sese precipitat. Nam quoad primum utraque est univoce ecclesia, ideo oportet quod sit eadem generalis racio utriusque. Quoad secundum patet, cum ecclesia militans erit ecclesia triumphans, contradiccionem claudit quod infinitum distent in perfeccione essenciali; eedem enim persone que iam sunt ecclesia militans erunt ecclesia triumphans (ut patet ex fide). [418] Quoad tercium errorem patet ex testimonio sanctorum et

is clear that it admits an objection from all the predestinate erring from the faith, whom, although they deviate from the faith for a time, God nevertheless, out of the election of predestination, always loves equally. And hence Christ says, John 10:16: "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold, and they shall hear my voice." On which text Augustine, on John, Homily 45, notes how Christ says that he has sheep among the gentiles yet to be converted: "these things," he says, "are said [417] according to predestination."[7] Therefore (as I said above) Richard of St Victor posits three degrees of members of the church.[8] And although the predestinate fall short of faith and grace according to present justice, they nevertheless have infused faith according to the grace of predestination. If therefore, according to the doctor, a foreknown man existing in mortal [sin] is, according to infused faith, a member of holy mother church, although unbelief is shared with every mortal sin, much more would every predestinate man be a member of holy mother church.[9]

To another little argument the answer is, first, that the account of the church militant and of the church triumphant is not the same; second, the answer is that the church triumphant is infinitely distant in essential perfection from the church militant; third, the answer is that in no way is one church [made] of these, since they differ as much as substance and accident, which are not one in any way.[10] And this is said to be the teaching of Augustine, Letter 32 to Boniface, where, distinguishing between the church militant and triumphant, he posits the church triumphant to be without spot or wrinkle, but the triumphant is immune from all fault.[11] These three errors are more manifest than the earlier ones, because a blind horse continually throws itself deeper.[12] For as to the first: each is univocally church; therefore there must be the same general account of both. As to the second, it is clear: since the church militant will be the church triumphant, it implies a contradiction that they are infinitely distant in essential perfection; for the same persons who are now the church militant will be the church triumphant (as is clear, as faith teaches). [418] As to the third error, it is clear from the testimony of the saints[13]

Notes

1. *Approbando … reprobando*: Wyclif will approve what is true in the doctor's replies and reprove what is false. *Alias quinque raciunculas*: the sixth to the tenth (Loserth's side-note: "6.").
2. A in the margin at 415.11: *Prima responsio. An presciti qui habent fidem sint de ecclesia et predestinati in mortali sint tunc extra ecclesiam*. S. Loserth compares p. 114.23.

3. ***Prima tamen suadetur est sentencia*** does not construe; the plate prints the words so (415.18–19), with nothing lost at the line end; "[because it]" is supplied for the sense. S. Thomas Aquinas, ***In III Sent.*** d. 13 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 2, solutio (Loserth: ***Opp.*** IX, p. 156), closely paraphrased; ***paganorum, hereticorum et separatorum*** expands Thomas's ***infideles***. R. A in the margin at 415.19: ***Sanctus Thomas***.
4. ***Non faciunt pro***: "do not tell for". ***Peccato indelebili***: the final impenitence of the foreknown, which nothing deletes; so the foreknown are never bound by right faith. T. At 416.5 A reads ***seperantur***.
5. Aquinas, the same place, ad 3 (***qui est in gratia, membrum est, quamvis postea abscindatur***; ***presciti*** is Wyclif's application). C. ***Ecclesia secundo modo dicta***: the second of the three senses of 17-f (p. 409), the predestinate and foreknown mixed while they are in grace.
6. Augustine, ***De doctrina christiana*** 3.32.45, Tyconius' second rule, "the bipartite body of the Lord", a name Augustine says was ill chosen, since what will not be with the Lord for ever is not his body (PL 34); Loserth refers back to p. 4. "Letter 32 to Boniface": Loserth, "not 32 but 98 (alias 23)", ***Opp.*** II, p. 263: Ep. 98.5, the chaff that carries the grain to the threshing-floor (PL 33). Loserth compares Wyclif, ***De civili dominio*** 1.2, p. 15. C. ***Adnascencia***: a growing-on, adhesion without being part, as waste matter in the mesaraic (mesenteric) veins. ***Secundum presentem iusticiam***: by present justice, as against predestination. T. At 416.18 A_1 reads ***meseraicis***. R. A in the margin at 416.16: ***Nota quomodo presciti sunt in ecclesia et tamen nunquam sunt pars ecclesie***.
7. John 10:16; Wyclif omits ***et illas oportet me adducere*** (DR "them also I must bring") and the end of the verse. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem***: the manuscripts give homily 49, Loserth prints 45 (***Opp.*** III.2, p. 600); the manuscripts are right: ***Tract.*** 49.27, ***Haec autem secundum praedestinationem dicta sunt*** (PL 35). C. ***Capit instanciam***: "admits an objection", a counter-instance. ***Qui ... eos***: the relative is taken up again by ***eos***. R. A in the margin at 416.23: ***Predestinatus carens fide est de ecclesia***.
8. Richard of St Victor, ***De potestate ligandi et solvendi*** (Loserth: part 2, ch. 20; Migne col. 1172): ***triplici modo membrum Christi dici solemus: praedestinatione, praeparatione, concorporatione***. "As I said above": the place is not identified.
9. ***Licet omne peccatum mortale concommunicetur infidelitas***: both nouns stand in the nominative; taken as "although unbelief goes with every mortal sin". The argument is ***a fortiori*** from the doctor's own concession. T. At 417.8 B omits ***licet ... ecclesie***.
10. A in the margin at 417.12: ***Secunda responsio. Tres errores***. S. Loserth compares p. 114.31. C. ***Racio***: "account", what it is to be a church; not the glossary's technical "aspect".
11. Augustine to Boniface (Loserth: ***Opp.*** II, p. 658): Ep. 185 (***De correctione Donatistarum***) §§38–40, paraphrased (PL 33); "without spot or wrinkle" is Ephesians 5:27 (DR "not having spot or wrinkle"). C. ***Ponit ecclesiam triumphantem esse sine macula vel ruga, triumphans autem ...***: the contrast wants the militant church in the first clause (cf. 418, ***maculata et rugosa dum militat***); the plate prints ***triumphantem***, and the print is translated.
12. ***Equus cecus ... sese precipitat***: a proverb, the blind horse plunging deeper. T. At 417.24 B reads ***profundus***. R. A in the margin at 417.25: ***Contra illos***.
13. ***Univoce***: church in one and the same sense, so with one general account. The sentence runs on into the next part (18-b), where the plate prints ***et ecclesia*** at 418.2.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 415: ***CAP. XVIII.***
  - 415: ***sunt*** (2 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 415: ***III°***
  - 416: ***III°***
  - 416: ***XXXII^{a}***
  - 416: ***XLV^{a}***
  - 417: ***secundo*** (2 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 417: ***racio*** (print has whole racio; side-note overlaps line end) [NW]
  - 417: ***utriusque*** (2 is a margin argument numeral)
  - 415: ***II^{a},*** [-MARK]

*Part 2: One church militant and triumphant; Cardinal John on *Fundamenta**

Loserth pp. 418.2–422.18

¶1 418.2–420.18

418.17 *There are defects in the militant Church that are not in the triumphant, but this does not make a specific difference.*

419.1 *Description of the Church given by Cardinal John:*

[418] **ecclesia quod est unum corpus Christi misticum compositum ex ecclesia militante, dormiente et triumphante, sicut allegatus est superius Augustinus, Encheridion LXIV° cap., LXV° cap. et LXIX° cap., et in De Questionibus veteris et nove legis cap. XLVII°. Non ergo tantum differunt sicut substancia et suum accidens, cum utraque ecclesia dicitur substancia eiusdem speciei specialissime, quia homo; and [it is clear that] the church is that which is one mystical body of Christ, composed of the church militant, sleeping and triumphant, as Augustine was alleged above, *Enchiridion* chapter 64, chapter 65 and chapter 69, and in *On the Questions of the Old and New Law*, chapter 47.[1] Therefore they do not differ as much as a substance and its accident, since each church is called a substance of the same most special species, namely**

419.6 *a) it is the assembly of all the faithful, and has two parts, militant and triumphant;*
419.26 *b) in the militant Church there are wicked, but in the triumphant only the good.*
420.27 *Hence we see that the differences between militant and triumphant are not essential, but accidental,*

ymmo secundum philosophos substancia et accidens sunt unum aliquo modo, quia unum per accidens, sicut oportet doctorem dicere de personis ecclesie et fide qua ille persone sunt formaliter ecclesia. Et quantum ad evidenciam captam ex testimonio Augustini, patet quod inducit ignoranciam arguentis. Nam verum est (ut sepe docet Augustinus ex fide scripture) quod ecclesia est maculata et rugosa dum militat, sed omnino sine mortali vel veniali dum triumphat. Sed omnino dementis foret ex istis arguere diversitatem specificam illarum ecclesiarum, vel quod non fit una ex illis, vel quod una infinitum excedit aliam in perfeccione essenciali. Nam beatus viator et dampnatus sunt eiusdem speciei specialissime, componunt unum genus humanum et sunt pares in perfeccione essenciali; et tamen sunt illius condicionis quod inferior est plenus macula et rugosus, et secundus est omnino sine macula vel ruga. Accidens ergo non variat tantum unam substanciam ab alia. Nec valet dicere quod est dare unum aggregatum ex substancia et accidente, ut puta ex habitu fidei infuso et substancia aggregatis, tum quia negatur talis unitas in fundamento responsionis, tum eciam quia talis habitus fidei manens perpetuo migraret de subiecto in subiectum et reciperet peregrinas predicaciones formales alienas a natura universalium, unde in confirmacionem supradicte sentencie. [419] Et contra istam sentenciam pertinenter notandus est Cardinalis in VI°, De Eleccionibus, cap. Fundamenta. Pertinenter dico, primo quia cardinalis, secundo quia papa et tota curia approbavit suam sentenciam in hac parte, et tercio ex affeccione nominis et cognominis, cum fuit Johannis Monachi. Scribit enim primo describendo ecclesiam quod est convocacio fidelium, quia omnes fideles ad se vocat, cum extra illam unicam non sit salus; hec quandoque dicitur militans et quandoque triumphans: Non, inquit, quia sunt due, sed una, habens diversas qualitates. Intendit autem doctor quod non sunt due ecclesie catholice, sed una tantum, habens duas partes solum per accidens differentes. Ideo subdit: prima est secundum Augustinum in tempore peregrinacionis, altera determinante mansionis, prima in labore, altera in requie, prima in via, altera in patria, prima cum hoste pugnat, altera sine hoste regnat; et hinc prior ecclesia dicitur militans et secunda triumphans. Nam Job VII°, 1 scribitur: Milicia est vita hominis super terram, et Apostolus IIª Thymotei II°, 3: Labora sicut bonus miles Christi Jesu. Oportet enim in via laborare certando contra carnem, mundum et demonem; sed homo superando fit victor et consummata victoria fugatis hostibus fit per Dei graciam triumphator. Et allegat pro modo loquendi leges multiplices. Secundo dicit quod hec ecclesia militans est corpus Christi misticum in quo congregantur fideles. Et

man; indeed, according to the philosophers, substance and accident are one in some way, namely one by accident, as the doctor must say of the persons of the church and of the faith by which those persons are formally the church.[2] And as to the evidence taken from the testimony of Augustine, it is clear that it brings out the ignorance of the one arguing. For it is true (as Augustine often teaches from the faith of scripture) that the church is spotted and wrinkled while it is militant, but wholly without mortal or venial [sin] while it triumphs. But it would be wholly a madman's [part] to argue from these a specific diversity of those churches, or that one [church] is not made of them, or that one infinitely exceeds the other in essential perfection.[3] For a blessed [man], a wayfarer and a damned [man] are of the same most special species, make up one human race, and are equal in essential perfection; and yet they are of such a condition that the lower is full of spot and wrinkled, and the second wholly without spot or wrinkle.[4] An accident therefore does not make one substance differ so much from another. Nor is it of avail to say that one may posit one aggregate of substance and accident, for instance of the infused habit of faith and the substances aggregated: both because such a unity is denied in the foundation of the reply, and also because such a habit of faith, remaining perpetually, would migrate from subject to subject and would receive foreign formal predications, alien to the nature of universals. Whence, in confirmation of the aforesaid teaching —[5] [419] And against this teaching the Cardinal is pertinently to be noted, on the Sext, *On Elections*, chapter *Fundamenta*. Pertinently, I say: first because [he was] a cardinal; second because the pope and the whole curia approved his teaching in this part; and third from the affection of name and surname, since it was [the teaching] of John the Monk.[6] For he writes first, defining the church, that it is the convocation of the faithful, because it calls all the faithful to itself, since outside that one [church] alone there is no salvation; this is sometimes called militant and sometimes triumphant: "Not," he says, "because they are two, but one, having diverse qualities." And the doctor maintains that there are not two catholic churches but one only, having two parts differing only by accident.[7] Therefore he adds: "The first is, according to Augustine, in the time of pilgrimage, the other [in the eternity] of abiding; the first in labour, the other in rest; the first in the way, the other in the homeland; the first fights with the enemy, the other reigns without an enemy; and hence the former church is called militant and the latter triumphant. For in Job 7:1 it is written: 'The life of man upon earth is a warfare'; and the

inter illos eciam sunt [420] infideles, ut allegat per leges multiplices, sed ecclesia triumphans tantum habet bonos, quia in illa non est macula mortalis neque ruga venialis (ut patet De Penitencia, distinccione prima, capitulo Ecclesia), et huius corpus scilicet ecclesie militantis caput est Christus ut sponsus. Et hec ecclesia militans fiet triumphans post resurreccionem universaliter, et cotidie fit triumphans in membris particulariter, ita quod ecclesia militans est sponsa, sed ducta in domum sponsi universaliter vel in suis membris fit uxor. Unde Apoc. XXI°, 9, dixit angelus beato Johanni: Veni et ostendam tibi sponsam, uxorem agni. Sic, inquit, reperio quod illa que est sponsa mariti ducta in domum efficietur uxor, Digestis, De Ritu Nuptiarum, Minorem. Et sicut hoc exemplo eadem mulier primo est sponsa et per qualitatem duccionis adiectam fit uxor, sic ecclesia militans vel anima fidelis hic sponsa Christi ducta in celestem Jerusalem uxor censebitur.

Apostle, 2 Timothy 2:3: 'Labour as a good soldier of Christ Jesus.' For one must labour on the way, striving against the flesh, the world and the devil; but a man by overcoming becomes victor, and, the victory consummated and the enemies put to flight, becomes by the grace of God a triumpher." And he alleges manifold laws for this manner of speaking.[8] Second, he says that this church militant is the mystical body of Christ in which the faithful are gathered. And among them there are also [420] unbelievers, as he alleges by manifold laws; but the church triumphant has only the good, for in it there is no spot of mortal [sin] nor wrinkle of venial (as is clear, *On Penance*, distinction 1, chapter *Ecclesia*); and of this body, namely of the church militant, Christ is the head as bridegroom.[9] And this church militant will become triumphant universally after the resurrection, and daily becomes triumphant in its members particularly; so that the church militant is a bride, but, led into the house of the bridegroom universally or in its members, it becomes a wife. Whence, Apocalypse 21:9, the angel said to blessed John: "Come and I will shew thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb." "So," he says, "I find that she who is the bride of a husband, led into the house, will be made a wife: *Digest*, *On the Rite of Marriages*, [the law] *Minorem*." And as by this example the same woman is first a bride and by the added quality of being led home becomes a wife, so the church militant, or a faithful soul, here the bride of Christ, led into the heavenly Jerusalem, will be reckoned a wife.[10]

¶2 420.19–420.26

[420] Istam celestem legem de articulo fidei a scriptura sacra per sanctos doctores et doctores iuris canonici elaboratam addiscerent legiste precipue et omnes catholici. Christus, inquit doctor, dicitur lapis angularis, duos parietes connectens adinvicem, quia ab Abel iusto in veteri testamento usque ad novissimum electum in fine seculi fideles connectit, constituendo ecclesiam, continue manens summus.

This heavenly law concerning an article of faith, worked out from holy scripture by holy doctors and by doctors of canon law, the legists above all, and all catholics, should learn.[11] "Christ," says the doctor, "is called the corner stone, joining two walls together, because from Abel the just in the old testament to the last elect at the end of the world he joins the faithful together, constituting the church, remaining continually highest."[12]

¶3 420.27–422.18
421.8 *and as spirits pass to glory they become part of the Church triumphant.*
421.15 *The spirit is the same person as the man.*

[420] Ex istis tercio patet destruccio erroris triplicis supradicti. Nam dicte differencie inter ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem non sunt differencie substanciales, sed valde accidentales, quia aliter nulla ecclesia militans foret triumphans; quod est contra predicta [421] et contra totam speciem militantis ecclesie. Si enim ista multitudo erit ecclesia triumphans, et ista multitudo est ecclesia militans, infallibiliter sequitur quod ecclesia militans erit ecclesia triumphans. Ex quo patet quod non differrent perfeccione essenciali excessu infinito, sicut substancia et accidens, et, si nemo militans Deo post

From these, thirdly, the destruction of the threefold error above is clear. For the said differences between the church militant and triumphant are not substantial differences, but very much accidental, because otherwise no church militant would be triumphant; which is against what has been said [421] and against the whole species of the church militant.[13] For if this multitude will be the church triumphant, and this multitude is the church militant, it infallibly follows that the church militant will be the church triumphant. From which it is clear that they would not differ in essential perfection by an infinite excess, as substance and accident do;

victoriam triumphabit, periret ab ecclesia animus militandi contra scripturam IIª Tim. IV, 8: De reliquo reposita est mihi corona iusticie quam reddet mihi in illa die iustus iudex; non quod nulla ecclesia est triumphans vel beata ante diem iudicii, sicut fingunt heretici, sed ut dicit Cardinalis particulatim: sicut spiritus transeunt ad gloriam, sic erunt ecclesia triumphans que quondam fuit militans. Ex quo secundo sequitur quod spiritus hominis est eadem persona cum homine, quia ecclesia que est modo militans, hoc est, multitudo personarum fidelium erit triumphans in nudo spiritu; aliter enim non diceret Apostolus ad Philippenses 1°, 23: Desiderium habens dissolvi et esse cum Christo, sicut diffuse et pulchre declarat Hugo, De Sacramentis, parte prima libri secundi, cap. XI°, in quo diffuse declarat quod Christus separata anima a carne et persona fuit et Deus et homo, ubi inter alia sic scribit: Anima quippe in quantum spiritus est racionalis ex se et per se habet esse personam, et quando corpus ei sociatur, eadem cum ipsa persona esse incipit; in quantum enim corpus cum anima unitum est, una persona cum anima est, sed tamen personam esse anima ex se habet, in quantum est racionalis spiritus, corpus vero hoc habet ex anima, in quantum unitum [422]est racionali spiritui. Istam autem materiam diffuse exposui in quodam tractatu De Anima, ubi ostendi quod anima, corpus et compositum sunt tres res sed idem homo in numero. Et idem expresse dicit venerabilis Anselmus in De Incarnacione cap. VII° quod, sicut in materia de trinitate multe persone sunt una substancia, sic in materia de incarnacione multe substancie vel nature sunt una persona. Et beatus Bernardus in Sermone De Nativitate qui sic incipit Hodie scietis quia veniet dominus. Attende, inquit, quia sicut in illa singulari divinitate trinitas est in personis, unitas in substancia, sic in ista speciali conmixcione incarnacionis trinitas est in substanciis, in persona unitas, utrobique tamen sine scissione vel confusione substancie vel persone. Verbum enim et anima et caro in unam convenere personam, et hec tria unum et hec unum tria non confusione substancie sed unitate persone.

and if no one soldiering for God will triumph after the victory, the spirit of soldiering would perish from the church, against the scripture, 2 Timothy 4:8: "As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the just judge will render to me in that day"; not that no church is triumphant or blessed before the day of judgement, as heretics feign, but, as the Cardinal says, one by one: "As spirits pass to glory, so will they be the church triumphant which once was militant."[14] From which, secondly, it follows that the spirit of a man is the same person with the man; for the church which is now militant, that is, the multitude of faithful persons, will be triumphant in bare spirit; for otherwise the Apostle would not say, Philippians 1:23: "having a desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ";[15] as Hugh declares at length and beautifully, *On the Sacraments*, the first part of the second book, chapter 11, in which he declares at length that Christ, the soul being separated from the flesh, was both a person and both God and man; where among other things he writes thus: "For the soul, in so far as it is a rational spirit, has of itself and through itself to be a person; and when a body is joined to it, it begins to be one person with it; for in so far as the body is united with the soul, it is one person with the soul; but yet the soul has of itself to be a person, in so far as it is a rational spirit, while the body has this from the soul, in so far as it is united [422]to a rational spirit."[16] And I have set out this matter at length in a certain treatise *On the Soul*, where I showed that the soul, the body and the composite are three things but the same man in number.[17] And the venerable Anselm says the same expressly in *On the Incarnation*, chapter 7: that as in the matter of the Trinity many persons are one substance, so in the matter of the incarnation many substances or natures are one person. And blessed Bernard [says it] in the sermon *On the Nativity* which begins thus, "Today you shall know that the Lord will come": "Attend," he says, "that as in that singular divinity there is trinity in persons, unity in substance, so in this special commingling of the incarnation there is trinity in substances, in person unity; yet on both sides without division or confusion of substance or person. For the Word and the soul and the flesh came together into one person; and these three [are] one, and this one three, not by confusion of substance but by unity of person."[18]

Notes

1. ***Patet ex testimonio sanctorum et ecclesia quod est unum corpus ...*** (running on from 18-a) is taken as "it is clear ... and [that] the church is that which is one mystical body"; *ecclesia* may instead stand beside *testimonio* ("from the testimony of the saints and of the church, that it is one body"). S. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 64 (remission of sins in the church), 65 (none outside it), 69 (the purgatorial fire) (PL 40); *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 47, the work of Ambrosiaster under Augustine's name (PL 35, 2247–2248).
2. ***Species specialissima***: the lowest species, here man. ***Unum per accidens***: the unity of a substance with its accident, which the doctor must grant of the persons of the church and the faith by which they are formally church.
3. ***Inducit ignoranciam arguentis***: the appeal to Augustine shows the arguer's ignorance. ***Non fit una ex illis***: "is not made", as the plate prints; *sit* would give "is not one [church] of them" (cf. 417, *nullo modo est una ecclesia ex hiis*). S. "Spot and wrinkle": Ephesians 5:27.
4. ***Beatus viator et dampnatus***: so the plate (418.21–22); taken as three, the blessed, the wayfarer and the damned. ***Inferior ... secundus*** then pairs loosely: the lower (the damned) and the "second" (the blessed). *Beatus viator*, "a blessed wayfarer", is also possible; the print may be faulty.
5. ***Est dare***: "one may posit". ***Substancia aggregatis*** does not agree; taken as "the substances aggregated". ***Peregrinas predicaciones***: predications foreign to it, as no accident passes from subject to subject. T. At 418.31 B reads *et fundamento*. *Unde in confirmacionem supradicte sentencie* has no verb; Loserth queries *nude* for *Unde* (418.35); something may be lost at the foot of the page.
6. Johannes Monachus (Jean Lemoine, d. 1313), cardinal, his gloss on the Sext, *VI* 1.6.17, *Fundamenta* (Loserth: *Sexti Decret.* lib. I, tit. VI, cap. XVII; the modern form is ours), with Loserth's literature on the gloss, Savigny VI.103 and Jöcher II.1933 (Loserth's references, not independently checked). C. ***Ex affeccione nominis et cognominis***: the third reason turns on the name, John "the Monk"; Wyclif does not say why it is pertinent. R. A in the margin at 419.1: ***Cardinalis. Nota distinccionem inter ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem; et ecclesia militans quomodo est hic sponsa et in celis est uxor***.
7. ***Doctor***: here the Cardinal. ***Describendo***: "defining" (glossary: *descripcio*). R. B in the margin at 419.8: ***Nota quid est unica ecclesia catholica tantum***.
8. ***Altera determinante mansionis*** (419.15–16) does not construe; the plate prints it so. It is translated as *altera in eternitate mansionis* (our emendation), Augustine's phrase, *Tract. in Ioh.* 124.5: *una in tempore peregrinationis, altera in aeternitate mansionis; una in labore, altera in requie*, whose sequence the passage follows (PL 35). At 419.15 B omits *in tempore peregrinacionis*. S. Job 7:1; 2 Timothy 2:3. The laws the Cardinal alleges are not given. G. ***Miles***: "soldier", the Pauline figure (glossary: *milicia; milites*).
9. B in the margin at 419.28: ***Ecclesia militans est corpus Christi misticum***. S. *De pen.* D. 1, the chapter *Ecclesia*; Loserth's reference is printed "Decr. II pars, causa XXIII, q. III, cap. LXX", but *De penitencia* stands in C. 33 q. 3, so read XXXIII: C. 33 q. 3 (*De pen.*) D. 1 c. 70, Jerome on Ephesians, *Ecclesia Christi est, non habens maculam neque rugam* (Friedberg I, 1180). C. ***Huius corpus scilicet ecclesie militantis caput***: *corpus* where the sense wants *corporis*; translated "of this body".
10. At 420.11 the manuscripts read *Apoc. XIX*; Loserth's correction is translated. At 420.16 B reads *a directa fit*, and at 420.17 *fidelis huius*. S. Apocalypse 21:9. *Dig.* 23.2.4, *Minorem* (Loserth: *Dig.* lib. XXIII, tit. II, *De ritu nuptiarum* 4; the modern form is ours). C. *Sponsa*: in the Digest the betrothed; "bride" is kept for the figure. *Duccio*: the leading of the bride into the husband's house. R. A in the margin at 420.6: ***Conclusio***.
11. ***Istam celestem legem***: the Cardinal's teaching on the church, an article of faith, which the civil lawyers (*legiste*, read on the plate) should learn from a canonist; *addiscerent* is taken as a subjunctive of what ought to be.
12. The corner stone: Ephesians 2:20 (DR "the chief corner stone"); Psalm 117:22. Abel the just: Matthew 23:35. The words continue the Cardinal's gloss. T. At 420.24 B reads *testamenti*. R. A in the margin at 420.22: ***Quomodo Christus est lapis angularis***.
13. ***Contra totam speciem militantis ecclesie***: as printed; *spem* "hope" would give the better sense ("against the whole hope of the church militant"), and the print is translated. R. A in the margin at 420.31: ***Ecclesia nunc militans postea erit triumphans***.
14. 2 Timothy 4:8: Wyclif reads *De reliquo* for *In reliquo* and omits *Dominus* (DR "the Lord the just judge"); *nemo militans Deo* echoes 2 Timothy 2:4 (DR "No man, being a soldier to God"). The Cardinal's words again from the gloss on *Fundamenta*. C. ***Particulatim***: one by one, as each spirit passes.
15. Philippians 1:23. C. ***In nudo spiritu***: in spirit alone, before the resurrection; the church triumphant now is the same persons as the church militant. R. A in the margin at 421.15: ***Spiritus hominis est eadem persona cum homine***; B at 421.21: ***Quod homo est anima sua***.
16. Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* 2.1.11 (Loserth: Migne col. 409): Hugh reads *Anima quippe in quantum est spiritus rationalis, ex se et per se habet esse personam*, which confirms Loserth's *personam*; Wyclif rearranges lightly. T. At 421.26–27 the manuscripts read *persona*; Loserth corrects to *personam* from Hugh's text, and his correction is translated. R. A in the margin at 421.21: ***Hugo***.
17. Wyclif's own treatise; the teaching is *De compositione hominis* c. 2 (Society ed., 31: *omnis homo est in principio tres nature, scilicet corpus, anima et compositum ex eisdem*), whose words B echoes (Loserth gives no reference). T. At 422.3 B reads *tres nature sed*.
18. Anselm, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (Loserth: *De fide Trinitatis*, *Opp.* p. 479; Wyclif's ch. 7; the passage, *sicut enim in Deo una natura est plures personae ... ita in Christo una persona est plures naturae*, is ch. 6 in Migne, PL 158). Bernard, *In vigilia Nativitatis Domini*, sermon 3 (Loserth: *Opp.* p. 41), §8: *sicut in illa singulari divinitate trinitas est in personis, unitas in substantia; sic in ista speciali commistione trinitas est in substantiis, in persona unitas* (PL 183); its opening words are the Christmas-vigil introit, from Exodus 16:6–7 (DR "In the evening you shall know"). C. *Et beatus Bernardus ...* has no verb; "[says it]" is supplied from *idem ... dicit*. T. At 422.7 A and A_1 read *vel substancie*; at 422.14 the manuscripts read *personis*, A's margin *persona, ut habetur in textu S. Bernhardi*, which Loserth prints. R. A in the margin at 422.5: ***Anselmus***; at 422.9: ***Bernhardus***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 418: *in*
  - 419: ∅ (inserted run is the end of p.418 already in the main scan; p.419 begins Et contra istam)

- **419: *istam***
- **419: *primo* (1 is a margin argument numeral)**
- **419: *fidelium* (italic)**
- **419: *1* (italic x-height numeral with no cap height = old-style 1 (leaf zoomed))**
- **419: *congregantur* (italic)**
- **419: *inter***
- **419: *illos***
- **420: *Christi***
- **420: *scriptura* (alinea E at the edge, not text)**
- **420: *legiste* (print reads legiste) [NW]**
- **420: ∅ (see is the English side-note (Hence we see))**
- **420: *predicta* (pre- here, dicta at top of p.421 with 187 folio mark; main token holds whole word, p.421 pos 0 is et)**
- **421: *II^{a}***
- **421: *iustus***
- **420: ∅ ('umphans' already inside neighbour 53 triumphans) [DELX]**
- **418: *Encheridion* (Enche-/ridion; ridion absent from output (next token LXIV), so whole word) [-MARK]**
- **418: *LXIV°* (no comma; followed by cap.) [-MARK]**
- **419: *II^{a}* (italic, superscript a) [-MARK]**
- **420: *ecclesia* (eccle-/sia; output holds both halves; 30 is the line number) [-MARK]**

Part 3: The church spread through the world; the devil head of his members; avarice and the death of Christ

Loserth pp. 422.19–426.30

¶1 422.19–424.10
422.19
8. My opponent grants that the Church is spread throughout the world, and cites Augustine.
423.5 *Why does he not admit with Augustine that militant are triumphant and one Church?*
423.24 *The militant Church is circumscribed as to place.*
424.4
9. My opponent allows that the Church has substance and parts.
424.11 *In denying that the devil is head of his members, he goes against holy doctors.*
424.24 *Iscariot is the type of foreknown bishops, as Peter is of the predestinate.*

[422] **Ad octavam raciunculam conceditur quod universalis ecclesia est diffusa per totum orbem terrarum, cum corpus Christi quod est ecclesia sit diffinitum loco, et allegatur Augustinus XVIII° De Civitate Dei, cap. L°, et XXII° De Civitate Dei, cap. XXVIII°. Hic miror quare de virtute sermonis ex auctoritate Augustini conceditur quod ecclesia est diffusa per totum orbem terrarum et tamen non conceduntur alia que eque asserit Augustinus de ipsa ecclesia; nam per maiorem partem orbis terrarum non est aliquis christianus, nullibi est ecclesia** [423] **nisi ubi est aliquis christianus, ergo per maiorem partem orbis terrarum non est ecclesia. Et si dicitur quod est ibi secundum potestatem, sic revera quelibet persona sancte matris ecclesie est ubique, et sic concederet cum beato Augustino quod tam ecclesia militans quam triumphans est pars tocius ecclesie. Hoc enim persepe dicunt sancti doctores, licet mendacissime dicatur quod nullibi dicit aliquis doctor unam esse ecclesiam ex istis. Nam (ut sepe allegavi) Augustinus, Encheridion LXIV° cap. ponit illud et in De Questionibus veteris et nove legis cap. XLVII° sic scribit: Non solum autem nos sed et superni cives ecclesie membra sunt. Aliter enim ipsa non esset corpus vel sponsa Christi et persona manens continue una a principio mundi usque in eternum. Non enim est racio quare ex omnibus christianis quantumcunque localiter distantibus componitur unum corpus, quin per idem ex beatis et viantibus; nec potest colorari racio, quomodo ex**

To the eighth little argument it is granted that the universal church is spread throughout the whole world, although the body of Christ, which is the church, is bounded by place; and Augustine is alleged, *City of God* book 18, chapter 50, and *City of God* book 22, chapter 28.[1] Here I wonder why, in the proper sense of the words, it is granted on Augustine's authority that the church is spread throughout the whole world, and yet the other things which Augustine asserts equally of the church herself are not granted; for through the greater part of the world there is no Christian; nowhere is there church [423] **except where there is some Christian; therefore through the greater part of the world there is no church.[2] And if it is said that it is there according to power, in that way truly any person of holy mother church is everywhere; and so he would grant with blessed Augustine that the church militant as well as the church triumphant is a part of the whole church. For the holy doctors say this very often, although it is said most mendaciously that no doctor anywhere says that one church is made of these. For (as I have often alleged) Augustine lays it down in the *Enchiridion*, chapter 64, and in *On the Questions of the Old and New Law*, chapter 47, writes thus: "And not only we, but the citizens above too, are members of the church."[3] For otherwise she would not be the body or bride of Christ, and one**

tota multitudine fidei christianorum, licet fuit valde disparis speciei, resultat una fides que est formale quo constituitur ecclesia, quin a pari ex omnibus predestinatis sit una sponsa Christi. Sic enim ex beatis viantibus et dampnatis fit unum genus humanum, unde quod dicitur ecclesiam militantem non esse circumscriptive alicubi falsum est, cum sit corpus habens unum locum circumscribentem, sicut habet unam fidem, et sic est corpus animatum racionale, nam est corpus sensibile exercens actus vitales, sicut multitudinis credencium erat cor unum et anima una, ut dicitur Act. IV°, 32. Ideo valde remota est dissimilitudo ad probandum quod non est animata, licet vivat, sicut spiritus vivunt, et non sunt animati. Si enim spiritus forent organici [424]sensibiles et gressibiles, sicut sunt militantes ecclesie, tunc oporteret concedendo ipsos vivere consequenter concedere quod sunt animati, sed hoc concedit doctor de ecclesia. Dicit enim in responsione ad novam raciunculam quod ecclesia est aliquid, quia substancia, cum totum sit sue partes, et habet dicta ecclesia tam partes quantitativas quam qualitativas, nec fingetur habere partes qualitativas, si non animas, et per consequens, sicut ecclesia est vivens multis vitis, sic est animata multis animabus.

person remaining continuously from the beginning of the world for ever. For there is no reason why one body is composed out of all Christians, however distant in place, but that by the same token [one is composed] out of the blessed and those on the road; nor can a reason be given colour how out of the whole multitude of the faith of Christians, although it was of very unlike species, there results one faith, which is the formal [principle] by which the church is constituted, but that equally out of all the predestinate there is one bride of Christ.[4] For so out of the blessed, those on the road and the damned there comes one human race; whence what is said, that the church militant is not anywhere circumscriptively, is false, since it is a body having one circumscribing place, as it has one faith; and so it is an ensouled rational body, for it is a perceptible body exercising vital acts, as the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul, as it is said, Acts 4:32.[5] Therefore the unlikeness [brought] to prove that it is not ensouled, although it lives, as spirits live and are not ensouled, is very remote. For if spirits were organic, [424]perceptible and able to walk, as the militants of the church are, then in granting that they live one would have consequently to grant that they are ensouled; now the doctor grants this of the church. For he says in his answer to the ninth little argument that the church is something, because a substance, since the whole is its parts, and the said church has quantitative parts as well as qualitative ones; nor will it be feigned to have qualitative parts, if not souls; and consequently, as the church is living with many lives, so it is ensouled with many souls.[6]

¶2 424.11–426.30
425.15 *Augustine remarks that it was avarice that led the High Priests to conspire against Christ;* 426.20 *and to bring about the ruin that they feared.*

[424]Ulterius quando negatur dyabolum caput esse membrorum suorum, expresse contradicitur sanctis doctoribus, cum beatus Gregorius, Omelia XVI[a], super illud Matthei IV°, 1: Ductus est Jesus in desertum a spiritu, ita scribit: Certe iniquorum omnium dyabolus caput est, et huius capitis membra sunt omnes iniqui. An non dyaboli membrum fuit Pylatus? Sicut ergo est corpus iniquorum, sic est caput eorum, sicut multi qui censentur summi pontifices sunt capita particularium membrorum diaboli; nullus autem prescitus est caput sancte matris ecclesie nec alicuius membri eius, sed sicut Petrus gessit typum omnium predestinatorum pastorum ipsum sequencium post Christum, sic Scarioth gessit typum omnium episcoporum prescitorum ipsum sequencium post dyabolum, non quod ante istos non erant priores in sancta matre ecclesia quorum ipsi erant filii nati pro patribus, sed quod in tempore novi testamenti isti erant capitales post caput ecclesie et principem huius [425]mundi. Differencia

Further, when it is denied that the devil is head of his members, the holy doctors are expressly contradicted, since blessed Gregory, homily 16, on that text of Matthew 4:1, "Jesus was led by the spirit into the desert," writes thus: "Surely the devil is head of all the wicked, and all the wicked are members of this head. Was not Pilate a member of the devil?"[7] As, therefore, there is a body of the wicked, so there is a head of them, just as many who are reckoned highest pontiffs are heads of particular members of the devil; but no foreknown [man] is head of holy mother church or of any member of her; but as Peter bore the type of all the predestinate pastors following him after Christ, so Iscariot bore the type of all the foreknown bishops following him after the devil; not that before these there were not earlier ones in holy mother church, whose sons they were, born instead of the fathers, but that in the time of the new testament these were the chiefs after the head of the church and the prince of this

autem est inter istos capitaneos, quia boni siciunt precipue virtutes subditorum et lucra animarum suarum, mali autem econtra precipue siciunt temporalia subditorum. Unde Scarioth maximus symoniacus et proprietarius ferens loculos dixit, quasi continuando avariciam pontificum veteris testamenti: Quid vultis mihi dare et ego eum vobis tradam, Matthei XXVI°, 15. Nec dubium quin avaricia quam pontifices habebant circa lucrum templi fecit eos intendere mortem Christi; Johannis XI°, 47, 48, sic scribitur: Collegerunt pontifices et pharisei consilium adversus Jesum et dicebant: Quid faciemus, quia hic homo multa signa facit? si dimittimus eum sic, omnes credent in eum et venient Romani et tollent locum nostrum et gentem. Super quo Augustinus Omelia XLIXª notat primo quomodo invalescente avaricia sacerdotum tempore Christi fuit officium venale nedum pluribus existentibus sacerdotibus simul, ut elicit de Zacharia, Luce I, sed eodem anno per circumvencionem avaram versati fuerunt summi pontifices, et ista avaricia excecavit et excitavit eos ad blaspheme conspirandum in mortem domini. Plus, inquit Augustinus, perditi homines cogitabant quomodo nocerent ut perderent, quam quomodo sibi consulerent ne perirent; ideo collegerunt consilium contra salutem anime sue, quia contra signa veritatis salutaris seviebant. Secundo notat Augustinus quomodo timor perdicionis questus templi fuit causa precipua mortis Christi: Temporalia, inquit, perdere timuerunt et vitam eternam non cogitaverunt et sic utrumque amiserunt. [426] Hec autem timuerant ne, si omnes homines in Christum crederent, nemo remaneret qui adversus Romanos civitatem et templum defenderet. Conceperant enim Christum esse hostem templi et ministrorum eius, et per consequens inimicum ecclesie capitalem, eo quod tradiciones avaricie detexit (Matthei XV°), contra scelera eorum multiplex ve invexit (Matthei XXIII°), ymmo de templo eorum instrumenta avaricie dominanter evexit (Matthei XXI°, 12 et Johannis II°). Ideo accusarunt eum reportacione falsa de potestate ruine templi minata, quod potuit destruere templum illud et in tribus diebus reedificare illud (ut patet Matthei XXVI° ex dicto Christi Johannis II°, 19: Solvite templum hoc et in tribus diebus excito illud). Unde tamquam habentes hoc plus cordi inproperabant domino crucifixo: Vach, inquiunt, qui destruit templum Dei et in tribus diebus reedificat illud, Matthei XXVII°, 40. Contra templum, inquit Augustinus, et contra suas paternas leges esse totam doctrinam Christi temere senciebant, et ideo iusto Dei iudicio evenit eis finis quem prepostere sic timebant. Nam quadragesimo secundo anno post ascensionem domini per Tytum et Vespasianum tam gentem quam locum perpetuo deperdebant, et sic verificatum est de eis illud

[425] world.[8] And the difference between these captains is that the good thirst chiefly for the virtues of their subjects and the gain of their souls, but the bad, on the contrary, thirst chiefly for the temporal goods of their subjects. Whence Iscariot, the greatest simoniac and a proprietary, carrying the purse, said, as if continuing the avarice of the pontiffs of the old testament: "What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" Matthew 26:15.[9] Nor is there doubt that the avarice which the pontiffs had about the gain of the temple made them aim at the death of Christ; in John 11:47–48 it is written thus: "The chief priests and the Pharisees gathered a council against Jesus and said: What shall we do, for this man doth many miracles? If we let him alone so, all will believe in him; and the Romans will come, and take away our place and nation."[10] On which Augustine, homily 49, notes first how, as the avarice of the priests grew strong in Christ's time, the office was for sale: not only were there several priests at once, as he draws out of Zachary, Luke 1, but in the same year, by avaricious circumvention, the high priests were changed; and this avarice blinded them and stirred them to conspire blasphemously in the death of the Lord. "Lost men," says Augustine, "thought more how they might do harm, so as to destroy, than how they might take counsel for themselves, so as not to perish"; therefore they gathered a council against the salvation of their own soul, because they raged against the signs of saving truth.[11] Secondly, Augustine notes how fear of losing the gain of the temple was the chief cause of the death of Christ: "They feared," he says, "to lose temporal things, and did not think of eternal life, and so they lost both. [426] And they had feared this, lest, if all men believed in Christ, no one would remain to defend the city and the temple against the Romans." For they had conceived Christ to be an enemy of the temple and of its ministers, and consequently the chief enemy of the church, because he exposed the traditions of avarice (Matthew 15), brought in a manifold woe against their crimes (Matthew 23), indeed carried the instruments of avarice out of their temple as a lord (Matthew 21:12 and John 2).[12] Therefore they accused him with a false report about a threatened power of ruin to the temple, that he could destroy that temple and in three days rebuild it (as is clear in Matthew 26, from Christ's saying, John 2:19: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I raise it up").[13] Whence, as though they had this more at heart, they reproached the Lord crucified: "Vah," they say, "he that destroyeth the temple of God and in three days rebuildeth it," Matthew 27:40. "They thought rashly," says Augustine, "that the whole doctrine of Christ was against the temple and against

Matthei VIII°, 12: Filii autem regni huius eicientur in tenebras exteriores. Unde imposuerunt sibi horribiliorem speciem heresis que est blasphemia, per quam coloracius possent eum extinguere. Johannis XIX°, 7 scribitur: Nos legem habemus et secundum legem debet mori, quia filium Dei se fecit. De lege autem occidendi blasphemum patet Levitici XXIV°, 16.

their fathers' laws"; and therefore by the just judgment of God there befell them the end which they so perversely feared. For in the forty-second year after the ascension of the Lord, through Titus and Vespasian, they lost both nation and place for ever, and so that text of Matthew 8:12 was verified of them: "But the children of this kingdom shall be cast out into the exterior darkness."[14] Whence they laid on him the more horrible species of heresy, which is blasphemy, by which they could extinguish him with more colour. In John 19:7 it is written: "We have a law; and according to the law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." And the law of killing a blasphemer is clear from Leviticus 24:16.[15]

Notes

1. ***Cum ... sit diffinitum loco*** is taken as concessive ("although"): the doctor grants the church's diffusion although the body is bounded by place; causal "since" is also possible. S. Augustine, ***De civitate Dei*** 18.50, ***primum se ab Jerusalem diffudit Ecclesia*** (PL 41); Wyclif's 22.28 (on Plato, Labeo and Varro and the resurrection) does not fit and is given as he cites it. Loserth gives no reference. R. A in the margin at 422.19: ***Tercia responsio***. Loserth compares p. 115.
2. A syllogism: no Christian through most of the world; no church where there is no Christian; therefore no church through most of the world. R. A in the margin at 422.25: ***Ecclesia est diffusa per totum orbem et per maiorem partem orbis non est ecclesia***.
3. ***Secundum potestatem***: present by power, not in place; then every person of the church would be everywhere. ***Unam esse ecclesiam ex istis***: that one church is made of the militant and the triumphant. S. Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 64 (PL 40); ***Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*** 47, the work of Ambrosiaster under Augustine's name (Loserth: Aug. ***Opp.*** III, Append. p. 60). Both were cited at 418.4–5.
4. ***Non est racio quare ... quin***: there is no reason why the one holds and not the other. ***Formale quo***: the formal principle by which the church is constituted. ***Licet fuit valde disparis speciei***: the faith of the many believers, though unlike in species, yields one faith; so the predestinate, though unlike, make one bride. G. ***Colorari***: "be given colour", a plausible ground (glossary: ***color***, ***colorare***).
5. ***Circumscriptive***: in a place as a body is, bounded by it. ***Corpus animatum racionale***: the definition of man, here applied to the church. S. Acts 4:32, an allusion, roman in the print. R. B in the margin at 423.27: ***Ecclesia est corpus animatum racionale***.
6. ***Militantes ecclesie***: the church's members in the warfare. ***Nec fingetur habere partes qualitativas, si non animas***: no qualitative parts can be supposed in the church unless they are souls. ***Totum sit sue partes***: the whole is its parts. R. A in the margin at 424.4: ***Quarta responsio***. Loserth compares p. 115. T. The print reads ***novam*** (plate n0461, 424.4; no variant). It does not fit the count of the opponent's arguments (side-note 424.4: '9.'), and 'ninth' follows ***nonam*** (our emendation).
7. Gregory, ***Homiliae in Evangelia*** 1.16.1 (Loserth: ***XL Homil. in Evang.*** lib. I, hom. XVI, 1, ***Opp.*** I, p. 1492): ***iniquorum omnium caput diabolus est, et hujus capitis membra sunt omnes iniqui*** (PL 76); Matthew 4:1, where Wyclif gives only the opening words. R. A in the margin at 424.11: ***Diabolus est caput omnium suorum membrorum*** (B: ***omnium iniquorum***); at 424.13: ***Gregorius***.
8. ***Summi pontifices***: "highest pontiffs" here, of the popes reckoned as such; of the Jewish priesthood at 425.20 the same words are "high priests". ***Capitales***: "the chiefs", Peter after Christ, Iscariot after the devil, the prince of this world. S. Psalm 44:17 (DR "Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to thee"); John 12:31. T. At 424.25 B omits ***prescitorum***. R. A in the margin at 424.22: ***Sicut Petrus gessit typum omnium predestinatorum pastorum, sic Judas omnium prescitorum pastorum ipsum in avaricia sequencium***; B: ***Petrus gessit typum pastorum predestinatorum et Scarioth pastorum iniquorum***.
9. ***Proprietarius***: one who holds property as his own, set against the propertyless. S. John 12:6 (the purse); Matthew 26:15. T. At 425.2 and 425.4 A reads ***sciciunt*** (corrected in the margin at 425.4 to ***siciunt***).
10. John 11:47–48: Wyclif adds ***adversus Jesum*** and reads ***faciemus*** for the Vulgate's ***facimus*** (DR "What do we"), and ***consilium*** for ***concilium***. R. A in the margin at 425.8: ***Avaricia sacerdotum fecit mortem Cristi***. T. At 425.9 B reads ***lucra***.
11. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 49.27 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** III, ii, p. 629); Wyclif calls the tractate a homily. Zachary's course: Luke 1:5–9. C. ***Nedum ... sed***: "not only ... but". ***Versati fuerunt***: the high priests were turned over, changed within the year. T. At 425.20 B reads ***variati fuerunt***. R. B in the margin at 425.18: ***Nota bene quare pontifices et pharisei Christum fuerant persecuti***.
12. The quotation is taken to run to ***defenderet*** (426.2); ***Conceperant enim*** is Wyclif's. ***Dominanter***: "as a lord". S. Matthew 15:1–9; 23:13–33; 21:12; John 2:15. T. At 425.30 B reads ***utraque***.

13. ***Minata*** is ablative and agrees with ***potestate*** (or with ***reportacione***), not with the genitive ***ruine***: the power of destroying the temple that he was said to have threatened. S. Matthew 26:61; John 2:19, where the Vulgate reads ***excitabo*** (DR "I will raise it up"); Wyclif has the present ***excito***. T. At 426.9 A adds ***Ideo accusarunt … potestate*** in the last line of the page, and B sets it in the margin; at 426.10 B omits ***de potestate***; B in the margin at 426.15: ***de potestate***.
14. Matthew 27:40: the Vulgate reads ***Vah qui destruis templum Dei et in triduo illud reaedificas*** (DR "Vah, thou that destroyest the temple of God and in three days dost rebuild it"); Wyclif gives it in the third person. Augustine again ***Tract. in Ioh.*** 49. Matthew 8:12: Wyclif adds ***huius***. T. At 426.22 AA_1 read ***Vaspasianum***, B ***Vaspesianum***.
15. ***Imposuerunt sibi***: ***sibi*** for ***ei***, "on him". ***Coloracius***: "with more colour", a more plausible ground (glossary: ***color***). S. John 19:7; Leviticus 24:16. R. A in the margin at 426.26: ***Christo fuit imposita blasphemia et heresis, ut cicius extingueretur***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 422: ***diffusa***
  - 423: ***nisi*** (folio mark 187[b] glued, reading is the Latin word)
  - 423: ***cum***
  - 424: ***esse*** (alinea letter H glued) [NW]
  - 424: ***1*** (x-height old-style arabic 1 (verse number after IV°))
  - 425: ***mundi*** (folio mark 187[c] glued)
  - 425: ***15*** (main token i. covers printed 15.)
  - 425: ***XLIX[a]***
  - 425: ***fuit***
  - 426: ***II°*** (print has Johannis II°). before Ideo)
  - 426: ***II°*** (print has Johannis II°). before Ideo)
  - 426: ***II°***

Part 4: The devil's four-horse chariot; the abuse of endowment; the betrayers of the truth

Loserth pp. 426.31–430.31

¶1 426.31–428.7
427.18 *Avarice makes our clergy dread the loss of endowments more than the sin of a war with France.*
428.8 *An abuse of this kind can be best remedied by removing the thing abused.*

[426]Et ex isto consolati sunt fideles equanimiter tolerare obprobria heresis a pseudocardinalibus et [427]discipulis Scarioth ad hoc promoventibus propter defensionem veritatis evangelice, cum Christus propter persecucionem humiliter ita tulit. Et utinam pontifices templi, scribe et pharisei non haberent hodie cum Scarioth in ecclesia discipulos imitantes. Si enim sunt hodie seculares sacerdotes tamquam pontifices et religiosi possessionati tamquam pharisei qui secundum apparenciam religionis a populo sunt divisi et tercio doctores tradicionis humane tamquam scribe ac quarto profitentes evangelicam paupertatem cum Scarioth qui omnes nitantur impugnare evangelicam veritatem, non mirum si in ista quadriga diaboli Christi ecclesia perturbatur. Signum autem perversionis persone prime partis proprietarie foret, si plus fureret propter audicionem ablacionis suorum temporalium quam propter quantumcunque gravem lapsum ecclesie in peccatum; tunc enim plus afficeretur temporalibus quam honori Dei vel utilitati ecclesie verbi gracia. Si clerus Anglie magis timet amissionem dotacionis regie quam peccatum regni invadendo regnum Francie, non video quin philargiria sit seductus; utrumque nempe istorum potest bene fieri, sed indubie primum est propinquius potestati et facilitati humane, ut

And from this the faithful are comforted to bear with equanimity the reproaches of heresy from pseudo-cardinals and [427]disciples of Iscariot who promote [them] to this, for the defence of gospel truth, since Christ bore it so humbly for persecution.[1] And would that the pontiffs of the temple, the scribes and Pharisees, did not have disciples today in the church imitating them, with Iscariot! For if there are today secular priests as pontiffs, and possessioner religious as Pharisees, who according to the appearance of religion are separated from the people, and thirdly doctors of human tradition as scribes, and fourthly those professing gospel poverty, with Iscariot, who all strive to attack gospel truth, it is no wonder if in this four-horse chariot of the devil the church of Christ is thrown into disorder.[2] And it would be a sign of perversion in a person of the first, proprietary party if he raged more at hearing of the taking-away of his temporal goods than at a lapse of the church into sin, however grave; for then he would be more affected toward temporal goods than toward the honour of God or the profit of the church. For example: if the clergy of England fears the loss of the royal endowment more than the sin of the kingdom in invading the kingdom of France, I do not see

absque periculo anime fiat iuste. Quis (inquam) dubitat quin facilius foret regem et regnum ponere clerum nostrum in statu primevo qui foret isto statu perfeccior servando undique caritatem et evacuando pompam, rancorem ac avariciam quam exercitum Anglie invadendo Franciam, propter caritatem ad hostes, ipsos temporalibus spoliando et propter amorem eos generaliter occidendo. Et tamen ad hoc secundum consulimus ex isto colore quod potest fieri meritorie in casu possibili quoad Deum et possibilitatem primi [428] tamquam venenum abnuimus contra fidem scripture et sanctorum testimonium. Nam beatus Jeronimus libro II° super Osee, exponens illud Osee IX°, 14: Da eis ubera arencia, ita scribit: Si hiis que pro benediccione donavit male abutamur et in contrarium quam ab eo data sunt convertantur, expedit ut auferantur a nobis.

but that it has been seduced by love of money; for both of these can well be done, but undoubtedly the first is nearer to human power and ease, so that it may be done justly without danger to the soul.[3] Who (I say) doubts that it would be easier for the king and kingdom to put our clergy in the primitive state, which would be more perfect than this state, keeping charity on every side and emptying out pomp, rancour and avarice, than [to put] the army of England to invading France, for charity toward the enemies despoiling them of temporal goods, and for love killing them wholesale?[4] And yet to this second we give counsel, on this colour, that it can be done meritoriously in a possible case as regards God; and the possibility of the first [428] we reject as poison, against the faith of scripture and the testimony of the saints.[5] For blessed Jerome, in book 2 on Hosea, expounding that text of Hosea 9:14, "Give them dry breasts," writes thus: "If we abuse what he gave for a blessing, and they are turned to the contrary of that for which they were given by him, it is expedient that they be taken from us."[6]

¶2 428.8–430.31
429.18 *The friars, who profess poverty, neglect to preach the truth.*
430.20 *We ought not to be silent for fear of offending the enemies of the gospel.*

[428] Nec credo esse meliorem medicinam contra abusum huiusmodi quam bonum abusum per eum cuius interest amoveri, nec dubium quin rex penes quem oportet residere capitale dominium (ut ostendit Hugo II° De Sacramentis, parte secunda, cap. VII°) habet precipuum interesse. Unde in desidiam regum monet Deus nunc gentem exteram ad predandum, nunc eventum aeris vel bestie ad vastandum (ut patet Joelis I°, 5). Ululate, inquit propheta, omnes qui bibitis vinum in dulcedine, quoniam periit ab ore vestro vel (ut habent septuaginta) ablatum est ab ore vestro. Super quo Jeronimus: Sepe quippe fit Dei providencia ut qui non cognoverant eum in prosperis cognoscent in adversis, et qui diviciis male abusi sunt ad vicia, ad virtutes penuria corrigantur. Et talem abusum temporalium reor esse causam bellorum et perturbacionis tocius ecclesie militantis; quibus enim servus Christi abutitur irregulariter in hiis punitur; quod si animus cleri inordinate afficitur istis bonis, nemo in ecclesia magis nocet, eo quod sub colore religionis palliat perseverancius et forcius abusum temporalium et plus inficit residuum ecclesie (ut ostendit Crisostomus, Omelia XXXI[a] Operis Imperfecti). Unde Augustinus tractatu [429] quarto super Psalmo XXX: Maxime illi persecuntur ecclesiam qui christiani nolunt bene vivere; per hos enim obprobrium habet ecclesia et ab hiis inimicicias sustinet; quando corripiuntur, quando male vivere non permittuntur, quando cum eis vel verbo agitur, ipsi mala in suis cordibus meditantur et erumpendi occasionem exquirunt. Tales

Nor do I believe there is a better medicine against abuse of this kind than that the good abused be removed by him whose concern it is;[7] nor is there doubt that the king, with whom the chief lordship must reside (as Hugh shows, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 2, chapter 7), has the chief interest.[8] Whence, against the sloth of kings, God prompts now a foreign nation to plunder, now a happening of the air or of beasts to lay waste (as is clear in Joel 1:5). "Mourn," says the prophet, "all ye that take delight in drinking sweet wine: for it is cut off from your mouth," or (as the Seventy have it) "it is taken away from your mouth." On which Jerome: "For it often comes about by the providence of God that those who had not known him in prosperity know him in adversity, and that those who abused riches to vices are corrected to virtues by want."[9] And I reckon such abuse of temporal goods to be the cause of wars and of the disturbance of the whole church militant; for in the things which a servant of Christ abuses irregularly, in these he is punished; and if the mind of the clergy is inordinately affected toward these goods, no one in the church does more harm, because under colour of religion it cloaks the abuse of temporal goods more persistently and more strongly, and infects the rest of the church more (as Chrysostom shows, homily 31 of the *Opus imperfectum*).[10] Whence Augustine, in the [429] fourth treatise on Psalm 30: "Those persecute the church most who, being Christians, will not live well; for through them the church has reproach, and from them it suffers

declarat beatus Gregorius, I° Pastoralium, esse sacerdotes malos. Et hec est racio quare Christus et sancti doctores invexerunt tam acute contra huiusmodi sacerdotes. Nam, ut ait Gregorius, Omelia XVII, nullum puto fratres carissimi maius preiudicium tolerat Deus quam a sacerdotibus. Ideo ad vindicandum illam Dei iniuriam debent christiani magis animose, aspere et unite consurgere, quia secundum Crisostomum, Omelia XVIII[a] Operis Imperfecti, non est verus discipulus qui non imitatur magistrum nec est imago qui non est similis auctori. Et quoad discipulos Scariothis consideremus, si sunt aliqui professores vite exproprietarie, quin vel impugnant vel sophisticant vel tacent indebite evangelicam veritatem. Omnes enim illi sunt cum Scarioth proditores veritatis evangelice que est Christus, ut declarat Crisostomus, Omelia XLIX[na] Operis Imperfecti et parcialiter ponitur in decretis XI[a], q. III[a]: Nolite, inquit, timere eos qui occidunt corpus, ne forte propter timorem mortis non libere dicatis quod audistis nec fiducialiter predicetis omnibus quod in aure soli audistis. Sic ergo ex hiis verbis ostenditur quod non [430] solum ille est proditor veritatis qui transgrediens veritatem palam pro veritate loquitur mendacium, sed eciam ille qui non libere pronunciat veritatem quam libere pronunciare oportet aut qui non libere veritatem defendit quam libere defendere convenit, proditor est veritatis. Nam sicut sacerdos debitor est, ut veritatem quam audivit a Deo predicet, sic laicus debitor est, ut veritatem quam audivit a sacerdotibus probatam quidem in scripturis fiducialiter defendat. Quod si non fecerit, prodidit veritatem. Ex istis dictis cum explanatis alibi et statu ecclesie patet quod nimis multi sunt vicarii Scariothis, non solum qui pro ecclesia vel fama impugnant, sophisticant vel tacent evangelicam veritatem, nec solum qui portantes loculos furtive ut Scarioth ineque parciuntur patrimonium Crucifixi cum fratribus bona pauperum dominative in uxoribus, in filiis, in pompa seculi consumendo, sed tercio qui propter desidiam aut timorem mortis pro loco et tempore congruis obmutescunt. Nec valet ficcio qua dicimus inimicos evangelii exasperatos esse ex veritatis preconio magis segnes, quia iuxta hunc fucum caput martirum et sui milites nunquam sic pro publicacione veritatis usque ad mortem meritorie decertarent. Sed audi Augustinum super Johannis Omelia XXVII exponentem illud Johannis VI°, 7: Ex hoc multi discipulorum eius abierunt retro, dicentem: Hoc factum ad nostram consolacionem quoniam aliquando contingit ut dicat quis verum et quod dicit non capiatur, sed quod scandalizentur qui audiunt et discedant. Penitet enim hominem quandoque dixisse quod verum est; dicit enim aput seipsum:

enmities; when they are rebuked, when they are not permitted to live wickedly, when even a word is had with them, they meditate evils in their hearts and seek an occasion to break out."[11] Such, blessed Gregory declares in the first [book] of the *Pastoral Rule*, are wicked priests. And this is the reason why Christ and the holy doctors inveighed so sharply against priests of this kind. For, as Gregory says, homily 17, "I think, dearest brethren, that God bears no greater injury than from priests." Therefore, to avenge that injury to God, Christians ought to rise up more spiritedly, harshly and unitedly, because according to Chrysostom, homily 18 of the *Opus imperfectum*, "he is not a true disciple who does not imitate the master, nor is that an image which is not like its author."[12] And as for the disciples of Iscariot, let us consider whether there are any professors of a life without property who do not either attack, counterfeit or keep unduly silent about gospel truth. For all these, with Iscariot, are betrayers of the gospel truth which is Christ, as Chrysostom declares, homily 49 of the *Opus imperfectum*, and it is set down in part in the decrees, [Causa] 11, question 3: "Fear ye not them that kill the body," he says, "lest perhaps through fear of death you do not freely say what you have heard, nor confidently preach to all what you heard in the ear alone. So therefore it is shown from these words that not [430] only is he a betrayer of the truth who, transgressing the truth, openly speaks a lie for truth, but also he who does not freely pronounce the truth which he ought freely to pronounce, or who does not freely defend the truth which it befits him freely to defend, is a betrayer of the truth. For as the priest is a debtor to preach the truth which he has heard from God, so the layman is a debtor confidently to defend the truth which he has heard from priests, proved indeed in the scriptures. And if he has not done so, he has betrayed the truth."[13] From these sayings, with things explained elsewhere and the state of the church, it is clear that far too many are vicars of Iscariot: not only those who, for the church or for reputation, attack, counterfeit or keep silent about gospel truth; nor only those who, carrying the purse stealthily like Iscariot, unjustly share out the patrimony of the Crucified with their brethren, consuming the goods of the poor in lordly fashion on wives, on sons, on the pomp of the world; but thirdly those who from sloth or fear of death fall silent at a fitting place and time.[14] Nor does the fiction avail by which we, the more sluggish, say that the enemies of the gospel are exasperated by the proclamation of the truth; for by this disguise the head of martyrs and his soldiers would never so have contended meritoriously, even to death, for the publishing of the truth.[15]

But hear Augustine on John, homily 27, expounding that text of John 6:67, "After this, many of his disciples went back," saying: "This was done for our consolation, since it sometimes happens that someone says what is true and what he says is not taken, but those who hear are scandalized and depart. For a man sometimes repents of having said what is true; for he says within himself:[16]

Notes

1. ***A pseudocardinalibus et discipulis Scarioth ad hoc promoventibus***: the reproach of heresy comes from those who push it forward; ***propter defensionem veritatis evangelice*** is taken with ***tolerare***: the faithful bear it for defending gospel truth. ***Propter persecucionem***: as printed, "for persecution", that is, when persecuted. R. A in the margin at 426.31: ***Contra avariciam cleri***; at 427.5: ***Condicionalis***.
2. ***A populo sunt divisi***: the name Pharisee as "separated". The four horses are the secular priests, the possessioner religious, the doctors of human tradition, and those who profess gospel poverty (the friars). ***Quadriga***: a team of four, a four-horse chariot.
3. ***Persone prime partis proprietarie***: a person of the first of the four parties, the secular priests who hold property; ***proprietarie*** might also go with ***persone***. ***Verbi gracia***, printed at the end of its sentence, is taken as opening the example. ***Utrumque istorum***: giving up the endowment and invading France; the first is easier to do justly. T. At 427.14 B reads ***urerent***.
4. ***Quam exercitum Anglie invadendo Franciam***: the verb is understood from ***ponere***, "than [to put] the army ... to invading France". The last clauses are ironic: charity that despoils, love that kills. R. B in the margin at 427.30: ***Nota bene ambas columpnas***.
5. ***Ex isto colore***: "on this colour", a plausible ground (glossary: ***color***). ***Consulimus ... abnuimus***: Wyclif speaks for the English church: we counsel the second, the war, and reject the first, though it is possible.
6. Hosea 9:14, of which Wyclif quotes the last words (Vulgate ***da eis vulvam sine liberis et ubera arentia***; DR "Give them a womb without children, and dry breasts"). Jerome, ***Commentarii in Osee*** 2, on 9:14 (Loserth: ***Comment. in Oseam*** lib. II, cap. IX). T. At 428.4–5 the manuscripts read ***per benediccionem*** and ***quod ab eo data***; Loserth corrects to ***pro benediccione*** and ***quam*** from Jerome's text, and his correction is translated. R. B in the margin at 427.28: ***Inferius nota textum Jeronymi satis pugnantem pro ablacione temporalium***; A at 428.2: ***De ablacione temporalium***.
7. ***Bonum abusum***: "the good abused", subject of ***amoveri***; ***cuius interest***: whose concern it is.
8. Hugh of St Victor, ***De sacramentis*** 2.2.7, ***Quomodo Ecclesia terrena possideat***, on the earthly power's hold over church possessions (PL 176), paraphrased; cf. 2.2.4, ***Terrena potestas caput habet regem***. Loserth gives no reference. G. ***Capitale dominium***: "chief lordship", the king as chief lord (glossary: ***capitalis dominus***).
9. ***Monet ... ad predandum***: "prompts ... to plunder". S. Joel 1:5, from ***ululate*** (Vulgate ***Expergiscimini ebrii et flete et ululate omnes qui bibitis vinum in dulcedine***; DR "mourn"). "The Seventy": the Septuagint's reading as Jerome reports it. Jerome, ***Commentarii in Ioelem*** on 1:5: ***ut qui non cognoverunt Deum in prosperis cognoscant in adversis*** (PL 25); Wyclif adds ***ad vicia*** and changes the tenses.
10. ***Quibus ... abutitur ... in hiis punitur*** echoes Wisdom 11:17 (DR "by what things a man sinneth, by the same also he is tormented"). ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 31, then current as Chrysostom's (Loserth: ***Op. Imp.*** p. CXXX). R. A in the margin at 428.25: ***contra avariciam cleri bona correccio***.
11. Augustine, ***Enarrationes in Psalmos*** 30, II, sermo 3 (Loserth: the manuscripts read ***Psalmo XX***; "rightly ***tractatu tertio***, Ps. XXX, pars II, sermo III"; ***Opp.*** IV, i, p. 162). The print's ***quarto*** is translated; Loserth's note says the third. T. At 429.2 AA$_1$ read ***per hoc***. R. B in the margin at 429.1: ***Nota que faciunt clerici, quando corripiuntur***.
12. Gregory, ***Regula pastoralis*** 1.2 (Loserth: cap. II); ***Homiliae in Evangelia*** 1.17.14 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** I, p. 1503). ***Op. imperf.*** hom. 18: Loserth notes that the passage is not in hom. 18 but rather 28 (***Op. Imp.*** p. CXIX). C. ***Preiudicium***: injury done to God. R. A in the margin at 429.13: ***Qui non pronunciat veritatem est proditor eius et similiter qui ipsam non defendit***.
13. ***Consideremus si sunt aliqui ... quin***: whether there are any who do not; the friars are meant. The quotation is taken to run to ***prodidit veritatem*** (430.10). S. Matthew 10:28 and 10:27. ***Op. imperf.***, hom. 49 as Wyclif cites it; Friedberg's inscription to the canon below gives hom. 25; Decretum C. 11 q. 3 c. 86 (Loserth: ***Dec. sec. pars, causa XI, q. III, cap. LXXXVI***; the modern form is ours), whose rubric is ***Veritatem prodit non solum qui pro veritate mendacium loquitur, sed etiam qui veritatem non libere predicat***; Wyclif's text matches it with small variants. T. At 429.22 B reads ***qui est*** and omits ***Christus***; at 430.8, ***probatam quid***.
14. ***Pro ecclesia vel fama***: for a church (a benefice) or for reputation. ***Fratribus***: their brethren, perhaps their kin. ***Dominative***: "in lordly fashion". S. John 12:6. T. At 430.17 B reads ***pompa simili***.
15. At 430.20 A reads ***dicius***, corrected in the margin to ***dicimus***; Loserth notes that a word seems to have fallen out here. C. ***Magis segnes*** is taken with the subject of ***dicimus***, "we, the more sluggish", which construes without supplying a word. ***Fucum***: "disguise" (glossary: ***fucus***). ***Caput martirum***: Christ. G. ***Milites***: "soldiers", the Pauline figure (glossary: ***milicia; milites***).
16. John 6:67. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 27 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** III, ii, p. 505); the quotation runs on into 431.1–3. T. At 430.25 the manuscripts read ***exponens***; Loserth's ***exponentem*** is translated. R. A in the margin at 430.25: ***Nota Augustinum bene***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 427: ***Franciam***
  - 428: ***II°***

- 428: *a* (print has a nobis.)
- 428: *huiusmodi*
- 428: *XXXI*ª
- 429: *quarto* (folio mark 188ª glued)
- 429: *persecuntur* (print spelling) [NW]
- 429: *Christus*
- 429: *iniuriam*
- 429: *impugnant*
- 429: *XLIX*ⁿª
- 429: *XI*ª
- 430: *Quod*
- 430: *veritatis*
- 430: *scandalizentur*
- 429: *XVIII*ª (no comma; followed by Operis) [-MARK]

Part 5: The betrayers of the truth; whether the church is properly virgin, mother and bride

Loserth pp. 431.1–435.25

¶1 431.1–433.23

431.25 *10. My opponent allows the Scriptural names of the Church but says they are used figuratively.*

432.3 *Still they are used and are therefore applicable.*

433.14 *My opponent uses terms that are not warranted by Scripture.*

[431]Non debui sic dixisse; sed ecce domino contigit: dixit et perdidit multos; solacium itaque in domino habeamus et tamen caute verba dicamus. Non dicit omnimode taceamus vel veritatem dicentibus resistamus, quia revera sic prodere sermonem Dei, qui est veritas et lex Christi, foret ipsum prodere, cum sit idem. Unde videtur quod nostri pretensi de parte dextera sponse Christi qui sic produnt veritatem in membris suis habent racionem maioritatis peccati super ambos proditores Christi tam novi quam veteris testamenti. Nam plura beneficia tam corporalia quam spiritualia a Christo receperant, maiorem veritatis noticiam tam ex lege Christi quam ex factis suis habuerant. Et ideo racione maioris ingratitudinis et peccandi sciencie videtur, si fuerint in maiori gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, quod maiorem culpam incurrant; et istam materiam tangit beatus Gregorius, Omelia XVIIIª super illud Johannis VIII°, 46: Si veritatem dico, quare non creditis mihi? Multi, inquit, sunt hodie qui Judeorum duriciam detestantur, quia predicacionem domini audire noluerant et tamen quales illos arguunt fuisse ad fidem, tales ipsi sunt ad operacionem. Precepta Dei audiunt, miracula cognoscunt, sed converti a pravitatibus suis renuunt. Ad decimam raciunculam respondetur, concedendo quod ecclesia est virgo. Et allegantur ad hoc decreta ecclesie, et sic dicitur iuvenescere, senescere, et multa alia predicata suscipit quorum racionem oportet distinguere; alia, inquit, dicuntur proprie de ecclesia, ut quod habet temporalia, privilegia et regulam vivendi, alia autem dicuntur de ecclesia improprie, methaforice et [432]transsumptive, ut quod ecclesia sit virgo, vetula, sponsa et mater cum denominacionibus huiusmodi. Omnia ista

"I ought not to have spoken so; but behold, it happened to the Lord: he spoke and lost many. Let us therefore have comfort in the Lord, and yet speak words with caution."[1] He does not say: let us altogether keep silent, or resist those who speak the truth; because truly so to betray the word of God, which is truth and the law of Christ, would be to betray him, since it is the same. Whence it seems that those of ours who pretend to be of the right side of the bride of Christ, who so betray the truth in his members, have a ground of greatness of sin over both betrayers of Christ, of the new as well as of the old testament. For they had received more benefits, bodily as well as spiritual, from Christ, [and] had had a greater knowledge of the truth, as well from the law of Christ as from his deeds. And therefore, by reason of greater ingratitude and knowledge in sinning, it seems, if they were in greater grace according to present justice, that they incur greater guilt;[2] and blessed Gregory touches this matter, homily 18, on that text of John 8:46, "If I say the truth, why do you not believe me?" "There are many today," he says, "who detest the hardness of the Jews, because they would not hear the preaching of the Lord; and yet such as they accuse them of having been toward faith, such are they themselves toward works. They hear the precepts of God, they know his miracles, but they refuse to be converted from their depravities."[3] To the tenth little argument the reply is by granting that the church is a virgin. And the decrees of the church are alleged for this; and so it is said to grow young, to grow old, and it takes many other predicates whose ground must be distinguished: "some," he says, "are said

dicuntur de ecclesia transsumptive, mistice et improprie. Inprimis suppono quod sequitur: Ecclesia est improprie virgo, mater, sponsa Christi etc., ergo ipsa est ecclesia, est virgo, mater et sponsa Christi. Patet tripliciter: Primo ex hoc quod doctor sepe concedit huiusmodi proposiciones simpliciter; secundo ex hoc quod aliter non satisfaceret alicui tali proposicioni, dicendo utrum debet concedi simpliciter vel negari. Si enim iste terminus improprie sit terminus distrahens, tunc negaretur maior pars dictorum sanctorum de ecclesia et maior pars scripture sacre ac modi loquendi, que tamen bene concessa sunt. Scribit enim Augustinus in De Verbis Domini super Joh., Sermone L°, ecclesie: Concessit Christus in spiritu quod mater eius habuit in corpore, ut et mater et virgo sit. Et hoc est proprium Deo nostro, ut de corrupta possit facere virginem, sicut homo contra de virgine facit corruptam, dicente Jeronimo, libro primo, super illo Osee II°, 19: Sponsabo te mihi in sempiternum et sponsabo te in iusticia et iudicio et misericordia et miseracionibus et sponsabo te mihi in fide. Super quo sic loquitur sanctus doctor: O quanta clemencia Dei, meretrix que cum multis amatoribus fornicata est et ob hoc crimen bestiis tradita, postquam revertitur ad virum, nequaquam ei reconciliari dicitur sed desponderi. Et vide quid sit inter Dei coniunccionem et hominum; homo cum uxorem acceperit, de virgine mulierem facit, id est, non virginem; Deus autem meretricibus copulatus [433] eas mutat in virgines iuxta illud, quod adultere dicitur per Jeremiam: Non ut dominum me invocasti aut patrem aut principem virginitatis tue. Unde et Apostolus post fornicacionem et ydolorum cultum credentibus Corinthiis loquitur: Despondi vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo. Et post exponit Jeronimus quare Deus desponsacionem ecclesie tripliciter repeciit: Primo, inquit, despondit eam in Abraham sive in Egipto, ut uxorem habeat sempiternam. Secundo in monte Synay, dans ei in sponsalibus legis iusticiam. Et tercio veniente Dei filio domino Jesu Christo fuit desponsata in fide perfecta, dum videndo filium vidit et patrem, Johannis XIV°, 10, 11. Sic ergo sancti doctores concedentes ista simpliciter non sunt ausi asserere quod auctor scripture dicit ista improprie et false. Sed videtur mihi quod doctor loquitur improprie vocando ecclesiam vetulam vel post eius incepcionem dicendo ipsam iuvenescere. Non enim memini me legisse ista de sancta matre ecclesia, sed synagoga sathane, ecclesia malignancium et meretrix cuius dyabolus est caput, quam doctor dicit partem sancte matris ecclesie, potest racionabiliter dici vetula turpissima.

properly of the church, as that it has temporal goods, privileges and a rule of living; but others are said of the church improperly, metaphorically and [432] transumptively, as that the church is a virgin, an old woman, a bride and a mother, with namings of this kind. All these are said of the church transumptively, mystically and improperly."[4] First, I suppose that it follows: the church is improperly virgin, mother, bride of Christ, etc.; therefore she, the church, is virgin, mother and bride of Christ. This is clear in three ways: first from this, that the doctor often grants such propositions without qualification; secondly from this, that otherwise he would not satisfy any such proposition by saying whether it ought to be granted without qualification or denied. For if this term "improperly" is a diminishing qualifier, then the greater part of the sayings of the saints about the church, and the greater part of holy scripture and of its manners of speaking, would be denied, which are nevertheless well granted.[5] For Augustine writes in *On the Words of the Lord*, on John, sermon 50: "To the church Christ granted in spirit what his mother had in body, that she should be both mother and virgin. And this is proper to our God, that he can make a virgin out of one corrupted, as man on the contrary makes one corrupted out of a virgin";[6] as Jerome says, book 1, on that text of Hosea 2:19: "I will espouse thee to me for ever: and I will espouse thee in justice, and judgment, and mercy, and commiserations; and I will espouse thee to me in faith." On which the holy doctor speaks thus: "O how great the clemency of God! The harlot who has fornicated with many lovers, and for this crime was handed over to the beasts, after she returns to her husband is by no means said to be reconciled to him, but betrothed. And see what [difference] there is between the union of God and that of men: a man, when he has taken a wife, makes of a virgin a woman, that is, not a virgin; but God, joined to harlots, [433] changes them into virgins, according to that which is said to the adulteress through Jeremiah: You have not called upon me as lord, or father, or prince of your virginity. Whence the Apostle too speaks to the Corinthians, who believed after fornication and the worship of idols: I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."[7] And afterwards Jerome expounds why God repeated the betrothal of the church three times: "First," he says, "he betrothed her in Abraham or in Egypt, that he might have an everlasting wife. Secondly on Mount Sinai, giving her the justice of the law as betrothal gifts. And thirdly, at the coming of the Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, she was betrothed in perfect faith," when in seeing the Son she saw the Father too, John

¶2 433.24–435.25
434.5 *It would be a fitting work for the doctor to shew what language is figurative and what literal;*
434.11 *e. g. as to whether the Church is a person.*
434.29 *If the Church is only figuratively something, it is literally nothing,*
435.3 *and so has no parts,*
435.15 *and no head;*
435.24 *likewise no religious corporation could be or do anything;*

[433]**Ponit enim doctor quod prescitus eciam dum fuerit in mortali, si habuerit fidem infusam, est membrum sancte matris ecclesie, et indubie tunc est membrum sathane et dyabolus caput eius (ut dicit beatus Gregorius). Dicitur autem sancta mater ecclesia proprie senescere et florere virtutibus, cum Psalmo XCI°, 11, sic loquitur propheta: Senectus mea in misericordia uberi; nam in tercia desponsacione quando sponsa Christi est mulier antiqua et tamquam senex persecucionibus membrorum diaboli tribulata, habet uberiorem** [434]**misericordiam quam in tempore sue adolescencie, et sic vere vocatur vidua propter elongacionem sponsi ab ea peregrinante ad patriam, dum Psalmo CXXXI°, 15, dicit sponsus: Viduam eius benedicens benedicam. Ulterius foret opus doctole detegere quid proprie et quid improprie ac figurative conveniat sancte matri ecclesie, quia nimis suspectum verbum et carnale est dicere quod ecclesia proprie habet possessiones et privilegia Constantini, sed improprie est mater vel sponsa Christi. Primo (inquam) querendum esset quid proprie foret ecclesia, si aliquid; non superest quid foret nisi substancia, et ulterius descendendo (ut sepe tetigi) oporteret concedere quod ecclesia sit substancia corporea et sic corpus animatum racionabile, et sic proprie foret homo, et per consequens desponsanda. Confirmatur, ecclesia est proprie privilegiata et possessionata (ut dicitur); quod non foret nisi posset uti privilegiis et vesci possessionibus. Ergo ecclesia posset comedere et actus humanos consimiles exercere, et per consequens ecclesia foret substancia animata que generaret omnem hominem, et sic cum foret individuum eiusdem speciei specialissime cum omni homine univoce generans hominem, foret homo (ut sepe dicunt sancti). Et certum est quod improprie foret homo, cum haberet propriam individuacionem, propriam racionabilitatem et propriissimam perfeccionem humanam; nam nisi foret substancia, potens exercere actus racionales, ut actus promerendi, contemplandi et gaudendi, aliter indignius quam**

14:10–11.[8] So, therefore, the holy doctors, granting these things without qualification, did not dare to assert that the author of scripture says them improperly and falsely. But it seems to me that the doctor speaks improperly in calling the church an old woman, or in saying that after her beginning she grows young. For I do not remember having read these things of holy mother church; but the synagogue of Satan, the church of the malignant and the harlot whose head is the devil, which the doctor calls a part of holy mother church, can reasonably be called a most foul old woman.[9]

For the doctor lays it down that a foreknown [man], even while he is in mortal [sin], if he has infused faith, is a member of holy mother church; and undoubtedly he is then a member of Satan, and the devil is his head (as blessed Gregory says).[10] And holy mother church is said properly to grow old and to flourish in virtues, since in Psalm 91:11 the prophet speaks thus: "my old age in plentiful mercy"; for in the third betrothal, when the bride of Christ is an ancient woman and, like an old woman, troubled by the persecutions of the members of the devil, she has more plentiful [434]**mercy than in the time of her youth; and so she is truly called a widow, because of the bridegroom's distance from her as she journeys as a pilgrim to the homeland, since in Psalm 131:15 the bridegroom says: "Blessing I will bless her widow."[11] Further, it would be work for the doctor to expose what properly and what improperly and figuratively befits holy mother church, because it is a word too suspect and carnal to say that the church properly has possessions and the privileges of Constantine, but improperly is mother or bride of Christ.[12] First (I say) it would have to be asked what the church would properly be, if anything; nothing remains that it could be but a substance; and descending further (as I have often touched on) one would have to grant that the church is a corporeal substance, and so an ensouled rational body, and so it would properly be a man, and consequently [one] to be espoused. It is confirmed: the church is properly privileged and possessioned (as is said); which would not be unless it could use privileges and feed on possessions. Therefore the church could eat and exercise like human acts, and consequently the church would be an ensouled substance which would generate every man; and so, since it would be an individual of the same most special species as every man, univocally generating man, it would be a man (as the saints often say).[13] And it is certain that it would improperly be a man, since it would have its own individuation,**

sacerdotes Baal comederet tantum cibum. Si dicitur quod ecclesia proprie nichil est sed est aliqua, tunc concedendum foret simpliciter quod ecclesia nichil est. Si enim illa simpliciter conceduntur [435] de ecclesia que improprie sibi conveniunt, multo magis forent predicata de ecclesia simpliciter concedenda que proprie sibi conveniunt. Si ergo proprie sit nichil, sequitur simpliciter quod sit nichil, et per consequens non est aliquid, et tunc non haberet partem qualitativam aut quantitativam, sicut concedetur, et per consequens nulla denominacio partis foret sibi proprie vere et proprie attributa. Ex quo sequitur quod ecclesia catholica non sit cesaree privilegiata nec seculariter possessionata, quia non secundum se totam (tum quia est indivisibilis, tum eciam quia multis de ecclesia non convenit hoc privilegium vel ista dotacio) nec eciam secundum partem que foret pars illius ecclesie, eo quod spiritus beati qui sunt de illa ecclesia sunt indivisibiles; et sic ecclesia non haberet partem vel partes, et per consequens papa non foret proprie caput ecclesie, cum ipsa proprie semper foret acephala, quia gens sine capite. Caput enim non proprie dicitur nisi in comparacione ad corpus capitatum, sed ecclesia (ut dicitur) non proprie est corpus, quia sic proprie foret homo, ergo non est proprie capitata; et cum proprie est, sequitur quod sit proprie incapitata, et per consequens est incapitata, et per idem quelibet abbathia sive religio non foret proprie antiqua vel iuvenis,

its own rationality and its most proper human perfection; for unless it were a substance able to exercise rational acts, such as acts of meriting, contemplating and rejoicing, it would otherwise eat so much food more unworthily than the priests of Baal.[14] If it is said that the church properly is nothing but is some things, then it would have to be granted without qualification that the church is nothing. For if those things which befit it improperly are granted without qualification [435] of the church, much more would the predicates which befit it properly have to be granted of the church without qualification. If therefore properly it is nothing, it follows without qualification that it is nothing, and consequently it is not something; and then it would not have a qualitative or a quantitative part, as will be granted, and consequently no naming of a part would be properly, truly and properly attributed to it.[15] From which it follows that the catholic church is not privileged in caesarean fashion nor possessioned in secular fashion: not according to itself as a whole (both because it is indivisible, and also because this privilege or that endowment does not befit many of the church), nor yet according to a part which would be a part of that church, since the blessed spirits who are of that church are indivisible; and so the church would not have a part or parts, and consequently the pope would not properly be head of the church, since she would always properly be acephalous, as a people without a head.[16] For "head" is not properly said except in comparison to a headed body; now the church (as is said) is not properly a body, because so it would properly be a man; therefore it is not properly headed; and since it properly is [so], it follows that it is properly unheaded, and consequently it is unheaded; and by the same token any abbey or religious order would not properly be old or young,[17]

Notes

1. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 27, continued from 430.25–28 (Loserth: *Opp.* III, ii, p. 505). C. *Non dicit*: Augustine does not say.
2. *Nostri pretensi de parte dextera sponse Christi*: those among us who claim to stand on the right side of Christ's bride. *Ambos proditores ... tam novi quam veteris testamenti*: the betrayer of the new testament (Iscariot) and of the old (the priests of the temple). *Majoritas peccati*: "greatness of sin". T. At 431.8 AA, read *perdunt*; at 431.14, *peccandi scire*.
3. Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 1.18.5 (Loserth: *XL Homil. in Evang.* lib. I, hom. XVIII, 5). John 8:46: Wyclif omits *vobis* (DR "If I say the truth to you"). R. A in the margin at 431.17: *Gregorius*.
4. The doctor's answer to the tenth argument, reported and then quoted (*inquit*). *Racionem oportet distinguere*: their ground (whether proper or improper) must be distinguished. *Transsumptive*: by transferred sense, metaphorically. R. A in the margin at 431.25: *Quinta responsio. Ecclesia est virgo, mater, vetula et sponsa etc.* Loserth compares p. 115.23. T. At 432.2 B reads *huius. Omnia*.
5. *Ergo ipsa est ecclesia, est virgo*: so printed, with the verb twice; taken as "she, the church, is virgin". *Patet tripliciter*: two grounds are numbered; the third may be the authorities that follow. *Iste terminus improprie*: the adverb "improperly" as a term; if it diminished what it qualifies, the scriptural names would be denied. T. At 432.7 B reads *concedit huius*.

6. ***Ecclesie***, printed after ***Sermone L°***, is taken as the dative with ***concessit***, "to the church Christ granted". S. Augustine, ***De verbis Domini***, sermon 50 of the old collection (Loserth: Aug. ***Opp.*** V, p. 675): the words are in Sermon 138.9 (PL 38), ***Ecclesiae concessit Christus in spiritu, quod mater ejus habuit in corpore, ut et mater et virgo sit***. The next sentence, on making a virgin of the corrupt, is not found there.
7. Jerome, ***Commentarii in Osee*** 1, on 2:19–20 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** VI (ed. Migne) 881). Hosea 2:19–20: Wyclif omits the second ***mihi*** and the ***in*** before ***misericordia***. Jeremiah 3:4 in Jerome's form (Vulgate ***voca me: Pater meus, dux virginitatis meae tu es***; DR "Thou art my father, the guide of my virginity"). 2 Corinthians 11:2. T. At 432.28 the manuscripts read ***coniunctos*** and at 433.1 ***adulteris***; Loserth corrects both from Jerome's text, and his corrections are translated. At 433.2 B reads ***non dominum***. R. A in the margin at 432.21: ***Christi desponsacio facit ex meretrice virginem***.
8. The quotation is taken to end at ***perfecta***; ***dum videndo filium vidit et patrem*** is Wyclif's gloss. S. John 14:9–11 (DR 14:9 "he that seeth me seeth the Father also"). T. At 433.11 B reads ***Sed tercio***.
9. Apocalypse 2:9; Psalm 25:5 (DR "the assembly of the malignant"). C. ***Vetula***: "old woman", the doctor's word, which Wyclif allows only to the church of the wicked.
10. ***In mortali***: in mortal [sin]. ***Prescitus***: one God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). S. Gregory as cited at 424.13–17, ***Hom. in Evang.*** 1.16.1 (our identification, confirmed: ***iniquorum omnium caput diabolus est***). T. At 433.27 B reads ***ut dum beatus***. R. A in the margin at 433.24: ***Opinio***; at 433.25: ***Quomodo ecclesia est vetula, vidua et virgo***.
11. Psalm 91:11; Psalm 131:15. C. ***Ab ea peregrinante***: ***peregrinante*** is taken with ***ea***, the church on pilgrimage; Christ's distance from her makes her a widow. T. At 434.3 B reads ***peregrinantem***.
12. ***Verbum ... carnale***: a carnal way of speaking, putting the church's possessions first and its scriptural names second. T. At 434.5 A_1 reads ***doctorem***.
13. ***Corpus animatum racionabile***: the definition of man again (423.27). ***Desponsanda***: "to be espoused", as a woman is. ***Univoce generans hominem***: generating man in the same sense as man generates man. T. At 434.16 AA_1 omit ***et***; at 434.19 B reads ***humanos sensibiles***; at 434.21–22, ***foret iudicium***.
14. At 434.25 the manuscripts read ***risibilitatem***, "risibility", the property of man; Loserth's ***racionabilitatem*** is translated. C. ***Improprie foret homo***: so printed; the argument seems to want ***proprie***, and the print is translated. ***Aliter*** repeats the condition of ***nisi***. S. The priests of Bel, Daniel 14:2–21.
15. ***Est aliqua***: "is some things" (neuter plural), the escape that the church is not one thing. ***Sicut concedetur***: as [the doctor] will grant. ***Proprie vere et proprie***: ***proprie*** twice, as printed. T. At 434.32 B reads ***Si est illa***; at 435.3–4, ***Si ergo sit proprie, sequitur***. R. A in the margin at 434.30: ***Responsio quedam. Nota si ecclesia est proprie corpus et que predicata sibi proprie conveniant***.
16. ***Cesaree privilegiata***: privileged as the caesarean church is (glossary: ***ecclesia cesarea***). ***Acephala***: headless. T. At 435.10 AA_1 read ***cesarea***, B ***cesarie***.
17. ***Et cum proprie est***: as printed the clause has no complement; taken as "since it properly is [so]", that is, properly not a body; a word may be lost. ***Abbathia sive religio***: any abbey or order, a corporation like the church; the sentence runs on into 435.26.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 431: ***sit idem*** (main token covers two printed words)
  - 431: ***Unde***
  - 431: ***Christi*** (line number 10 glued)
  - 431: ***XVIII[a]***
  - 431: ***alia***
  - 432: ***II°***
  - 432: ***O***
  - 433: ***eas*** (folio mark 188[c] glued)
  - 433: ***10***
  - 433: ***11***
  - 433: ***11***
  - 433: ***Christi***
  - 434: ***proprie*** (alinea letter Q glued)
  - 434: ***ut***
  - 434: ***foret***

Part 6: A multitude has parts; the church from the beginning of the world

Loserth pp. 435.26–438.26

¶1 435.26–436.18
435.30 *nor could any one be in or of the Church.*
436.12 *A multitude has parts as our sense tells us.*

[435] **nec ipsa nec aliqua pars eius haberet proprie possessiones, cum non sit proprie unum totum vel aliquid, nec quisquam foret in ecclesia vel de ecclesia. Non enim in ecclesia, quia sic foret pars datorum**

neither it nor any part of it would properly have possessions, since it is not properly one whole or something; nor would anyone be in the church or of the church. For [he would] not [be] "in the church", since so he

436.19 *It is impossible to believe that a convent is an indivisible unity (like the quidity of man); it would have to be an object and not an object*
436.31 *and could have neither sin nor grace.*

fidelium, et sic omnes componerent aliquod unum corpus; nam si sufficit ad esse hominis vel alterius rei esse de aliquibus quod sit de numero illorum, tunc quidlibet foret de mundo et omnis prescitus vel predestinatus foret tam de prescitis quam predestinatis et quelibet [436]multitudo de qualibet, et sic (ut sophiste arguunt) aliquis numerus non haberet partem vel partes ut numerus indivisibilium; aliquis autem est numerus qui habet partes et non partem, ut numerus rerum divisibilium non communicancium, aliquis vero est numerus qui habet partes et partem, ut Petrus et caput suum. Deliramenta sunt ista sophismata et modo loquendi philosophorum contraria de populo, exercitu et aliis artificialibus, sed specialiter sunt contraria scripture et sanctis doctoribus. Oportet ergo omnem talem multitudinem habere partes (sicut patet ad sensum). Nam videndo silvam, populum vel arenam videtur aliquid distincte secundum pyramidem radialem cuius basis terminatur ad multitudinem, et constat quod in casu non sic videtur una simplex pars talis multitudinis, sicut nec videtur punctus vel linea. Ideo relinquitur quod talis multitudo divisibiliter videatur, sicut habet operaciones proprias et est obiectum multorum actuum.

would be a part of the given faithful, and so all would compose some one body;[1] for if, for a man or any other thing to be of certain [things], it suffices that he be of their number, then anything whatever would be of the world, and every foreknown or predestinate [man] would be as much of the foreknown as of the predestinate, and any [436]multitude of any other; and so (as the sophists argue) some number would not have a part or parts, as a number of indivisibles; and some number has parts and not a part, as a number of divisible things that do not overlap; and some number has parts and a part, as Peter and his head.[2] These sophisms are ravings, and contrary to the philosophers' manner of speaking of a people, an army and other artificial things; but above all they are contrary to scripture and the holy doctors. Every such multitude must therefore have parts (as is clear to sense). For in seeing a wood, a people or sand, something is seen distinctly according to the radiant pyramid whose base is bounded at the multitude; and it is evident that in that case one simple part of such a multitude is not so seen, just as neither a point nor a line is seen. Therefore it remains that such a multitude is seen divisibly, as it has operations of its own and is the object of many acts.[3]

¶2 436.19–438.18
437.9 *Thus we should be brought to the wonderful conclusion that almost all things are nothing.*
437.17 *The faithful must beware of the heresy that there was no Church until the death of Christ.*
438.7 *Augustine teaches that the Church is from the beginning of the world and that it consists of two parts, heavenly and earthly.*

[436]Et confirmacio huius est quod continuacio non est nisi accidens, non faciens substanciam esse aliquid, et per idem sequitur quod vocata religio vel ritus humani non faciunt personas esse substanciam postquam erant non substancia, nec capit sensus dispositi quod conventus tam sensibilis, tam edax et tam multipliciter operativus sit indivisibiliter multiplicatus, ut quiditas hominis, nec negabitur quin talis conventus sit ecclesia particularis; et si sit nichil, tunc mutari potest per hominem ab aliquo in non aliquod et econtra. Et est obiectum sensus subiectumque accidentis, et tamen non est res obiecta vel subiecta, quod est contra grammaticam. Foret eciam omnino sine peccato vel gracia, quia nullum tale vel accidens sibi inesset et a pari nulla pars vel denominacio sibi inesset, et tunc ecclesia ex tribus hominibus et tribus angelis in nulla proporcione se [437]haberet ad aliquam partem sui, quia sic una medietas foret indivisibilis et alia medietas quantitativa foret equalis suo toti, si debeat dici totum; et sic illud totum haberet quatuor medietates inequales, ut ecclesia ex quatuor hominibus inequalibus haberet duos minores homines et quatuor medietates quantitativas illorum quatuor hominum pro suis medietatibus, et sic in quacunque proporcione volueris una medietas est maior reliqua. Et mirum videtur quod pars, medietas, mundus et maior pars rerum artificialium sit nichil, nam scriptura ita Johannis

And the confirmation of this is that continuity is nothing but an accident, not making a substance be something; and by the same token it follows that a so-called religion or human rites do not make persons be a substance after they were not a substance; nor does a well-disposed sense grasp that a convent so perceptible, so given to eating and so manifoldly active is indivisibly multiplied, like the quiddity of man; nor will it be denied that such a convent is a particular church; and if it is nothing, then it can be changed by a man from something into not-something, and conversely.[4] And it is the object of sense and the subject of an accident, and yet it is not a thing objected or subjected, which is against grammar. It would also be altogether without sin or grace, because no such thing or accident would be in it, and by parity no part or naming would be in it;[5] and then a church of three men and three angels would stand in no proportion [437]to any part of itself, because so one half would be indivisible, and the other, quantitative half would be equal to its whole, if it ought to be called a whole; and so that whole would have four unequal halves, as a church of four unequal men would have the two lesser men and the four quantitative halves of those four men for its halves; and so, in whatever proportion you please, one half is greater than the other. And it seems a wonder that a part, a half, the world and the greater part of

V° dicit spiritum, aquam et sanguinem esse unum, et communiter patet idem de aliis aggregatis que dicuntur unum. Nam predicato per se inferiori predicatur per se superius, ut si ecclesia sit persona, tunc est racionalis nature individua substancia. Redeundo ergo ad propositum notandum est fideli quod diligenter caveat ab heresi ista recenti qua dicitur quod ante mortem Christi non fuit sancta mater ecclesia nec quod ex militante et triumphante est una totalis ecclesia constituta sed quod presciti et membra dyaboli sunt partes sancte matris ecclesie, domus Dei et speciale habitaculum trinitatis, quia (ut sepe assumpsi) Augustinus in Encheridion LVI° exponens fidem ecclesie super ista particula Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam ita scribit: Rectus itaque confessionis ordo poscebat ut trinitati subiungeretur ecclesia tamquam habitatori domus sua et Deo templum suum et conditori civitas sua; que tota hic accipienda est non solum ex parte que peregrinatur in terris a solis ortu usque ad occasum laudans nomen domini et post captivitatem vetustatis cantans canticum [438] novum, verum eciam ex illa que in celis semper ex quo condita est cohesit domino nec ullum malum sui casus est experta; hec ecclesia in sanctis angelis beata persistit et sue parti peregrinanti sicut oportet opitulatur, quia utraque una erit eternitatis consorcio et nunc una est vinculo caritatis. Iste sanctus episcopus condidit ecclesie libellum quem vocavit Manuale ad finem quod fideles recte intelligant fidem suam, ubi quoad primum articulum notat quomodo immediate post eternitatem trinitatis increate, hoc est, in mundi principio secuta est sancta mater ecclesia in qua sit trinitatis habitacio et expresse duas partes illius totalis ecclesie scilicet celestem et terrenam commemorat. Unde, ut spes nostra in ista fide catholica confirmetur, ordinatur in ympno ecclesie quod postquam nulla nostra in Christo accepit cesivam in celo, et angelus conservus hominum prohibuit se adorari a Johanne, Apocalypsis penultimo, ut sic caveant fideles peregrinantes a domino:

¶3 438.19–438.19

[438] Triumphat ille splendide

¶4 438.20–438.20

[438] Et dignus amplitudine

artificial things should be nothing; for scripture says thus, in 1 John 5, that the spirit, the water and the blood are one; and commonly the same is clear of other aggregates which are called one. For when the lower is predicated per se, the higher is predicated per se: as, if the church is a person, then it is an individual substance of a rational nature.[6] Returning therefore to the matter in hand, the faithful [man] must note that he should diligently beware of that recent heresy by which it is said that before the death of Christ there was no holy mother church, nor that one total church is constituted of the militant and the triumphant, but that the foreknown and members of the devil are parts of holy mother church, the house of God and special dwelling of the Trinity;[7] for (as I have often assumed) Augustine in the Enchiridion 56, expounding the faith of the church on this clause, "the holy catholic church", writes thus: "The right order of the confession therefore required that the church should be joined to the Trinity, as his house to the dweller, and his temple to God, and his city to the founder; which is here to be taken whole, not only in the part which is a pilgrim on earth, from the rising of the sun to its going down praising the name of the Lord, and after the captivity of oldness singing a new [438] song, but also in that which in heaven has always, since it was founded, cleaved to the Lord, and has experienced no evil of its own fall. This church in the holy angels persists blessed, and helps its pilgrim part as it ought; for both will be one in the fellowship of eternity, and now are one in the bond of charity."[8] This holy bishop composed for the church a little book which he called the Manual, to the end that the faithful should rightly understand their faith; where, as regards the first article, he notes how, immediately after the eternity of the uncreated Trinity, that is, in the beginning of the world, holy mother church followed, in which the Trinity should have its dwelling; and he expressly mentions two parts of that total church, namely the heavenly and the earthly.[9] Whence, so that our hope may be confirmed in this catholic faith, it is set down in a hymn of the church (after our nature in Christ received [a seat] in heaven, and the angel, the fellow servant of men, forbade John to adore him, in the penultimate [chapter] of the Apocalypse), so that the faithful who are absent from the Lord may in this way beware:[10]

"He triumphs splendidly,[11]

and, worthy of the amplitude,

¶5 438.21–438.21

[438] **Soli polique patriam**

of earth and sky the homeland

¶6 438.22–438.26

[438] **Unam facit rempublicam, quasi diceret: Caput ecclesie Christus, Deus noster est dignus ex merito passionis sue habere civitatem tam amplam, que sit totalis ecclesia facta ex ecclesia militante in solo et triumphante in polo.**

makes one commonwealth"; as if he said: the head of the church, Christ, our God, is worthy from the merit of his passion to have a city so ample, which is the total church made of the church militant on earth and triumphant in heaven.[12]

Notes

1. The sentence runs on from 435.25 (the end of part 5): "it" is the church, which on the opponent's view is not properly one whole. *Non enim in ecclesia*: Wyclif takes up the first of the two phrases, "in the church", and argues that it would make each believer part of a body. *Datorum fidelium*: "of the given faithful", that is, of certain designated faithful. T. At 435.29 AA$_1$ read *doctorum fidelium*, "of the faithful doctors"; the print is translated.
2. *Esse de aliquibus*: "to be of" a group, membership taken as mere inclusion in a number, which Wyclif reduces to absurdity. The sophists' three cases: a number of indivisibles has neither part nor parts; a number of divisible things that do not overlap (*non communicancium*) has parts but no one part; Peter and his head have parts and a part, since the head is a part of Peter.
3. *Pyramidem radialem*: the perspectivists' visual pyramid, with its apex in the eye and its base on the thing seen; since a point or a line is not seen, what is seen of a wood or a crowd is the multitude itself, seen part by part. *Sicut habet operaciones proprias*: taken as "as [also] it has", a further ground. T. At 436.16 B reads *nec linea*.
4. *Continuacio*: the continuity of a body's parts. If continuity, an accident, does not make a substance be something, neither does discontinuity make a group nothing. *Vocata religio*: a religious order, "so-called" in Wyclif's sense. *Edax*: given to eating. *Ut quiditas hominis*: a universal, which is wholly in each of its many instances. R. A in the margin at 436.19: *Nota*; B in the margin: *Nota quod continuacio non facit aliquod corpus esse unum*. T. At 436.24 B reads *quam edax*; AA$_1$ omit *sit ... conventus*.
5. *Res obiecta vel subiecta*: Wyclif plays on the participles of *obicere* and *subicere*; what is an object and a subject must be a thing "objected" and "subjected". *A pari*: "by parity"; the clause stands without a connective after *inesset*. *Peccatum vel gracia* are accidents of the soul; a nothing can bear no accident.
6. 1 John 5:8 (Wyclif "Johannis V°"); DR "and these three are one". The definition of a person paraphrases Boethius, *Contra Eutychen* 3: *naturae rationabilis individua subsistentia* (PL 64; Wyclif *substancia*). C. *Predicato per se inferiori*: the ablative absolute, "the lower being predicated per se". If the church were a person, it would be a rational substance. T. At 437.13–14 B reads *predicatur* for *predicato*.
7. The three tenets of the "recent heresy" are reported as the opponent's; Wyclif names no one. R. A in the margin at 437.17: *Nota bene*; at 437.19, below the folio mark: *Longe ante Christi mortem fuit sancta ecclesia de qua non sunt presciti*.
8. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 15.56 (Loserth: *Opp.* VI, p. 217). Augustine echoes Psalm 112:3 ("from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same") and the "new song" of the psalms. T. Loserth corrects the manuscripts' chapter LXIV to LVI (437.24); their *Rectus itaque et conformis ordo* to *Rectus itaque ... ordo* (437.26); their *creatori* to *conditori* (437.29); and their *perstitit* to *persistit* (438.4). Each correction is from Augustine's text and is translated. R. A in the margin at 437.24: *Augustinus*.
9. *Manuale*: the *Enchiridion* ("handbook"). *Quoad primum articulum*: the article of the creed on the church, which Augustine treats after the Trinity; taken as "first" in that order.
10. At 438.15 the print has *nulla nostra*; Loserth's apparatus reads *recte: natura*, and "our nature" is translated. At 438.16 *cesivam* does not construe; "[a seat]" is our conjecture from the sense (the ascension), not a reading. C. The sentence is loose: *ordinatur ... quod* takes the hymn as its object, and the clauses on the ascension and the angel are taken as parenthetic. *Caveant*, "may beware", is printed; the sense before a hymn would suit a verb of singing, but the print is translated. S. Apocalypse 22:9 (also 19:10): DR "I am thy fellow servant ... Adore God". *Peregrinantes a domino*: 2 Corinthians 5:6, DR "we are absent from the Lord".
11. A stanza of the Easter hymn *Chorus novae Ierusalem*; Loserth (citing Matthew) places it in the Sarum Breviary at Vespers on the Sunday after Easter. The hymn is printed among Fulbert of Chartres's hymns (PL 141), where this is stanza 4 of 5, word for word; the attribution is the PL's.
12. *Solum* and *polus*: the ground and the sky, the hymn's "earth and heaven"; Wyclif's gloss takes them as the church militant and the church triumphant. *Dignus amplitudine*: glossed as worthy to have "a city so ample".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **436: *loquendi***
  - **436: *faciens***
  - **436: *aliquid et* (main token covers two printed words (aliquid, et))**
  - **436: ∅ (et already held in main token 148 (aliquidet); print has et once)**
  - **436: *sensibilis* (print sensi-/bilis across lines; main token sensi+side-note, no main token for -bilis, so whole word given) [NW]**
  - **436: *gracia***
  - **436: *vel* (main token is English side-note nor; print at box is vel)**

- **436: *accidens sibi*)**
- **436: *inesset***
- **437: *haberet* (folio mark 189ª glued)**
- **437: *est* (line number 10 glued)**
- **437: *Christi***
- **437: *militante* [NW]**
- **438: *consorcio* (line number 5 glued)**
- **438: *trinitatis***
- **438: *increate hoc* (main token covers two printed words)**
- **438: *ecclesia* (line number 25 glued)**

Part 7: The church before the death of Christ; the argument from the formation of Eve

Loserth pp. 438.27–441.25

¶1 438.27–440.4
439.21 *In Scripture etc. the Church means the predestinate.*
440.5 *Insufficient argument from the creation of Eve.*

[438] **Quamvis enim pro instanti quo factus est primus homo fuit illa ecclesia constituta, tamen novo modo post ascensionem fuit pars eius inferior super partem eius superiorem in celestibus collocata. Partem autem eius inferiorem intelligo totam naturam humanam que secundum partem suam que est Christi humanitas** [439] **taliter exaltatur; et ad destruendum istos errores in fide laborarent episcopi quorum principale officium foret fidem illam docere atque defendere nec non et errores in fide ista deviancium postposita solicitudine eorum que questum sapiunt declarare. Nam propter cecacionem temporalium oblita est fere ecclesia angelorum, et cum Encheridion LXI° sic scribit sanctus doctor Augustinus: Hec autem que in sanctis angelis et virtutibus Dei est ecclesia, tunc nobis sicuti est innotescet, cum ei coniuncti fuerimus in fine ad habendam beatitudinem sempiternam; ista vero que ab illa peregrinatur in terris eo nobis nocior est quod in illa sumus et quia hominum est quod et nos sumus. Et quod nulli presciti sint membra illius ecclesie sic declarat: Hec sanguine mediatoris nullum habentis peccatum ab omni est redempta peccato. Sed constat quod peccatum finalis impenitencie quale est in omni prescito non potest redimi vel deleri, ut in assimili docet Augustinus in De Dono Perseverancie VI°: Multi, inquit, finalem perseveranciam possunt non habere sed nullus amittere. Unde, quia ecclesia sancta catholica autonomatice dicitur ecclesia, ideo aput auctores scripture et sanctos doctores ipsa specialiter intelligitur, quando ecclesia nominatur, ut Ephes. V°, 25—27°: Viri diligite uxores vestras, sicut et Christus dilexit ecclesiam et semetipsum tradidit pro ea, ut eam sanctificaret, mundans eam lavacro aque in verbo vite, ut exhiberet ipse gloriosam ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed ut sit sancta et immaculata. Ubi non dubium quin loquitur limitate de ecclesia que est universitas**

For although at the instant at which the first man was made that church was constituted, yet in a new way, after the ascension, its lower part was set above its upper part in the heavenly places. And by its lower part I understand the whole of human nature, which, according to its part which is the humanity of Christ, [439] **is so exalted.[1] And to destroy these errors in the faith the bishops should labour, whose principal office should be to teach and defend that faith, and also, setting aside their care for the things that savour of gain, to declare the errors of those who stray in this faith.[2] For because of the blinding by temporal goods the church of the angels is almost forgotten, although in the Enchiridion 61 the holy doctor Augustine writes thus: "And this church which is in the holy angels and powers of God will become known to us as it is when we are joined to it at the end, to have everlasting blessedness; but this which is a pilgrim from it on earth is better known to us in that we are in it, and because it is of men, which we too are."[3] And that none of the foreknown are members of that church he declares thus: "This, by the blood of the mediator, who had no sin, is redeemed from all sin." Now it is evident that the sin of final impenitence, such as is in every foreknown [man], cannot be redeemed or blotted out, as Augustine teaches in a like case in *On the Gift of Perseverance* 6: "Many," he says, "can not have final perseverance, but no one can lose it."[4] Whence, since the holy catholic church is called the church by antonomasia, therefore among the authors of scripture and the holy doctors it is specially understood when the church is named; as in Ephesians 5:25–27: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and delivered himself up for it: that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life: that he himself might present a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing;**

predestinatorum, nam illam redemit, illam glorificabit post diem iudicii, illa erit non habens [440] tunc maculam sive rugam, et illa est corpus Christi quod fovet et diligit; et nullo modo verificatur ista de numero prescitorum, quantumcunque magna sanctitate ad tempus appareat prepollere.

but that it should be holy and without blemish." Where there is no doubt that he speaks restrictedly of the church which is the whole body of the predestinate; for that he redeemed, that he will glorify after the day of judgement, that will [440] then be not having spot or wrinkle, and that is the body of Christ which he cherishes and loves; and in no way is this verified of the number of the foreknown, however much they may appear for a time to excel in great holiness.[5]

¶2 440.5–440.23

[440] Nec vidi evidenciam unde crederetur quod ante mortem Christi non erat ecclesia, nisi forte per locum ab insufficienti similitudine, capta ex textu Apostoli Ephes. V°, 31: Erunt, inquit, duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia. Sicut enim ex latere primi Adam resoluti in soporem formata est Eva uxor sua (ut patet Gen. II°), sic ex latere secundi Adam dormientis in cruce formata ecclesia, uxor sua (ut patet Joh. XX°). Sed ante priorem formacionem non fuit Eva, ergo ante secundam formacionem non fuit ecclesia. Ista informis argucia induceret ex omnimoda similitudine in errores tocius fidei christiane, ut puta quod Christus non fuit mortuus, quod ecclesia habuit esse materiale ex sanguine et aqua effluxis de latere Christi, et quod Christus non formavit ecclesiam de suo latere, sed ipso soporato et ignorante solum passive contulit ad formacionem ecclesie. Et sic non foret Deus redemptor vel sponsus ecclesie.

Nor have I seen evidence from which it should be believed that before the death of Christ there was no church, unless perhaps by the topic from insufficient likeness, taken from the text of the Apostle, Ephesians 5:31[–32]: "They shall be," he says, "two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church."[6] For just as from the side of the first Adam, sunk in sleep, Eve his wife was formed (as is clear from Genesis 2), so from the side of the second Adam, sleeping on the cross, the church was formed, his wife (as is clear from John 20).[7] Now before the former formation there was no Eve; therefore before the second formation there was no church. This unformed quibble would lead, from likeness in every respect, into errors against the whole christian faith: for instance, that Christ was not dead; that the church had material being from the blood and water that flowed out of Christ's side; and that Christ did not form the church from his side, but, he being asleep and unaware, contributed only passively to the formation of the church. And so God would not be the redeemer or bridegroom of the church.[8]

¶3 440.24–441.25
441.7 *The Church was from the first in grace, but received a new glory at the crucifixion.*

[440] Ideo oportet intelligere hoc sacramentum ad literam iuxta sensum historicum expressum de primis parentibus, et supra hunc sensum oportet intelligere hoc sacramentaliter vel mistice de Christo et ecclesia secundum catholicam similitudinem a Christo et sanctis doctoribus expressatam. Christus enim secundum deitatem sicut ordinavit domum sponse sue mundum sensibilem, sic prius dignitate ordinavit sponsam ecclesiam sibi domum, sed utrumque factum est in principio mundi. Et sicut Deus immisit soporem in [441] Adam muliere formata ex eo sine priori contractu mutuo ad assensum, sic primus Adam secundum deitatem ex eternis racionibus exemplaribus formavit in principio mundi eciam ecclesiam sine previa consideracione consensus meritorii, quia (ut dicit Augustinus Enchiridion LVI°) ecclesia celestis semper ex quo condita est cohesit domino. Nam tam angelus quam homo creabatur in gracia gratificante, posterius autem in plenitudine temporis formavit

Therefore this sacrament must be understood according to the letter, following the historical sense expressed of the first parents; and above this sense it must be understood sacramentally or mystically of Christ and the church, according to the catholic likeness expressed by Christ and the holy doctors.[9] For Christ according to his deity, just as he ordained the perceptible world as the house of his bride, so, first in dignity, he ordained his bride the church as a house for himself; but both were made in the beginning of the world. And just as God sent a deep sleep upon [441] Adam, the woman being formed from him without a prior mutual contract to assent, so the first Adam, according to his deity, formed from eternal exemplar reasons, in the beginning of the world, the church also, without previous consideration of a meritorious consent;[10] for (as Augustine says, Enchiridion 56) "the heavenly church has always, since it was founded, cleaved to the Lord". For both angel and man were

ecclesiam suam humanitus que per multa millia annorum fuit prius, dum dormiens in cruce mortuus fecit eam formosam ex principiis eam mundantibus, virtute quorum tota prior ecclesia, sicut et ecclesia sequens accepit vitam spiritualem et pulchritudinem vite naturali superadditam. Et sicut preter materiam coste Adam oportet multiplicari spiritualiter, quia miraculose nobis abscondite aliam materiam ex quibus constituitur mater Eva, sic principaliter mundiciam vel virtutem corporalem sanguinis et aque redempcionis humane oportet dare ampliorem spiritualem mundiciam et virtutem ex eis originatam que se extendit ad totam ecclesiam preteritam et futuram; sed procul undique hoc venenum pestiferum, ut credatur ante mortem Christi non fuisse ecclesiam, sed Christum cum suis apostolis fuisse viando solummodo synagogam.

created in grace that makes pleasing; but later, in the fullness of time, he formed in human wise his church, which had existed for many thousands of years before, when, sleeping on the cross, dead, he made it beautiful from principles that cleanse it, by the power of which the whole prior church, as also the following church, received spiritual life and a beauty added over natural life.[11] And just as, beyond the matter of Adam's rib, other matter, from which mother Eve is constituted, had to be multiplied spiritually, since [it was done] miraculously, in a way hidden from us, so principally the bodily cleanness or power of the blood and water of human redemption must give a fuller spiritual cleanness and power, originating from them, which extends itself to the whole church, past and future. But far, on every side, [be] this pestilent poison, that it should be believed that before the death of Christ there was no church, but that Christ with his apostles was, in his wayfaring, only the synagogue.[12]

Notes

1. ***Pro instanti quo***: at the instant at which. The lower part of the church, human nature, is set above the upper, the angels, in Christ's humanity after the ascension; ***in celestibus***, "in the heavenly places", as Ephesians 2:6. T. At 438.27 A reads ***factus est factus***.
2. ***Laborarent ... foret***: subjunctives, taken as what bishops ought to do ("should"). ***Que questum sapiunt***: things that savour of gain.
3. ***Et cum ... scribit***: taken as concessive, "although": the angels' church is forgotten though Augustine wrote of it. S. Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 15.61 (PL 40); Wyclif has ***in fine*** for ***in finem***, omits ***simul***, and Loserth prints ***nocior*** for ***notior***. T. The manuscripts read ***Encheridion LXIX***; Loserth's correction to LXI is translated (439.7). At 439.12 AA_1 read ***quo in illa***. R. A in the margin at 439.7: ***Augustinus. Presciti non sunt de ecclesia, probatur per Augustinum***.
4. At 439.14 AA_1 read ***presciti sunt***; at 439.19 the manuscripts read ***de bono perseverancie***, corrected by Loserth. S. Augustine, ***De dono perseverantiae*** 6 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** X, p. 826); the words as quoted are compressed and altered: Augustine has ***multi eam possunt habere, nullus amittere*** (PL 45), where Wyclif's ***possunt non habere sed*** reverses the first clause. C. ***In assimili***: "in a like case": final perseverance, like final impenitence, cannot be undone once given. R. A in the margin at 439.16: ***Nota***.
5. Ephesians 5:25–27: Wyclif adds ***eam*** after ***mundans*** and omits ***sibi*** after ***ipse*** (DR "present it to himself"). C. ***Limitate***: in a restricted sense, of the predestinate only. ***Quantumcunque magna sanctitate ... prepollere***: "however much they excel in great holiness". T. At 439.28 AA_1 read ***atque rugam***.
6. ***Per locum ab insufficienti similitudine***: by the dialectical topic from likeness (glossary: ***locus a simili***), here an insufficient likeness. S. Ephesians 5:31–32; ***inquit*** is Wyclif's. R. A in the margin at 440.5: ***Apparens argumentum pro incepcione ecclesie post mortem Christi***; B in the margin at 440.9: ***Magnum sacramentum desponsacionis inter Christum et ecclesiam***.
7. Genesis 2:21–22. The blood and water from Christ's side are John 19:34; the print reads ***Joh. XX°***, and Wyclif's chapter is kept. T. At 440.12 the manuscripts read ***Gen. III°***; Loserth's II° is translated.
8. ***Informis argucia***: an "unformed" quibble, with a play on ***formacio***: the argument presses the likeness ***omnimode***, in every respect, and so would make Christ's death a sleep and his part merely passive.
9. ***Ad literam ... sensum historicum***: the literal, historical sense of Genesis, about Adam and Eve; ***sacramentaliter vel mistice***, the sense Ephesians gives it. T. At 440.25 AA_1 read ***expresse***. R. A in the margin at 440.23: ***Quomodo formata est ecclesia***.
10. ***Sic primus Adam secundum deitatem***: so printed (441.2, read on the plate). The comparison requires Christ, the second Adam, according to his deity, and ***primus*** is suspect; the print is translated. ***Sine priori contractu mutuo ad assensum***: without a prior mutual contract [leading] to assent; Eve did not consent to her making, nor did the church to hers. T. At 440.33 the manuscripts read ***sic Deus*** for ***sicut Deus***.
11. Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 15.56, as at 438.1–2. T. The manuscripts read ***Enchiridion LXIV***; Loserth's LVI is translated (441.6). At 441.11 B omits ***dormiens***. C. ***Gracia gratificante***: the grace that makes pleasing (***gratia gratum faciens***). ***Humanitus***: in his humanity, as against ***secundum deitatem***. R. A in the margin at 441.10: ***Nota***.
12. ***Oportet multiplicari ... aliam materiam***: ***aliam materiam*** is taken as the subject of ***multiplicari***, and ***quia miraculose nobis abscondite*** as elliptical ("since [it was done] miraculously, hidden from us"); ***ex quibus*** is plural for the matter of the rib and the other matter together. ***Procul ... hoc venenum***: "far [be]", the verb understood. ***Viando***: while on the way, Christ as wayfarer. R. After ***synagogam*** (441.25) A adds a prayer in Czech, which Loserth prints and glosses in Latin, ***Misericors domine, dimittere digneris nobis peccata vetera nec non recentiora*** ("Merciful Lord, deign to forgive us our old and also more recent sins").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **438: *primus* (alinea letter V glued)**
  - **439: *in* (print has in fine as two words)**
  - **439: *27°***
  - **440: *Christi***
  - **440: *per***
  - **440: *31***
  - **440: ∅ (1 already held in main token 31)**
  - **440: *II°* (leaf zoom: degree sign broken open on right, looks like ᶜ)**
  - **440: *secundum* (alinea letter a at right edge glued)**
  - **441: *Adam* (alinea letter b glued)**
  - **441: *gratificante***
  - **441: *Christi***

Chapter 19

Part 1: Whether the foreknown hold the orders and offices of the church; the character of orders

Loserth pp. 441.27–445.29

¶1 441.27–442.25
441.27 *Whether the foreknown hold orders and offices in the Church.*
442.18 *None such is a part or officer of the Church, but he has a duty of ministering within the Church.*
442.26 *God uses the wicked for good.*

[441]**Supposito ex fide scripture elaborata a sanctis doctoribus quod solum predestinati sint membra sancte matris ecclesie, restat dubitandum ulterius si** [442]**presciti gerant ordines et officia illius ecclesie. Et videtur ex dictis quod non; nam Deus summe sapiens non daret potestatem inhabili. Sed nullus talis habet potestatem huiusmodi si non per Deum, ergo nullus talis habet huiusmodi potestatem. Est autem inhabilis, quia in mortali peccato necessario dampnabili continue, ut suppono ex dictis XXVI° capitulo libri V^i^. Confirmatur ex Decreto, XI^a^, q. III, ubi ex dicto beati Gregorii sic habetur: Ipse ligandi atque solvendi potestate se privat qui hanc pro suis voluntatibus et non subditorum moribus exercet. Si ergo pro leviori peccato habens potestatem ordinis ipsa privatur, multo magis pro graviori peccato ipse qui reciperet huiusmodi potestatem ab ea excluditur; culpandus itaque foret Christus, si ecclesie sue preficeret membrum diaboli tam inhabile et nocivum. Non ergo habet talis caracterem indelebilem, ut sit de exercitu christiano. Hic videtur mihi indubie quod nullus prescitus est pars vel gerens officium tamquam de sancta matre ecclesia; habet tamen intra illam ecclesiam ad sui dampnacionem et ecclesie utilitatem certa officia ministrandi, ut patet de Scarioth et multis eius vicariis, et ad tantum Deus eligit tales dans eis ad tale officium potestatem. Nam Johannis VI°, 71 scribitur: Nonne ego duodecim vos elegi et unus ex vobis diabolus est?**

Supposing, from the faith of scripture as worked out by the holy doctors, that only the predestinate are members of holy mother church, it remains to ask further whether [442]**the foreknown hold the orders and offices of that church.[1] And it seems from what has been said that they do not; for God, supremely wise, would not give power to one unqualified. Now no such [man] has power of this kind if not through God; therefore no such [man] has power of this kind. And he is unqualified, because he is continually in mortal sin, necessarily damnable, as I suppose from what was said in the twenty-sixth chapter of book 5.[2] It is confirmed from the Decretum, Causa 11, question 3, where, from a saying of blessed Gregory, it is had thus: "He deprives himself of the power of binding and loosing who exercises it according to his own wishes and not according to the conduct of his subjects." If therefore for a lighter sin one having the power of order is deprived of it, much more for a graver sin is he who would receive power of this kind excluded from it; Christ would therefore be to blame if he set over his church a member of the devil so unqualified and harmful. Such a man therefore does not have the indelible character, so as to be of the Christian army.[3] Here it seems to me without doubt that no foreknown [man] is a part, or bears an office as being of holy mother church; yet within that church he has, to his own damnation and the church's profit, certain offices of ministering, as is clear of Iscariot and his many vicars; and to that extent God chooses such men, giving them power for such an office.[4] For in John 6:71 it is written: "Have not I chosen you twelve? And one of you is a devil."**

¶2 442.26–444.5
443.26 *The difficulty is whether the foreknown have "stamp" (caracter) of orders.*
444.6 *Predestinate and foreknown have the stamp in different ways.*

[442]**Super quo Augustinus, Omelia XXV^a^, dubitat quomodo Christus elegit dyabolum, et respondet quod electus est iste de quo nolente et nesciente magnum aliquid boni fieret. Hoc, inquit, est proprium Dei, iniquis contrarium quod, sicut iniqui male utuntur** [443]**bonis Dei operibus, sic econtra Deus bene utitur malis operibus iniquorum. Et ponendo multa exempla conclusionaliter sic concludit: Omnibus ergo bonis Dei, ne per singula currere longum sit, male utitur malus. Et hinc sepe dixi quod existens in mortali continue abutitur bonis Dei,**

On which Augustine, in Homily 25, asks how Christ chose a devil, and answers that this one was chosen through whom, unwilling and unknowing, some great good would be done. "This," he says, "is proper to God, contrary to the wicked: that, as the wicked use the good works of God [443]**badly, so conversely God uses well the bad works of the wicked."[5] And setting out many examples, he concludes by way of conclusion thus: "All the good things of God, therefore (lest it be long to run through**

et per consequens, quicquid sic fecerit peccat mortaliter; econtra de malis: malis malorum, inquit Augustinus, bene utitur bonus. Et quid tam bonum, ut Deus, de quo Marci X°, 18 dicitur: Nemo bonus nisi solus Deus? Quanto ergo ille melior tanto melius utitur malis nostris. Quid Iuda peius inter apostolos cui loculi commissi sunt et dispensacio pauperum distributa? Sed quia ingratus tanto beneficio et honori accepit pecuniam, perdidit iusticiam: mortuus tradidit vitam; quem ut discipulus secutus, ut inimicus persecutus est; toto hoc malo Iude bene usus est dominus, cum prodicione eius dampnabili nos redemit. Sic ergo habuit Iudas officium in ecclesia, non de illa, sicut stercus et apostemata habent officia in humano corpore, non de illo. Modo, inquit Augustinus, corpus Christi mixtum est tamquam area; sed novit Deus qui sunt eius, sicut tu nosti quid trituras, quia ibi est latens massa, nec consumit trituracio quod purgatura est ventilacio. Sed difficultas est utrum tales presciti habent caracterem ordinis, utrum sint sacerdotes episcopi vel prelati. Quoad primum est dissensio inter multos de quiditate caracteris. Aliqui enim dicunt quod est qualitas de secunda specie qualitatis sicut naturalis potencia. Alii autem dicunt quod non est per se in genere sed per reduccionem, sicut alie veritates consimiles extra genus, ita quod caracter sit deputacio [444] passiva creature racionalis ad serviendum Deo et ecclesie secundum gradum ordinis dignitatis; nec contendo circa quiditatem talis caracteris, cum certus sum quod non sit res ut serta regis vel aliquod signum inpressum quod poterit per se esse.

them one by one), the bad man uses badly." And hence I have often said that one who is in mortal [sin] continually abuses the goods of God, and consequently whatever he so does, he sins mortally. Conversely of evils: "The evils of the evil," says Augustine, "the good man uses well. And what is so good as God", of whom it is said in Mark 10:18, "None is good but God alone"? "The better he is, therefore, the better he uses our evils. What was worse than Judas among the apostles, to whom the purse was committed and the dispensing for the poor assigned? But because, ungrateful for so great a benefit and honour, he took money, he lost justice; dead, he betrayed life; whom he followed as a disciple, him he persecuted as an enemy. All this evil of Judas the Lord used well", since by his damnable betrayal he redeemed us.[6] So therefore Judas had an office in the church, not of it, as dung and abscesses have offices in the human body, not of it. "At present," says Augustine, "the body of Christ is mixed, like a threshing-floor; but God knows who are his, as you know what you thresh, since there is a mass lying hidden there, and the threshing does not consume what the winnowing is to purge."[7] But the difficulty is whether such foreknown [men] have the character of order, whether they are priests, bishops or prelates. As to the first there is dissension among many about the quiddity of the character. For some say that it is a quality of the second species of quality, like a natural capacity. But others say that it is not of itself in a category but by reduction, like other similar truths outside a category, so that the character is a passive deputation [444] of a rational creature to serve God and the church according to the degree of the order of dignity.[8] Nor do I contend about the quiddity of such a character, since I am certain that it is not a thing, like a king's crown, or some sign imprinted that could exist of itself.[9]

¶3 444.6–445.29
445.3 *Various senses in which the "stamp" is spoken of.*
445.16 *The "stamp" of the predestinate is a white stone with a new name: of the foreknown the mark of the beast; and there is the temporal "stamp" marking for a temporal office.*

[444] Tenendo ergo secundam viam de quiditate caracteris dico ulterius quod alius est necessario delebilis, ut caracter ecclesiasticus in prescitis, eo quod non ultra diem iudicii durabit in eis officium dignitatis. In predestinatis autem oportet esse caracterem omnino indelebilem, cum dignitas sequendi agnum mutuo illuminandi conbeatum et percipiendi fructum vivificum non posset deleri in eis, et de tanto habent caracterem ordinis vel caracterem baptismalem. Et patet quod predestinati et presciti secundum diversitatem officii equivoce habent caracterem. Et correspondenter dicitur quod equivoce habent ordinem, episcopatum vel aliam ecclesiasticam prelaciam, quia presciti ascribuntur ad tale officium solummodo temporale, non ut mereantur beatitudinem, sed ut mitigando penam

Holding therefore the second way about the quiddity of the character, I say further that one [character] is necessarily delible, as the ecclesiastical character in the foreknown, because the office of dignity will not last in them beyond the day of judgement.[10] But in the predestinate the character must be altogether indelible, since the dignity of following the Lamb, of mutually enlightening one's fellow-blessed, and of receiving the life-giving fruit could not be blotted out in them; and to that extent they have the character of order or the baptismal character. And it is clear that the predestinate and the foreknown, according to the diversity of office, have the character equivocally. And correspondingly it is said that they have order, the episcopate or another ecclesiastical prelacy equivocally,

per accidens prosint ecclesie. Et ita conceditur quod Scarioth et eius vicarii erant apostoli, presbiteri, episcopi et prelati, habentes proporcionaliter ad suum officium potestatem, et ad tantum aput Deum sunt habiles. Quod autem Iudas fuit apostolus, patet Matthei X°, ubi inter duodecim quos Christus elegerat computatur, et beatus Petrus testatur quod sortitus est sortem ministerii apostolatus et quod de illo scriptum est Psalmo CVIII°, 8: Fiant dies eius pauci et episcopatum eius accipiat alter; et sic cum singulum istorum sit nomen officii, patet quod non sequitur: Iudas est apostolus, episcopus vel sacerdos, ergo est membrum vel de sancta ecclesia. [445]Sufficit quod sit in illa tamquam palea temporaliter ministrans finaliter comburenda. Unde non dicimus quod ad serviendum Deo in inferno perpetuo paciendo oportet servum indelebiliter habere caracterem, nisi forte equivocetur de caractere bestie quam meminit Johannis Apoc. XIX°, 20, ubi dicitur: Seduxit eos qui acceperunt caracterem bestie et qui adoraverunt ymaginem eius. Et de isto caractere fit mencio Apocalypsis XIII° et XIV°. Caracterem autem transferimus in bonum pro scriptura predestinacionis in libro vite (ut loquitur Christus Luce X°, 20 et Apocalypsis XIII°, 8). Quandoque vero accipitur caracter pro aggregato ex predestinacione et limitacione per signum sacramentale, et sic secundum limitacionem signi caracteris est varie respondendum. Nam caracter predestinatorum et caracter prescitorum qui sunt de synagoga sathane (ut loquitur scriptura Apoc. II°) est indelebilis, quia primus est calculus candidus vel nomen novum, quod nemo scit nisi qui accipit (ut loquitur scriptura Apoc. II°, 9). Sed secundus est nomen finalis impenitencie vel comitans caracter bestie, caracter autem temporalis quando est limitacio ad officium temporale; et in talibus terminis magistralibus oportet responsalem quoad significacionem et quiditatem in principio stabiliri. Caracter enim communiter in malum sumitur in scriptura, sed aliter loquimur hic de caractere agni quoad dignitatem activam ministerii ad quam assignantur predestinati differenter a servis dyaboli in ordine vel baptismo.

because the foreknown are enrolled for such an office as a merely temporal one, not that they may merit blessedness, but that, by mitigating their punishment, they may by accident profit the church.[11] And so it is granted that Iscariot and his vicars were apostles, presbyters, bishops and prelates, having power in proportion to their office, and to that extent they are qualified before God. And that Judas was an apostle is clear from Matthew 10, where he is counted among the twelve whom Christ had chosen; and blessed Peter testifies that he "had obtained part of the ministry of the apostleship", and that of him it is written in Psalm 108:8: "May his days be few: and his bishopric let another take". And so, since each of these is the name of an office, it is clear that it does not follow: "Judas is an apostle, bishop or priest; therefore he is a member of holy church, or of it."[12] [445]It suffices that he be in it as chaff, ministering for a time, to be burned in the end. Whence we do not say that, to serve God in hell by suffering perpetually, a servant must have a character indelibly, unless perhaps "character" is used equivocally of the character of the beast which John mentions in Apocalypse 19:20, where it is said: "He seduced them who received the character of the beast and who adored his image." And of this character mention is made in Apocalypse 13 and 14.[13] But we transfer "character" to the good, for the writing of predestination in the book of life (as Christ speaks in Luke 10:20, and Apocalypse 13:8). And sometimes "character" is taken for the aggregate of predestination and assignment through a sacramental sign; and so, according to the assignment of the sign of the character, the answer must vary.[14] For the character of the predestinate and the character of the foreknown who are of the synagogue of Satan (as scripture speaks, Apocalypse 2) is indelible: for the first is the white counter or new name, "which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it" (as scripture speaks, Apocalypse 2:9); but the second is the name of final impenitence, or the accompanying character of the beast; and the character is temporal when it is an assignment to a temporal office. And in such masters' terms the respondent must be fixed at the outset as to signification and quiddity. For "character" is commonly taken in a bad sense in scripture; but here we speak otherwise, of the character of the Lamb, as to the active dignity of ministry to which the predestinate are assigned, differently from the servants of the devil, in order or in baptism.[15]

Notes

1. ***Gerant ordines et officia***: "hold" orders and offices, as one bears an office. ***Prescitus***: one whom God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). R. A in the margin at 441.29: ***Utrum presciti gerant ordines et officia ecclesie***.
2. The argument: God gives no power to the unqualified; no one has such power except from God; therefore the unqualified have none. ***Est autem inhabilis*** supplies the premiss that the foreknown man is unqualified. S. ***XXVI° capitulo libri V[i]***: Wyclif's own cross-reference, chapter 26 of book 5 of his *Summa*, i.e. *De civili dominio* III (*De ecclesia* is book 7), c. 26, which opens ***necessitati sumus peccare saltem venialiter continue*** (Society ed. IV, 604). R. A in the margin at 442.4: ***Responsio***.
3. Decretum C.11 q.3 c.60 (Loserth: ***Dec. sec. pars, causa XI, q. III, cap. LX***; the modern form is ours), from Gregory, ***Homiliae in Evangelia*** 26.5 (PL 76); Wyclif's wording follows Gratian's, omitting *pro* before ***subditorum***. T. At 442.13–14 the manuscripts read ***huius potestatem***; Loserth's ***huiusmodi*** is translated. G. ***Caracter***: the "character" of orders (glossary: ***carecter***); Loserth's side-notes say "stamp".
4. ***Hic videtur mihi***: Wyclif's answer begins. ***Tamquam de sancta matre ecclesia***: as one belonging to the church, against ***intra illam ecclesiam***, "within" it. ***Scarioth et ... eius vicariis***: Judas Iscariot and those who succeed to his part. R. A in the margin at 442.18: ***Responsio***.
5. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 27.10 (Loserth: ***In Joh. Evang. cap. VI, tract. XXVII, Opp.*** III, ii, p. 505); Wyclif cites it as "Homily 25". John 6:71 (DR, Wyclif's word order differs slightly). R. A in the margin at 442.26: ***Augustinus***; at 442.29: ***Sicut mali bonis abuntuntur*** (sic, for ***abutuntur***), ***sic boni malis bene utuntur***.
6. Mark 10:18 as Wyclif gives it has ***solus***, the wording of Luke 18:19 (DR "None is good but God alone"); Mark has ***unus***. C. Augustine's words are taken to resume at ***Quanto ergo*** and to end at ***usus est dominus***; ***cum prodicione ... redemit*** is taken as Wyclif's. ***In mortali***: in mortal [sin]. ***Ingratus***: here a person ungrateful for a benefit (glossary: ***ingratus***). T. At 443.7–8 B reads ***contra de bonis***; at 443.11 AA$_1$ omit ***ille***; at 443.14 they read ***sed quod***.
7. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 27.11, continuing: ***corpus Christi mixtum est tanquam in area*** (PL 35); Wyclif's "Homily 25" matches no numbering; 2 Timothy 2:19, DR "the Lord knoweth who are his". T. Loserth notes that Augustine's text reads ***tamquam in area*** (443.22). C. ***Modo***: Augustine's "at present", in this life.
8. ***Secunda species qualitatis***: in Aristotle's *Categories* 8 the second species of quality is natural capacity or incapacity (9a14–27). ***Per reduccionem***: placed in a category only by reduction to something that is in it. ***Deputacio passiva***: being deputed to a service. T. At 443.27 A reads ***utrum sit***. R. A in the margin at 443.26: ***Utrum presciti habent caracterem ordinis***; A and B in the margin at 443.33: ***quid est caracter***.
9. ***Serta***: a crown or wreath; Loserth's note at 444.4: ***corona ducalis, regalis sive imperialis***.
10. ***Secundam viam***: the second opinion, the character as a deputation. ***Alius***: "one [character]", taken with ***caracter***; the predestinate's character follows. T. At 444.6 B reads ***secundam vitam***. R. A in the margin at 444.6: ***Character ordinis est delebilis in prescitis, sed non sic in predestinatis***.
11. Following the Lamb: Apocalypse 14:4. C. ***Conbeatum***: one's fellow-blessed. ***Equivoce***: the one word "character" names two different things. ***Solummodo temporale***: taken with ***officium***, an office that is only temporal. T. At 444.16 B omits ***caracterem ... habent***.
12. Matthew 10:4. Peter: Acts 1:17 (DR "had obtained part of this ministry"), where Wyclif reads ***apostolatus*** for ***huius*** (cf. Acts 1:25), and Acts 1:20, quoting Psalm 108:8. C. ***Membrum vel de sancta ecclesia***: "a member of, or [one] of, holy church". T. At 444.32 B reads ***post quod***.
13. Apocalypse 19:20 (DR); 13:16–17; 14:9–11. C. ***Quam meminit Johannis***: taken as "which John mentions", the genitive ***Johannis*** standing for the nominative. T. At 445.8 B reads ***adoraverint***. R. A in the margin at 445.8: ***Duplex caracter***.
14. Luke 10:20, DR "your names are written in heaven"; Apocalypse 13:8, "the book of life of the Lamb". C. ***Limitacio***: assignment to an office (glossary: ***limitare***, "to assign"), here through a sacramental sign.
15. The synagogue of Satan is Apocalypse 2:9; the white counter and the new name are Apocalypse 2:17 (DR "a white counter: and in the counter, a new name written, which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it"). The print sets the verse 9 against the second reference; it is translated as printed. C. ***Responsalem***: the respondent in a disputation, whose terms must be fixed before he answers. ***Terminis magistralibus***: terms of the schools, the masters' technical terms.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 441: ***CAP. XIX.***
  - 442: ***V[i]***
  - 442: ***XI[a]***
  - 442: ***Christus***
  - 442: ∅ (English side-note word (the); print has no word before Super)
  - 442: ***XXV[a]***
  - 442: ***Christus***
  - 443: ***18***
  - 444: ***et*** (alinea letter C glued)
  - 444: ***necessario*** (ri clear in print; shared misreading) [NW]
  - 444: ***in***
  - 445: ***indelebiliter***
  - 445: ***habere*** (line number 5 glued)
  - 445: ***Christus***

- **445: *II°***
- **445: *II°***
- **445: ∅ (second half of secun-dus; neighbour 144 already secundus) [DELX]**
- **445: *Sufficit* (190ª folio mark and margin letter dropped) [-MARK]**
- **444: *X°,* [-VERSE]**

Part 2: The predestinate are priests in the homeland; the foreknown minister the sacraments; first conclusion: clerical litigation should cease

Loserth pp. 445.31–449.15

¶1 445.31–448.13
445.31 *Some offices in the Church are temporal.*
446.1 *some eternal.*
446.21 *All the blessed will be virgins, martyrs and priests.*
447.22 *God fits the creature for the power given to him,*
447.29 *but, it may be, only for the benefit of others,*
448.14 *The foreknown even when in actual sin minister the sacraments with profit to others.*

[445] **Unde videtur mihi quod nomina recitati officii eciam in predestinatis exhinc merentibus beatitudinem sunt quedam specialia, ut apostolatus et episcopatus. Nam missio ad evangelizandum et superintendencia solicita ad custodiendum videntur tantum pro statu** [446] **vie officiariis sponsi competere. Sed sacerdocium videtur esse eternum, cum beati dant et docent sacra illuminando suos socios in eternum, et ad illud potest applicari illud Apoc. 1°, 6: Fecisti nos Deo nostro regnum et sacerdotes; et sic predestinati qui digne presunt subiectis videntur mihi esse eis in beatitudine preferendi, et sic in celesti ierarchia eis in perpetuo sacerdocio sunt prelati, ut innuit beatus Gregorius, Omelia XVIIª super illo Luce X°, 1: Post hec designavit dominus alios septuaginta, et Crisostomus expressius, Omelia XXXIV Operis Imperfecti Melior, inquit, est laicus qui in prima facie profitetur vitam secularem sed studet spiritualem, quam sacerdos profitens vitam spiritualem sed amplectitur vitam carnalem, et melior est laicus ante Deum penitenciam agens quam clericus permanens in peccatis. Laicus enim in die iudicii stolam sacerdotalem accipiet, dum eciam crismate omnes sic unguentur in sacerdocio; sacerdos autem peccator spoliatur sacerdocii dignitate quam habuit; et tunc erit inter infideles et ypocritas (ut dicit veritas Matthei XXIV°, 51). Omnes eciam beati erunt virgines spiritualiter (ut patet Apocalypsis XIV°, 4). Et omnes erunt martyres modo suo, cum Luce XIV°, 27, dicitur: Qui non baiulat crucem suam et venit post me, non potest meus esse discipulus. Omnes (inquam) erunt sacerdotes in patria, quia dantes sacra beatitudinis accidentalia conbeatis. Et hinc Abel a quo cepit humana ecclesia in triumpho, fuit expresse virgo, martir et sacerdos, ut notat Augustinus in De** [447] **Mirabilibus Scripture Sacre, III° capitulo. Tota, inquit, iusticia, hec est virginitas, sacerdocium et martirium. Que triplex iusticia in Abel primo fuit qui et munera Deo placita obtulit, prosapiam generis in seculo non dereliquit et martirii coronam sanguinis effusione promeruit. Quilibet ergo salvandus debet esse spiritualiter virgo in hoc quod declinans a malo sequitur agnum sponsum ecclesie;**

Whence it seems to me that, among the names of the office just recounted, even in the predestinate who thereby merit blessedness, some are special, as apostleship and the episcopate.[1] For the sending to preach the gospel and anxious oversight in guarding seem to belong to the officers of the bridegroom only for the state of the way. [446] **But priesthood seems to be eternal, since the blessed give and teach holy things, enlightening their fellows for ever; and to it can be applied that word of Apocalypse 1:6: "[Thou] hast made us to our God a kingdom and priests."[2] And so the predestinate who worthily preside over subjects seem to me to be preferred to them in blessedness, and so in the heavenly hierarchy they are set over them in a perpetual priesthood, as blessed Gregory hints in Homily 17, on that of Luke 10:1, "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy";[3] and Chrysostom more expressly, in Homily 34 of the *Opus imperfectum*: "Better," he says, "is a layman who on the face of it professes the secular life but strives after the spiritual, than a priest who professes the spiritual life but embraces the carnal life; and better before God is a layman doing penance than a cleric remaining in sins. For the layman will receive the priestly stole on the day of judgement, since all are then anointed with chrism in priesthood; but the sinful priest is stripped of the dignity of the priesthood that he had"; and then he will be among the unbelievers and hypocrites (as the Truth says, Matthew 24:51).[4] All the blessed, too, will be virgins spiritually (as is clear from Apocalypse 14:4). And all will be martyrs in their own way, since it is said in Luke 14:27: "And whosoever doth not carry his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple." All, I say, will be priests in the homeland, since they give the holy things, the accidental [goods] of blessedness, to their fellow-blessed.[5] And hence Abel, with whom the human church in triumph began, was expressly virgin, martyr and priest, as Augustine notes in *On the* [447] *Wonders of Holy Scripture*, chapter 3: "The whole of justice," he says, "is this: virginity, priesthood and martyrdom. Which**

debet secundo esse sacerdos, offerens Deo fructum meriti, et debet tercio connectendo hec duo ad invicem in istis perseverare finaliter tamquam martir. Et ideo signanter notat Christus Matthei XXIII°, 35 quomodo ecclesia dicitur cepisse ab Abel iusto cui secundum Augustinum Jesus commisit primatum iusticie. In hoc, inquit, quod non nominat Zachariam iustum, ut Abel iustum, hereditatem iusticie Abel tenere Zachariam ostendit, sicut in genealogia Christi scribitur primo et solitarie David fuisse regem, dum dicitur: Gesse autem genuit David regem; Salomoni autem et aliis non additur nomen regis, cum alii patres regnum iure hereditario tenuerunt. Sed notanda est alia causa (quam dixi superius) quod Abel fuit primus veteranus ecclesie triumphantis qui spe felici spiritualis nectaris missus est in locum refrigerii expurgandus. Et patet ad formam argumenti quod Deus quidquid creature racionali dederit, eam prius ad ipsum habilitat; et quantum ad decretum beati Gregorii, patet quod intelligitur abutentem potestate sua ut sic privare se illa, quantum ad racionem sibi merendi, dum tamen maneat potestas secundum racionem aliis promerendi. Et sic Deus dedit potestatem Iude propter causam multiplicem; ipse autem non fuit inhabilis ad recipiendum illam potestatem, licet [448] ex culpa propria fuerit inhabilis ad sibi merendum beatitudinem; nec Christus ordinavit eum sic demereri sed permisit ordinando eum in hoc per accidens sponse sue proficere. Unde talis mixcio atque prefeccio prodest ex gracia ordinantis sancte matri ecclesie eciam plus quam si solum membrum ecclesie in ipsa preficeret. Prodest enim strenuo militi ad exercitum quod habeat rebellantem. Nec contradico sed assencio quod sepe evenit, ut pontifex fingat vel putet se signare sacerdotem caractere, ubi propter inhabilitatem ad ordines vel negligenciam ordinarii manet laycus non signatus (de quo alibi).

threefold justice was first in Abel, who both offered gifts pleasing to God, left no offspring of his race in the world, and merited the crown of martyrdom by the shedding of his blood."[6] Every one, therefore, who is to be saved must be spiritually a virgin, in that, turning aside from evil, he follows the Lamb, the bridegroom of the church; he must, secondly, be a priest, offering to God the fruit of merit; and he must, thirdly, joining these two to each other, persevere in them to the end as a martyr. And therefore Christ notes pointedly, in Matthew 23:35, how the church is said to have begun from Abel the just, to whom, according to Augustine, Jesus committed the primacy of justice. "In this," he says, "that he does not name Zacharias 'just', as he names Abel 'just', he shows that Zacharias holds the inheritance of Abel's justice; as in the genealogy of Christ it is written first and alone that David was king, when it is said: 'And Jesse begot David the king'; but to Solomon and the others the name of king is not added, since the other fathers held the kingdom by hereditary right."[7] But another cause is to be noted (which I gave above): that Abel was the first veteran of the church triumphant, who, in happy hope of spiritual nectar, was sent to the place of refreshment, to be purged.[8] And as to the form of the argument, it is clear that whatever God gives to a rational creature, he first fits it for that; and as to the decree of blessed Gregory, it is clear that it is understood [to mean] that one who abuses his power so deprives himself of it, as regards the aspect of meriting for himself, while yet the power remains under the aspect of meriting for others.[9] And so God gave power to Judas for a manifold cause; and he was not unqualified to receive that power, although [448] through his own fault he was unqualified to merit blessedness for himself; nor did Christ ordain him so to demerit, but permitted it, ordaining that he should in this profit his bride by accident.[10] Whence such a mixing and setting-over profits holy mother church, by the grace of the one who ordains, even more than if he set over it only a member of the church. For it profits a vigorous soldier, for exercise, that he have someone rebelling against him. Nor do I contradict, but assent, that it often happens that a bishop feigns or thinks that he signs a priest with the character, where, through unfitness for orders or the negligence of the ordinary, he remains a layman, unsigned (of which elsewhere).[11]

¶2 448.14–449.3
449.4 All the litigation in ecclesiastical causes ought to cease.

[448] Videtur autem mihi quod prescitus eciam in mortali peccato actuali ministrat fidelibus, licet sibi dampnabiliter, tamen subiectis utiliter sacramenta. Sic enim Balaam, Num. XXIII°, Cayphas, Joh.

And it seems to me that a foreknown man, even in actual mortal sin, ministers the sacraments to the faithful, though damnably for himself, yet profitably for his subjects. For so Balaam (Numbers 23) and Caiaphas

XI°, prophetarunt, et dyaboli sepe deiecti per Christum a personis quas obsederant confessi sunt publice dominum Jesum Christum. Et istam sentenciam diffinivit Salvator Matthei VII°, 22: Multi, inquit, dicent mihi in illa die: Domine, domine, nonne in nomine tuo prophetavimus et in nomine tuo demonia eiecimus et virtutes multas fecimus? Et tunc confitebor illis: Quia nunquam novi vos, ut patet de uno Marci IX° et Luce IX° quem apostoli increparunt, quia fecit miracula et non secutus fuit eos. Sed Christus approbavit quantum ad substanciam miraculi, ut non per se ex signis huiusmodi iudicemus filium Dei vel filium diaboli. Sic ergo sacerdotes mali iniuriantur sed non nocent piis fidelibus non demerentibus ministrando eis ecclesiastica sacramenta, ut patet in [449]decretis Iª, q. I, Si fuerit, ex testimonio Augustini, et XVª, questione ultima, cap. ultimo, et III° Decretalium, De Cohabitacione clericorum et mulierum, Vestra.

(John 11) prophesied, and devils, often cast out by Christ from persons whom they had possessed, publicly confessed the Lord Jesus Christ.[12] And the Saviour defined this teaching in Matthew 7:22: "Many," he says, "will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, have not we prophesied in thy name, and cast out devils in thy name, and done many miracles? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you"; as is clear of the one in Mark 9 and Luke 9 whom the apostles rebuked because he worked miracles and did not follow them. But Christ approved [him] as to the substance of the miracle, so that we should not judge, from signs of this kind of themselves, a son of God or a son of the devil.[13] So therefore bad priests wrong the pious faithful who do not demerit, but do not harm them, in ministering to them the church's sacraments, as is clear in [449]the decrees, Causa 1, question 1, *Si fuerit*, from the testimony of Augustine, and Causa 15, last question, last chapter, and in book 3 of the Decretals, *On the joint dwelling of clerics and women*, *Vestra*.[14]

¶3 449.4–449.15

[449]Ex istis videtur primo quod cessaret in clero omnis contencio circa temporalia que sub titulo cause ecclesiastice est tractata. Feci autem ad hoc raciones multiplices et allegavi ad hoc auctoritates scripture. Nam posita licencia taliter contendendi via paciendi iniurias foret securior, ergo generaliter sub pena peccati foret via illa eligenda; patet consequencia ex hoc quod via meritorior et facilior est generaliter eligenda, et ideo dicit Gregorius Omelia XVIIª: Qui locum predicacionis suscipit mala inferre non debet sed tolerare, ut ex ipsa sua mansuetudine iram seviencium mitiget et peccatorum vulnera in aliis ipse afflicciones vulneratus sanet.

From these things it seems, first, that all contention in the clergy about temporal goods that has been conducted under the title of an ecclesiastical cause should cease.[15] And I have made many arguments for this, and alleged authorities of scripture for it. For, granted licence to contend in this way, the way of suffering wrongs would be safer; therefore, generally, under pain of sin, that way would have to be chosen. The inference is clear from this, that the more meritorious and easier way is generally to be chosen;[16] and therefore Gregory says in Homily 17: "He who takes up the place of preaching ought not to inflict evils but to bear them, so that by his very meekness he may soften the anger of those who rage, and, himself wounded by afflictions, may heal the wounds of sins in others."[17]

Notes

1. *Nomina recitati officii*: the offices named in the previous part (apostle, bishop, priest, prelate, 444–445). *Quedam specialia*: taken as "some [of these names] are special", proper to the state of the way, as Loserth's side-note reads it ("Some offices in the Church are temporal"); *exhinc merentibus*, "who thereby merit", by holding them. *Superintendencia*: oversight, the bishop's office.
2. The words are Apocalypse 5:10 (DR); the print cites 1:6, DR "hath made us a kingdom, and priests to God and his Father". C. *Dant et docent sacra*: the priest's work, to give and teach holy things. T. At 446.1 B reads *sacerdocium vestrum*. R. A in the margin at 446.4: *Quilibet sanctorum in patria erit sacerdos*.
3. Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 17, on Luke 10:1 (PL 76; the homily is right, the content loosely given). Wyclif's *septuaginta* is translated; the Vulgate has *septuaginta duos*, DR "other seventy-two". C. *Prelati*: the participle, "set over", not the noun "prelates". R. A in the margin at 446.8: *Gregorius*; at 446.10: *Crisostomus*.
4. *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 34, then read as Chrysostom's (Loserth: *Opus Imperfectum l. c. pag. CXLV*). Matthew 24:51, DR "appoint his portion with the hypocrites"; *infideles* is from Luke 12:46, DR "with unbelievers". C. The print italicises the quotation through *quam habuit*; *et tunc erit inter infideles* is Wyclif's. T. At 446.12 B reads *laicis*. R. A in the margin at 446.13: *Laycus melior quam sacerdos*.
5. Apocalypse 14:4, DR "for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb". C. *Martyres modo suo*: martyrs in their own way, by carrying the cross. *Sacra beatitudinis accidentalia*: the accidental [goods] of blessedness, the joys added to essential blessedness, which the blessed give one another as priests. *Conbeatis*: fellow-blessed, as at 444.

6. Pseudo-Augustine, *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* (Loserth: *Aug. Opp. tom. III, App. pag. 5*, among the spuria), now given to the Irish "Augustinus Hibernicus"; PL 35 heads it *Auctor incertus*. The passage is book I, chapter 3. Abel: Genesis 4:4, 4:8. T. The manuscripts give chapter *IV°*; Loserth corrected it to *III°* (447.1). C. *Humana ecclesia in triumpho*: the human part of the church triumphant began with Abel, the first of the just to die. R. A in the margin at 446.29: *Augustinus*.
7. Matthew 23:35, DR "from the blood of Abel the just, even unto the blood of Zacharias"; Matthew 1:6, DR "And Jesse begot David the king" (Vulgate *Iesse*, end of 1:5; Wyclif *Gesse*). The words given to Augustine (*In hoc ... tenuerunt*) carry no reference in Loserth; they condense *De mirabilibus* I.3 (PL 35), *haereditatem iustitiae Abel tenere Zachariam ... Iesse autem genuit David regem*. T. At 447.11 B reads *signanter nota*.
8. *Quam dixi superius*: an earlier place, not located; cf. 391.4–393 (the church begins from Abel). *Veteranus*: one who has completed his service, the church's first discharged soldier. *Missus est in locum refrigerii expurgandus*: sent to the place of refreshment, there to be purged. T. At 447.24 B reads *qui sepe felici* and *iussus est*.
9. The answer to the argument that opened the chapter (442, previous part): God gives no power to the unqualified. The decree of Gregory is the canon cited there (Decretum C.11 q.3 c.60). *Racio*: the respect under which the power is taken, meriting for oneself or for others. R. B in the margin at 447.15: *Nota quomodo abutens sua potestate ea privatur*; A at 447.28: *Sacerdos quomodo se privat sacerdocio et quomodo manet sacerdos*.
10. At 448.3 AA_1 read *promisit*; Loserth's *permisit* is translated. C. *Per accidens*: not by the nature of Judas's act but by God's ordering of it.
11. *Mixcio atque prefeccio*: the mixing of the foreknown among the faithful and their being set over them. *Ad exercitum*: taken as "for exercise" (*exercitium*); "for the army" is possible. *Miles*: "soldier", the Pauline figure (glossary: *milites*). *Pontifex*: the ordaining bishop; *ordinarius*, the ordinary, the bishop with jurisdiction. *De quo alibi*: not located. R. A in the margin at 448.8: *Episcopus non semper quando pretendit ordinare ordinat*; B there: *Presciti ministrant sacramenta*.
12. *Prescitus*: one whom God foreknows will be damned (the glossary). *In mortali peccato actuali*: in actual mortal sin, not only under the foreknowledge of damnation. S. Numbers 23; John 11:49–52; the devils' confession, as Mark 1:24, 3:11. T. At 448.17–18 AA_1 read *prophetavit*. R. A in the margin at 448.14: *Nota conclusionem bonam: Sacerdos malus est sacerdos et ministrat*.
13. Matthew 7:22–23 (DR "done many miracles in thy name"): Wyclif omits the third "in thy name", and Loserth notes that *discedite a me*, "depart from me", seems to have fallen out after *novi vos* (448.25). Mark 9:37 and Luke 9:49, DR "we saw one casting out devils in thy name, who followeth not us". C. *Sentencia*: the position taught, "teaching" (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), not a judicial sentence. *Virtutes*: "miracles", with DR. *Per se*: taken with *ex signis*, "from signs ... of themselves".
14. Decretum C.1 q.1 c.30 (*Si fuerit*); C.15 q.8 c.5; Decretals X 3.2.7 (*Vestra*), under the title *De cohabitatione clericorum et mulierum* (Loserth: *Decr. II pars, causa I, q. I, cap. XXX et causa XV, q. VIII, c. V*; *Decret. Greg. IX, lib. III, tit. II, c. VII*; the modern form is ours). C. *Iniuriantur sed non nocent*: they do the faithful wrong, but it does them no harm. R. A in the margin at 448.30: *Nota*.
15. *Contencio ... sub titulo cause ecclesiastice*: litigation over temporal goods conducted as an ecclesiastical cause in the church's courts. *Feci ... raciones*: Wyclif's earlier arguments, not located. R. A in the margin at 449.3: *Clericus vel sacerdos non debet litigare pro temporalibus. Prima conclusio*.
16. At 449.9 the manuscripts read *elicienda*; Loserth's *eligenda*, "to be chosen", is translated. C. *Posita licencia*: even granting that such contending were licit.
17. Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 17.4 (Loserth: *Greg. XL Hom. lib. I, Hom. XVII, 4*). T. At 449.14 AA_1 read *seviciencium*. The print closes the sentence with a comma; the next part opens with *Item*. R. A in the margin at 449.13: *Nota Gregorius*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 445: *eciam* (folio mark 190[b] glued)
  - 445: *Nam*
  - 446: *XVII[a]*
  - 446: *permanens*
  - 446: *in*
  - 446: *peccatis*
  - 447: *III°*
  - 447: *offerens* (margin numeral 3 glued)
  - 449: *et XV[a]* (main token covers two printed words)
  - 449: *III°*
  - 449: *XVII[a]*
  - 448: ∅ (G is margin alinea letter; 'tali' is second half of mor-tali, neighbour 95 already mortali) [DELX]
  - 448: *XXIII°,* [-VERSE]
  - 448: *XI°,* [-VERSE]

Part 3: The church's judges cannot judge suits over temporal goods; the forfeited stipend and the precarial grant

Loserth pp. 449.16–453.28

¶1 449.16–450.4
449.16 *The clergy should not act as judges.*
450.3 *It is a mere pretence to say that the clergy need temporal possessions for their duties .*
450.17 *None can rightly hold the patrimony of 1 the Crucified but members of the Church,*

[449]**Item, iudex generaliter ignorat que sit voluntas Dei quoad partes contendentes, que occuparet temporalia vendicata; sed nullus iudex ecclesiasticus iudicare debet pro parte nisi pro qua scit Deum discernere, quia aliter foret Deo contrarius iudicando. Ergo nullus iudex ecclesiasticus iudicaret in foro cleri contencioso nisi forte quod utraque pars cessaret a lite, intendens circa officium a domino limitatum. Illi enim quibus Christus limitat non portare saculum neque peram, sed, propter preponderanciam spiritualis officii ad quod primo accelerant, neque calciamenta ferre neque hominem per viam salutare neque quomodolibet occupari unde gravius officium discipuli Christi prepediat (ut docetur Luce X°, 4), valde alieni sunt, ut circa contenciones temporalium occupentur. Salutaciones** [450]**enim per viam sunt nimis periculose et nimis a predicacione evangelii tardative. Nec valet ficcio qua dicitur temporalia pro quibus contenditur esse Christi discipulo pro suo officio necessaria**

Again, a judge is generally ignorant what the will of God is as regards the contending parties, [that is,] which should occupy the temporal goods claimed; now no ecclesiastical judge ought to judge for a party except for the one for which he knows that God decides, for otherwise he would be contrary to God in judging. Therefore no ecclesiastical judge would judge in the contentious court of the clergy, unless perhaps [to rule] that each party should cease from the suit, attending to the office assigned by the Lord.[1] For those to whom Christ assigns not to carry purse or scrip, but, because of the preponderance of the spiritual office to which they hasten first, neither to wear shoes nor to salute any man by the way, nor to be occupied in any way whereby he would hinder the weightier office of a disciple of Christ (as is taught in Luke 10:4), are far removed from being occupied about contentions over temporal goods.[2] For salutations [450]**by the way are too dangerous, and delay too much from the preaching of the gospel. Nor does the fiction avail by which it is said that the temporal goods contended for are, for a disciple of Christ, necessary**

¶2 450.5–450.16

[450]**instrumenta, quia exequatur suum officium sine retrospeccione ad temporalia, et non est compossibile Deum sibi deficere in temporalibus necessariis non ad onus. Ideo dicit Apostolus Heb. ultimo: Sint mores sine avaricia, contenti presentibus. Ipse enim dixit: Non te deseram neque derelinquam, ita ut confidenter dicamus: Dominus mihi adiutor, non timebo quid faciat mihi homo. Ideo dicit beatus Gregorius Omelia XVII[a] Predicatori tanta debet esse in Deo fiducia ut presentis vite sumptus quamvis non provideat, tamen hos non sibi deesse certissime sciat, ne dum mens eius occupetur ad temporalia, minus aliis provideat eterna.**

instruments for his office; for let him carry out his office without looking back to temporal goods, and it is not compossible that God should fail him in necessary temporal goods that are not a burden.[3] Therefore the Apostle says in Hebrews, the last chapter: "Let your manners be without covetousness, contented with such things as you have. For he hath said: I will not leave thee: neither will I forsake thee. So that we may confidently say: The Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man shall do to me." Therefore blessed Gregory says in Homily 17: "The preacher ought to have such trust in God that, though he does not provide for the expenses of the present life, he yet knows most certainly that they will not fail him, lest, while his mind is busied with temporal things, he provide the less of eternal things for others."[4]

¶3 450.17–450.28

[450]**Item, eo ipso quo quis est non membrum sancte matris ecclesie est indignus habere patrimonium Crucifixi titulo vel iure viri ecclesiastici, sed omnino iudex ecclesiasticus cui non sit de hoc specialis revelacio ignorat si dicta persona contendens sit membrum sancte matris ecclesie, ergo ignorat si sit dignus habere patrimonium vendicatum. Assumptum patet eo quod nullius alterius ecclesie persona nisi persona sancte matris ecclesia habet titulo illius ecclesie colorem aliquid vendicandi, cum sit de civitate et corpore dyaboli,**

Again, by the very fact that someone is not a member of holy mother church, he is unworthy to have the patrimony of the Crucified by the title or right of a churchman; now any ecclesiastical judge at all, to whom there is no special revelation about this, is ignorant whether the said person contending is a member of holy mother church; therefore he is ignorant whether he is worthy to have the patrimony claimed.[5] The assumption is clear from this, that the person of no other church, except the person of holy mother church, has by the title of that church any colour for claiming

contrarius prime iusticie. Et maior patet ex hoc quod nullus iudex ecclesiasticus subducta revelacione predicta

anything, since he is of the city and body of the devil, contrary to the first justice.[6] And the major is clear from this, that no ecclesiastical judge, the said revelation withdrawn,

¶4 450.29–450.34

[450] scit si alius sit predestinatus, et per consequens, si sit membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Cum ergo fundamentum tocius iuris contencionis foret incorporacio qua contendens foret de sancta matre ecclesia, quod nec contendens scit docere nec iudex

knows whether another is predestinate, and consequently whether he is a member of holy mother church. Since, therefore, the foundation of the whole right of contention would be the incorporation by which the contender would be of holy mother church, which neither the contender knows how to show nor the judge[7]

¶5 451.1–451.3
451.1 *but the judge cannot know who is such,*
451.6 *Since the ground of just judgments cannot be reached, it were better to give up such trials.*

[451] ex quacunque probacione humana discernere, videtur quod propter ambiguitatem offendendi in Dei iusticiam cessaret omnis talis contencio.

[451] to discern by any human proof whatever, it seems that, because of the uncertainty of offending against God's justice, all such contention should cease.

¶6 451.4–453.8
452.11 *A claimant may have forfeited his right to dues by not ministering,*
453.9 *in which case all laws shew that he should not be paid.*
453.15 *The real question is who should withdraw the stipend? I say the patron.*

[451] Nam si fundamentum tituli foret mendacium, quomodo non foret omne iudicium innitens illi fundamento iniquum? Aliter enim sufficeret cuicunque layco vel mechanico habere pretensionem vel apparenciam iuris ad iuste vendicandum et obtinendum quamcunque possessionem ecclesiasticam vel civilem; ex quo absurdissima sequerentur. Cum ergo pars Antichristi non sufficit probare quod sit vir ecclesiasticus, et iudex debet cavere omnino ne discrepet a divino iudicio, cum nullum nisi illud sit iustum simpliciter, videtur quod debet cessare omnino tale iudicium; et qui nituntur generaliter excusare curias ecclesiasticas in talibus iudiciis a peccatis lavant lateres et proditorie inpinguant inimicos iusticie oleo peccatoris. Nam Christus cum suis apostolis renuit talia placita secularia atque iudicia, et sic omnes curati vel clerici non cecati possessione et lege cesarea, de quibus loquitur Gregorius Omelia XVII: Multi, inquit, cum regiminis iura suscipiunt, ad lacerandum subditos inardescunt, terrorem potestatis exhibent, et quibus prodesse debuerant nocent, et quia caritatis viscera non habent, domini appetunt videri, patres se esse mimine recognoscunt, humilitatis locum in elacionem dominacionis immutant, et si quandoque extrinsecus blandiuntur, intrinsecus seviunt. De quibus veritas dicit: Veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces. Et forte sicut in tempore sancti Gregorii, sic sunt hodie in ecclesia quidam tales, et [452] cum leges ecclesie licet sopite cum suis doctoribus illud dicunt concorditer, (ut patet III° Decretalium, cap. Fraternitatem), nec aliter possumus excusari de tanta occupacione temporalium

For if the foundation of the title were a lie, how would every judgement resting on that foundation not be unjust? For otherwise it would suffice for any layman or craftsman to have a pretension or appearance of right in order justly to claim and obtain any possession whatever, ecclesiastical or civil; from which the most absurd things would follow. Since, therefore, Antichrist's party is not able to prove that [such a one] is a churchman, and the judge must altogether beware lest he differ from the divine judgement, since none but that is just without qualification, it seems that such judgement ought altogether to cease;[8] and those who strive to excuse the ecclesiastical courts generally from sins in such judgements are washing bricks, and treacherously fattening the enemies of justice with the oil of the sinner.[9] For Christ with his apostles refused such secular pleas and judgements, and so do all curates or clerics not blinded by possession and caesarean law; of whom Gregory speaks in Homily 17: "Many," he says, "when they take up the rights of rule, burn to tear their subjects; they display the terror of power, and harm those whom they ought to have profited; and because they have not the bowels of charity, they desire to seem lords, and do not at all acknowledge themselves to be fathers; they change the place of humility into the elation of the exercise of lordship; and if sometimes they flatter outwardly, they rage inwardly." Of whom the Truth says: "They come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."[10] And perhaps, as in the time of St Gregory, so today there are some such in the church;

differenter a Christo et suis apostolis, nisi quod sumus ministri eorum et procuratores pauperum quorum sunt bona que servamus non ut domini seculares, et tamen servare illam racionem in facto vel audire loqui de illa in verbo contempnimus ut venenum, sed tam sermone quam opere aspiramus ad dominium seculare. Item, ad repellendum tale humanum iudicium confert quod iudex ut plurimum ignorat si exactor interim cecidit a iure suo propter omissionem spiritualis ministerii subditis rependendum, sed stante illa iniusticia iniuste ferretur pro tali iudicium: ergo temerarium foret dare pro tali iudicium. Minor patet pro eo quod continuatim creatorum spirituale ministerium est magis debitum quam aliquod debitum corporale, ergo illis subtrahentibus magis debitum iniuste exigerent minus debitum et sub condicione quod retribuant magis debitum. Ymmo videtur quod excedunt in malicia servum nequam qui post magnam misericordiam factam maioris debiti minus sibi debitum exegit crudeliter (ut patet Matthei XVIII°). Talis enim curatus exigit a subditis sibi indebitum et hoc horribiliter per censuras et quomodocunque clerici circa prelacias contenderint, demum temporalia exigunt a viduis, a subiectis. Unde et istam iniuriam tangit Decretum, XII[a], q. II. Sepe fit, ubi ex decreto septimi Tolnensis concilii sic habetur: Si quis clericorum stipendium de rebus ecclesie cuiuscunque episcopi perceperit largitate, [453]sub precarie nomine debeat professionem scribere, ne per retencionem diuturnam preiudicium afferat ecclesie, et quicunque in usu perceperit debet utiliter laborare, ut nec res divini iuris videantur aliqua occasione negligi et ut subsidium ab ecclesia cui deserviunt percipere possint clerici. Quod si quis eorum contempserit facere, ipse se stipendio suo videbitur privare.

and [452]since the laws of the church, though lulled asleep, together with their doctors say this with one accord (as is clear in book 3 of the Decretals, chapter *Fraternitatem*), we cannot be excused otherwise for so great an occupation with temporal goods, so different from Christ and his apostles, except that we are their ministers and the proctors of the poor, whose are the goods that we keep, not as secular lords; and yet we despise as poison keeping that account in deed, or hearing it spoken of in word, but in speech as in deed we aspire to secular lordship.[11] Again, it contributes to rejecting such human judgement that the judge for the most part is ignorant whether the claimant has meanwhile fallen from his right through omission of the spiritual ministry that he is to render in return to his subjects; now while that injustice stands, judgement would be given unjustly for such a one: therefore it would be rash to give judgement for such a one.[12] The minor is clear from this, that the spiritual ministry [owed] continually to creatures is more owed than any bodily debt; therefore, while they withhold what is more owed, they would unjustly exact what is less owed, and that on the condition that they repay what is more owed.[13] Indeed it seems that they exceed in malice the wicked servant who, after great mercy had been shown him over a greater debt, cruelly exacted a lesser debt owed to him (as is clear in Matthew 18). For such a curate exacts from his subjects what is not owed to him, and that horribly, through censures; and however clerics may have contended about prelacies, in the end they exact temporal goods from widows, from subjects.[14] Whence the Decretum also touches on this wrong, Causa 12, question 2, *Sepe fit*, where from a decree of the seventh council of Toledo it is had thus: "If any of the clerics has received a stipend from the goods of the church by the largesse of any bishop whatever, [453]he must write a profession under the name of a precarial grant, lest by long retention he bring prejudice to the church; and whoever has received [it] for use must labour usefully, so that the things of divine law may not seem on any occasion to be neglected, and that the clerics may receive support from the church that they serve. But if any of them scorns to do this, he will be seen to deprive himself of his stipend."[15]

¶7 453.9–453.28

[453]Iura autem nature, iura scripture et iura ecclesie contestantur quod ecclesiasticus omnino omittens laborare pertinenter ad suum officium non debet accipere a subditis quibus non proficit sed officit temporale stipendium, quia tunc deberent laici conducere apostatas ad eis nocendum. Sed (ut sepe tetigi) contencio est quis exequeretur

And the laws of nature, the laws of scripture and the laws of the church attest that an ecclesiastic who altogether omits to labour as pertains to his office ought not to receive a temporal stipend from subjects whom he does not profit but harms; for then lay people would have to hire apostates to harm them.[16] But (as I have often touched on) the dispute is who should

subtraccionem talem iustam, et videtur mihi non esse tantum sacramentum, quin illi qui stipendium ministrandi conferrent vacanti subtraherent, nec nocet fidelibus excommunicacio vel censura alia in hac parte (ut patet XI[a], q. III. Quomodo sacerdos). Sumitur precaria nunc stricte pro dono vel stipendio temporali ad preces hominis pro tempore limitato, et nunc large pro quacunque donacione gratuita, eciam perpetua quoad usufructum donatore reservante penes se dominium, et sic in primitiva ecclesia tota dotacio censebatur precaria, ne elemosinarius prescriberet contra patronum; in defectu vero officii non cadit prescripcio sicut nec fit prescripcio contra Deum.

carry out such a just withdrawal; and it seems to me that it is no such great mystery but that those who conferred the stipend for ministering should withdraw it from the one who is idle; nor does excommunication or other censure harm the faithful in this matter (as is clear in Causa 11, question 3, *Quomodo sacerdos*).[17] A precarial grant is taken for, sometimes strictly, a gift or temporal stipend at a man's prayers for a limited time, and sometimes broadly any gratuitous donation whatever, even a perpetual one as to the usufruct, the donor reserving the lordship with himself; and so in the primitive church the whole endowment was reckoned a precarial grant, lest the almsman should acquire by prescription against the patron; and where the office fails, prescription does not run, just as there is no prescription against God.[18]

Notes

1. ***Que occuparet***: "which [party] should occupy", an indirect question resuming ***que sit voluntas Dei***. ***Sed*** brings the minor premiss. ***Nisi forte quod utraque pars cessaret***: the only judgement allowed is that both parties drop the suit. ***Intendens***: "attending to", taken with ***utraque pars***; not the glossary ***intendere*** "maintain". R. A in the margin at 449.16: ***Iudex ecclesiasticus non debet iudicare inter litigantes pro temporalibus***.
2. Luke 10:4, DR "Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way"; Wyclif paraphrases. C. ***Limitat***: "assigns", prescribes to them (glossary: ***limitare***). ***Unde ... prepediat***: no subject is expressed; taken as the disciple himself. ***Saculum***: so the print, for ***sacculum***.
3. The sentence runs on from the previous paragraph (***necessaria / instrumenta***). ***Quia exequatur***: the subjunctive taken as an injunction, "let him carry out". ***Non ad onus***: taken with ***necessariis***, necessaries that are no burden to him; or "not so as to be a burden [to others]". R. A in the margin at 450.3: ***Ficcio***.
4. Hebrews 13:5–6 (DR). Gregory, ***Homiliae in Evangelia*** 17.5 (Loserth: ***Greg. XL. Hom. lib. I, Hom. XVII, 5***). T. At 450.10 B omits ***te***. R. A in the margin at 450.11: ***Gregorius. Nota qualem spem debet habere predicator ad Deum***.
5. ***Vir ecclesiasticus***: "churchman", one who claims the church's goods as a cleric. ***Omnino iudex***: "any judge at all", ***omnino*** taken with ***iudex***; or adverbial, "is altogether ignorant". ***Patrimonium Crucifixi***: the church's goods as the patrimony of Christ.
6. ***Assumptum*** here proves the first premiss (the non-member's unworthiness) and ***maior*** the second (the judge's ignorance), the reverse of the usual labels; translated as printed. ***Sancte matris ecclesia*** (p. 450): ***ecclesia*** is taken as the genitive ***ecclesie***. ***Colorem***: a plausible ground for a claim (glossary: ***color***). ***Contrarius prime iusticie***: taken with the non-member, opposed to God, the first justice; or with the devil.
7. ***Incorporacio***: being incorporated as a member into holy mother church, the ground of any title. ***Docere***: "to show", as by proof.
8. ***Pretensionem***: so the print, a claim put forward. ***Pars Antichristi non sufficit probare quod sit vir ecclesiasticus***: ***sit*** has no expressed subject; taken as a member of Antichrist's party pleading as a churchman.
9. ***Lavant lateres***, "they wash bricks": the proverb of wasted labour; Loserth refers to Terence, ***Phormio*** 186, and Erasmus, ***Adagia***, ***Chil. I***, 370. The oil of the sinner: Psalm 140:5, DR "let not the oil of the sinner fatten my head".
10. ***Placita***: pleas, suits at law (cf. the glossary ***placitare***). ***Lege cesarea***: the caesarean law, the civil law under which the clergy hold as of Caesar (cf. the glossary ***clerus cesareus***). ***De quibus***: taken as the clergy who are so blinded, the contrary of those just named. S. Gregory, ***Homiliae in Evangelia*** 17 (Loserth's identification), and Matthew 7:15 (DR), which may still be Gregory's words. T. The manuscripts read ***Omelia nona***, for which Loserth gives ***XVII*** (451.21); at 451.25 they read ***patres esse minime***, and Loserth supplies ***se*** from Gregory's text. R. A in the margin at 451.21: ***Gregorius. Contra malos rectores ecclesiasticos***.
11. Decretals book 3, ***Fraternitatem*** (Loserth: ***vid. Decret. Greg. IX, lib. III, tit. XXVIII, cap. III***). X 3.28.3 ***Fraternitatem*** concerns burial and does not fit; X 3.24.2 (Alexander III: the bishop is ***procurator, non dominus*** of church goods) does, as at E13f-3. T. At 452.3 AA_1 read ***Firmitatem***. C. ***Licet sopite***: "though lulled asleep", a concession about the laws, not a canon's incipit. ***Illud***: what follows, that the clergy are ministers and proctors of the poor. ***Ministri eorum***: ***eorum*** taken with ***pauperum***. ***Racionem***: "account", the principle just stated.
12. At 452.11–12 A reads ***constat*** in the text, corrected in the margin to ***confert***, which B has; A_1 ***constat***; Loserth's ***confert*** is translated. At 452.15 A reads ***fereretur***, A_1 ***feretur***. C. ***Exactor***: the one exacting dues, the claimant. ***Rependendum***: to be paid back to the subjects in return for their dues.
13. ***Creatorum***: taken as "[owed] to creatures", the subjects; AA_1 read ***creatoris*** (452.17), "the Creator's spiritual ministry"; neither construes easily. ***Sub condicione quod retribuant***: the lesser debt is owed only on condition that the greater is paid. T. At 452.19 AA_1 read ***exigeret***.
14. Matthew 18:23–34; the manuscripts give chapter 16, corrected by Loserth (452.24). C. ***Curatus***: a priest with the cure of souls (the glossary).

15. Decretum C.12 q.2 c.72 (Loserth: *Decreti sec. part. c. XII, q. II, cap. LXXII*; the modern form is ours), from the Seventh Council of Toledo (Gratian: *in VII. Concilio Toletano*). T. A reads *Tolnensis*, which Loserth prints with the note *recte Toletanensis* (452.29); Toledo is translated. At 452.31 the Decretum reads *percipit*; at 453.5 *negligi et subsidium*; at 453.6 the manuscripts read *deservit*, which Loserth corrected from the canon. C. *Sepe fit*: taken as the canon's incipit. *Precaria*: a grant held at the grantor's will, acknowledged by a written profession; Wyclif defines it at 453.21–24.
16. *Pertinenter ad suum officium*: as his office requires. *Proficit / officit*: Wyclif's play, "profit / harm". *Ecclesiasticus*: "ecclesiastic", a cleric (glossary: *ecclesiastici*). *Conducere*: to hire (cf. the glossary *conducentes*).
17. Decretum C.11 q.3 c.44 (Loserth: *Decr. sec. pars, caus. XI, q. III, cap. XLIV*; the modern form is ours). C. *Ut sepe tetigi*: earlier places, not located. *Non esse tantum sacramentum*: *sacramentum* in the sense "mystery", a hidden matter; Loserth's side-note: "I say the patron". *Vacanti*: to one who is idle, who fails in his office.
18. *Ad preces hominis*: at a man's prayers, the etymology of *precaria* (*preces*). *Pro tempore limitato*: "for a limited time" (glossary: *limitare*, "to limit" where it restricts). *Dominium*: the lordship stays with the donor, the holder having only the usufruct. *Prescriberet*: acquire title by long possession. T. At 453.28 B omits *Sicut ... prescripcio*. R. A in the margin at 453.21: *Precaria accipitur dupliciter*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- *Mimine* (451.25): so the print (plate), Loserth's misprint; translated as *minime* (our emendation).
- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 449: *Christus*
  - 449: *Christi*
  - 450: *a* (print has a predicacione at line start)
  - 450: *necessaria* (print has necessaria before instrumenta; main scan lacks it)
  - 450: *officium* (line number 5 glued)
  - 450: *XVII^{a}* (print has lia XVII^{a}: before Predicatori; main scan lacks it)
  - 450: *ut presentis* (main token covers two printed words)
  - 450: *Crucifixi* (print Cruci-/fixi; main token holds whole word)
  - 450: *iudex*
  - 451: *pretensionem* (print spelling) [NW]
  - 452: *III°*
  - 452: *XII^{a}*
  - 453: *Quod*
  - 453: *Iura*
  - 453: *XI^{a}*
  - 450: ∅ ('in-' (of in-corporacio, 229 already incorporacio) glued to ergo (222 present)) [DELX]

Part 4: Errors refuted: judges, oaths and letters of orders; the layman's faith does not hang on his priest

Loserth pp. 453.29–457.29

¶1 453.29–454.8
454.1 *Some pretend f we have only to, consider human 1 law.*
454.9 *Others, that the claimant acts for the Church.*
454.15 *Ecclesiastical judges make witnesses swear to things they cannot know.*
454.20 *Once a man was curate because he did the work.*

[453]Et ex istis patent errores multi: Quidam enim fingunt quod si secundum leges humanas testificatum [454]fuerit quod tali debeatur datum beneficium, debet iudicari pro illo quomodocunque secundum mores secum fuerit quoad Deum, quia certum est quod Deus in superatis excipit contra illum nisi habuerit rectificacionem secundum veritatem iusticie. Ideo iura civilia que non per se attendunt ad habilitaciones virtutum ut plurimum sunt iniusta (ut dicit Augustinus, Epistola XXXVIII^{a} ad Macedonium).

And from these things many errors are evident. For some feign that if it has been [454]testified according to human laws that a given benefice is owed to such a one, judgement must be given for him however it may stand with him in morals before God; for it is certain that God, in [suits] won, takes exception against him unless he has had rectification according to the truth of justice.[1] Therefore civil laws that do not of themselves attend to the qualifications of the virtues are for the most part unjust (as Augustine says, Letter 38, to Macedonius).[2]

¶2 454.9–454.14

[454]Patet secundo destruccio fuci sophistici quo fingunt contendentes se exequi pro iure suo atque ecclesie; nam per

Secondly, there is evident the destruction of the sophistical disguise by which contenders feign that they are prosecuting for their own right

execucionem talem et omissionem divini consilii ac debiti ministerii ius quod prius habuerunt extinguitur, ymmo haberent ius et dominum ulterius faciendo opus evangeliste sine contencione huiusmodi.

and the church's; for through such prosecution, and the omission of God's counsel and of the due ministry, the right that they had before is extinguished; rather, they would have the right, and the Lord, further, by doing the work of an evangelist without contention of this kind.[3]

¶3 454.15–456.19
455.5 *Doubts as to the legitimacy of ordinations.*
456.1 *Unfitness may go so far as to prevent ministration or only so far that a man ministers to his own damnation.*
456.20 *It does not affect the layman's faith that he cannot tell whether the priest is qualified;*

[454]Item, tales iudices communiter exigunt absolutum iuramentum in tali casu a testibus, cuius iuramenti veritatem cognoscunt testes ut plurimum ignorare; quod cum sit magnum periculum sicut iudicare sine sufficiencia probacionis, videtur quod debent omnino iudicium tale dimittere. Nam sine ritu tali crevit et stetit mater nostra prospere, quando scilicet quilibet sacerdos vel curatus habuit ex evidencia sui ministerii suffragium temporale; tunc enim fuit cura diligencior, profectus ecclesie maior, concordia extensior, ministracio ac veneracio sacerdotis complecior et omnino progressus ecclesie legi Christi conformior. Ideo status iste et eius antecedencia, licet ritus introductos interimant, sunt racionabiliter admittenda. Quis rogo sacerdos vel laycus cognoscit si dictus sacerdos advena fuit rite in sacris ordinibus constitutus? Nam litere ordinum, quid propter variacionem impressionis sigilli, quid propter mutacionem nominis literati et quid propter latentem defectum in ordinante vel ordinato, non dant vel evidenciam topicam alteri qui [455]super testificacione ordinum dati presbiteri fuerit requisitus? Sic enim facta apostolorum ostenderant se esse sacerdotes, licet nesciamus quando et qua forma fuerint a domino ordinati. Confirmatur, si ordinans vel ordinatus vel uterque fuerit pro tempore ordinacionis simpliciter infidelis, aut ordinanti deest intencio cum verbis sacramenti ordinis que profert, tunc cum paribus non fit ordinacio legitima, sed hoc ex tibi dubio contigit de quocunque sacerdote cui debes testimonium prohibere: ergo ex tibi dubio non fuit legitime ordinatus. Assumptum videtur eo quod nemo accipit baptismum quod est sacramentum necessariissimum sine fide, ergo a pari nec alia minus necessaria sacramenta, et per idem videtur quod omnino infidelis non ministrat fidelibus sacramenta. Sic enim paganus, iudeus vel omnino hereticus deridendo et intendendo oppositum ministraret in casu fidelibus sacramenta, et per idem in casu avis, bestia vel res inanimata infundens aquam et formans vocem, quod videtur ridiculum et contra decreta ecclesie. Nam I[a], q. I scribitur sub auctoritate beati Gregorii: Quicunque sacros ordines vendunt aut emunt sacerdotes esse non possunt. Unde scriptum est anathema danti et anathema accipienti, hoc est symoniaca heresis. Quomodo ergo, si anathema sunt et sancti non sunt, sanctificare alios possunt? Et cum in Christo corpore non sunt, quomodo corpus Christi tradere vel accipere possunt?

Again, such judges commonly require an absolute oath from witnesses in such a case, the truth of which oath the witnesses know that for the most part they do not know; and since this is a great danger, as is judging without sufficiency of proof, it seems that they ought altogether to give up such judgement.[4] For without such a rite our mother grew and stood prosperously, namely when every priest or curate had temporal aid on the evidence of his ministry; for then the cure was more diligent, the profit of the church greater, concord wider, the ministry and veneration of the priest more complete, and altogether the progress of the church more conformed to the law of Christ. Therefore this state and what went before it, although they would do away with the rites introduced, are reasonably to be admitted.[5] Who, I ask, priest or layman, knows whether the said priest, a newcomer, was duly constituted in holy orders? For letters of orders, partly because of variation in the impression of the seal, partly because of a change in the name written, and partly because of a hidden defect in the ordainer or the ordained, do they not fail to give even topical evidence to another who has been required to testify [455]to the orders of a given presbyter? For in this way the deeds of the apostles showed that they were priests, although we do not know when and in what form they were ordained by the Lord.[6] It is confirmed: if the ordainer or the ordained or both were, at the time of ordination, an unbeliever without qualification, or the ordainer lacks intention with the words of the sacrament of order that he utters, then, other things being equal, no lawful ordination takes place; now this, for all you know, has happened with any priest whatever for whom you are to bear testimony; therefore, for all you know, he was not lawfully ordained.[7] The assumption appears from this, that no one receives baptism, which is the most necessary sacrament, without faith; therefore, by parity, neither the other, less necessary sacraments; and by the same token it seems that one who is altogether an unbeliever does not minister sacraments to the faithful. For so a pagan, a Jew, or an outright heretic, mocking and intending the opposite, would in that case minister sacraments to the faithful; and by the same token, in that case, a bird, a beast, or an inanimate thing pouring water and forming a sound; which seems

Qui maledictus est benedicere quomodo potest? Talia sunt multa decreta, ut IX[a], q. I, et sepe alibi. Et quicquid doctores dixerint, ignoratur de alio utrum sit perpetuo infidelis excommunicatus [456]sive hereticus, et tunc secundum decretum IX[a], q. I. Sed excommunicati, non ministrat ecclesiastica sacramenta. Ideo patet quod est dare indisposicionem in ministro que vetaret confeccionem vel ministerium sacramenti, est dare aliam indisposicionem que ministrantem dampnificet et habili recipienti proficeret; qui gradus sunt Deo absconditi. Ex istis videtur quod, sicut laicus de quocunque sacerdote suo in casu dubitat utrum sit sacerdos de sancta matre ecclesie, sic est sibi evidens dubitare utrum sit sacerdos rite ordinatus secundum formam statutam in iam militante ecclesia vel sub aliquo gradu clericus secundum presentem iusticiam in ministerio temporali. Probatur ex hoc quod ignoratur error fidei in ordinante vel in ordinato, sicut ignoratur utrum sit perpetuo hereticus et infidelis, sicut est de quolibet prescito, et ita de infinitis illusionibus que possent contingere in verbis sacramentalibus in intencione consecrantis.

ridiculous and against the decrees of the church.[8] For in Causa 1, question 1, it is written under the authority of blessed Gregory: "Whoever sell or buy holy orders cannot be priests. Whence it is written: anathema to the giver and anathema to the receiver; this is the simoniacal heresy. How then, if they are anathema and are not holy, can they sanctify others? And since they are not in the body of Christ, how can they give or receive the body of Christ? He who is cursed, how can he bless?" Many decrees are of this kind, as Causa 9, question 1, and often elsewhere.[9] And whatever the doctors may have said, it is not known of another whether he is perpetually an unbeliever, excommunicate, [456]or a heretic; and then, according to the decree in Causa 9, question 1, *Sed excommunicati*, he does not minister the church's sacraments.[10] Therefore it is clear that, [as] there is [such a thing as] an unfitness in the minister that would prevent the confection or ministry of the sacrament, there is another unfitness that would damn the one ministering and yet profit a qualified recipient; which degrees are hidden in God.[11] From these things it seems that, as a layman in that case doubts of any priest of his whether he is a priest of holy mother church, so it is evident to him to doubt whether he is a priest duly ordained according to the form established in the church now militant, or a cleric under any degree according to present justice in a temporal ministry. It is proved from this, that an error of faith in the ordainer or in the ordained is unknown, as it is unknown whether he is perpetually a heretic and unbeliever, as is the case with every foreknown man; and so of the infinite illusions that could occur in the sacramental words, in the intention of the one consecrating.[12]

¶4 456.20–457.29

[456]Ulterius videtur quod fides non titubaret in laicis, licet ignorent in particulari disposicionem sui presbiteri, nam nichil quod est supra potestatem eorum faceret in eis fidem deficere, sed certitudo talis circumstancie sacerdotis est supra potestatem eorum. Ideo non faceret in eis fidem deficere, nam sensus laici non iudicat de verbis vel intencione presbiteri consecrantis, nec est aliqua particula fidei catholice quod ipse rite consecrat; et sic de testificacione, de racione vel quocunque alio loco evidencie assignando, ita quod vita sacerdotis (ut mihi videtur) est maxima naturalis evidencia per quam crederetur in talibus [457]sacerdoti. Notandum tamen quod stultum est laicum de talibus nimium dubitare, dicente decreto I[a] q. I, sub auctoritate Gregorii: Multi secularium hominum cum plus sacerdotum vitam quam suam discuciunt, magnum contempcionis divinorum sacramentorum crimen incurrunt, quia sicut paulo ante

Further, it seems that faith would not totter in lay people, although they do not know in particular the disposition of their presbyter; for nothing that is above their power would make faith fail in them; now certainty of such a circumstance of the priest is above their power; therefore it would not make faith fail in them.[13] For the layman's sense does not judge of the words or the intention of the consecrating presbyter, nor is it any particle of the catholic faith that he duly consecrates; and so of testimony, of reason, or of any other topic of evidence to be assigned; so that the life of the priest (as it seems to me) is the greatest natural evidence through which the priest would be believed in such matters. [457]Yet it is to be noted that it is foolish for a layman to doubt too much about such things, as the decree says, Causa 1, question 1, under the authority of Gregory: "Many secular men, when they examine the life of priests more than

recitatur ex dicto beati Augustini: Omnia sacramenta cum obsunt indigne tractantibus, prosunt tamen per eos digne sumentibus sicut et verbum Dei. Unde dictum est: Que dicunt facite, que autem faciunt facere nolite. Et infra sub auctoritate beati Ambrosii Cum scriptura testatur quod ad preces Jeroboam ignis descendit de celo et rursus precante Helia ignis missus est de celo qui sacramenta consumeret (ut patet III° Regum XII° et XVIII°), datur intelligi quod Deus non merita personarum considerat sed officia sacerdotum. Requiritur tamen laicum habere aliquam evidenciam de presbitero citra suam fidem. Ulterius videtur quod sine sacramentis nostris sensibilibus de possibili servatur fides in nostra ecclesia, servata in nobis cum caritate fide catholica. Nam articuli fidei catholice sunt generales et non implicant quod iste sit sacerdos, quod hic sit corpus Christi et sic de aliis nisi de quanto veritas est substrata. Nec tenetur christianus nisi subintellecta tali condicione credere quidquam tale; opinionem tamen habet de ministerio diffamati presbiteri ultra consimile ministerium laicorum, sicut credibile est quod Christus sepe supplet defectum presbiteri, ordinando, conficiendo vel

their own, incur the great crime of contempt of the divine sacraments"; because, as is recited a little before from a saying of blessed Augustine: "All the sacraments, while they harm those who handle them unworthily, yet profit through them those who receive them worthily, as does the word of God also. Whence it is said: What they say, do; but what they do, do not do."[14] And below, under the authority of blessed Ambrose: "Since scripture testifies that at the prayers of Jeroboam fire came down from heaven, and again, when Elijah prayed, fire was sent from heaven to consume the sacrifices (as is clear from 3 Kings 12 and 18), it is given to be understood that God considers not the merits of persons but the offices of priests."[15] Yet it is required that the layman have some evidence about the presbyter short of his faith. Further, it seems that without our perceptible sacraments faith could possibly be kept in our church, the catholic faith being kept in us with charity.[16] For the articles of the catholic faith are general, and do not imply that this man is a priest, that here is the body of Christ, and so of other things, except in so far as the truth underlies them. Nor is a Christian bound to believe anything of the kind except with such a condition understood as implied; yet he has an opinion about the ministry of a defamed presbyter beyond the like ministry of lay people, as it is credible that Christ often supplies the defect of the presbyter, in ordaining, in confecting, or[17]

Notes

1. ***Quia certum est***: the answer to the error, given without a formula. ***In superatis***: taken as "in [suits] won", cases in which the claimant has prevailed; the sense is doubtful. ***Excipit***: takes exception, as a defendant pleads an exception at law. ***Rectificacio***: being set right before God. R. A and B in the margin at 453.29: ***Primus error***.
2. Augustine to Macedonius; Wyclif's "Letter 38" is to Profuturus in the Maurist numbering; the thought is loosely from Ep. 153.6.26 to Macedonius, civil laws are made ***non quod hinc fiat ut bene utentes sint, sed ut male utentes minus molesti sint*** (PL 33). C. ***Habilitaciones virtutum***: the fitness that the virtues give.
3. ***Dominum***: so the print, read on the plate (454.13), taken as "the Lord" (on their side); ***dominium***, "lordship", would read more easily, but no witness gives it. ***Exequi***: to prosecute a suit. S. 2 Timothy 4:5, DR "do the work of an evangelist". T. At 454.14 B reads ***contencione huius***. R. A in the margin at 454.9: ***Secundus error***.
4. ***Absolutum iuramentum***: an oath without qualification, not limited to the witness's belief. ***Cognoscunt testes ut plurimum ignorare***: the witnesses know that for the most part they are ignorant of what they swear to.
5. ***Ritu tali***: the practice of such trials (glossary: ***ritus***). ***Ex evidencia sui ministerii***: on the evidence of the ministry he did (Loserth's side-note: "Once a man was curate because he did the work"). ***Cura***: the cure of souls. ***Status iste et eius antecedencia***: that state of the early church and what led to it. T. At 454.28 A reads ***intimant*** for ***interimant***.
6. ***Advena***: a priest come from elsewhere. ***Nominis literati***: taken as "the name written" in the letters; or "of the lettered man", the clerk. ***Non dant vel evidenciam topicam***: not even probable evidence (cf. the glossary ***argumentum topicum***); the print punctuates the sentence as a question. ***Sic enim***: the apostles' priesthood was known from their deeds, not from letters. T. At 454.29 B reads ***si dulus*** (so our copy of the page foot).
7. ***Cum paribus***: ***ceteris paribus***, "other things being equal". ***Ex tibi dubio***: "for all you know", from what is doubtful to you. ***Prohibere testimonium***: taken as ***perhibere testimonium***, "to bear testimony". T. At 455.4 AA$_1$ read ***fuerunt***. R. A in the margin at 455.5: ***Confirmacio***.
8. ***Assumptum***: the premiss that an unbelieving ordainer makes no ordination. ***Omnino infidelis***: one wholly an unbeliever. ***Formans vocem***: uttering the form of words. T. At 455.14 and 455.18 B reads ***per illud***.
9. Decretum C.1 q.1 c.12, from Gregory (Loserth: ***Decr. sec. pars, causa I, q. I, cap. XII***; the modern form is ours); the Decretum has ***dandi ... accipiendi*** (455.24). C. ***In Christo corpore***: so the print; translated as ***in Christi corpore***. R. A in the margin at 455.21: ***Nota. Dubitatur an qui pretenduntur esse sacerdotes sint sacerdotes cum motivis***.

10. Decretum C.9 q.1 c.3 (Loserth: *Decr. sec. pars, causa IX, q. I, cap. III*; the modern form is ours); *Sed excommunicati* is the canon's incipit. C. The subject of *ministrat* is the unknown unbeliever, excommunicate or heretic.
11. *Est dare*: "there is [such a thing as]". The two clauses stand without a connective (456.3–4); "as" is supplied. *Confeccio*: the confecting of the sacrament. *Indisposicio*: "unfitness" (cf. the glossary *indispositus*). *Deo absconditi*: hidden in God, known to him alone.
12. *Sic est sibi evidens dubitare*: he has evident ground to doubt. *De sancta matre ecclesie*: the print's *ecclesie* (p. 456) is taken as *ecclesia*. *Secundum presentem iusticiam*: as against predestination (the glossary). *In verbis sacramentalibus in intencione*: no connective between the two phrases (p. 456); taken as "in the words, [and] in the intention". T. At 456.14–15 B reads *inordinate*. R. A in the margin at 456.8: *Secunda conclusio*.
13. The argument: what is beyond the layman's power cannot make his faith fail; certainty about his priest is beyond it. T. At 456.20 B reads *tutubaret*. At 456.23–24 A's word is damaged by an erasure (*circumstancia*), and A_1 has *talis circum— sacerdotis*. R. A in the margin at 456.20: *Tercia conclusio*.
14. *Particula fidei*: a part of the catholic faith. *Loco evidencie*: a "place" in the dialectical sense, a source of argument (testimony, reason). S. Decretum C.1 q.1 c.84 (Gregory) and c.78 (Augustine) (Loserth: *Decr. sec. pars, q. I., cap. LXXXIV*; *ib. cap. LXXVIII*; the modern form is ours). Matthew 23:3 as the canon gives it; DR "All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not". R. A in the margin at 456.27: *Conclusio*.
15. Decretum C.1 q.1 c.83, from Ambrose (Loserth: *ib. cap. LXXXIII*; the modern form is ours). Jeroboam's altar: 3 Kings 12:32–13:5; Elijah: 3 Kings 18:38. C. *Sacramenta*: here the sacrifices.
16. *Citra suam fidem*: evidence short of faith (glossary: *citra fidem*). *De possibili*: "possibly", it is possible that. *Servata … fide catholica*: ablative absolute.
17. *De quanto veritas est substrata*: in so far as the truth underlies [the particular claim]. *Diffamati presbiteri*: a presbyter of ill fame. The sentence continues in the next part.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 454: ∅ (English side-note word (the); print has no word before Patet)
  - 454: *iure* [NW]
  - 455: *fuerit*
  - 456: *sive*
  - 457: *tamen*
  - 457: *est*
  - 457: *de*
  - 457: *talibus*
  - 457: *nimium*
  - 457: *Iª* (English side-note text glued)
  - 457: *ut* (line number 15 glued)
  - 457: *Christi*
  - 457: *Christus*

Part 5: The layman's eucharist and the danger of signs; fifth conclusion: no cleric may fight for temporal goods

Loserth pp. 457.30–460.25

¶1 457.30–460.25
458.1 *while we have no reason to suppose he will do so with lay ministrations.*
458.23 *The sensible sacrament profits only so far as it helps to the spiritual acceptance of Christ.*
459.1 *Yet we must not neglect the Sacraments,*
459.5 *The danger is that more attention is paid to the signs than to the things signified.*

[457] absolvendo, sine ipso rite ministerialiter concurrente; [458] nec sequitur ex isto quod debemus credere Christum sic concurrere in pretensione ministerii laycalis, nam nullum tale de communi cursu absolute credere debemus explicite sed vivere in fide filii Dei que est universalis sive catholica. Unde Encheridion LX°, quando dyabolus corporis sensus fallit, mentem vero non movet a vera rectaque sciencia qua quisque vitam fidelem gerit, nullum est in religione periculum; vel cum se bonum fingens ea facit sive dicit que bonis angelis congruunt, eciamsi credatur bonus, non est error christiane fidei periculosus aut morbidus. Cum vero per hec aliena ad sua incipit ducere, tunc eum dinoscere nec ire post eum magna et necessaria vigilancia est. Vult iste sanctus dicere quod multa sunt que

absolving, without his duly concurring as minister; [458] nor does it follow from this that we ought to believe that Christ so concurs in the pretence of a lay ministry; for nothing of the kind ought we, in the common course, to believe absolutely and explicitly, but [we ought] to live in the faith of the Son of God, which is universal or catholic.[1] Hence Enchiridion 60: "When the devil deceives the senses of the body, but does not move the mind from the true and right knowledge by which each man leads the life of faith, there is no danger in religion; or when, feigning himself good, he does or says those things that befit good angels, even if he is believed good, it is not an error of the christian faith that is dangerous or diseased. But when through these things that are not his he begins to lead

459.19 *No cleric may fight for temporalities.*
460.1 *False teaching on this point is common.*
460.17 *It is even said that temporal possessions are as needful now as was the power of miracles at first.*

fidelis neque tenetur plene et particulariter credere neque discredere, sed stat sine mortali cum formidine falsum credere, ut patet de opinantibus vel reputantibus multa bona et religiosa de membris dyaboli licet falsa; sed oportet cavere ne affectus per consensum ad vetitum seducatur. Omnis autem error in veritate videtur mihi sapere peccatum ad minimum veniale. Sed redeundo notandum est quod non sequitur ex isto quod haberetur quoad sacramentum eukaristie devocio laicorum, quia potest contingere quod efficacius et meritorius accipiat laicus corpus Christi, credendo in ipsum in celo et credendo generaliter sacramentum universalis ecclesie, quam datus laicus vel sacerdos qui sub actibus sacramentalibus corporalibus accipit corpus Christi. Nam ritus talis non proficit nisi de quanto disponit ad accepcionem et manducacionem corporis Christi secundum animam in fide et caritate (de qua manducacione Joh. VI° loquitur Jesus noster). Non enim nego quin [459] necesse sit nos in vita intendere signis sensibilibus in quibus stat modo suo christiana religio, cum debemus credere quod omnia sacramenta sensibilia rite ministrata habent efficaciam salutarem. Sed in isto stat periculum militantis ecclesie quod iudaizando secundum sensum carnalem signa illa cum tradicionibus humanis plus suis signatis preponderet vel eciam legem Dei plus attendat iudicio sensus corporei quam oculo mentis vel eciam lumini fidei. Et correspondenter ad istos motus anime opera consecuntur, unde ad elidendum istum errorem Christus ordinavit nos in fide vivere et membra matris nostre particulariter ignorare, ne quis presumat se extollere vel exigendo temporalia gentiliter a lege scripture recedere, sciendo quod nulla solempnitas vel tradicio humana facit hominem caput vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie aut Christi vicarium nisi specialis Christi gracia et imitacio Christi in moribus. Ulterius videtur quod non licet pure clerico in causa et persona propria fratres suos corporaliter pro temporalibus ecclesie expugnare. Patet sic: Clero minus elongatum a vita apostolica est omnino illicitum, et magis elongatum est magis illicitum, sed iuxta conclusionem primam clerum contendere in foro ecclesiastico pro patrimonio Christi est omnino illicitum, ergo multo magis ipsum bellando pro temporalibus invadere fratrem suum, nam cum sit a vita et doctrina Christi magis extraneum, foret sacerdoti Christi magis illicitum. Ille ergo qui pateretur iniurias, antequam cum fratre suo contenderet, pateretur iniurias, antequam spoliando bona nature fratrem suum invaderet. Unde magnus videtur defectus in nostris doctoribus qui dimissa scola Christi in sequendo ipsum et paciendo iniurias [460] consulunt nedum laicis sed pontificibus ad pugnandum, palliantes per sompnia et scripta apocrifa quomodo pugne tales eciam

[men] to his own, then to discern him and not to go after him is a great and necessary vigilance."[2] This saint means that there are many things which the believer is bound neither fully and in particular to believe nor to disbelieve; but it stands without mortal [sin] to believe a falsehood with misgiving, as is clear of those who think or reckon many good and religious things of members of the devil, though falsely; but one must take care that the affection is not seduced, through consent, to what is forbidden.[3] And every error in [matters of] truth seems to me to savour of sin, venial at the least. But, to return, it is to be noted that it does not follow from this that the devotion of lay people as to the sacrament of the eucharist would [not] be had; for it can happen that a layman receives the body of Christ more efficaciously and more meritoriously, by believing in him in heaven and believing in general the sacrament of the universal church, than a given layman or priest who receives the body of Christ under the bodily sacramental acts. For such a rite profits only in so far as it disposes to the receiving and eating of the body of Christ according to the soul, in faith and charity (of which eating our Jesus speaks in John 6).[4] For I do not deny that [459] it is necessary for us in this life to attend to the perceptible signs in which, in its own way, the christian religion stands, since we ought to believe that all perceptible sacraments duly ministered have saving efficacy. But in this stands the danger of the church militant: that, judaizing according to the carnal sense, it gives those signs, together with human traditions, more weight than the things they signify, or even attends to God's law more by the judgement of bodily sense than by the eye of the mind, or even than by the light of faith.[5] And correspondingly to these motions of the soul works follow; hence, to strike down this error, Christ ordained that we should live in faith and be ignorant in particular of the members of our mother, lest anyone presume to exalt himself, or, by exacting temporal goods in the manner of the gentiles, depart from the law of scripture; knowing that no solemnity or human tradition makes a man head or member of holy mother church, or vicar of Christ, but the special grace of Christ and the imitation of Christ in conduct.[6] Further, it seems that it is not lawful for a pure cleric, in his own cause and person, to make war bodily on his brothers for the temporal goods of the church. It is clear thus: what is less removed from the apostolic life is altogether unlawful to the clergy, and what is more removed is more unlawful; now, according to the first conclusion, for the clergy to contend in the ecclesiastical court for the patrimony of Christ is altogether unlawful; therefore much more [is it unlawful for a cleric] to attack his brother

in Romano pontifice per signa que vocant miracula sunt laudate (ut tetigi XVII° cap. libri quarti). Rogamus itaque in verbis ut habeamus Christi et sue paciencie documenta, sed tamquam ypocrite adversamur in factis, nitendo totis viribus quomodo habeamus de factis hostibus temporales victorias et fastuosa ac huic vite voluptuosa delectamenta, et ad hoc applicamus triplicem sapienciam huius mundi, de qua Jacobi III°, 15 dicitur quod est terrena, animalis et dyabolica. Necessarius ergo foret cogitare cogitaciones pacis, rogare et predicare que ad pacem sunt, quam adducere fucos sophisticos ad palliandum quod nedum mundi principibus sed eciam summis pontificibus licitum est bellare. Ad tantum enim cecati sunt eciam professores scripture quod dicunt tam necessariam esse clero hodie possessionem temporalium, quam necessaria fuit in primitiva ecclesia potestas faciendi miracula, et intelligunt necessarium pro utili (ut oportet), quia aliter concederent quod tam necessaria ecclesie foret sua predicacio, ymmo sua decepcio sicut fuit Christi passio, cum sit sub eodem gradu contingens necessitas utrobique.

by fighting for temporal goods; for since this is more foreign to the life and doctrine of Christ, it would be more unlawful for a priest of Christ.[7] He, therefore, who would suffer injuries before he would contend with his brother would suffer injuries before he would attack his brother by despoiling [him of] the goods of nature. Hence there seems to be a great failing in our doctors who, having left the school of Christ in following him and suffering injuries, [460] counsel not only lay people but pontiffs to fight, cloaking with dreams and apocryphal writings how such fights, even in the Roman pontiff, have been praised by signs which they call miracles (as I touched on in chapter 17 of the fourth book).[8] So we ask in words that we may have the lessons of Christ and of his patience, but like hypocrites we oppose them in deeds, striving with all our strength to have temporal victories over enemies we have made, and delights pompous and voluptuous to this life; and to this we apply the threefold wisdom of this world, of which James 3:15 says that it is "earthly, sensual and devilish".[9] It would therefore be more necessary to think thoughts of peace, to ask for and preach the things that are for peace, than to bring forward sophistical disguises to cloak [the claim] that it is lawful not only for the princes of the world but even for the highest pontiffs to wage war.[10] For even professors of scripture are blinded to such a degree that they say that possession of temporal goods is as necessary to the clergy today as the power of working miracles was necessary in the primitive church; and they understand "necessary" for "useful" (as they must), since otherwise they would grant that their preaching, nay, their deception, would be as necessary to the church as was the passion of Christ, since the contingent necessity is of the same degree on both sides.[11]

Notes

1. The sentence continues from the previous part ("in ordaining, in confecting, or"). ***Sine ipso … concurrente***: without the presbyter duly concurring as minister; Christ may supply what he lacks. ***Pretensio ministerii laycalis***: a layman's pretended ministry. ***De communi cursu***: in the ordinary course of things. R. Side-note 458.1.
2. Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 60 (Loserth: the codices read ***Encheridion LXVIII***, "recte LX"; Aug. Opp. VI p. 218); the print's ***LX°*** is Loserth's correction. The quotation runs to ***vigilancia est***. T. At 458.9 AA_1 read ***vel si*** for ***vel cum***; at 458.13 B reads ***magna et multa***. R. A in the margin at 458.5: ***Augustinus***.
3. ***Stat sine mortali***: it is compatible with being free of mortal sin. ***Cum formidine***: with the "fear of the opposite" that qualifies assent (the glossary). ***Affectus***: the affection of the will. T. AA_1 lack ***autem*** (458.20) and ***in veritate*** (458.21): "every error".
4. ***Haberetur***: so the print (B ***habetur***, 458.23). As printed the clause says that the laity's devotion "would be had", which does not fit the reply, whose point is that the devotion is not lost; "[not]" is supplied (our emendation; the print has no ***non*** and nothing is lost at the line end). ***Datus laicus***: a given layman. ***Meritorius***: comparative adverb. S. John 6, the spiritual eating (e.g. 6:57). R. A in the margin at 458.22: ***Conclusio notanda***. Side-note 458.23.
5. ***Intendere signis***: attend to signs; not the scholastic "maintain". ***Preponderet***: the subject is the church militant, which makes the signs outweigh what they signify. T. B lacks ***lumini*** (459.9). R. A in the margin at 459.5: ***Periculum***. Side-notes 459.1, 459.5.
6. ***Membra matris nostre particulariter ignorare***: not to know in particular who are members of the church, that is, who are predestinate. ***Gentiliter***: in the manner of the gentiles. R. A in the margin at 459.14: ***Conclusio***.

7. ***Pure clerico*: a cleric acting purely as cleric. *Clero minus elongatum*: what departs less from the apostolic life; the argument runs from the lesser to the greater departure. The codices read *Clero cui* (459.21); Loserth prints *Clero*, which is translated. *Conclusionem primam*: the first conclusion of this chapter, against contending at law. T. The codices spell *expungnare* (459.21). At 459.26 the codices read *talibus*, which Loserth corrected (his *Correxi*); the corrected word is evidently *temporalibus*. R. A in the margin at 459.18: *Quinta conclusio. Non licet pure clerico invadere fratrem suum propter temporalia nec licet sibi ut pro illis pugnet*. Side-note 459.19.**
8. ***Bona nature*: life and limb, as against the goods of fortune. *Ut tetigi XVII° cap. libri quarti*: Wyclif's cross-reference to an earlier book of his own; book 4 of the *Summa* is *De civili dominio* II; c. 17 ends with the chronicle of Gregory VI, the warring pope whose bier was borne into the church, which Wyclif calls *illusiones tamquam miracula* (Society ed., 257–58). T. A spells *pungne* (460.3). R. Side-note 460.1.**
9. ***De factis hostibus*: taken as "over enemies we have made"; the words could also echo *in factis*, "in deeds". S. James 3:15.**
10. ***Necessarius*: comparative adverb, answered by *quam*. S. *Cogitare cogitaciones pacis* recalls Jeremiah 29:11 ("thoughts of peace"); *que ad pacem sunt*, Psalm 121:6 ("Pray ye for the things that are for the peace of Jerusalem"). R. A in the margin at 460.16: *Conclusio falsa*, marking the doctors' thesis.**
11. The doctors must mean "useful" by "necessary": taken strictly, the necessity they claim would be the contingent necessity of Christ's passion. *Ymmo sua decepcio*: Wyclif's sarcastic correction of *predicacio*. T. B reads *quod aliter* (460.21). R. Side-note 460.17.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **457: *ministerialiter***
  - **458: *pretensione* (print spelling) [NW]**
  - **458: *laycalis***
  - **459: *modo***
  - **459: *iudaizando* (margin numeral 1 glued)**
  - **459: *vel* (margin numeral 2 glued)**
  - **459: *consecuntur* (print con-/secuntur; main token holds whole word; print spelling) [NW]**
  - **459: *Christi***
  - **459: *Christi***
  - **459: *nam***
  - **459: *Christi***
  - **459: *Christi***
  - **460: *XVII°***
  - **460: ∅ (other scans split XVII° (xui + 1); print has no word before cap.)**
  - **460: *III°***
  - **460: *15* (main token i covers printed 15)**
  - **460: *necessaria***
  - **459: *quod* (English side-note "The" glued on (agent 10))**

Part 6: The doctors' thesis on temporal possession refuted; sixth conclusion: no contending for greatness

Loserth pp. 460.26–464.30

¶1 460.26–462.21
461.9 Friars should oppose such teaching,
461.14 or it may be turned against them.
462.22 I say that possession was more needed in the primitive Church than now.
462.31 Simon Magus was wiser than these teachers,

[460]**Primo ergo videtur quod cesar dedisset principaliter naturalia bona clero tam utilia sicut Christus, et iterum tam perfecta fuisset temporalis possessio, sicut carismata supernaturalia concessa a Christo, quia si potestas quam Christus concessit suis apostolis fuit cesareo dono perfeccior, fuit ecclesie Christi necessarior, quod fuit patulum ex fructu et cremento** [461]**ecclesie. Et iterum proporcionaliter ut membrum ecclesie habet plus de talibus possessionibus foret perfeccior et ecclesie necessarior, et sic fratres et viri contemplativi forent sub non gradu necessitatis ecclesie et persone mundo divites maxime necessarie, quia nullius possessio est necessarior ecclesie quam est ipse. Sed quid plus repugnaret scripture**

First, then, it seems [to follow] that Caesar would have given the clergy, principally, natural goods as useful as [those of] Christ, and again that temporal possession would have been as perfect as the supernatural charisms granted by Christ; for if the power which Christ granted to his apostles was more perfect than Caesar's gift, it was more necessary to the church of Christ, which was manifest from the fruit and growth [461]**of the church.[1] And again, proportionally, as a member of the church has more of such possessions, he would be more perfect and more necessary to the church; and so friars and contemplative men would stand at no degree of necessity to the church, and persons rich in the world would**

sacre vel sacris legibus de status minoritate? Ideo consulerem fratribus quod omnino resisterent isti sentencie, quia nedum derogaret perfeccioni sue retrahendo seculares, ne accipiant ordinem evangelice paupertatis, sed animaret divites seculi ne faciliter imperciantur eis elemosinas corporales. Possent enim seculares dicere (ut audivi quosdam instructos ex ista sentencia): Tu dicis quod tam necessaria est modo possessio temporalium quam necessaria fuit in primitiva ecclesia potestas faciendi miracula, sed possessio temporalium est ecclesie utilior et congruencior in secularibus quam in clero. Ideo quam necessaria fuit in clero potestas faciendi miracula in primitiva ecclesia, tam necessaria est hodie in secularibus possessio terrena. Sed nemo in primitiva ecclesia diminueret de potestate sua faciendi miracula propter communionem cum fratribus, ergo nec secularis debet communicare cum fratribus de possessione temporalium, ne diminuatur perfeccio sibi necessaria; et sic frater qui ad hoc hortatur vel consulit, deficit a caritate, nitens dampnificare gracia questus temporalium fratrem suum. Sed quis temptaret taliter membrum Christi? Si dicitur quod propter dispersionem temporalium accresceret elemosinanti donum spirituale perfeccius, hoc repugnat sentencie propter duo: Primo quia tunc foret expediens cuicunque clerico possessionato plus [462] de possessione sua egenis tribuere et sic usque ad non gradum, et sic renunciando cunctis que possidet sequi Christum in evangelica paupertate. Secundo, quia tam necessaria est clero modo temporalium possessio, sicut fuit alia potestas concessa a Christo ad faciendum miracula, sed notum est quod propter nullas corporales elemosinas dat Deus meliora carismata quam fuit potestas faciendi miracula; ergo propter tales elemosinas non recipiet distribuens carismata pociora. Ymmo cum necessarior sit modo temporalium possessio quam potestas faciendi miracula, et quelibet partis possessionis particio perderet illam possessionem, cum sit res inanimata, videtur sequi ex principio quod fatuum foret clero possessionato possessionem suam perdere. Nec valet egenti allegare possessionato quod de superfluo vel principaliter necessario debet tribuere, quia (ut sequitur ex principio sapiencie dyabolice) nichil est clerico possessionato superfluum, sed de quanto plus possidet, de tanto quod possidet est sibi magis necessarium, quia complet unam possessionem magnam necessariorem ecclesie.

be most necessary, since no one's possession is more necessary to the church than he himself is.[2] But what would be more repugnant to holy scripture, or to the sacred laws, on the lesser standing of [their] state? Therefore I would counsel the friars to resist this teaching altogether; for it would not only derogate from their perfection by holding seculars back from taking the order of evangelical poverty, but would encourage the rich of the world not to give them bodily alms readily.[3] For seculars could say (as I have heard some say who were instructed out of this teaching): "You say that possession of temporal goods is now as necessary as the power of working miracles was necessary in the primitive church; now possession of temporal goods is more useful and more fitting for the church in seculars than in the clergy. Therefore, as necessary as the power of working miracles was in the clergy in the primitive church, so necessary is earthly possession in seculars today. Now no one in the primitive church would diminish [anything] of his power of working miracles for the sake of communion with the brethren; therefore neither ought a secular to share his possession of temporal goods with the friars, lest the perfection necessary to him be diminished; and so the friar who exhorts or counsels him to this fails in charity, striving to damage his brother for the sake of gain in temporal goods."[4] But who would so tempt a member of Christ? If it is said that through the dispersal of temporal goods a more perfect spiritual gift would accrue to the almsgiver, this is repugnant to the teaching for two reasons. First, because then it would be expedient for any possessioned cleric to give more [462] of his possession to the needy, and so down to no degree [at all], and so, renouncing all that he possesses, to follow Christ in evangelical poverty.[5] Secondly, because possession of temporal goods is now as necessary to the clergy as that other power granted by Christ for working miracles was; now it is known that for no bodily alms does God give better charisms than the power of working miracles was; therefore for such alms the one who distributes will not receive more powerful charisms. Indeed, since possession of temporal goods is now more necessary than the power of working miracles, and any parting of a portion of the possession would destroy that possession, since it is an inanimate thing, it seems to follow from the principle that it would be foolish for a possessioned clergy to lose its possession.[6] Nor does it avail the needy man to allege to the possessioned [cleric] that he ought to give from what is superfluous, or from what is principally necessary; for (as follows from the principle of the devil's wisdom) nothing is superfluous to a possessioned cleric, but

¶2 462.22–463.31
463.5 *whose teaching if received would stop all alms to the poor.*

[462]Ideo detestando hoc porisma de scola dyaboli dico quod necessarior fuit in clero dominacio temporalium in primitiva ecclesia militante quam est modo. Patet ex hoc quod tunc fuit utilior et meritorior et per consequens necessarior. Tunc enim fuit pure evangelica civili dominio impermixta. Ulterius dico secundo quod potestas faciendi miracula fuit necessarior ecclesie, quam unquam fuit temporalium possessio quodammodo infinite, quia potestas illa est natura superior, sicut virtus excedit civile dominium. Unde Symon magus non fuit tam fatuus quin libenter voluerit commutasse pecuniam pro potestate faciendi miracula, [463]ymmo affeccione commodi hoc censuit fore lucrum; patet Act. VIII°. Multo magis fidelis sciens quod potestas faciendi miracula plus lucrefaciendo pacificaret ecclesiam quam quelibet divicie temporales. Et ex istis patet tercio quod seminans illud dogma in populo non foret ut sic utilis procurator vel minister pauperum sed egenis Christi ex doctrina sibi contraria subdolus inimicus. Nam gracia et caritas sunt precipua potestas faciendi miracula, quia illa sunt per se bona per que docetur homo mundum et peccata relinquere et Deum diligere; quod est opus excellentissimum viatoris. Ideo si illud porisma per impossibile foret verum, tunc sicut nemo tenetur alienare a se caritatem vel spiritum sanctum, sic nemo teneretur temporalia pauperibus impertiri. Suppono autem de logica quod sicut confundit, ut si temporalia sint tam necessaria sicut aliqua potestas faciendi miracula, tunc nulla talis potestas est necessarior; quod est falsum de potestate quam Joh. I°, 12 exprimit: Dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri. Illa enim est infinitum melior quam possessio temporalis, nam ex illa potestate legitur Evangelistam mutasse silvestres frondes in aurum et litoria saxa in gemmas. Ex quo patet quod illa potestas fuit infinitum validior quam illa possessio et plus fecit ad profectum ecclesie. Aliter enim Christus infinitum potencior cesare, habens discipulos prudenciores ad ministrandum bona fortune, foret notabiliter increpandus quod non dotasset ecclesiam plus quam cesar. Hoc enim propter minorem mundi avariciam fuisset tunc melius, et per consequens ex dictis tam bonum sicut potestas quam Christus habuit.

the more he possesses, the more necessary to him is what he possesses, since it makes up one great possession, more necessary to the church.[7]

Therefore, detesting this porism out of the devil's school, I say that the exercise of lordship over temporal goods was more necessary in the clergy in the primitive church militant than it is now. This is clear from the fact that then it was more useful and more meritorious, and consequently more necessary. For then it was purely evangelical, unmixed with civil lordship.[8] Further, I say secondly that the power of working miracles was more necessary to the church than possession of temporal goods ever was, in a manner infinitely [more], since that power is superior in nature, as virtue exceeds civil lordship. Hence Simon Magus was not so foolish that he would not gladly have exchanged money for the power of working miracles; [463]indeed, out of desire for advantage he reckoned that this would be gain, as is clear from Acts 8. Much more a believer, knowing that the power of working miracles would, by gaining [souls], bring more peace to the church than any temporal riches whatever, [would reckon so].[9] And from these things it is clear, thirdly, that one who sows this dogma among the people would not be, as such, a useful proctor or minister of the poor, but a crafty enemy to Christ's needy, by a doctrine contrary to them. For grace and charity are the chief power of working miracles, since they are the goods in themselves through which a man is taught to leave the world and sins and to love God; which is the most excellent work of the wayfarer. Therefore, if that porism were, per impossibile, true, then, just as no one is bound to alienate from himself charity or the Holy Spirit, so no one would be bound to impart temporal goods to the poor.[10] Now I suppose from logic that "as" confounds [the term after it]: so that if temporal goods are as necessary as any power of working miracles, then no such power is more necessary; which is false of the power that John 1:12 expresses: "He gave them power to be made the sons of God."[11] For that is infinitely better than temporal possession; for by that power the Evangelist is read to have changed branches of the woods into gold and stones of the shore into gems. From which it is clear that that power was infinitely stronger than that possession and did more for the profit of the church.[12] For otherwise Christ, infinitely more powerful than Caesar, having disciples more prudent for ministering the goods of fortune, would be notably to be rebuked for not having endowed the church more than Caesar. For this would then have been better,

because of the lesser avarice of the world, and consequently, from what has been said, as good as the power that Christ had.

¶3 463.32–464.30
464.1 *There should be no contention for high place in the Church,*
464.14 *since we cannot tell whether even the highest are members.*

[463]Sexto videtur quod nullus clericus contenderet circa maioritatem sui ad subditos in ecclesiastica ierarchia, [464]nam homine habente revelacionem ad hoc non contenderet circa illud, sed sentiret humiliter de se ipso, si non habeat revelacionem de hoc; cum tunc ignorat si sit de sancta matre ecclesia, in vanum contenderet si sit maior de illa ecclesia, cum deest sibi probacio si sit de illa ecclesia (ut tactum est in conclusione prima). Maioritas autem in ecclesia et non de illa foret contendenti inutilis et ecclesie tamquam impertinens sive contrarium contemptibilis. Et ex istis videtur quod nimis magna demencia foret urgere ecclesiam ut credat quemlibet Romanum pontificem esse caput sue ecclesie, nam iuxta dicta quilibet talis posset esse episcopus in ecclesia sine hoc quod sit de illa. Sicut ergo non est de fide quod omnis Romanus pontifex sit predestinatus sic non est de substancia fidei quod sit caput vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Et patet quod non sequitur perire in laicis fides de recto sacramentali ministerio sacerdotis, quia sufficit fideli credere fidem catholicam et quod Deus propter nullum errorem spiritualis prepositi dampnificat subditum nisi suum demeritum sit in causa. Non ergo debet subditus desperare de peccato prepositi, quia, quantumcunque malus sacerdos fuerit, dummodo subditus in Christum crediderit, salvus erit, et dampnabile ministerium sacramenti sui curati sibi proderit, ut ostendit decretum sub auctoritate Augustini, in De Consecracione, dist. IV: Quomodo ipsum, inquit, caracterem multi lupi eciam lupis infigunt qui videntur esse intus, verumptamen ad illam ovem que ex multis una est non pertinent.

Sixthly, it seems that no cleric should contend about his greatness over his subjects in the ecclesiastical hierarchy; [464]for a man having a revelation of it would not contend about it, but would think humbly of himself; if he has no revelation of this, since he is then ignorant whether he is of holy mother church, he would contend in vain whether he is greater in that church, since he lacks proof whether he is of that church (as was touched on in the first conclusion).[13] And greatness in the church and not of it would be useless to the one contending, and contemptible to the church, as something irrelevant or contrary. And from these things it seems that it would be too great a madness to urge the church to believe that every Roman pontiff is head of his church; for according to what has been said, any such [pontiff] could be a bishop in the church without being of it.[14] As, then, it is not of faith that every Roman pontiff is predestinate, so it is not of the substance of faith that he is head or member of holy mother church. And it is clear that it does not follow that faith in the right sacramental ministry of the priest perishes in lay people; for it suffices for the believer to believe the catholic faith, and that God, for no error of a spiritual superior, damages the subject unless his own demerit is the cause.[15] The subject, then, ought not to despair over the sin of the superior; for, however bad the priest may be, provided the subject believes in Christ, he will be saved, and the damnable ministry of the sacrament by his curate will profit him, as the decree shows under the authority of Augustine, in De consecratione, distinction 4: "In the way," he says, "that many wolves also imprint that very character on wolves who seem to be within; yet they do not belong to that sheep which is one out of many."[16]

Notes

1. The first of the absurdities drawn from the doctors' thesis that temporal possession is now as necessary as the power of miracles once was (460.17–20). *Tam utilia sicut Christus*: as useful as [what] Christ [gave]. T. At 460.26–27 B reads *dedisset preter naturalia*. R. A in the margin at 460.26: *Nota contra possessionem et dominium ecclesie, quod sic necessarium nunc reputatur, sicut in primitiva ecclesia potestas faciendi miracula* (Loserth: above 192ª, without mark of reference).
2. *Sub non gradu*: at no degree, the schoolmen's zero degree. *Quia nullius possessio ...*: on the thesis, a man's worth to the church is measured by what he possesses. T. A_1 would correct to *sub uno genere* (461.4); the print is translated.
3. *De status minoritate* is taken with *legibus*, the laws on the lesser standing of the clerical state; it may also hang on *repugnaret*. *Imperciantur eis*: give to them, the friars. T. B reads *si animaret* (461.11–12). R. A in the margin at 461.8: *Consilium*. Side-notes 461.9, 461.14.
4. The seculars turn the thesis against the friars. The quotation is closed at *fratrem suum*; *Sed quis temptaret* may still be theirs. *Fratres*: "the brethren" of the primitive church, then "the friars"; the argument plays on the word. *Diminueret*: so the print; Loserth asks whether it should be *diminueretur* (461.22). The print has a stray stop after *quosdam*. T. B reads *ideo nec* (461.24) and lacks *ne* (461.25).

5. ***Si dicitur***: a reply the doctors might make. ***Usque ad non gradum***: down to nothing. S. Luke 14:33 ("renounce all that he possesseth"). R. A and B in the margin at 461.30: ***Responsio quedam***.
6. ***Ex principio***: from the doctors' principle. ***Quelibet partis possessionis particio***: any giving away of a part would destroy the possession as one whole, since it is a thing without life. T. B reads ***tam multa est*** (462.3–4). R. A in the margin at 462.12: ***Responsio quedam***.
7. ***De superfluo vel principaliter necessario***: so the print (B ***vel principio***, 462.16); the common teaching is that alms are owed from what is superfluous and, in need, even from what is necessary. ***Allegare***: to plead, with no implication about truth (the glossary).
8. ***Porisma***: a consequence drawn from a principle; rendered "porism", kept apart from ***corollarium***. C. ***Dominacio temporalium***: the exercise of lordship over temporal goods. T. AA_1 read ***impermixti*** (462.27). R. A and B in the margin at 462.22: ***Responsio propria. Potestas faciendi miracula semper fuit utilior ecclesie quam bona temporalia***; A at 462.27: ***Conclusio***. Side-note 462.22.
9. Acts 8:18–19. C. ***Quodammodo infinite*** goes with ***necessarior***. ***Multo magis fidelis ...*** has no main verb; "would reckon so" is supplied from ***censuit***. ***Lucrefaciendo***: gaining [souls]. T. AA_1 read ***voluit*** (462.32). R. A in the margin at 463.4: ***Conclusio***. Side-note 462.31.
10. ***Roret*** is read as ***foret*** (463.5). ***Sibi contraria***: contrary to them, the needy. ***Per se bona***: goods in themselves. ***Per impossibile***: on an impossible supposition. T. B reads ***utilis procreator*** (463.6); A ***sicut nemo*** (463.14). R. Side-note 463.5.
11. ***Sicut confundit***: in the logic of supposition, "as" in a comparison of equality makes the term after it (***aliqua potestas***) stand confusedly, for every such power; so "as necessary as any power" entails "no such power is more necessary". S. John 1:12.
12. The legend of John the Evangelist turning branches into gold and pebbles of the shore into gems: Isidore, ***De ortu et obitu Patrum*** (PL 83), on John, ***silvestres frondium virgas in aurum mutavit, littoreaque saxa in gemmas formavit***. T. B reads ***valior*** (463.24).
13. ***Nam homine habente revelacionem ad hoc***: at the page head (464.1) the ablative is taken as "a man having a revelation of it"; ***si non habeat revelacionem de hoc*** opens the next clause. ***Conclusione prima***: the first conclusion of this chapter. R. A in the margin at 463.32: ***Sexta conclusio. Nullus clericus debet contendere pro maioritate ad subditos in ecclesiastica ierarchia***. Side-note 464.1.
14. ***Maioritas***: Loserth's reading; the codices have ***Minoritas*** (464.7). B reads ***impertis*** (464.9). C. ***Contrarium***: "a contrary [thing]". R. A in the margin at 464.9: ***Non tenemur credere Romanum pontificem esse caput nostre ecclesie***. Side-note 464.14.
15. ***De fide***: of faith, not the ***ex fide*** formula. ***Perire in laicis fides***: answers the worry of the previous part about the layman's certainty of his priest. T. B lacks ***vel*** (464.16).
16. Decretum, ***De consecratione*** D.4 (Loserth: ***Decreti III pars, De Consecr. dist. IV, cap. XLI***), i.e. ***De cons.*** D.4 c.41; its source is Augustine, ***De baptismo contra Donatistas*** V.20–21. C. ***Quomodo***: "in the way that", a comparison whose first member the canon leaves out. ***Dampnabile ministerium***: the ministry of an unworthy curate. R. A in the margin at 464.24: ***Augustinus***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 461: ***iterum***
  - 461: ∅ (s is line number 5; print has no extra word)
  - 462: ***de***
  - 462: ***possessione***
  - 462: ***fuit***
  - 462: ***fuit***
  - 463: ***ymmo*** (folio mark 192^{c} glued)
  - 463: ***populo*** (print has populo whole on the line (not hyphenated))
  - 463: ***Christi***
  - 464: ***si***
  - 464: ***probacio*** (line number 5 glued)
  - 464: ***ergo***

Part 7: Works, not names; relics and the devil's signs; seventh conclusion: baptism and the foreknown

Loserth pp. 464.31–468.31

¶1 464.31–465.13
465.5 Excessive trust in miracles.
465.14 Evil of relic worship.

[464]Nec sequitur ex isto confusio policie ecclesie, quia ecclesia militans operibus sui curati debet credere, et [465]non nudo nomini vel prefecture in facie ecclesie, quia talis foret evidencia nimis fallax. Obediendum est tamen tali pretenso preposito salva semper obediencia legi Christi; et in ista cecitate tantum turbatur ecclesia quod quidam plus credunt signis mortis factis in vestigio mortuorum

Nor does confusion of the church's polity follow from this; for the church militant ought to believe the works of its curate, and [465]not the bare name or the prefecture in the face of the church, since such evidence would be too fallacious.[1] Yet such a pretended superior is to be obeyed, obedience to the law of Christ being always preserved; and in

defunctorum quam operibus vivacibus superstitum quantumcunque conformiter legi Christi vivencium. Et credo quod illusio diaboli in talibus signis excecat populum; post illum ergo in quo claruit viva vite sanctitas probabiliter credi potest ad ostendendum eius sanctitatem signorum claritas, sed adhuc non tam evidenter sicut in uno opere fructuoso.

this blindness the church is so troubled that some believe signs of death, done at the traces of dead men departed, more than the living works of survivors, however conformably to the law of Christ they live.[2] And I believe that the illusion of the devil in such signs blinds the people; after one, then, in whom the living holiness of life has shone, the brightness of signs can probably be believed [to come] to show his holiness; but even so not as evidently as in one fruitful work.[3]

¶2 465.14–468.31
466.10 *The devil has always drawn men to hypocrisy by means of sensible signs.*
467.14 *Christ's priests should care only to do service to the Church.*
467.27 *Baptism does not altogether destroy original Sin in the foreknown.*
468.13 *The profit of present righteousness to the foreknown is that they lessen their punishment,* 468.26 *and gain a qualified right to temporal goods.*

[465] Unde talis culpanda cecitas, inordinatus ac cupidus cultus circa reliquias faciunt in penam peccati populum multum falli. Unde in multis patriis cupido pecunie facit in multis ecclesiis quod pars persone empte, ut canonizetur pro confessore vel martire, plus honoretur peregrinacione, sumptuosa oblacione et sepulcri ornacione auro et lapidibus preciosis quam corpus matris Dei, apostolorum Petri et Pauli vel alterius notorie beati. Et evidencia talium stat in isto quod talia possunt fieri vere ac meritorie, et prelati quibus hoc est incognitum approbant quod sit ita; nullum tale factum reprobo et pauca vel nulla approbo, quia peregrinantes, reliquias adorantes et pecunias congregantes nedum possent occupari utilius hoc dimisso, sed ex factis in lege Christi et scriptura videtur sequi quod omnes sic colentes debent protunc melius occupari et per consequens peccant graviter melius omittendo. Dimitto peccata que contingunt altrinsecus in hoc facto et quomodo ipsum est factum pharisaicum patrum veteris testamenti, sed non ex lege [466] nova efficaciter nobis fundatum, sed ut plurimum ambiguum et vel ex parte colencium vel ex parte occupancium reliquias viciatum. Sicut enim in lege veteri Judeis declinantibus a cultu insensibilium invaluerunt signa generacionis adultere, sic in nova lege torpente affeccione celestium oportet tradiciones humanas et ritus ceremoniarum sensibilium dimissa religione et affeccione insensibilium prevalere, et ad hoc movent tres hostes anime. Nam necesse est dyabolum illusionibus signorum sensibilium seducere ypocritas sub specie sanctitatis, quia peccata facta in populo hoc requirunt, et dyabolus videt quod populus ad seduccionem illam est pronior. Sic enim legitur I° Regum XXVIII^vo^ quod Saul consuluit phitonissam que arte diaboli suscitavit sibi dyabolum pretendentem effigiem Samuel, qui dyabolus multas veritates commiscuit, ut Saulem in desperacionem induceret et caucius in aliis erroribus seduceret post et ante. Declarat autem Augustinus libro II° De Mirabilibus Sacre Scripture, cap. X°, quod fuit dyabolus, non spiritus Samuelis, primo quia mulier tam malifica non haberet arte diaboli potestatem ad imperandum tam sancte anime; secundo quia tyrannus Saul non meruit tantam illustracionem

Hence such blameworthy blindness, an inordinate and covetous cult around relics, make the people, in punishment of sin, be much deceived. Hence in many homelands covetousness of money brings it about in many churches that part of a person bought so that he may be canonized as confessor or martyr is honoured more, with pilgrimage, costly offering and the adornment of the tomb with gold and precious stones, than the body of the mother of God, of the apostles Peter and Paul, or of another who is notoriously blessed.[4] And the evidence for such things stands in this, that such things can be done truly and meritoriously, and prelates to whom this is unknown approve that it is so; I reprove no such deed and I approve few or none, since pilgrims, those who adore relics and those who gather money could not only be occupied more usefully, this being left aside, but from what is done in the law of Christ and scripture it seems to follow that all who worship so ought then to be better occupied, and consequently sin grievously by omitting the better.[5] I leave aside the sins that occur on both sides in this matter, and how it is a pharisaic deed of the fathers of the old testament, but not efficaciously founded for us from the new [466] law, but for the most part ambiguous, and vitiated either on the side of the worshippers or on the side of those who hold the relics.[6] For as in the old law, when the Jews declined from the worship of imperceptible things, the signs of an adulterous generation prevailed, so in the new law, when affection for heavenly things grows torpid, human traditions and rites of perceptible ceremonies must prevail, the religion and affection of imperceptible things being given up; and to this the three enemies of the soul move [men].[7] For it is necessary that the devil seduce hypocrites under the appearance of holiness by illusions of perceptible signs, since the sins done among the people require this, and the devil sees that the people is more prone to that seduction. For thus it is read in 1 Kings 28 that Saul consulted a pythoness, who by the devil's art raised up for him a devil putting forward the likeness of Samuel; and that devil mixed in many truths, so as to lead Saul into despair and to seduce him

et ministracionem a bono spiritu inquietato per duos homines tam indignos, et tercio quia dicit ille spiritus: Cras tu et filii tui mecum eritis. Saul autem et filii eius creduntur fuisse reprobi et sic cum diabolo et non cum spiritu Samuelis. Ista movent hunc sanctum [467]ad credendum hoc totum factum fuisse illusione diaboli, et credo quod nemo faciet evidenciam quin licet fidelibus opinari quod feretrum pape bellantis translatum fuit in ecclesiam arte dyaboli. Nec sequitur ex sentencia Augustini quod scriptura I° Regum XXVIII$^{v°}$ sit falsa, quia dicit quod nomen Samuelis signat translative dyabolum figurantem; sic enim dicitur I Johannis V°, 8 quod spiritus, aqua et sanguis unum sunt in officio, designando trinitatem divine essencie, et in communi modo loquendi pretendens personam alterius vocatur nomine illius cuius vicem pretendit. Sic enim Johannes dicitur Helyas, et angelus vicarius Dei loquitur in lege veteri in persona Dei cuius sentenciam representat. Redeundo ergo ad propositum, patet quod necesse est sacerdotes Christi dimittere ritus gentiles de maioritate civili et omnino attendere quomodo copiosius atque humilius fructuose servient in ecclesia sancta Dei scientes ex fide quod secundum hoc laus et maioritas sunt a Deo. Ideo secundum Crisostomum sicut membra humani corporis nobiliora non impugnant minus nobilia sed iuvando se reciproce complent sua officia, sic debet esse de membris sancte matris ecclesie: unusquisque sine pompa maioritatis vel eius solicitudine debet iuvando et amando quemlibet operari in sua vocacione subducta contenciosa adversacione. Septimo videtur quod nullus prescitus recipit rite baptismum quo deleatur simpliciter suum originale peccatum; patet ex dictis XXVII° capitulo libri V^{i}. Nam omnis prescitus manet perpetuo in defectu finalis perseverancie, quod est peccatum gravissimum et indelebile, et per consequens non tollitur simpliciter per baptismum. Verumptamen sicut aliqua est gracia predestinacionis [468]et aliqua gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, sic aliquod est peccatum presciencie vel finalis impenitencie, et aliquod peccatum secundum presentem iniusticiam, et quia termini videntur multis extranei et preter significacionem verbalem, ideo alias illos exposui, declarans quomodo ista dicuntur gracie et peccata equivoce et quomodo ista sunt alternatim sibi opposita. Nam omnis prescitus habet perpetuum et originalem defectum, ille tamen ad tempus in malicia sua suspenditur per graciam secundum presentem iusticiam, ut graciam baptismalem et alias, et ideo dixi quod peccatum originale non deletur simpliciter. Et si queratur quid meretur prescitus existens in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam, dicitur quod aput rectiloquos et non equivocantes nunquam meretur

more craftily into other errors, after and before.[8] And Augustine declares in book 2 of On the Wonders of Holy Scripture, chapter 10, that it was a devil and not the spirit of Samuel: first, because a woman so evil-doing would not have power, by the devil's art, to command so holy a soul; secondly, because the tyrant Saul did not merit so great an enlightening and ministry from a good spirit disturbed by two men so unworthy; and thirdly, because that spirit says: "To morrow thou and thy sons shall be with me." But Saul and his sons are believed to have been reprobate, and so with the devil and not with the spirit of Samuel.[9] These things move this saint [467]to believe that this whole deed was done by illusion of the devil; and I believe that no one will produce evidence that it is not lawful for the faithful to hold the opinion that the bier of the warring pope was translated into the church by the devil's art.[10] Nor does it follow from Augustine's teaching that the scripture of 1 Kings 28 is false; for he says that the name of Samuel signifies, by transference, the devil who figured him; for so it is said in 1 John 5:8 that the spirit, the water and the blood "are one" in office, designating the trinity of the divine essence; and in the common way of speaking one who puts forward the person of another is called by the name of him whose place he puts forward. For so John is called Elias, and an angel, the vicar of God, speaks in the old law in the person of God, whose teaching he represents.[11] Returning, then, to the point, it is clear that the priests of Christ must give up the gentile rites of civil greatness and attend altogether to how they may serve more abundantly and more humbly, fruitfully, in the holy church of God, knowing, as faith teaches, that according to this are praise and greatness from God. Therefore, according to Chrysostom, as the nobler members of the human body do not attack the less noble but, helping one another reciprocally, fulfil their offices, so it ought to be with the members of holy mother church: each one, without the pomp of greatness or solicitude for it, ought, by helping and loving each, to work in his own calling, contentious opposition being withdrawn.[12] Seventhly, it seems that no foreknown [person] duly receives a baptism by which his original sin is blotted out without qualification; it is clear from what was said in chapter 27 of book 5. For every foreknown [person] remains perpetually in the defect of final perseverance, which is a most grievous and indelible sin, and consequently is not taken away without qualification by baptism.[13] Nevertheless, as there is a grace of predestination [468]and a grace according to present justice, so there is a sin of foreknowledge or of final impenitence and a sin according to present injustice; and since the

beatitudinem, quia nunquam est dignus beatitudine sed meretur perpetuam mitigacionem pene eterne cum aliis bonis temporalibus; et sic Deus redemit prescitum non ad beatitudinem sed ad pene eterne miticiam, sicut redemit omnes dampnatos. Et correspondenter prescitus absolvitur a peccato, non ut omnino non perpetuo puniatur sed ne tam graviter perpetuo puniatur. Et sic (ut dicit Lincolniensis) peccata redemit non actus sed defectus quorum malicia per temporalem graciam est suspensa. Et sic presciti, sive seculares sive clerici, quantumcunque iuste videantur prefici bonis Dei, hoc est, dumtaxat secundum quid dum sunt in gracia temporali et iniuste simpliciter dum carent omnino momentanea caritate. Ex quo patet quod iudices tam seculares quam ecclesiastici deficiunt persepe in suis iudiciis a regulis

terms seem strange to many and beyond the verbal signification, I have expounded them elsewhere, declaring how these are called graces and sins equivocally and how they are alternately opposed to one another.[14] For every foreknown [person] has a perpetual and original defect; yet for a time that [defect] is suspended in its malice by grace according to present justice, such as baptismal grace and others; and therefore I said that original sin is not blotted out without qualification. And if it is asked what the foreknown [person] existing in grace according to present justice merits, the answer is that, among those who speak correctly and do not equivocate, he never merits blessedness, since he is never worthy of blessedness, but he merits a perpetual mitigation of eternal punishment, with other temporal goods; and so God redeemed the foreknown not to blessedness but to the mildness of eternal punishment, as he redeemed all the damned.[15] And correspondingly the foreknown [person] is absolved from sin, not so that he is not punished perpetually at all, but so that he is not punished so grievously perpetually. And so (as Lincoln says) he redeemed sins, not acts but defects, whose malice is suspended by temporal grace.[16] And so the foreknown, whether seculars or clerics, however justly they seem to be set over the goods of God, are so only in a certain respect, while they are in temporal grace, and unjustly without qualification, while they altogether lack momentary charity. From which it is clear that judges, secular as well as ecclesiastical, very often fail in their judgements from the rules[17]

Notes

1. ***Policia***: the church's polity, its order of government. ***Prefectura in facie ecclesie***: an office of command as it appears before the church, outward appointment as against works. ***Sui curati***: the priest with the cure of its souls (glossary: ***curatus***).
2. ***Signis mortis factis in vestigio mortuorum defunctorum***: miracles reported at the remains and tombs of the dead, set against the works of the living. T. B reads ***quod quidem*** (465.5) and lacks ***mortuorum*** (465.6), which would remove the doubling ***mortuorum defunctorum***. R. Side-note 465.5.
3. ***Post illum ... in quo claruit***: only after a man whose life has shone with holiness may signs probably be believed to show that holiness, and even then they are weaker evidence than one fruitful work.
4. ***Patriis***: here countries, the earthly sense of ***patria*** (the glossary). ***Pars persone empte, ut canonizetur***: a relic of a person whose canonization was bought; ***empte*** could instead agree with ***pars***, "a part bought". R. A in the margin at 465.14: ***Nota de peregrinacione***. Side-note 465.14.
5. ***Evidencia talium***: the ground alleged for such cults. ***Nullum tale factum reprobo et pauca vel nulla approbo***: Wyclif condemns no particular case outright and approves few or none. ***Protunc***: at that time. R. A in the margin at 465.19: ***Nota de colentibus reliquias sanctorum*** (Loserth: below 192^{d}, without mark of reference).
6. ***Altrinsecus***: on both sides, of the worshippers and of the keepers of relics. ***Occupancium reliquias***: those who hold the relics.
7. ***Generacionis adultere***: Matthew 12:39 ("An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign"). C. ***Insensibilium***: of imperceptible things, set against ***sensibilium***. ***Tres hostes anime***: the world, the flesh and the devil. ***Dimissa religione***: ablative absolute. R. A in the margin at 466.10: ***Diabolus sepe seducit homines per corpora mortuorum et de Samuele, an ipse fuisset suscitatus*** (Loserth: above 193^{a}, without mark of reference). Side-note 466.10.
8. 1 Kings 28 (1 Samuel 28). C. ***Phitonissa***: a woman with a divining spirit. ***Pretendentem effigiem Samuel***: presenting Samuel's likeness. ***Post et ante***: before and after the consultation. T. AA$_1$ read ***pretendem*** (466.16). R. B in the margin at 466.20: ***Nota secundum Augustinum quod phitonissa suscitavit diabolum Sauli***.

9. ***De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae*** **II.10 (II.11, *De Samuele suscitato a Pythone*, in PL 35), under Augustine's name (Loserth: Aug. Opp. III, pars II, p. 18 of the appendix); for the author. 1 Kings 28:19. C. *Duos homines tam indignos*: Saul and the woman. *Reprobi*: "the reprobate", not *presciti*. R. A in the margin at 466.21: *Samuel*; *Augustinus*.**
10. ***Hunc sanctum*****: Augustine. *Feretrum pape bellantis*: the bier of "the warring pope", carried into a church amid reported signs; the pope, not named here, is Gregory VI (1045–6), whose bier, by Higden's story, a whirlwind drove through the closed doors of St Peter's (*Polychronicon* VI. 22; Wyclif, *De civili dominio* II. 17, pp. 253, 257, the place cited at 460.3–4). *Nemo faciet evidenciam quin*: no one will show that it is not lawful. R. B in the margin at 467.7: *Nota de papa bellatore*.**
11. ***Translative*****: by transference of the name. *Dyabolum figurantem*: the devil who took Samuel's figure. *Sentenciam*: the mind or teaching of God that the angel conveys. S. 1 John 5:8 ("these three are one"); *in officio* and the trinitarian reading are Wyclif's. Matthew 11:14 ("he is Elias").**
12. **Chrysostom on the members of the body; Loserth gives no reference; not located; not in the *Opus imperfectum*; perhaps the homilies on 1 Corinthians 12. C. *Ritus gentiles de maioritate civili*: gentile customs of civil greatness. *Copiosius atque humilius fructuose*: three adverbs, the last without a connective. T. B lacks *Ideo* (467.19). R. A in the margin at 467.19: *Crisostomus*. Side-note 467.14.**
13. ***Prescitus*****: one whom God foreknows will be damned (the glossary); the conclusion turns on the difference between grace for the present and the grace of predestination. *Ex dictis XXVII° capitulo libri V*: *De civili dominio* III (book 5 of the *Summa*); the matter is in its c. 26 (Society ed. IV, 615–17: baptism restores to grace *si non sit finaliter impenitens*), not c. 27, which is on testaments and suffrages. T. AA_1 read *quomodo deleatur* (467.28). R. A in the margin at 467.27: *Septima conclusio. Nullus prescitus recipit rite baptismum quo deleretur peccatum originale*. Side-note 467.27.**
14. ***Peccatum presciencie*****: the sin that answers to foreknowledge, final impenitence, against sin "according to present injustice". *Preter significacionem verbalem*: *preter* is Loserth's reading of an abbreviation in the codices (468.5). *Alias ... exposui*: *De civili dominio* III c. 24 (Society ed. IV, 520–21), where the two graces and the matching sins are set out: *equivoce insunt peccata venialia et mortalia in predestinatis et prescitis correspondenter ad gracias et ad penas*. *Alternatim*: crosswise, each kind of grace opposed to its kind of sin. T. AA_1 read *sicut aliquod* (468.2). R. A in the margin at 468.2: *Nota quid meretur prescitus per temporalem iniusticiam* (so the OCR of the page foot; Loserth: above 193[a], without mark of reference).**
15. ***Ille ... suspenditur*****: *ille* is the defect. *Et alias*: Loserth adds *scil. gracias* (468.11). *Rectiloqui*: those who speak strictly, without equivocation. *Miticia*: mildness. R. A in the margin at 468.13: *Nota*. Side-note 468.13.**
16. **Lincoln is Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln; Loserth gives only A's margin; not found in his letters (ed. Luard) or the opuscula in Brown's *Fasciculus* II. C. *Peccata redemit non actus sed defectus*: the sins redeemed are defects, not acts. T. B reads *peccata redeunt* (468.24). R. A in the margin at 468.23: *Lincolniensis*.**
17. ***Prefici bonis Dei*****: set over God's goods as stewards. *Momentanea caritas*: charity for the moment, as against final charity. The sentence continues in the next part. R. A in the margin at 468.30: *Conclusio. De iudiciis sepe dubiis iudicancium*. Side-note 468.26.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **464: *quia* (alinea letter c and margin T glued)**
  - **465: *non* (folio mark 192[d] glued)**
  - **465: *operibus* [NW]**
  - **466: *efficaciter***
  - **466: ∅ (has is from the English side-note "The devil has"; print has Nam (main token pos 61))**
  - **466: ∅ (boxed item is the alinea letter V at the right edge)**
  - **466: *sensibilium***
  - **466: *I°* (tall capital I, same height as R)**
  - **466: *XXVIII^{vo}* (superscript vo)**
  - **466: *II°* (tall capitals)**
  - **466: *quia* (trailing 1 is a note/margin mark, not text) [NW]**
  - **467: *ad* (folio mark 193a glued)**
  - **468: ∅ (previous page closing text (est gracia predestinacionis); p468 line starts destinacionis et aliqua gracia)**
  - **466: ∅ (duplicate: torpente already at 37) [DELX]**

Part 8: Human judgements against the judgement of God; the good born of the wicked

Loserth pp. 469.1–471.12

¶1 469.1–471.12

469.1 *Judges decide wrongly from not knowing who is predestinate.*

[469] **et iudiciis prime iusticie. Si enim secundum leges hominum iudex iudicans seculare dominium vel ecclesiasticum officium pro procreato extra matrimonium quem vocat filium populi et illegitimum, quantumcunque predestinatus et habilis fuerit quoad Deum, multo and the judgements of first justice.[1] For if, according to the laws of men, a judge who adjudges a secular lordship or an ecclesiastical office in favour of one begotten outside marriage, whom they call a son of the people and**

469.19 *Augustine said that civil laws are mostly unjust,*
470.13 *Fourfold division of Christians.*
471.4 *Prelates should be removable for bad behaviour.*

magis iudex iudicans pro prescito quem Deus decrevit inhabilem iniuste iudicat, quia contrarie iusticie legis Dei. Nec valet ficta excusacio qua dicitur quod iudex facit suam diligenciam iudicando secundum suam noticiam, et nisi forent talia iudicia, maius malum contingeret. Nam quoad primum constat quod in talibus ambiguis, utrum iniusta fuerint, debet homo dubium illud dimittere et partem securam eligere. Hoc enim docuerunt Christus et sui apostoli tam scripto quam opere. Et quantum ad secundam partem, patet quod non est peccandum vel venialiter propter aliquod bonum signabile acquirendum vel malum culpe aut pene persone vel perpetuo precavendum. Et ex istis patet veritas conclusionis beati Augustini Epistola XXXVII[a] ad Bonifacium quod leges hominum quas sanctus vocat iura civilia communiter sunt iniuste. Nam supposito quod Petrus sit predestinatus, carnaliter illegitimus, vendicans hereditatem vel ecclesiasticum officium, et supposito quod Paulus prescitus sit legitimus, vendicans illud idem beneficium, Petrus tamen habilis et Paulus inhabilis quoad Deum, et sint duo iudices quorum primus iudicet pro Paulo secundum leges hominum allegatas et testificaciones legalis testimonii plane depositas et iudicet secundus iudex pro Petro ex revelacione qua noscit Deum iudicare Petrum habilem ad datum beneficium et Paulum inhabilem, [470] et patet quod secundus iudex iudicat iustum iudicium, et per consequens primus iudicando sibi contrarie iudicat secundum faciem et iniustum iudicium; et talis perplexitas est communiter in humano iudicio. Et patet possibilitas casus ex sentencia Augustini super Johannis, Sermone XI°, super illud Johannis III°, 1: Erat homo ex phariseis, ubi notat scripturam Exodi III°, quare Deus signanter dicit: Ego sum Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, cum Noe, Job, Moyses et alii multi erant patres veteres nominandi, et respondet quod in istis tribus patriarchis qui erant principia generis Hebreorum, Israelitarum et Judeorum figuratum est genus populi christiani. Nam illi tres habuerunt prolem de liberis et ancillis secundum divisionem quadruplicem; et sic est in populo christiano. Nam sicut Abraham genuit ex Sara libera Isaac bonum, sic ex Agar ancilla figurans malos (ut notat Apostolus Galatis IV°, 30) peperit Ysmahelem. Iterum Rebeca uxor Isaac nedum peperit Jacob bonum sed Esau malum tam nomine quam figura, et Jacob de liberis et ancillis peperit duodecim patriarchas. Sic ergo habemus bonos procreatos ex bonis, ut Ysaac de Sara, malos de malis, ut Ysmael de Agar ancilla, malos de bonis, ut Esau de Rebeca, bonos de malis, ut sunt filii Jacob quibus datur hereditas de ancillis. Correspondenter (ut dixi superius) inter christianos quicunque servaverint semen fidei patris nostri Jesu, de quantumcunque malis processerint quoad carnem,

illegitimate, [judges unjustly,] however predestinate and qualified he may have been with respect to God, much more does a judge who adjudges in favour of a foreknown [man], whom God has decreed unqualified, judge unjustly, since [he judges] contrary to the justice of God's law.[2] Nor does the feigned excuse avail by which it is said that the judge does his diligence by judging according to his knowledge, and that, were there not such judgements, a greater evil would happen. For as to the first [part], it is evident that in such ambiguous cases, whether they were unjust, a man ought to leave that doubtful [course] and choose the safe part. For this Christ and his apostles taught, in writing as well as in deed. And as to the second part, it is clear that one is not to sin even venially for the sake of acquiring any signifiable good, or of guarding against an evil of guilt or of punishment, for a person or perpetually.[3] And from these things the truth is clear of the conclusion of blessed Augustine in Letter 37 to Boniface, that the laws of men, which the saint calls civil laws, are commonly unjust.[4] For supposing that Peter is predestinate, illegitimate according to the flesh, claiming an inheritance or an ecclesiastical office, and supposing that Paul, foreknown, is legitimate, claiming that same benefice, Peter nevertheless qualified and Paul unqualified with respect to God; and let there be two judges, of whom the first judges for Paul according to the laws of men alleged and the testimonies of legal witness plainly deposed, and the second judge judges for Peter from a revelation by which he knows that God judges Peter qualified for the given benefice and Paul unqualified: [470] then it is clear that the second judge judges a just judgement, and consequently the first, by judging contrary to him, judges according to the appearance, and an unjust judgement; and such perplexity is common in human judgement.[5] And the possibility of the case is clear from the teaching of Augustine on John, Sermon 11, on that [text] of John 3:1, "There was a man of the Pharisees", where he notes the scripture of Exodus 3, why God expressly says: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac", although Noe, Job, Moses and many others were old fathers who might have been named; and he answers that in these three patriarchs, who were the beginnings of the race of the Hebrews, the Israelites and the Jews, the race of the christian people is figured.[6] For those three had offspring by free women and by bondwomen, according to a fourfold division; and so it is in the christian people. For as Abraham begot of Sara, a free woman, Isaac, who was good, so of Agar, a bondwoman, figuring the wicked (as the Apostle notes, Galatians 4:30), he brought forth Ismael. Again Rebecca, Isaac's

de quantumcunque malis sacramenta et legem Dei receperint, si perseveranciam finalem servaverint, sunt finaliter premiandi. [471]Ex quibus patet quod natale vicium sanari potest per viam morum tam quoad celeste beneficium quam terrenum, nec dubium quin dimisso affectu primatus vel data prepositura amovibili iuxta testimonium digni operis vel indigni foret melius in ecclesia quam est modo. Leges ergo secundum quas iudicatur contra magis habilem quoad Deum pro minus habili vel indigno sunt omnino iniuste vel, si non sic iudicatur secundum leges illas nec ille sufficiant habilitatem hominis ad talia edocere, stultum foret legibus illis in iudiciis cecis intendere et evidenciam operis quam Deus dedit relinquere.

wife, bore not only Jacob, who was good, but Esau, who was wicked in name as well as in figure; and Jacob, of free women and bondwomen, brought forth the twelve patriarchs. So, then, we have the good begotten of the good, as Isaac of Sara; the wicked of the wicked, as Ismael of Agar the bondwoman; the wicked of the good, as Esau of Rebecca; the good of the wicked, as are the sons of Jacob to whom the inheritance is given, [born] of the bondwomen.[7] Correspondingly (as I said above), among christians, whoever keep the seed of the faith of our father Jesus, from however wicked [parents] they have proceeded as to the flesh, from however wicked [men] they have received the sacraments and God's law, if they keep final perseverance, are finally to be rewarded.[8] [471]From which it is clear that the defect of birth can be healed by way of conduct, as to the heavenly benefice as well as the earthly; nor is there doubt that, the affection for primacy being given up, or the office of superior being given as removable according to the testimony of worthy or unworthy work, it would be better in the church than it is now.[9] The laws, then, according to which judgement is given against one more qualified with respect to God in favour of one less qualified or unworthy, are altogether unjust; or, if judgement is not so given according to those laws, and they do not suffice to teach a man's qualification for such things, it would be foolish to attend to those laws in blind judgements and to abandon the evidence of work which God has given.[10]

Notes

1. The print reads *et iudiciis prime iusticie* (469.1). The sentence runs on from the previous part: judges very often fail "from the rules and the judgements of first justice". *Prima iusticia*: the first justice, God's, against which human judgements are measured. R. Side-note 469.1.
2. The *si* clause has no finite verb of its own: *iniuste iudicat* serves both halves of the comparison, hence "[judges unjustly]". *Quem vocat*: the subject is the law of men, hence "they call". *Filium populi*: a child with no acknowledged father, whom human law bars from lordship and office. *Habilis* is rendered "qualified", the positive of *inhabilis* (glossary: "unqualified"). After *quia contrarie iusticie legis Dei* the verb *iudicat* is understood.
3. *Ficta excusacio* has two parts, the judge's diligence according to his knowledge and the greater evil averted; Wyclif answers each in turn. *Partem securam*: the safe side in a doubt. *Bonum signabile*: any good that can be named. *Malum culpe aut pene persone vel perpetuo precavendum*: *persone vel perpetuo* is obscure; "personal or perpetual" (*perpetue* with *pene*) is possible; translated as printed. R. A in the margin at 469.8: *Ficcio*.
4. Augustine, "Letter 37 to Boniface": Loserth says the sentence is not in the letter to Boniface (his Ep. 185, Opp. II, p. 643) but is rather in the letter to Macedonius, *Quaedam inter eos iura constituuntur quae appellantur civilia, non quod hinc fiat, ut bene utentes sint* (Opp. II, p. 534). The letter to Macedonius is Ep. 153, c. 6, in the modern numbering (PL 33). G. *Iura civilia*: *ius* in the sense of law. T. B reads *quod veritas* and lacks *beati* (469.19). R. A in the margin at 469.19: *Augustinus*. Side-note 469.19.
5. Peter and Paul are the names of a case, not the apostles. *Testificaciones legalis testimonii plane depositas*: testimonies deposed by witnesses valid in law. *Secundum faciem*: cf. John 7:24 ("Judge not according to the appearance: but judge just judgment"). *Perplexitas*: the judge's dilemma, kin to the *perplexus* of the glossary. T. AA_1 lack *patet* (470.1).
6. Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 11, on John 3:1 (Loserth: In Joh. Ev. cap. III, tract. XI, Opp. III, pars II, p. 378). Exodus 3:6 continues "and the God of Jacob". T. Loserth notes that the codices lack *et Deus Jacob* (470.9), though the three patriarchs follow; translated as printed. C. *Super Johannis*: on [the gospel of] John (Loserth). *Hebreorum, Israelitarum et Judeorum*: the three names of the one people, answering to the three patriarchs.

7. Galatians 4:22–31, the two sons of Abraham; 4:30 "Cast out the bondwoman and her son". The codices read *Gal. III*; the chapter is Loserth's correction (470.18). C. *Peperit* is used of fathers as of mothers, "brought forth". *Quibus datur hereditas de ancillis*: the sons born of the bondwomen who yet receive the inheritance; *de ancillis* could also go with *hereditas*. T. AA_1 lack *sic* (470.17). R. A in the margin at 470.18: *Nota nativitatem bonorum ex malis et econtra*. Side-note 470.13.
8. *Patris nostri Jesu*: Christ as father of the faithful, as Abraham of his seed. *De quantumcunque malis … receperint*: the sacraments and God's law avail though received from wicked ministers. *Ut dixi superius*: a loose cross-reference; on sacraments from wicked ministers cf. 448 and 464.
9. *Natale vicium*: the defect of birth, illegitimacy. *Per viam morum*: by conduct. *Beneficium* covers the heavenly benefit and the earthly benefice. *Data prepositura amovibili*: if the office of superior were granted as removable, on the evidence of the holder's works. R. A in the margin at 471.1: *Conclusio*. Side-note 471.4.
10. *Vel, si non sic iudicatur … nec ille sufficiant*: the second horn of the dilemma: if the laws do not so judge and cannot teach fitness, to rely on them is folly. *Ille* is *illae*, the laws. *Intendere* here is "attend to", not the thesis sense. T. B reads *legibus vel in* (471.10). R. After *relinquere* (471.12) the page foot gives a Bohemian gloss, *Jako czynye nassy pravilegiste*, which Loserth renders *ut faciunt nostri iuris legiste*, "as our legists do".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 469: *XXXVII*ª
  - 470: *et*
  - 470: *patet*
  - 470: *III°*
  - 470: *I* (x-height old-style arabic 1 (shorter than III capitals), leaf zoomed)
  - 471: *foret* [NW]
  - 471: *melius*
  - 471: *in*
  - 471: *iudicatur* [NW]

Chapter 20

Part 1: The song of the valiant woman; her finding, her price and her husband's trust (Prov. 31:10–11)

Loserth pp. 471.14–475.31

¶1 471.14–472.25
471.14 *This discussion should lead to knowledge of Scripture, especially the Apocalypse, the Song of the Church (Prov. XXXI) and the Canticles.*
472.11 *A short exposition of the Song of the virtuous woman.*
472.21 *It is in three parts: a) telling of the marriage of the Church b) of its office c) of its praise.*

[471]**Fructus huius longe contencionis de nostra sancta matre ecclesia foret sequens noticia scripture sacre, et per consequens dileccio sponsi et sponse inducens laborantes in ista fide fideliter in domum domini ad regulandum, ita quod illi applicetur illud Apoc. ultimo: Spiritus et sponsa dicunt: Veni. Quamvis autem quilibet liber scripture requirit pro eius sensu noticiam istius articuli fidei de ecclesia sancta catholica, specialiter tamen liber Apocalypsis, canticum ecclesie Proverbiorum XXXI° et Cantica canticorum. Quando enim partes ecclesie turbantur erga plurima, vocantur adolescentule non habentes ubera, quarum Salomon dicit non esse numerum propter volubilem affeccionem animi circa multa; sed quando Martha dimissa vita activa induit figuram Marie, intendens incomplete tamen uni necessario contemplando, inducta** [472]**in thalamum, secundum numerum octogenarium dicitur concubina; sed tercio plus accedens ad unitatem que est omnia in omnibus notatur sub nomine regine et sub numero sexagenario post miliciam triumphalem; sed quarto quando cessabit omnis exaccio, area tocius ecclesie plene purgata a palea per ventilabrum finalis iudicii, non derelicta in corpore tocius ecclesie macula sive ruga, tunc dicitur una columba adepto fine unitatis caritative, secundum quam tota ecclesia est Christus. Patet ista sentencia Canticorum VI° et sparsim alibi in processu. Intendo ergo illam partem mediam scilicet canticum de muliere forti succincte transcurrere et difficultates profundas tam expositorias quam scolasticas superioribus meis relinquere. Video tamen (licet obscure) quomodo omnis difficultas logica, philosophica vel methaphisica includitur in scriptura de sancta matre ecclesia, ymmo (ut habundancius loquar) si quid subtilitatis repertum est a nobis in aliqua istarum arcium, eius sentenciam innuit nobis spiritus sanctus in cantico sapientissimi Salomonis de sancta matre ecclesia, Proverbiorum XXXI°, 10, Mulierem fortem quis inveniet; quod potest dividi in tres partes, in quarum prima narratur ecclesie sancte coniugium, in secunda describitur eius officium et in tercia concluditur eius preconium.**

The fruit of this long contention about our holy mother the church would be the knowledge of holy scripture that follows, and consequently the love of the bridegroom and the bride, leading those who labour faithfully in this faith into the house of the Lord to rule [it], so that to it may be applied that [text] of the last [chapter] of the Apocalypse: "And the spirit and the bride say: Come."[1] And although every book of scripture requires for its sense the knowledge of this article of faith, the holy catholic church, yet especially [so] the book of the Apocalypse, the song of the church in Proverbs 31, and the Canticle of canticles.[2] For when the parts of the church are troubled about very many things, they are called young maidens having no breasts, of whom Solomon says there is no number, because of the fickle affection of the mind about many things; but when Martha, the active life left behind, puts on the figure of Mary, attending, though incompletely, to the one thing necessary by contemplating, brought [472]**into the bridechamber, she is called a concubine, according to the number eighty;[3] but thirdly, coming nearer to the unity which is all in all, she is marked under the name of queen and under the number sixty, after the triumphal soldiery; but fourthly, when all exaction shall cease, the floor of the whole church being fully purged of the chaff by the fan of the final judgement, and no spot or wrinkle being left in the body of the whole church, then she is called one dove, the end of the unity of charity being attained, according to which the whole church is Christ.[4] This teaching is clear from Canticles 6, and here and there elsewhere in the course of the book. I intend, therefore, to run briefly through that middle part, namely the song of the valiant woman, and to leave the deep difficulties, expository as well as scholastic, to my superiors. Yet I see (though darkly) how every difficulty, logical, philosophical or metaphysical, is included in scripture concerning holy mother church; indeed (to speak more abundantly), if any subtlety has been found by us in any of these arts, the Holy Spirit intimates its teaching to us in the song of the most wise Solomon about holy mother church, Proverbs 31:10, "Who shall find a valiant woman?" It can be divided into three parts: in the**

¶2 472.26–475.31
473.1 *Verse Io. By the virtuous woman we understand the Church.*
473.11 *Christ has part in the making of his spouse, as Adam of Eve.*
474.19 *The Church is fit to espouse Christ because of the predestination of her members,*
475.4 *which makes her love to the end.*
475.24 *Verse II. The husband's trust in his spouse.*

[472]**Primo autem supponitur esse unum primum coniugium quod sit metrum omnium aliorum inter fortissimum virorum et mulierem sibi proporcionalem faciendum, nam secundum philosophos in omni genere est reperibile tale primum. In genere ergo coniugii supposita incarnacione verbi (quod est Deus fortis et potens in prelio) oportet invenire sibi coniugem bene fortem. Ideo primo de illa queritur: Mulierem fortem** [473]**quis inveniet, ubi secundum sanctos doctores concorditer oportet per mulierem fortem intelligere sanctam matrem ecclesiam, quia quamvis sexaginta sint regine et octoginta concubine adolescentularumque non est numerus (ut dicitur Canticorum VI°, 7), tamen ex omnibus illis constat una columba (ut dicitur ibidem). Quis ergo inveniet dignam coniugem tanto sponso? Et videtur quod nullus hominum nisi ipse, nam in constitucione primi carnalis coniugii primus coniux concurrebat materialiter ad causandum suam coniugem (ut patet Genesis III°): ergo multo magis in illo coniugio celesti oportet coniugem concurrere in causa triplici ad causandum suam coniugem ex natura angelica et humana. Primo ergo opere creacionis secundum raciones exemplares in verbo, secundo vero opere ministracionis secundum raciones seminales in genere humano, et tercio opere recreacionis in Christo facto circulariter ista duo inventa est mulier ista fortis. Nam secundum illam partem lapsa in devium erravit, sicut ovis que periit in vepribus peccatorum, et (ut dicitur Matthei XVIII°, 12) pastor et sponsus dimissis nonaginta novem ovibus in pascuis semper virentibus in celo perditam ovem invenit et humeris suis labore et penalitate debita reportavit. Nec moveat quod beatus Augustinus in tractatu huius cantici dicit quod hec mulier est civitas supra montem posita quam difficile est nescire. Videmus enim modo per fidem secundum quam tamquam lucem secundam illuminat mundum, faciens nos luscos tenebra ignorancie obfuscatos videre eam speculariter et obscure, sic quod ignoramus quoad noticiam distinctam partes ecclesie, sicut videns civitatem longinque, confuse et** [474]**indistincte videt domos eius et alia ornamenta. Nec sufficeremus sic cernere, nisi dicta mulier a sponso prius in racionibus exemplaribus et visceribus misericordie sit inventa. Unde post conclusionem propositam supponendo quod ille invenit hanc mulierem qui secundum divinitatem est immensus, a cuius oculis nichil potest esse absconditum et secundum humanitatem ascendit super omnes celos, subditur inventorem illum quoad naturam et quoad tempus respectu patrum veterum esse procul, sicut et mulier**

first of these the marriage of the holy church is narrated, in the second its office is described, and in the third its praise is concluded.[5]

Now first it is supposed that there is one first marriage, which is to be the measure of all the others, to be made between the strongest of men and a woman proportioned to him; for according to the philosophers such a first is to be found in every genus.[6] In the genus of marriage, then, the incarnation of the Word being supposed (who is God "strong and mighty in battle"), a spouse right strong must be found for him. Therefore first it is asked of her: "Who shall find a valiant woman?" [473]**Here, according to the holy doctors with one accord, we must understand by the valiant woman holy mother church; for although "there are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and young maidens without number" (as is said in Canticles 6:7), yet of all of them one dove is made up (as is said in the same place). Who, then, shall find a spouse worthy of so great a bridegroom? And it seems: no one of men but he himself; for in the constitution of the first carnal marriage the first spouse concurred materially in causing his spouse (as is clear from Genesis 3); much more, then, in that heavenly marriage must the spouse concur in a threefold cause in causing his spouse out of angelic and human nature.[7] First, then, by the work of creation, according to the exemplary reasons in the Word; secondly, by the work of ministration, according to the seminal reasons in the human race; and thirdly, by the work of re-creation in Christ, made in a circle these two, this valiant woman was found. For according to that part she fell and strayed into the byway, like the sheep that perished among the brambles of sins; and (as is said in Matthew 18:12) the shepherd and bridegroom, leaving the ninety-nine sheep in the ever-green pastures in heaven, found the lost sheep and carried it back on his shoulders with due labour and hardship.[8] Nor let it trouble [anyone] that blessed Augustine says in his treatise on this song that this woman is a city seated on a mountain, which it is hard not to know. For we see now through faith, according to which, as a second light, she illuminates the world, making us, purblind and darkened by the darkness of ignorance, see her as in a glass and darkly; so that we are ignorant, as to distinct knowledge, of the parts of the church, as one who sees a city from far off sees indistinctly and** [474]**without distinction its houses and its other ornaments.[9] Nor should we suffice to discern even so, unless the said woman had first been found by the bridegroom in the exemplary reasons and in the bowels of mercy. Hence, after the conclusion propounded,**

illa procul erat localiter a Iudeis, partim in celo secundum angelos et partim in terra secundum gentes pro tempore gracie convertendas, sicut procul erat a Deo per culpam, cum non sit possibile quicquam esse a Deo distancius quam peccatum. Inventa itaque muliere forti copulanda in primo coniugio videndum est secundo de suis passionibus, utrum sit apta nubere tanto sponso; et respondet litera consequenter quod de ultimis finibus precium eius. Quod videtur sic posse intelligi: causa finalis quare ecclesia est valida, ut Christo matrimonialiter coniungatur, sunt predestinaciones suorum membrorum. Nam causa celestis particularis coniugii est opus meritorium viatoris, et causa operis meritorii est gracia infusa, et causa gracie infuse est predestinacio que quasi ultimus finis citra Deum dignificat ecclesiam ad illud coniugium, quia (ut dicitur Johannis I°, 16), de eius plenitudine nos omnes accepimus graciam pro gracia. Nam ex caritate eterna dedit nobis caritatem subiectivam secundum quam cum opere meritorio simus digni vel (ut habet litera Augustini) preciosiorem preciosis lapidibus que eiuscemodi est; cum quo verbo innuit eiusmodi [475] mulierem in mente habere dilecionem usque ad finem; que Canticorum VIII°, 6 fortis ut mors dicitur. Ex quo sequitur quod mulier habens membra dileccione sic forcia sit sponsa racione consumate fortitudinis preciosa, quia usque ad finem diligit sponsum suum. Alii autem lapides scilicet caritates horales finaliter excidentes (ut fuit in Donato et aliis prescitis) non sunt tanti precii, ut subiecta sua sponso ecclesie coniungantur; vel tercio intelligitur non contrarie supradictis quod de ultimis finibus celorum et seculorum est precium, unde est dignitas huius sponse; vel quarto de divinitate ac humanitate in Christo qui sunt ultimi fines circuli intelligibilis est precium huius mulieris, ut patet ex fide, quia sicut verbum creat, ita dignificat sponsam suam. Et de ipso dicitur Psalmo XVIII°, 7: A summo celo egressio eius, et in ultima etate seculi consummata est gracia unionis virtute cuius originatur tota dignitas huius coniugii; Ia Cor. X°, 11 scribitur: Nos sumus in quos fines seculorum devenerunt. Inventa ergo coniuge et inventa eius dignitate ex precio vel valore, cum sponsus sit totum per se dignificans opus suum non restat quid tardaret illud coniugium. Ideo innuitur tercio affidacio celestis, dum subditur: Confidit in ea cor viri sui. Plane, inquit Augustinus, confidit et ut confidamus in eum edocuit. Prescius predestinacionis proprie confidit qui falli non poterit. Mulier autem cum filiis suis potest in ipsum confidere, eo quod mentiri non poterit nec sponse vel membris suis deficere, sed totus timor huius affidacionis stat in nostra desidia quod per nos non sit precium vel dos huius coniugii consummata.

supposing that he found this woman who according to divinity is immense, from whose eyes nothing can be hidden, and according to humanity ascended above all the heavens, it is added that that finder was "far" off, as to nature and as to time, with respect to the old fathers; as that woman too was far off in place from the Jews, partly in heaven in the angels and partly on earth in the gentiles to be converted in the time of grace, as she was far from God by guilt, since nothing can possibly be more distant from God than sin.[10] The valiant woman to be joined in the first marriage having, then, been found, we must see secondly about her attributes, whether she is fit to marry so great a bridegroom; and the letter answers next that "from the uttermost coasts is the price of her". This, it seems, can be understood thus: the final cause why the church is strong, so as to be joined to Christ in matrimony, is the predestinations of its members. For the cause of the particular heavenly marriage is the meritorious work of the wayfarer, and the cause of the meritorious work is infused grace, and the cause of infused grace is predestination, which, as the last end, as it were, short of God, makes the church worthy of that marriage; since (as is said in John 1:16) "of his fulness we all have received grace for grace."[11] For out of eternal charity he gave us subjective charity, according to which, with meritorious work, we are worthy, or (as Augustine's text has it) "more precious than precious stones is she who is of this kind"; by which word he intimates that a woman of this kind [475] has in mind love unto the end, which in Canticles 8:6 is called "strong as death".[12] From which it follows that a woman having members so strong in love is a bride precious by reason of consummate strength, since she loves her bridegroom unto the end. But the other stones, namely charities for an hour that finally fall away (as it was in Donatus and other foreknown men), are not of such price that their subjects should be joined to the bridegroom of the church;[13] or, thirdly, it is understood, not contrary to what was said above, that the price is from the uttermost ends of the heavens and of the ages, whence is the dignity of this bride; or, fourthly, the price of this woman is from the divinity and the humanity in Christ, which are the uttermost ends of the intelligible circle, as is clear, as faith teaches, since as the Word creates, so it makes its bride worthy. And of him it is said in Psalm 18:7: "His going out is from the end of heaven"; and in the last age of the world the grace of union was consummated, by virtue of which the whole dignity of this marriage takes its origin; in 1 Corinthians 10:11 it is written: "We are [those] upon whom the ends of the world are come."[14] The spouse, then, having been found,

and her dignity found from her price or value, since the bridegroom is the whole, of himself making his work worthy, nothing remains that should delay that marriage. Therefore, thirdly, the heavenly affiance is intimated, when it is added: "The heart of her husband trusteth in her." "Plainly," says Augustine, "he trusts, and he has taught us to trust in him. Foreknowing his own predestination, he trusts who cannot be deceived." And the woman with her sons can trust in him, because he cannot lie, nor fail his bride or his members; but the whole fear of this affiance stands in our sloth, lest through us the price or dowry of this marriage should not be consummated.[15]

Notes

1. *Fructus ... foret sequens noticia*: *fructus* is the subject and *noticia* the complement. *Illi applicetur*: most naturally the love of bridegroom and bride. T. B reads *ad regnandum*, "to reign" (471.17–18). The codices read *Sponsus et sponsa dicunt*; Loserth corrected the text from Apocalypse 22:17 (471.19). R. Side-note 471.14.

2. *Canticum ecclesie Proverbiorum XXXI*: the song of the valiant woman, Proverbs 31:10–31, read as a song of the church. *Istius articuli fidei de ecclesia sancta catholica*: the creed's article of the holy catholic church. T. A reads *quilibet librum* (471.20).

3. *Turbantur erga plurima*: Luke 10:41 ("thou art troubled about many things"); *uni necessario*, Luke 10:42 ("one thing is necessary"). *Non habentes ubera*: Canticles 8:8 ("Our sister is little, and hath no breasts"). The numbers are those of Canticles 6:7. C. Four grades follow: the young maidens (the many-minded), the concubines (eighty: contemplatives, still incomplete), the queens (sixty), and the one dove. R. A in the margin at 472.1: *De adolescentulis, concubinis et reginis Salomonis*.

4. *Milicia*: the soldiery of the church in the Pauline figure, here its warfare brought to triumph (glossary: *milicia*). S. *Area ... ventilabrum*: Matthew 3:12 ("Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor"). *Macula sive ruga*: Ephesians 5:27 ("not having spot or wrinkle"). *Omnia in omnibus*: 1 Corinthians 15:28. *Una columba*: Canticles 6:8. C. *Exaccio*: the exaction of toil and tribute laid on the church in this life. *Unitatis caritative*: the unity of charity. T. B reads *si tercio* (472.2).

5. *Illam partem mediam*: of the three books just named, the middle one, Proverbs 31. *Superioribus meis*: my betters. *Tam expositorias quam scolasticas*: of exegesis and of the schools. *Quod potest dividi*: *quod* refers to the song. R. A in the margin at 472.22: *Exposicio illius: Mulierem fortem quis inveniet*. Side-notes 472.11, 472.21.

6. *Primum ... metrum omnium aliorum*: the first in a genus as the measure of the rest; for the philosophers' principle cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* X.1, 1052b18–20, where to be one is to be the first measure of each kind. *Faciendum* goes with *coniugium*. T. B reads *omne unum* (472.26). R. A in the margin at 472.26: *Supposicio*.

7. *Deus fortis et potens in prelio*: Psalm 23:8 reads *Dominus* ("the Lord who is strong and mighty: the Lord mighty in battle"). Proverbs 31:10; Canticles 6:7–8. *Genesis III°*: the forming of Eve is Genesis 2:21–22. C. *Concurrebat materialiter*: Adam's rib as matter. *In causa triplici*: the three works that follow. T. B reads *quod est dominus* (472.31). R. A in the margin at 473.14: *Nota de coniugio* (superscript *matrimonio*) *Christi et sponsa ecclesie*. Side-notes 473.1, 473.11.

8. *Raciones exemplares ... seminales*: the exemplars of things in the Word and the seed-causes set in creatures, Augustine's terms. *In Christo facto circulariter ista duo*: Christ, in whom God and man are joined, closes the circle (cf. 475.13–14, *ultimi fines circuli intelligibilis*); the construal is doubtful. *Secundum illam partem*: the human part, which fell. S. Matthew 18:12; *humeris suis*, Luke 15:5 ("lay it upon his shoulders").

9. Augustine, *Sermo* 37 on Proverbs 31 (Loserth: Aug. Sermo XXXVII de Prov. cap. XXXI, Opp. V, p. 181). *Civitas supra montem posita*: Matthew 5:14 ("A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid"). *Speculariter et obscure*: 1 Corinthians 13:12 ("through a glass in a dark manner"). C. *Tamquam lucem secundam*: the church lights the world by faith as a second light. *Luscos*: one-eyed, purblind. G. *Confuse et indistincte*: *confuse* by the glossary "indistinctly"; *indistincte* is rendered "without distinction".

10. *In racionibus exemplaribus et visceribus misericordie*: in God's exemplars and in his mercy (cf. Luke 1:78, "the bowels of the mercy of our God"). *Procul*: Wyclif reads the verse's "far" of the finder (far from the old fathers in nature and time) and of the woman (far in place, and by guilt). S. *Ascendit super omnes celos*: Ephesians 4:10. R. A in the margin at 474.7: *Solus Christus potuit talem mulierem fortem invenire, que est sua sponsa*.

11. *Passionibus*: her attributes (glossary: *passio*), not her sufferings. C. *Valida*: strong, answering to *fortis*. *Citra Deum*: short of God. *Sunt predestinaciones*: the plural predicate is kept as "the predestinations". S. Proverbs 31:10; John 1:16 (Wyclif without *et*). R. A in the margin at 475.5: *Nota de passionibus ecclesie, an posset nubere Christo*. Side-note 474.19.

12. Augustine's text of Proverbs 31:10 is the Old Latin, *pretiosior est lapidibus pretiosis quae eiuscemodi est*, not the Vulgate (Loserth: Aug. l.c. cap. III, at 474.31). Canticles 8:6 ("love is strong as death"). C. *Preciosiorem* stands in the accusative as the object of *habet*. *Caritatem subiectivam*: charity as it is in its subject, given out of the eternal charity that is God. R. Side-note 475.4.

13. ***Lapides***: the stones of Augustine's verse. ***Caritates horales***: charities for an hour, failing at the end (cf. ***momentanea caritas***, 468.29). ***Donato***: Donatus, the schismatic of Augustine's day, named among the foreknown who fall away. ***Subiecta sua***: their subjects, those in whom such charity is. T. B reads ***licet caritates*** (475.6). For ***sponso ecclesie*** (475.8–9) AA_1 read ***sponsa ecclesia*** and B ***sponso ecclesia***; translated as printed.
14. Psalm 18:7. 1 Corinthians 10:11, where ***Nos sumus*** is not in the Apostle's text (Loserth). C. ***Ultimi fines***: the verse's "uttermost coasts" read of heaven and the ages, and of the Godhead and manhood in Christ. ***Gracia unionis***: the grace of the union of the two natures. T. B reads ***Eciam de*** (475.15) and ***erigitur tota*** (475.18).
15. Proverbs 31:11. Augustine, the same sermon; Loserth gives Augustine's wording as ***Prescius confidit, falli non potest qui confidit***. C. ***Sit totum per se dignificans***: the bridegroom is himself the whole cause of the bride's worth. ***Affidacio***: betrothal by plighted trust; "affiance" keeps both senses and the play on ***confidit***. ***Dos***: dowry. T. B reads ***dictum coniugium*** (475.22–23) and ***prescitus*** (475.26). R. Side-note 475.24.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 471: ***CAP. XX.***
  - 471: ***illi*** [NW]
  - 471: ***dicunt***
  - 472: ***thalamum***
  - 472: ***difficultates***
  - 472: ***coniugium*** (main token holds the whole hyphenated con-iugium)
  - 473: ***mulierem*** [NW]
  - 473: ***III°***
  - 473: ***angelica*** (bold argument numeral 1 glued)
  - 473: ***dicit*** (folio mark 194a glued)
  - 474: ***indistincte***
  - 474: ***angelos*** (print ange-|los; main token anges covers both halves (no separate los token))
  - 474: ***distancius*** [NW]
  - 474: ***est*** (trailing 1 is a margin mark, not text) [NW]
  - 474: ***de***

Part 2: The office of the valiant woman: good to her husband, wool and flax, the merchant's ship, rising in the night (Prov. 31:11–15)

Loserth pp. 476.1–480.15

¶1 476.1–476.11
476.12 *The office of the Church.*
476.14 *Verse 12. All the works of the predestinate are profitable to the Church.*

[476] **Quarto infertur quod uxor tanti domini cuius sunt omnia et ipsa cum eo una persona (ut docetur Matthei XIX°, 5), erit sicut vitis habundans in lateribus domus sue, ideo subditur quod spoliis non indigebit. Non, inquit Augustinus, quia non querit spolia, cum diffusa per mundum eius trophea accipit tamquam sua, quia Sapiencie X°, 19 scribitur: Iusti tulerunt spolia impiorum. Et hinc nimirum dicit sponsa, Psalmo CXVIII°, 162: Letabor ego super eloquia tua, sicut qui invenit spolia multa. Et sic ista quadruplex proposicio declarat in parte predictum coniugium.**

Fourthly it is inferred that the wife of so great a lord, whose are all things, she being one person with him (as is taught in Matthew 19:5), will be "as a fruitful vine, on the sides of [her] house"; therefore it is added that "he shall have no need of spoils".[1] "Not," says Augustine, "because she does not seek spoils, since she receives as her own his trophies spread through the world"; for in Wisdom 10:19 it is written: "The just took the spoils of the wicked." And hence, no wonder, the bride says in Psalm 118:162: "I will rejoice at thy words, as one that hath found great spoil." And so this fourfold proposition declares in part the aforesaid marriage.[2]

¶2 476.12–476.14

[476] **Quoad secundam partem cantici in qua declaratur mulieris huius officium primo in generali premittitur quod sponsa tam grata, tam fida et tam fertiliter dotata**

As to the second part of the song, in which the office of this woman is declared, first it is premised in general that the bride, so pleasing, so faithful and so fruitfully dowered[3]

¶3 476.15–477.25
477.26 *Verse 13 specifies the work of the Church, in giving a law both for our outward and inward life.*

[476]**a viro reddet ei bonum et non malum omnibus diebus vite sue. Operatur, inquit Augustinus, viro suo bona eterna continue, quia (ut mihi videtur) omnes predestinati semper prosunt ecclesie sine dampnacionis sue demerito vel ecclesie detrimento. In hoc enim differt peccatum predestinati a peccato presciti quod primum est necessario remissibile et secundum dampnabile. Primum per accidens prodest ecclesie et peccanti (ut patet de peccato Petri) et secundum licet per accidens faciat ad bonum ecclesie, tamen continue sibi nocet, quia sicut quicquid predestinatus hic fecerit tendit ad sui salvacionem, sic quicquid prescitus hic fecerit tendit ad sui dampnacionem. Quod autem quidam dicunt peccatum predestinati dampnabile, equivocatur in nomine dampnabile sumpto large vel proprie. Large dicitur dampnabile culpandum quod perpetuo dampnaretur, si non foret Christi gracia** [477]**preservatum, et sic omnis peccator foret dampnabilis. Sed proprie solum illud dicitur dampnabile ad quod est Dei ordinacio, ut dampnetur, et sic nunquam hec mulier vel aliquod eius membrum fecit malum dampnabile sponso suo. Et (ut notat Augustinus) hec mulier fecit non sibi principaliter, sed sponso bonum quodcunque fecerit tamquam viro et capiti modo quo loquitur Apostolus IIª, Cor. V°, 15: Qui vivit iam non sibi vivat, sed ei qui mortuus est pro omnibus et resurrexit, sic quod ecclesia et quodlibet eius membrum quicquid operatum fuerit hoc facit, ut ei placeat cui se probavit. Omnes enim alii querunt que sua sunt, non que domini Jesu Christi. Et hec est racio (ut dixi superius), quare Christus non usus est proprietate civili in se nec in suis apostolis. Nec moveat quod nemo debet bonum reddere huic viro propter hoc quod omnis homo est servus sibi inutilis, cum fecerit omnia que rector iste precepit, ut dicitur Luce XVII°, 10; et Psalmo XV°, 2 dicitur: Dixi domino: Deus meus es tu, quoniam bonorum meorum non eges. Verum est quod Christus in persona propria non eget modo humanitus neque divinitus, sed nos egemus ut faciamus omnia nostra opera primo sibi, hoc est ad honorem suum et utilitatem sui corporis in quo eget.**

by her husband, "will render him good, and not evil all the days of her life." "She works," says Augustine, "eternal goods for her husband continually"; for (as it seems to me) all the predestinate always profit the church, without demerit of their damnation or detriment to the church.[4] For in this the sin of a predestinate [person] differs from the sin of a foreknown [person], that the first is necessarily remissible and the second damnable. The first by accident profits the church and the sinner (as is clear from the sin of Peter); and the second, although by accident it makes for the good of the church, yet continually harms the sinner himself; since, as whatever a predestinate [person] has done here tends to his salvation, so whatever a foreknown [person] has done here tends to his damnation.[5] And as for what some say, that the sin of a predestinate [person] is damnable: there is equivocation in the name "damnable", taken broadly or properly. Broadly, that blameworthy [thing] is called damnable which would be damned perpetually were it not [477]**preserved by the grace of Christ; and so every sinner would be damnable. But properly only that is called damnable for which there is an ordinance of God that it be damned; and so this woman, or any member of hers, never did evil damnable to her bridegroom.[6] And (as Augustine notes) whatever good this woman has done, she did not principally for herself but for the bridegroom, as for her husband and head, in the way in which the Apostle speaks in 2 Corinthians 5:15: "He who lives, let him not now live to himself, but unto him who died for all and rose again"; so that the church and each member of it, whatever it has worked, does it so as to please him to whom it has engaged itself. For all others seek the things that are their own, not the things that are the Lord Jesus Christ's.[7] And this is the reason (as I said above) why Christ did not use civil property, in himself or in his apostles. Nor let it trouble [anyone] that no one is to render good to this husband, on the ground that every man is an unprofitable servant to him when he has done all that this ruler commanded, as is said in Luke 17:10; and in Psalm 15:2 it is said: "I have said to the Lord, thou art my God, for thou hast no need of my goods." It is true that Christ in his own person has no need now, either humanly or divinely; but we have need to do all our works first for him, that is, to his honour and to the profit of his body, in which he has need.[8]**

¶4 477.26–478.18
478.4 *Both laws require observance.*

[477]**Habita solicitudine generali huius matrisfamilias, specificat secundo opus suum, cum subditur: Quesivit lanam et linum et**

The general care of this mother of the household having been treated, [the song] secondly specifies her work, when it is added: "She hath

478.19 *Verse 14. The Church is like a ship.*

operata est consilio manuum suarum. Secundum Augustinum lana est habitus collectus ex campo scripture ad regulandum vitam laudabilem corporalem et linum est habitus ad conversacionem spiritualem ducendam. Sic enim in ordine vestimentorum nostrorum corporalium interiora sunt linea, sed vestimenta exteriora sunt lanea. Correspondenter in vestibus anime que secundum fidem scripture sunt virtutes: [478] quidquid carne operamur, est a dextra sensibile: quidquid spiritu, in secreto. Oportet ergo hanc feminam cum sua familia indui hoc geminum vestimentum. Operari autem carne et non spiritu quamvis bonum videatur, utile tamen non est. Operari vero spiritu et non carne pigrorum est; nam dans elemosinam pro laude hominum nudam vestem videtur indui, sicut dicens sibi sufficere in consciencia sua Deum colere, nec quod debet ad ecclesiam ire vel ceteris christianis actibus sensibilibus immisceri. Talis, inquit Augustinus, nudam vestem lineam vult habere. Non sic docet hec mulier, sed instituit simul secundum praxim et theoricam operari, nam ad hoc colligere debemus hos habitus, ut consilio manuum operemur. Virtus enim secundum philosophos est propter opera, et hinc felicitas consistit in actu vel opere, et melior est virtute. Omnem autem virtutem moralem oportet prudenciam regulari, et ideo signanter dicitur quod hec mater operata est consilio manuum suarum.

sought wool and flax, and hath wrought by the counsel of her hands." According to Augustine, the wool is the habit gathered from the field of scripture for ruling a praiseworthy bodily life, and the flax is the habit for leading a spiritual manner of life. For so, in the order of our bodily garments, the inner ones are linen, but the outer garments are woollen. Correspondingly in the garments of the soul, which according to the faith of scripture are the virtues: [478] "whatever we work in the flesh is on the right hand, perceptible; whatever in the spirit, in secret."[9] This woman, then, with her household, must be clothed with this twofold garment. "And to work in the flesh and not in the spirit, though it seems good, yet is not profitable. But to work in the spirit and not in the flesh is [the part] of the slothful; for one who gives alms for the praise of men seems to be clothed with a bare garment, as [is] one who says that it suffices him to worship God in his conscience, and not that he ought to go to church or to take part in the other perceptible christian acts." "Such a one," says Augustine, "wants to have a bare linen garment."[10] Not so does this woman teach; but she sets [us] to work at once according to practice and theory; for we ought to gather these habits to this end, that we may work by the counsel of [our] hands. For virtue, according to the philosophers, is for the sake of works, and hence happiness consists in act or work, and is better than virtue. Now every moral virtue must be ruled [by] prudence; and therefore it is said expressly that this mother "hath wrought by the counsel of her hands",[11]

¶5 *478.19–480.15*
479.11 *Verse 15. The Church gives the "prey" of converted peoples, and distributes "a portion" of the law of God.*

[478] Unde ad denotandum varietatem operacionum huius matrone subiungit tercio: Facta est quasi navis institoris de longe portans panem suum. Notum est ex tractantibus de archa Noe et navicula Petri quomodo ecclesia similatur navi in qua divicie et diversa mercimonia congeruntur habetque intra se mercantes tam venditores quam eciam institores, et cum per totam habitabilem nostram saltem potestative diffunditur, ymmo per purgatorium atque celos, patet quod de longe portat panem quo pascitur. Navis autem nedum in figura tendit ad similitudinem matrone sed ligna levigata ad imitacionem ligni crucis composita evehunt navigantem in seculo, ne procellis undarum [479] et aliis maris periculis submergatur. Mercimonia et divicie huius navis sunt omnia genera virtutum et merita quibus bona patrie comparantur; sic pascitur anima viatrix per effluxum longinquum a triumphante ecclesia, sed anima purganda recipit panem ab ecclesia militante. Divicie, inquit Augustinus, in quibus pascitur et mercatur ecclesia sunt largiflue laudes sponsi, de quibus Psalmo CXII°

Hence, to denote the variety of the operations of this matron, he adds thirdly: "She is like the merchant's ship, she bringeth her bread from afar." It is known from those who treat of the ark of Noe and the little ship of Peter how the church is likened to a ship, in which riches and diverse merchandise are gathered, and it has within itself traders, sellers as well as merchants; and since it is spread through the whole of our habitable [world], at least potentially, indeed through purgatory and the heavens, it is clear that it carries from afar the bread by which it is fed.[12] And the ship not only in figure tends to the likeness of the matron, but its smoothed timbers, put together in imitation of the wood of the cross, bear up the voyager in the world, lest he be sunk by the storms of the waves [479] and the other perils of the sea. The merchandise and riches of this ship are all kinds of virtues, and the merits by which the goods of the homeland are purchased; so the wayfaring soul is fed by a far-off outflow from the church triumphant, but the soul to be purged receives bread

dicitur: A solis ortu usque ad occasum laudabile nomen domini. Non enim pascitur nec solicitatur membrum ecclesie nisi in laude domini. Sed quia nec navis dicta nec sui incole debent ab operibus ociari, ideo quarto subiungitur huius matrone provida prudencia operando. De nocte, inquit, surrexit deditque predam domesticis suis et cibaria ancillis suis. Nox secundum Augustinum est tempus quo tortores dyaboli persequuntur christicolas, in qua involuti peccatorum tenebris videntur nocere fidelibus, sed eis surgentibus ad vitam plus prosperam nocent realiter sibi ipsis. Unde quia in talibus tribulacionibus claruit et profecit ecclesia, sicut granum trituracione separatum a palea, ideo signanter dicit sapiens quod de nocte surrexit. Aporiamur, inquit apostolus, et non defecimus, IIª Corinth. IV°, 8 et Ysaie XXVI°, 9: Anima mea desideravit te in nocte, et Job XXXVI°, 20: Ne protrahas noctem ut ascendant populi. Dedit autem predam domesticis suis, quando viris evangelicis domesticis fidei dedit ex vi communionis sanctorum populum conversum ad Christum, quem dyabolus ante captivavit, et dedit cibaria ancillis suis, quando christianis inferioribus esurientibus et sicientibus iusticiam dedit pastum legis domini et potum in complemento iusticie delectandi. Et sic de matre nostra verificata est doctrina matrone Anne, Tobie X°, [480] ubi docta est a parentibus honorare soceros, diligere maritum, regere familiam, gubernare domum et se ipsam irreprehensibilem exhibere. Nec moveat quod filii ecclesie sunt ancille, cum vir tocius ecclesie sit eius dominus; quod figuratum est in Sara Genesis XVIII°, 12, vocante Abraham dominum suum (ut notat beatus Petrus Iª Petri III°, 6). Non timeat, inquit Augustinus, condicionem, sed speret miseracionem, quia revera si Deo servire sit regnare, ancilla domini est regina. Et hinc vere ac meritorie profitetur Psalmista Psalmo CXV°, 16: Ego, inquit, servus tuus et filius ancille tue. Oportet enim membra ecclesie precipue cavere ocium et servire continue, quia aliter non datur eis spirituale cibarium. Unde IIª Thessal. III°, 10 dicit Apostolus: Qui non laborat non manducet.

from the church militant.[13] "The riches," says Augustine, "in which the church is fed and trades are the overflowing praises of the bridegroom, of which it is said in Psalm 112: 'From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, the name of the Lord is worthy of praise.'" For a member of the church is not fed, nor busied, except in the praise of the Lord.[14] But since neither the said ship nor its inhabitants ought to be idle from works, therefore fourthly the provident prudence of this matron in working is added: "She hath risen," he says, "in the night, and given a prey to her household, and victuals to her maidens." The night, according to Augustine, is the time in which the devil's torturers persecute the worshippers of Christ, in which, wrapped in the darkness of sins, they seem to harm the faithful; but as these rise to a more prosperous life, they really harm themselves.[15] Hence, since in such tribulations the church has shone and profited, like grain separated from the chaff by threshing, the wise man therefore says expressly that "she hath risen in the night". "We are straitened," says the apostle, "and have not failed" (2 Corinthians 4:8); and Isaiah 26:9: "My soul hath desired thee in the night"; and Job 36:20: "Prolong not the night that people may come up."[16] And she gave a prey to her household when to evangelical men, those of the household of the faith, she gave, by force of the communion of saints, the people converted to Christ, whom the devil had before taken captive; and she gave victuals to her maidens when to lower christians, hungering and thirsting after justice, she gave the food of the Lord's law and the drink of delight in the fulfilment of justice.[17] And so the doctrine of the matron Anna, Tobias 10, is verified of our mother, [480] where [the daughter] was taught by her parents "to honour her father and mother in law, to love her husband, to take care of the family, to govern the house, and to behave herself irreprehensibly."[18] Nor let it trouble [anyone] that the sons of the church are handmaids, since the husband of the whole church is its lord; which is figured in Sara, Genesis 18:12, calling Abraham "her lord" (as blessed Peter notes, 1 Peter 3:6). "Let her not fear," says Augustine, "her condition", but let her hope for mercy; for truly, if to serve God is to reign, the handmaid of the Lord is a queen. And hence the Psalmist truly and meritoriously professes in Psalm 115:16: "I," he says, "am thy servant, and the son of thy handmaid." For the members of the church must especially beware of idleness and serve continually, since otherwise spiritual victuals are not given them. Hence the Apostle says in 2 Thessalonians 3:10: "He who does not labour, let him not eat."[19]

Notes

1. Matthew 19:5 ("they two shall be in one flesh"); Wyclif's *una persona* is his gloss. Psalm 127:3 ("Thy wife as a fruitful vine, on the sides of thy house"): Wyclif reads *domus sue*. Proverbs 31:11. C. *Spoliis non indigebit*: the verse's subject is the husband; Wyclif's comment turns at once to the wife. T. B reads *Quarto infert* (476.1); AA_1 lack *una* (476.2).
2. Augustine, *Sermo* 37 on Proverbs 31. The codices read *quia querit*; Loserth corrected to *quia non querit* from Augustine, whose text runs *Non quia non querit spolia, ideo non indigebit, sed quia multis abundabit* (476.5). Wisdom 10:19 ("Therefore the just took the spoils of the wicked"); Psalm 118:162. C. *Eius trophea*: her husband's trophies. *Quadruplex proposicio*: the four points drawn from verses 10–11 (the finding, the price, the trust, the spoils).
3. The editor's paragraph ends inside the sentence; it continues in the next paragraph. *Tam fertiliter dotata a viro*: so richly dowered by her husband. R. A in the margin at 476.12: *Secunda pars*. Side-notes 476.12, 476.14.
4. Proverbs 31:12. Augustine, the same sermon, whose text has *in omni tempore* for *continue* (476.17). C. *Sine dampnacionis sue demerito*: without any demerit that would bring their damnation. T. AA_1 lack *a* (476.15).
5. *Per accidens*: incidentally, not of its own nature. *De peccato Petri*: Peter's denial, which turned to his and the church's good. *Sibi nocet*: *sibi* is the foreknown sinner. T. B reads *Peccatum per accidens* (476.22) and lacks *et secundum ... tamen* (476.23). R. A in the margin at 476.20: *Differencie inter peccatum presciti et predestinati*.
6. *Equivocatur in nomine dampnabile*: the word is used equivocally. *Culpandum*: the blameworthy act. *Ad quod est Dei ordinacio, ut dampnetur*: what God has ordained to damnation. *Fecit malum dampnabile sponso suo* answers to the verse, "will render him good, and not evil". T. AA_1 lack *equivocatur ... dampnabile* (476.29).
7. Augustine on the verse. 2 Corinthians 5:15 ("that they also who live may not now live to themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again"): Wyclif's wording differs. *Ut ei placeat cui se probavit*: 2 Timothy 2:4 ("that he may please him to whom he hath engaged himself"). Philippians 2:21 ("For all seek the things that are their own not the things that are Jesus Christ's"): Wyclif adds *alii* and *domini*.
8. *Ut dixi superius*: cf. 303. *Proprietate civili*: civil property, the ownership of human law. *Nemo debet bonum reddere*: the objection is that no one can owe or render good to Christ. *Modo*: now. S. Luke 17:10 ("We are unprofitable servants"); Psalm 15:2.
9. Proverbs 31:13: Wyclif's *consilio* for the Vulgate's *consilia*. Augustine, the same sermon, worked over with some words changed (Loserth, 478.4; his text *Quidquid carne operamur, in promptu est: quidquid spiritu, in secreto*). C. *A dextra sensibile*: "on the right hand, perceptible", the open work set against the secret. T. B lacks *carne* and reads *ad extra* for *a dextra* (478.1), "is outward, perceptible", closer to Augustine's *in promptu*; translated as printed.
10. The words from *Operari autem* to *immisceri* are printed as Augustine's, as is *Talis ... habere*. *Nudam vestem*: one garment without the other; the almsgiver for praise has the outer without the inner, the one content with conscience the inner without the outer. *Pigrorum est*: the mark of the slothful. R. Side-note 478.4.
11. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*: virtue for the sake of activity, happiness an activity and better than virtue, and the moral virtues ruled by prudence (I.8, 1098b31–1099a7; X.6, 1176a33–b2; I.12, 1101b10–1102a4; VI.13, 1144b30–1145a6). C. *Secundum praxim et theoricam*: in practice and theory together. *Prudenciam regulari*: read as *prudencia*, "be ruled by prudence"; the accusative as printed would make prudence the subject of a passive. T. B reads *moralem et potenciam oportet enim et ideo* (478.16–17).
12. Proverbs 31:14. C. *Tractantibus de archa Noe et navicula Petri*: the expositors of the ark and of Peter's boat as figures of the church. *Institores* is "merchants", as in the verse; *mercantes* "traders". *Potestative*: potentially, in reach of its power. R. Side-note 478.19.
13. *Ligna levigata*: the planed timbers of the ship. *Evehunt*: bear up, carry over. *Per effluxum longinquum a triumphante ecclesia*: the wayfarer is fed from the far-off church triumphant; the soul in purgatory receives from the church militant (its prayers and suffrages). *Comparantur*: are bought.
14. Augustine, with the words changed (Loserth, 479.6). Psalm 112:3; the codices read *CXXII*, corrected by Loserth (479.8). C. *Solicitatur*: is busied.
15. Proverbs 31:15. Augustine, Sermo 37, where the nights are tribulations; the devil's torturers are Wyclif's. C. *Tortores dyaboli*: the devil's torturers, the persecutors. *Eis surgentibus*: as the faithful rise. R. Side-note 479.11.
16. 2 Corinthians 4:8: the Vulgate has *aporiamur, sed non destituimur* ("We are straitened: but are not destitute") (Loserth, 479.22–23); Wyclif's *et non defecimus* is translated. Isaiah 26:9. Job 36:20 (Wyclif without *pro eis*, "for them"). C. *Sicut granum trituracione separatum a palea*: cf. Matthew 3:12.
17. *Domesticis fidei*: Galatians 6:10 ("those who are of the household of the faith"). *Esurientibus et sicientibus iusticiam*: Matthew 5:6 ("they that hunger and thirst after justice"). C. *Predam*: the prey is the people taken back from the devil. *Christianis inferioribus*: christians of lower rank, the maidens of the verse. *Potum in complemento iusticie delectandi*: the drink of delighting in justice fulfilled.
18. Tobias 10:13 ("Admonishing her to honour her father and mother in law, to love her husband, to take care of the family, to govern the house, and to behave herself irreprehensibly"). The parents are Raguel and Anna, instructing their daughter Sara; Wyclif names the teaching for the mother, the matron Anna. T. The codices read *socios*; *soceros* is Loserth's reading (480.1). C. *Matre nostra*: the church.
19. Genesis 18:12 ("my lord is an old man"); 1 Peter 3:6 ("As Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord"). Augustine, Sermo 37 (*nec timeat conditionem*); the rest of the sentence is Wyclif's. *Ancilla domini*: cf. Luke 1:38. Psalm 115:16 (verse 7 in the Clementine numbering). 2 Thessalonians 3:10: the Vulgate reads *si quis non vult operari, nec manducet* ("if any man will not work, neither let him eat"). C. *Ancille*: "handmaids", the maidens of the verse; the church's sons are its servants.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 476: *Iusti*
  - 477: *II*^{a}

- **477: *15***
- **477: *10***
- **479: *usque***
- **479: *suis* (15 is the line number)**
- **479: ∅) [GAP]**
- **479: *non***
- **479: *defecimus***
- **480: *Iª***
- **480: *III°***
- **480: *filius* [NW]**
- **480: *IIª***
- **480: *III°***
- **477: *specificat* (spe-/cificat; output holds both halves; 194ᶜ folio mark dropped) [-MARK]**
- **479: *IIª* (citation printed "et non defecimus, IIª Corinth. IV°, 8" (agent 11); wrongly dropped as DEL)**
- **479: *Corinth.* (as above)**
- **479: *IV°, 8* (as above)**

Part 3: The office of the valiant woman: the field, the girded loins, the lamp, the spindle, the open hand, the double garments (Prov. 31:16–21)

Loserth pp. 480.16–484.28

¶1 480.16–484.28
480.16 *Verse 16. The field that she buys is the Kingdom of Heaven.*
481.6 *Verse 17. The Church requires strength to contend with spiritual enemies.*
481.24 *Verse 18. The taste is purified by a good conscience.*
482.12 *Verse 19 tells of the Church's sedulous industry.*
483.20 *Verse 20. Her readiness to help those in need.*
484.3 *Verse 21. She is not afraid of persecution.*

[480]**Sed quia matrona prudens considerans quod cibaria vie non sufficiunt homini in eternum, ideo quinto subditur: Consideravit agrum et emit illum, de fructu manuum suarum plantavit vineam. Ager ille secundum Augustinum est regnum celorum in quo sunt fructus semper virentes, ut patet Apoc. ultimo, et Psalmo XLIX°, 11 dicitur: Pulchritudo agri mecum est. Illam autem patriam fidelis discursu fidei infuse considerat, et ex fide scripture pro levi tribulacionis momentanee ipsum sperat, et sic illud quod non videtur modo sensibiliter pondus eterne glorie operatur in nobis et voluntariam persecucionis pacienciam propter iusticiam que secundum vocem veritatis Matthei VI° est precium huius agri. Unde quid propter exemplum martirum et iustorum sancte vivencium et quid propter virtutes theologicas infusas desuper mater nostra in spe boni futuri plantavit vineam, hoc est, superiorem cleri ecclesiam que residuum agri letificet? Et hoc merito tocius ecclesie quod est fructus** [481]**sue potencie promerendi. Et utinam non propter ocium sive demeritum vinea ista transeat in ortum olerum. Unde quia ager iste in racione colendi et possidendi requirit laborem sollicitum et ordinatum, ideo sexto subditur de muliere forti predicta quod accinxit fortitudine lumbos suos et roboravit brachium suum. Nam ancilla apparate serviens tanto sponso nedum stringit carnales concupiscencias zona precepti dominici, sed cuncta opera sua facit ad regulam inter habundanciam et defectum, ne spiritualiter adulteretur cum viro alio, sic quod ad omne opus agendum in agro**

But since the prudent matron considers that the victuals of the way do not suffice a man for eternity, therefore fifthly it is added: "She hath considered a field, and bought it: with the fruit of her hands she hath planted a vineyard."[1] That field, according to Augustine, is the kingdom of heaven, in which are fruits ever green, as is clear from the last [chapter of the] Apocalypse; and in Psalm 49:11 it is said: "With me is the beauty of the field." And the faithful [soul] considers that homeland by the discursive reasoning of infused faith, and from the faith of scripture hopes for it in return for the light [burden] of a momentary tribulation; and so that which is not now seen perceptibly works in us a weight of eternal glory, and [works in us] the willing patience of persecution for justice, which according to the voice of Truth, Matthew 6, is the price of this field.[2] Hence why, both on account of the example of the martyrs and of the just who live holily, and on account of the theological virtues infused from above, did our mother, in hope of the good to come, plant a vineyard, that is, the higher church of the clergy, to gladden the rest of the field? And this by the merit of the whole church, which is the fruit of [481] **its power of meriting. And would that this vineyard may not, through idleness or demerit, pass into a garden of herbs.[3]**

Hence, since this field, in respect of tilling and possessing it, requires careful and ordered labour, therefore sixthly it is added of the aforesaid valiant woman that "she hath girded her loins with strength, and hath

dominico sit parata; et ad ista requiritur fortitudo resistendi et prevalendi cunctis spiritualibus inimicis. Et videtur posse intelligi in predicacione secundum causam per agrum predictum ipsum caput ecclesie, cuius participacione omnes predestinati sunt regnum celorum; qui licet sint secundum naturam sensibiles, racio tamen qua sunt ecclesia et in potencia beatificabiles est insensibilis. Ad reducendum potenciam istam ad actum requiritur labor assiduus, et illud exercicium fortificat potenciam operandi; et ideo signanter dicitur quod roboravit brachium suum, nec est ista exercitacio nimium tediosa. Ideo septimo subditur: Gustavit et vidit quia bona est negociacio eius; non extinguetur in nocte lucerna eius. Quibus, inquit Augustinus, est palatum quo gustatur sic indulcoratum terrestribus, ut videatur laborem pro beatitudine esse amarum eis, non est celum carum. Rectificat autem gustum anime consciencia bona, que si pungitur peccato amara videntur omnia quibus anima nutriretur. Que ergo dulciter [482] delectatur in domino, non solum exponit exercicio laudis divine sua omnia sed se ipsam; talis enim interim gustat in actibus quam suavis est dominus, quousque infima dulcedo timentibus Deum abscondita sit illapsa. Nec potest obici quod hec mulier non vidit quomodo operandum sit propter noctis tenebras in qua viat, quia lucerna ardebit continue, dum semper habet oculum et affeccionem, sperando in domino, verbo domini consolacionem scripture et continuacionem beneficencie tamquam oleum continue largiente, et ex ista luce cum oleo devocionis exhilarata. Unde octavo subiungitur: Manum suam misit ad forcia et digiti eius apprehenderunt fusum; ubi ista bona matrona lanifica per manum et digitum specificat expressius quam supra applicacionem potencie et prudencie ad sedule operandum. Nam manus et digiti sunt propiores quam brachium actui operandi; et potest opus huius femine dici forte, quia collectim procedit ex viribus universalis ecclesie resistente toto corpore dyaboli cum eius omnibus instrumentis. Sed quantum ad sensum habendum de fuso dicit magnus doctor Augustinus quod non tacebit caritati nostre quod magister suus inspirando donaverit. Primo ergo supponit quod christianus scit bene quid fecerit in preteritum, sed ignorat quid aut qualiter faciet in futurum. Secundo supponitur quod pius christianus de futuro opere bono timet, de preterito gaudet, et ut perseveret in bonis operibus caute vigilat, ne forte negligens futurorum perdat preteritum, et sic habet firmam conscienciam de facto et non de fiendo. Tercio supponit quod in arte nendi lanifici involutum in colo nondum artificiatum est in forma fili, sed ab illo ad fusum trahitur, non econtra. [483] Ex istis elicitur quod sancta mater ecclesia dum subtili operacione

strengthened her arm." For a handmaid serving so great a bridegroom in readiness not only binds fleshly concupiscences with the girdle of the Lord's precept, but does all her works by the rule [that lies] between abundance and defect, lest she commit spiritual adultery with another man, so that she is ready for every work to be done in the Lord's field; and for these is required the strength to resist and prevail over all spiritual enemies.[4] And it seems that by the aforesaid field can be understood, in predication by cause, the very head of the church, by participation in whom all the predestinate are the kingdom of heaven; who, although according to nature they are perceptible, yet the aspect by which they are the church and potentially beatifiable is imperceptible.[5] To reduce this potency to act, assiduous labour is required, and that exercise strengthens the power of working; and therefore it is said expressly that "she hath strengthened her arm"; nor is this exercise too wearisome. Therefore seventhly it is added: "She hath tasted, and seen that her traffic is good: her lamp shall not be put out in the night." "Those," says Augustine, "who have a palate, by which one tastes, so sweetened by earthly things that labour for blessedness seems to be bitter to them: to them heaven is not dear."[6] But a good conscience sets right the taste of the soul; and if [conscience] is pricked by sin, all the things by which the soul would be nourished seem bitter. The [soul], therefore, that sweetly [482] delights in the Lord exposes to the exercise of divine praise not only all her own things but herself; for such a one meanwhile tastes in [her] acts how sweet the Lord is, until the deepest sweetness, hidden for those that fear God, has flowed in.[7] Nor can it be objected that this woman did not see how she was to work, because of the darkness of the night in which she makes her way; for the lamp will burn continually, while she always has [her] eye and affection [on it], hoping in the Lord, the word of the Lord continually bestowing, as oil, the consolation of scripture and the continuity of beneficence; and [she is] gladdened by this light with the oil of devotion.[8]

Hence eighthly it is added: "She hath put out her hand to strong things, and her fingers have taken hold of the spindle"; where this good wool-working matron, by the hand and finger, specifies more expressly than above the application of power and prudence to working sedulously. For hands and fingers are nearer than the arm to the act of working; and the work of this woman can be called strong, since it proceeds collectively from the forces of the universal church, the whole body of the devil resisting with all its instruments.[9] But as to the sense to be had concerning

apprehendit opus suum preteritum ad sensum scripture, apprehendit digitis suis fusum, quia rem anteriorem posteriorat, ut contingit de nentibus; est tamen conneccio, quia in opere preterito debent firmari brachia, debet securari consciencia et fundari spes ad futura premia capienda: Quidquid, inquit, operaris tota firmitas animi sit ad fusum, quia quod pendet in colo ad fusum trahicitur, non econtra. Et secundum istam leccionem non sollicitaret fidelis nec aspiraret ad grandem statum seculi in futurum, sed instanter trahiceret opus meritorium in preteritum, confidens quod ut sic erit humilior ad futurum. Et istam sollicitudinem ad colum prohibet sponsus Matthei VI° capitulo. Jactemus ergo thesaurum meriti in memoriam sponsi nostri qui pendens in cruce noluit memoriam passionis in preteritum intranslate relinquere, quamvis Judei false dixerint: Si rex Israel est, descendat nunc de cruce et credimus ei Matthei XXVII°, 40. Et hinc conclusio sequitur pertinenter: Manum suam aperuit inopi et palmas suas extendit ad pauperem. Nam dicens beneficencie et communionis non oblivisci ex proposicione septima et sciens quod solum firma spes premii est de perfecta operacione plene preterita ex proposicione proxima dat operam pro ulteriori elemosina facienda. Sperans, inquit Augustinus, in domino sibi dicit: Da domine, quia dedi, dimitte, quia dimisi, fac mecum misericordiam, quia feci. Nam Jacobi IIª, 12 scribitur: Iudicium sine misericordia illi qui non fecit misericordiam. Habens, inquit, plenum sacellum apotecam vel orreum nendo salubriter a colo transferat ad fusum. Et multo magis operandum est instanter opus misericordie spirituale et notum ex textu quomodo ecclesia egenciori [484]dat largius de eo quod indiget sed potestatem defensionis exercet in paupere. Ex istis decimo sequitur quod vir talis matrone non timebit domui sue a frigoribus nivis: omnes enim domestici eius vestiti sunt duplicibus. Quomodo, inquit Augustinus, timeret dominus de suis domesticis qui sunt membra talis matrone, cum Romanorum VIII°, 30 scribitur: Quos predestinavit ipsos vocavit et quos vocavit ipsos et iustificavit et quos iustificavit ipsos et glorificavit. Igitur nec Christus nec ecclesia timebit membris suis ex persecucione nivea in qua refrigescit caritas multorum (ut dicitur Matthei XXIV°, 12), cum omnes de domo ecclesie vestiti sunt duplicibus. Hoc vestimentum est preciosissimum, cum sit realiter ipse sponsus. Unde ad Galatos III°, 27 dicitur: Omnes qui in Christo baptizati estis Christum induistis. Illi ergo qui et predestinantur et virtuose superaddite operantur, digne laudantes Christum divinitus atque humanitus, sunt vestiti duplicibus. Heretici autem presciti qui baptizati sunt, habentes temporaneam graciam baptismalem, et post nude confitentur in Christo unam simplicem naturam (ut puta, solum

the spindle, the great doctor Augustine says that he will not keep silent from our charity what his master has given [him] by inspiration. First, then, he supposes that a christian knows well what he has done in the past, but does not know what or how he will do in the future. Secondly it is supposed that the pious christian fears for the good work to come and rejoices over the past, and, that he may persevere in good works, watches cautiously, lest perhaps, neglecting the things to come, he lose the past; and so he has a firm conscience of what has been done, and not of what is to be done. Thirdly he supposes that in the art of spinning, what of the wool-work is wound on the distaff is not yet worked into the form of thread, but is drawn from it to the spindle, not the reverse. [483]From these it is drawn out that holy mother church, while by subtle working she takes hold of her past work according to the sense of scripture, takes hold of the spindle with her fingers, since she makes the earlier thing later, as happens with those who spin; yet there is a connection, since in past work the arms must be strengthened, the conscience made secure and hope founded for gaining the rewards to come: "Whatever you work," he says, "let the whole firmness of the mind be at the spindle, since what hangs on the distaff is passed to the spindle, not the reverse."[10] And according to this lesson the faithful [man] would not be anxious nor aspire to a great state in the world in the future, but would earnestly pass meritorious work into the past, trusting that so he will be humbler for the future. And this solicitude for the distaff the bridegroom forbids in Matthew, chapter 6. Let us therefore cast the treasure of merit into the memory of our bridegroom, who, hanging on the cross, would not leave the memory of the passion untransferred into the past, although the Jews falsely said: "If he be the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross: and we will believe him," Matthew 27:40.[11] And hence the conclusion follows pertinently: "She hath opened her hand to the needy, and stretched out her hands to the poor." For [she], telling [herself] not to forget beneficence and communion, from the seventh proposition, and knowing, from the proposition next before, that the firm hope of reward is only of a perfect work fully past, applies herself to making further alms.[12] "Hoping in the Lord," says Augustine, "she says to herself: 'Give, Lord, because I have given; forgive, because I have forgiven; deal mercifully with me, because I have done [mercy].'" For in James 2:12 it is written: "Judgment without mercy to him that hath not done mercy." "Let one who has," he says, "a full purse, storehouse or barn, spinning wholesomely, transfer from the distaff to the spindle." And much more

divinitatem vel solum humanitatem, ut Fotiniani et Manichei) vestiti sunt tamquam servi ecclesie simplici vestimento, ne fingant se velle perseverare finaliter, si habuerint vestimentum. Sed mali secundum Augustinum vestiti sunt tantum forma sacramenti, boni vero opere et imitacione finali.

is the spiritual work of mercy to be worked earnestly; and it is known from the text how the church gives more largely to the needier [484] of that which he needs, but exercises the power of defence in [the case of] the poor.[13]

From these it follows tenthly that the husband of such a matron "shall not fear for [his] house in the cold of snow: for all [his] domestics are clothed with double garments." "How," says Augustine, "should the Lord fear for his domestics, who are members of such a matron, since in Romans 8:30 it is written: 'Whom he predestinated, them he also called. And whom he called, them he also justified. And whom he justified, them he also glorified'?" Therefore neither Christ nor the church will fear for its members from the snowy persecution, in which "the charity of many shall grow cold" (as is said in Matthew 24:12), since all of the house of the church are clothed with double garments.[14] This garment is most precious, since it is really the bridegroom himself. Hence in Galatians 3:27 it is said: "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ." Those, therefore, who are both predestined and work virtuously besides, worthily praising Christ divinely and humanly, are clothed with double garments. But foreknown heretics who are baptized, having a temporary baptismal grace, and afterwards barely confess in Christ one simple nature (for example, only the divinity or only the humanity, as the Photinians and Manichees), are clothed, as servants of the church, with a single garment, lest they pretend that they would will to persevere finally if they had had the garment.[15] But the wicked, according to Augustine, are clothed only with the form of the sacrament, and the good with the work and final imitation.[16]

Notes

1. Proverbs 31:16 (Wyclif *illum* for the Vulgate's *eum*). C. *Cibaria vie*: the "victuals" of verse 15 (480.13–14), food for the way, set against the field bought for eternity. T. AA_1 lack *matrona ... ideo* (480.16). R. Side-note 480.16.
2. Augustine, *Sermo* 37 on Proverbs 31. *Apoc. ultimo*: Revelation 22:2 (the tree of life "yielding its fruits every month"). Psalm 49:11 ("with me is the beauty of the field"). *Pro levi tribulacionis momentanee ... pondus eterne glorie operatur in nobis*: 2 Corinthians 4:17 ("that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us ... an eternal weight of glory"), worked into Wyclif's sentence. *Matthei VI°*: the codices read *Matth. V.* (Loserth, 480.29); the sense is Matthew 5:10 ("Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"). Translated as printed. C. *Operatur* governs two objects, *pondus* and *pacienciam*: the unseen glory works in us both the weight of glory and the patience that buys the field.
3. *Quid ... et quid* is taken as "why", introducing the printed question. It may instead be read as "both ... and" (on account partly of the martyrs' example, partly of the virtues), with the sentence a statement. *Superiorem cleri ecclesiam*: the clergy as the vineyard planted within the field of the whole church. *Potencie promerendi*: the power of meriting; the "fruit of her hands" of the verse. S. *In ortum olerum*: 3 Kings 21:2, Achab's wish to turn Naboth's vineyard into "a garden of herbs". T. A reads *boni fuci* (480.32); B *vinea est* (481.2).
4. Proverbs 31:17. From here Loserth notes that what follows is in Augustine's *Sermo* 37 on Proverbs 31, with some words changed (481.10). C. *Apparate*: in readiness. *Ad regulam inter habundanciam et defectum*: the rule of the mean, between excess and defect. *Zona precepti dominici*: the girdle of the verse read as the Lord's precept. T. B reads *super habundanciam* (481.10). R. Side-note 481.6.

5. ***In predicacione secundum causam*: predication by cause, in which a thing is named by its cause; so the field, which is the kingdom, can be said to be Christ the head, by participation in whom the predestinate are that kingdom. *Racio ... qua sunt ecclesia*: the aspect under which they are the church, set against their perceptible nature. T. The codices read *per dictum* (481.15); B *verificabiles* for *beatificabiles* (481.19).**
6. **Proverbs 31:18. Augustine, the same sermon, 37.10 (*Ubi est palatum, quod gustatur hoc?*); *non est celum carum* is Wyclif's. C. *Quibus ... est palatum ... non est celum carum*: the relative *quibus* is resumed by *eis*; "to those whose palate ... to them heaven is not dear." R. Side-note 481.24.**
7. ***Gustat ... quam suavis est dominus*: Psalm 33:9 ("O taste, and see that the Lord is sweet"). *Dulcedo timentibus Deum abscondita*: Psalm 30:20 ("the multitude of thy sweetness, O Lord, which thou hast hidden for them that fear thee"). T. The codices read *se ipsum*; *se ipsam* is Loserth's (482.2). C. *Que ergo*: the soul (*anima*). *Infima dulcedo*: as printed, "the lowest", that is, deepest, sweetness; *intima*, "inmost", would read more easily. *Illapsa*: flowed in, the word Wyclif uses of Christ flowing into the soul.**
8. ***In qua viat*: in which she makes her way, as a wayfarer. *Verbo domini ... largiente* is an ablative absolute: the word of the Lord supplies scripture's consolation and continued beneficence as the oil of the lamp. *Habet oculum et affeccionem*: keeps eye and affection fixed. T. B reads *inde qua viat* (482.7); AA, lack *oleum* (482.10).**
9. **Proverbs 31:19. T. The codices read *Ut octavo* (482.11); A has the letter K in the lower margin (one of the Hebrew letters it sets against the verses, cf. 483.1). C. *Resistente toto corpore dyaboli* is printed as an ablative absolute, "the whole body of the devil resisting"; the sense may be that the church's forces resist the devil's body. R. Side-note 482.12.**
10. **Augustine, the same sermon: the three suppositions and *Quidquid operaris ... non econtra*. C. *Caritati nostre*: the preacher's address to his hearers, "your charity", here in the first person plural. *De facto ... de fiendo*: of what has been done, not of what is to be done. *Lanifici*: genitive of *lanificium*, wool-work. *Rem anteriorem posteriorat*: on the spindle the earlier work is put behind, as spun thread passes from distaff to spindle. *Trahicitur* (and *trahiceret* below): *traicitur*, is passed over. R. A in the margin at 482.23: *Triplex supposicio*. T. B reads *supponit quod pius* (482.24); A lacks the letter L (483.1).**
11. **Matthew 6:34 ("Be not therefore solicitous for to morrow"). The words of the Jews are Matthew 27:42; Loserth's verse 40 is "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." C. *Noluit memoriam passionis ... intranslate relinquere*: Christ would not leave his passion unfinished, still on the distaff, but carried it through into the past. T. B reads *dixerunt* (483.18).**
12. **Proverbs 31:20. *Beneficencie et communionis non oblivisci*: Hebrews 13:16 ("do not forget to do good and to impart"). C. *Ex proposicione septima*: verse 18, the lamp fed with the oil of beneficence (482.6–9); *ex proposicione proxima*: verse 19, the spindle. R. A in the margin at 483.20: *Conclusio*. Side-note 483.20.**
13. **Augustine, the same sermon: *Da domine, quia dedi ...* and *Habens plenum sacellum ...*. James 2:13 ("For judgment without mercy to him that hath not done mercy"); Loserth's verse is 12. C. The last sentence sets the two halves of the verse apart: to the needy (*inopi*) the church gives of what he lacks; for the poor (*pauperi*) she exercises the power of defence. R. B in the margin at 483.34: *Nota*.**
14. **Proverbs 31:21: the Vulgate's subject is the woman; Wyclif makes it her husband. Augustine, Sermo 37.15, rephrased; the print's italics run through *glorificavit*, so Romans 8:30 is inside the quotation. Romans 8:30 (Wyclif without *autem*); Matthew 24:12 (Wyclif *refrigescit* for *refrigescet*). T. B lacks *decimo* (484.3). R. Side-note 484.3.**
15. **Galatians 3:27 (Wyclif *Omnes qui* for *Quicumque enim*). The Photinians held Christ to be man only, the Manichees to have had no true human nature, as in Sermo 37.17. C. *Divinitus atque humanitus*: as God and as man; the double garment is faith in both natures, with predestination. *Ne fingant ... si habuerint vestimentum*: the foreknown receive only the single garment, so that they cannot claim they would have persevered had they had the double one. T. A reads *Fetiniani* (484.23).**
16. **Augustine, Sermo 37.16: the good servants have put on Christ *non tantum in forma Sacramenti, sed etiam in opere exempli*, the others *usque ad Sacramentum*. C. *Opere et imitacione finali*: by the deed and by imitation to the end.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **480: *subditur***
  - **482: *ad* (8 is the bold argument numeral)**
  - **482: *fusum***
  - **482: *fiendo* [NW]**
  - **482: *Tercio* (3 is the bold argument numeral)**
  - **484: *timebit***
  - **484: *30* (Rom. VIII°, 30: x-height 0 after 3)**
  - **484: *III°***

Part 4: The office of the valiant woman: her clothing, her husband in the gates, the fine linen and the girdle, wisdom on her tongue; and the beginning of her praise (Prov. 31:22–30)

Loserth pp. 484.29–490.4

¶1 484.29–490.4
484.29 Verse 22. She is splendidly clothed, having put on Christ.

[484] **Unde pro declaracione ulteriori huius secte ecclesie undecimo subditur: Stragulatam vestem fecit sibi, byssus et purpura**

Hence, for the further declaration of this sect of the church, it is added eleventhly: "She hath made for herself clothing of tapestry: fine linen,

485.11 *Verse 23. Christ will sit in the gate at the day of judgment,*
485.30 *Verse 24. The linen garment is evangelical teaching.*
486.26 *She gives the girdle in preaching to the heathen.*
487.5 *Verse 25. She gains in glory by the grafting in of the Gentiles.*
487.24 *Verse 26. The Church is full of the wisdom of the Father,*
488.11 *Verse 27. and is not given to idleness.*
488.19
3. Praise of the matron.
488.21 *Verse 28. Her praise is attested by all the elect and by Christ.*
489.5 *Verse 20. The many daughters are the foreknown who are outwardly members of the Church.*
489.21 *Verse 30. Outward grace is of no avail.*

vestimentum eius. Non, inquit Augustinus, decebat matronam tanti viri nudam incedere vel pannosam, sed ornatam undique preciosis. Cum enim membra que Christus induit ex clero et [485]laicis tamquam vestimento qualificato varie sint contexta et matrona ista vestimentum hoc varium in se contexuit, patet quod stragulatam vestem fecit sibi, et cum de utroque membro sint alii virginitate candidi sicut byssus, alii autem vernantes martirio tamquam purpura, Christus autem amictus sit utroque istorum luminum sicut vestimento, patet quod ipsa induens Christum habet byssum et purpuram vestimenta, sicut et habet de candida anima Christi et eius natura corporea rubricata. Ex istis sequitur duodecimo quod nobilis in portis vir eius, quando sederit cum senatoribus terre; oportet enim tam ex parte bonorum quam malorum quod iste cursus finem habeat, et per consequens, oportet (ut dicitur Isaie III°, 14) quod vir veniat ad iudicium cum senioribus populi sui. Unde et Matthei XXV°, 31 dicitur: Cum venerit filius hominis in maiestate sua et omnes angeli eius cum eo, tunc sedebit super sedem maiestatis sue et congregabuntur ante eum omnes gentes. Locus autem iudicii potest propter patenciam et introitum in civitatem duplicem dici porte. Tunc patebit Christi nobilitas primo in forma duplici quoad se ipsum, secundo in totali sua ecclesia sine macula vel ruga quoad suam familiam, et tercio in expulsione servi dampnabilis inhonesti, quia eius nobilitas non sinit cohabitacionem malefici talis perpetuam nec tantam iniuriam impunitam. Sed cognoscamus quod dictus paterfamilias posuit excrescenciam de corpore sue coniugis in cuiuslibet hominis libera potestate. Ideo terciodecimo subinfertur. Syndonem fecit et vendidit et cingulum tradidit Chananeo. Syndonem intelligo doctrinam evangelicam qua tamquam lineo vestimento purissimo et subtilissimo animus induatur. Vendidit autem spirituali vendicione, [486]cum Luce XIX°, 23 dicitur: Huius coniugis pecuniam suam dedit ad usuram, et sic vendicio ista est satis gratuita, de qua dicitur Isaie LV°, 1: Venite et emite absque argento et absque ulla commutacione vinum et lac. In usura autem spirituali gratis precium est datum et donans querit fructum, et sic super excrescenciam, ut compossideat ad utilitatem datarii et honorem sui, ymmo (ut recitat Augustinus) cum evangelizans habeat temporalem mercedem pro sua evangelizacione, videtur quod sit racio dati mutui et accepti. Nam I Corinth. IX°, 11 dicit apostolus: Si nos vobis spiritualia seminavimus, non est magnum si carnalia vestra metamus. Sed non est contractus civilis, cum evangelizans principaliter querit salutem populi et non sua, ideo debentur stipendia evangelizantibus non pro commutacione civiliter possessorum. Oportet ergo quod

and purple, is her covering."[1] "It was not fitting," says Augustine, "for the matron of so great a husband to go about naked or in rags, but adorned on every side with precious things." For since the members whom Christ clothes, from the clergy and [485]the laity, are woven together variously, as a garment of varied quality, and this matron has woven this varied garment in herself, it is clear that "she hath made for herself clothing of tapestry"; and since of each [kind of] member some are white with virginity like fine linen, and others flourishing with martyrdom like purple, and Christ is clothed with both of these lights as with a garment, it is clear that she, putting on Christ, has fine linen and purple as garments, just as she also has [them] from the white soul of Christ and his reddened bodily nature.[2] From these it follows twelfthly that "her husband is honourable in the gates, when he sitteth among the senators of the land"; for it is necessary, on the side of the good as much as of the wicked, that this course have an end, and consequently it is necessary (as is said in Isaiah 3:14) that the husband come to judgment with the ancients of his people. Hence also in Matthew 25:31 it is said: "When the Son of man shall come in his majesty, and all his angels with him, then shall he sit upon the seat of his majesty: and all nations shall be gathered together before him." And the place of judgment can be called "gates" because of its openness and the entry into the twofold city. Then the nobility of Christ will be manifest: first in his twofold form, as regards himself; secondly in his whole church without spot or wrinkle, as regards his household; and thirdly in the expulsion of the damnable, dishonest servant, since his nobility does not suffer the perpetual joint dwelling of such an evildoer, nor so great an injury unpunished.[3] But let us recognize that the said father of the household has placed the increase from the body of his spouse in the free power of every man. Therefore it is inferred thirteenthly: "She made fine linen, and sold it, and delivered a girdle to the Chanaanite." By the fine linen I understand the evangelical doctrine, with which, as with a most pure and most fine linen garment, the mind is clothed.[4] And she sold [it] by a spiritual sale, [486]since in Luke 19:23 it is said: [the husband] of this spouse gave his money at usury; and so this sale is quite gratuitous, of which it is said in Isaiah 55:1: "Come ye, buy wine and milk without money, and without any price."[5] And in spiritual usury the price is given freely and the giver seeks the fruit, and so upon the increase, so that he may possess [it] jointly, to the profit of the receiver and to his own honour; indeed (as Augustine relates), since the one who preaches the gospel has a temporal wage for his preaching of the

recipientes hanc syndonem dent se ipsos, quia melius est ut pro frumento spirituali vendamus nos in servos perpetuos Joseph nostro quam pro fame spirituali sub dyabolo pereamus; cum enim das te carni, mundo sive dyabolo, tantum precium das pro voluptate transitoria et peccato quantum dares pro beatitudine et pro Deo. Ideo cum istis attento tedio patet quod in dampnatis est stulta mercacio. Cingulum autem tradidit, quando precepta evangelica gentibus predicavit; nam Cananei erant infideles ad literam et alienigene Israel et postquam sponsus dixit suis apostolis: Ite, docete omnes gentes, Luce ultimo, dicit apostolus Ephesiorum II°, 19: Iam non estis hospites et advene, sed estis cives sanctorum et domestici Dei, quod prefiguravit mulier Cananea de [487] finibus suis egressa Matthei XV°. Nam ex predicacione fidei gentibus exeuntes de gentilitatis errore accincti sunt ad precepta domini adimplenda. Et quia hoc redundat ad profectum ecclesie, ideo decimo quarto subinfertur: Fortitudo et decor indumentum eius, et ridebit in die novissimo. Nam ex insercione gentilium induit ecclesia copiosius dominum Jesum Christum. Fortitudo secundum Augustinum signat constanciam passionis sanguinee et decor florem castitatis virginee iuxta dictum superius: Bissus et purpura indumentum eius. Nam hec due virtutes invaluerunt ultra Judeam in ecclesia gencium conversarum, et exhinc nimirum habebit hec matrona iubileum in die iudicii; nec miremur quid scriptura tam crebro precipit nos induere Isaac nostrum, quia notum est quod indumenta anime sunt virtutes, Christus autem Dei virtus et Dei sapiencia et forma exemplaris extrinseca efficiens et finis sine cuius illapsi informacione non est creatura aliqua virtuosa. Habitus autem qui sunt qualitates et forme intrinsece non sunt nisi consuetudines et promptitudines ad agendum. Unde Christus illapsus membro suo tamquam sibi accidente dicitur et ipsum induere et contexens virtutibus sapiencia perornare. Unde sequitur decimo quinto: Os suum aperuit sapiencie et lex clemencie in lingua eius. Virtus enim que est sapiencia patris illapsa ecclesie fecit eam ebullire sapiencia tam secundum actus quam habitus virtutis que sunt eius vestigia, et in lingua eius ordinate ponitur lex laudandi in suo ordine domini et quodlibet opus suum. Prestet nobis, inquit Augustinus, in illa constitutis, ipsam laudantibus, illi coherentibus, cum illa et in illa tamquam matre gloriam suam expectantibus, ut et nos in timore aperiamus os nostrum attente et caute et sollicite. Nam Iª Corinth. II°, 3 scribit Apostolus: Cum timore et tremore multo [488] fui aput vos. Et sequitur: Os nostrum patet ad vos o Corinthi. Ordinem, inquit, posuit lingue sue, laudans creatorem et quamlibet creaturam in suo ordine, vel pulcrius hoc ordine quo homo amat quidlibet

gospel, it seems that there is an account of mutual giving and receiving. For in 1 Corinthians 9:11 the apostle says: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, it is no great matter if we reap your carnal things."[6] But it is not a civil contract, since the one who preaches the gospel principally seeks the salvation of the people and not his own things; therefore wages are owed to those who preach the gospel, not as an exchange for things civilly possessed. Those who receive this fine linen must therefore give themselves, since it is better that for spiritual grain we sell ourselves as perpetual servants to our Joseph than that we perish under the devil for spiritual hunger; for when you give yourself to the flesh, the world or the devil, you give as great a price for transitory pleasure and sin as you would give for blessedness and for God. Therefore, when the weariness that goes with these things is weighed, it is clear that in the damned there is a foolish trade.[7] And she delivered the girdle when she preached the gospel precepts to the gentiles; for the Chanaanites were, in the letter, unbelievers and aliens from Israel; and after the bridegroom said to his apostles, "Go, teach all nations," Luke, last [chapter], the apostle says in Ephesians 2:19: "Now you are no more strangers and foreigners: but you are fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God"; which the woman of Canaan, coming out [487] of her coasts, prefigured, Matthew 15.[8] For by the preaching of the faith to the gentiles, those who went out from the error of heathendom were girded to fulfil the Lord's precepts.

And since this redounds to the profit of the church, therefore it is inferred fourteenthly: "Strength and beauty are her clothing, and she shall laugh in the latter day." For by the grafting in of the gentiles the church has put on the Lord Jesus Christ more abundantly.[9] Strength, according to Augustine, signifies the constancy of bloody suffering, and beauty the flower of virginal chastity, according to what was said above: "Fine linen and purple is her covering." For these two virtues grew strong beyond Judea in the church of the converted gentiles, and hence, no wonder, this matron will have jubilee on the day of judgment.[10] Nor let us wonder why scripture so often commands us to put on our Isaac; for it is known that the garments of the soul are the virtues, and Christ is "the power of God and the wisdom of God", and the extrinsic exemplary form, the efficient [cause] and the end, without the informing of whose inflowing no creature is virtuous. And habits, which are qualities and intrinsic forms, are nothing but customs and readinesses for acting. Hence Christ, having flowed into his member as into something accidental to him, is said both to clothe it and, weaving it with virtues,

non ut aliud sed vere in ordine bonitatis quo Deus ipsum posuit. Tunc enim vere ipsum diligit ut se ipsum; unde signanter mater nostra Canticorum II°, 4 de sponso testatur: Ordinavit, inquit, in me caritatem. Sed quia ad illud requiritur noticia philosophica qua ordines bonitatum rerum secundum sapienciam cognoscuntur, ideo sexto decimo et ultimo ita subdit: Consideravit semitas domus sue et panem ociosum non comedit. Qui enim vigilanter considerat viam per quam sanctam matrem ecclesiam oportet in Deum ascendere, contemplando ipsum ordinate in suis effectibus, ocio culpabili non vacabit, cum oportet eum studiose vigilare ad fores sapiencie increate. Et in istis sedecim stat officium matris nostre. Quoad terciam partem Cantici qua declamatur huius matrone preconium, primo sic subditur: Surrexerunt filii eius et beatissimam predicaverunt et vir eius laudavit eam. Testimonium infallibile laudis huius domine capitur ascendendo a testibus expertis qui surrexerunt a miseriis huius vie usque ad testimonium viri sui. Ipse enim est veritas increata, Johannis XIV°; multi enim surrexerunt a purgatorio et a limbo qui communicarunt nobis noticiam de beatitudine et gloria ecclesie triumphantis, et veritas testatur in facto sue transfiguracionis et in verbis sue predicacionis laudem sponse Matthei XXV, 34: Venite benedicti patris mei, percipite paratum vobis regnum; et sequitur verbum laudis: Esurivi enim et dedistis mihi manducare; [489]et modo, inquit Augustinus, in paupertate vivimus et cum morimur in paupertate dormimus, sed surgemus et vere ditabimur. Unde quia pars beatitudinis est verorum bonorum possessio, ideo secundo subditur in preconium huius matris: Multe filie congregaverunt divicias, tu supergressa es universas. Nam omnia temporalia transeunt et decipiunt quoscunque qui ea preponderanter diligunt. Ideo Matthei VI°, 19 dicitur: Nolite thesaurizare vobis thesauros in terra, ubi erugo et tinea demolitur et ubi fures effodiunt et furantur, sed thesaurizate vobis thesauros in celo; et sequitur: Ubi est enim thesaurus tuus, ibi et cor tuum. Filie autem vocantur secundum Augustinum heretici presciti, ut finaliter ab ecclesia dividantur. Inter has filias splendet ecclesia sicut lilium inter spinas: Tales, inquit, spine habent florem sine fructu; nam existentes ad tempus in ecclesia percipiunt fallaciter fidem et ecclesiastica sacramenta, eo quod eis deficit caritas consummata. Unde quia tales persepe habundant mundana gloria et fama seculi propter eius divicias, ideo tercio subditur: Fallax gracia et vana pulchritudo: mulier timens dominum ipsa laudabitur. Nam gracia laudis humane, mundane glorie vel carnalis concupiscencie declinant homines a Deo ad hostem triplicem. Ideo necesse est ut ista sit fallax gracia, quia abducit a sponso, qui

to adorn it with wisdom.[11] Hence it follows fifteenthly: "She hath opened her mouth to wisdom, and the law of clemency is on her tongue." For the Power that is the wisdom of the Father, having flowed into the church, made her bubble over with wisdom, according to acts as much as to habits of virtue, which are its traces; and on her tongue is set in order the law of praising, each in its order, the Lord and each work of his.[12] "May he grant us," says Augustine, "who are set in her, praising her, cleaving to her, awaiting his glory with her and in her as in a mother, that we too may open our mouth in fear, attentively and cautiously and solicitously." For in 1 Corinthians 2:3 the Apostle writes: "In fear and in much trembling [488]I was with you." And it follows: "Our mouth is open to you, O ye Corinthians."[13] "She has set order," he says, "on her tongue, praising the Creator and each creature" in its order; or, more beautifully, in this order, by which a man loves each thing not as something else but truly in the order of goodness in which God has set it. For then he truly loves it as itself; hence our mother, in Canticles 2:4, testifies expressly of the bridegroom: "He set in order," she says, "charity in me."[14] But since for that is required the philosophical knowledge by which the orders of the goodnesses of things are known according to wisdom, therefore sixteenthly and lastly he adds thus: "She hath looked well on the paths of her house, and hath not eaten her bread idle." For one who watchfully considers the way by which holy mother church must ascend into God, contemplating him in order in his effects, will not be at leisure in culpable idleness, since he must studiously "watch at the doors" of uncreated wisdom. And in these sixteen stands the office of our mother.[15]

As to the third part of the song, in which the commendation of this matron is proclaimed, first it is added thus: "Her children rose up, and called her blessed: her husband, and he praised her." The infallible testimony of the praise of this lady is taken by ascending from expert witnesses, who rose from the miseries of this way, up to the testimony of her husband. For he is the uncreated truth, John 14; for many rose from purgatory and from limbo who communicated to us knowledge of the blessedness and glory of the church triumphant; and the Truth testifies, in the fact of his transfiguration and in the words of his preaching, to the praise of the bride, Matthew 25:34: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you"; and the word of praise follows: "For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat."[16] [489]"And now," says Augustine, "we live in poverty, and when we die we sleep in poverty; but we shall rise and be truly enriched."[17] Hence, since a part of blessedness

est plenus gracie et veritatis. Vana eciam est pulchritudo quecunque sensibilis, cum non sit pulchritudo nisi propter proporcionalem numerum insensibilem increatum, in quo est primo per se et proprie pulchritudo (ut patet cap. Multe). Ideo signanter dicitur vanitas talis pulchritudo sensibilis et potissime temporalis. Unde rectus et per se ordo iniciandi materiam vere laudis est timor domini; ex hoc [490] enim quod caste filialiter timetur sponsus, operatur mulier predicta totum bonum narratum secundum dictum ordinem sponso suo, et certum est quod talis bona operacio non potest finaliter a laude deficere.

is the possession of true goods, therefore secondly it is added in commendation of this mother: "Many daughters have gathered together riches: thou hast surpassed them all." For all temporal goods pass away and deceive whoever love them preponderantly. Therefore in Matthew 6:19 it is said: "Lay not up to yourselves treasures on earth: where the rust and moth consume, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up to yourselves treasures in heaven"; and it follows: "For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also."[18] And the daughters, according to Augustine, are called the foreknown heretics, as those who are finally to be divided from the church. Among these daughters the church shines "as the lily among thorns": "Such thorns," he says, "have a flower without fruit"; for, being in the church for a time, they receive deceitfully the faith and the sacraments of the church, because consummated charity is lacking to them.[19] Hence, since such men very often abound in worldly glory and the fame of the world on account of its riches, therefore thirdly it is added: "Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain: the woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised." For the favour of human praise, of worldly glory or of carnal concupiscence turns men aside from God to the threefold enemy. Therefore it must be that this is deceitful favour, since it draws [men] away from the bridegroom, who is "full of grace and truth".[20] Vain, too, is any perceptible beauty whatever, since there is no beauty except on account of the proportional number, imperceptible and uncreated, in which beauty is first, of itself and properly (as is clear in the chapter *Multe*). Therefore such perceptible, and above all temporal, beauty is expressly called vanity.[21] Hence the right and essential order of beginning the matter of true praise is the fear of the Lord; for from the fact [490] that the bridegroom is feared chastely and filially, the aforesaid woman works for her bridegroom all the good narrated, in the said order; and it is certain that such good working cannot finally fail of praise.[22]

Notes

1. Proverbs 31:22 (Wyclif *vestimentum* for the Vulgate's *indumentum*). C. *Huius secte ecclesie*: the glossary's "sect" is kept; the word here is the church's following as a whole, and with the clothing of the verse it may carry the sense "suit, livery". R. Side-note 484.29.
2. Augustine, *Sermo* 37 on Proverbs 31. *Amictus ... sicut vestimento*: Psalm 103:2 ("clothed with light as with a garment"). C. *Membra que Christus induit*: Christ clothes his members (as at 487.22–23, *ipsum induere*); the church, conversely, puts on Christ. *De utroque membro*: of each of the two orders, clergy and laity. *Candida anima ... natura corporea rubricata*: Christ's white soul and his body reddened in the passion answer to the linen and the purple. T. AA_1 lack *decebat* (484.32); AA_1 read *sunt* for *sint* (485.1, 485.4); B reads *amicus* (485.6).
3. Proverbs 31:23. Isaiah 3:14 (the Vulgate: *Dominus ad judicium veniet cum senibus populi sui*; Wyclif has *vir* and *senioribus*). Matthew 25:31–32. *Sine macula vel ruga*: Ephesians 5:27. *Servi ... inhonesti*: cf. Matthew 25:30. C. *Civitatem duplicem*: the two cities, heavenly and earthly (Augustine, *De civ. Dei* XIV.28, PL 41:436), entered from the judgment. *Forma duplici*: the form of God and the form of a servant. T. B reads *quando dederit* (485.12). R. Side-note 485.11.

4. Proverbs 31:24. C. *Excrescenciam*: the increase or surplus of the spouse's body, the fruit of her work, which the father of the household leaves to each man's free use; hence the sale and the girdle that follow. T. For *excrescenciam* (485.28–29) A has an abbreviation, B *existentibus*. B lacks *autem ... ad* (485.34). R. Side-note 485.30.
5. Luke 19:23 ("why then didst thou not give my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have exacted it with usury?"); Loserth prints Luke's words at the page foot. Wyclif gives the sense, not the words. Isaiah 55:1 (DR "without any price" for *absque ulla commutacione*). C. *Huius coniugis pecuniam suam dedit ad usuram*: as printed the genitive has no noun to hang on; it is taken as the husband "of this spouse", who gave his money at usury.
6. "As Augustine relates": the same sermon. *Racio dati ... et accepti*: Philippians 4:15 ("as concerning giving and receiving"). 1 Corinthians 9:11: the Vulgate asks *magnum est si ...?* ("is it a great matter if ...?"); Wyclif's statement is translated. C. *Compossideat ad utilitatem datarii*: the giver shares in the possession of the increase, to the profit of the one who receives. *Mutui*: taken with both participles, "mutual giving and receiving".
7. *Non pro commutacione civiliter possessorum*: the preacher's wage is not the price of goods held by civil title. *Joseph nostro*: Christ as Joseph, to whom the Egyptians sold themselves for grain (Genesis 47:19–25). *Cum istis attento tedio*: when the weariness accompanying these [pleasures] is considered. T. B lacks *pereamus ... tantum* (486.20–21); AA_1 lack *et* (486.23).
8. *Ite, docete omnes gentes* is Matthew 28:19 ("Going therefore, teach ye all nations"), not *Luce ultimo*; Luke 24:47 has preaching "unto all nations". Ephesians 2:19 (the Vulgate *Ergo jam*). Matthew 15:22. C. *Infideles ad literam*: the Chanaanites, unbelievers in the literal sense, stand for the gentiles. T. At 486.30 B reads *Iam non et advene sed*; AA_1 lack *et advene*. R. Side-note 486.26.
9. Proverbs 31:25. *Induit ... dominum Jesum Christum*: Romans 13:14. *Ex insercione gentilium*: the grafting of Romans 11:17–24. R. Side-note 487.5.
10. Augustine, the same sermon, 37.22 (*decore, tanquam bysso; fortitudine, tanquam purpura*); virginity is Wyclif's. C. Strength answers to the purple of martyrdom, beauty to the linen of virginity (484.30, 485.5–6). *Iubileum*: the laughter of the verse. T. The codices read *iubilium* (487.13).
11. 1 Corinthians 1:24. C. *Virtus*: in "the power of God" *virtus* is power; Wyclif plays on the virtues as the soul's garments. *Isaac nostrum*: Christ, of whom Isaac is the figure. *Illapsi*: of Christ flowing into the soul (glossary: *illabi*). *Tamquam sibi accidente*: the member is to Christ as an accident to its subject, so that he can be said to clothe it. *Consuetudines*: acquired habits are only customs and readinesses to act, against Christ the extrinsic form. T. The codices read *que sunt* (487.19).
12. Proverbs 31:26. C. *Virtus ... que est sapiencia patris*: the Son, as in 1 Corinthians 1:24. *Eius vestigia*: the acts and habits are traces of that wisdom. R. Side-note 487.24.
13. Augustine, the same sermon. 1 Corinthians 2:3 (the Vulgate *in infirmitate, et timore*; Wyclif omits "in weakness"). The words introduced by *Et sequitur* are 2 Corinthians 6:11. T. B reads *accincte et caute* for *attente et caute* (487.34); the codices read *apud* (488.1).
14. Augustine, Sermo 37.23; the print's italics close at *creaturam*, and *in suo ordine* paraphrases Augustine's *tanquam creaturam*. Canticles 2:4. C. *Ipsum diligit ut se ipsum*: "loves it as itself", the thing loved in its own order of goodness; "as himself" (the lover) is also possible.
15. Proverbs 31:27: Loserth notes that the right reading is *ociosa* (488.13), "she hath not eaten her bread idle"; the print's *ociosum* makes the bread idle. *Vigilare ad fores*: Proverbs 8:34 ("that watcheth daily at my gates"). T. A reads *ad fortes* (488.17). C. *Istis sedecim*: the sixteen verses of the office (31:12–27). R. Side-note 488.11.
16. Proverbs 31:28. John 14:6. *Multi ... surrexerunt*: cf. Matthew 27:52–53. *In facto sue transfiguracionis*: Matthew 17:1–9. Matthew 25:34: Loserth notes the Vulgate's *possidete* (488.31), where Wyclif reads *percipite*, "receive"; 25:35. C. *Preconium*: commendation, the praise proclaimed. *Testibus expertis*: witnesses with experience of the life to come. R. A in the margin at 488.19: *Tercia pars*. Side-notes 488.19, 488.21.
17. Augustine, *l. c.* p. 191 (Loserth, 489.1). T. B reads *eciam modo* (489.1); the codices read *dormivimus*, corrected by Loserth from Augustine's text (489.2).
18. Proverbs 31:29 (A *universa*, 489.6). Matthew 6:19–21, with 6:20 shortened. C. *Preponderanter*: loving temporal goods more than they weigh.
19. Augustine. Canticles 2:2 ("As the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters"). C. *Ut finaliter ... dividantur*: taken as describing them, those who will finally be divided from the church. *Caritas consummata*: charity brought to its end, final perseverance. R. Side-note 489.5.
20. Proverbs 31:30 (Wyclif without *est*). John 1:14. C. *Gracia*: "favour" in the verse; Wyclif turns it against Christ "full of grace". *Gracia ... declinant*: a singular subject with a plural verb, the three kinds of favour being meant. *Hostem triplicem*: the world, the flesh and the devil. T. B reads *Una eciam* (489.26). R. Side-note 489.21.
21. *Cap. Multe*: Loserth refers to the Decretum, II, C. 1 q. 1 c. 38 (489.29; the form is ours); that canon (*Multae autem operationes sunt Spiritus sancti*, from Augustine, *De baptismo* III.16) is on charity as the Spirit's proper gift and does not bear on beauty or number. C. *Proporcionalem numerum insensibilem increatum*: beauty as proportion and number, imperceptible and uncreated. T. The codices read *ut patet 6. Multe* (489.30).
22. *Timor domini* as the beginning: Psalm 110:10 ("The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"). C. *Per se ordo*: the order that belongs to the thing of itself. *Caste filialiter*: the chaste fear of a son, not the servile fear of a slave. T. The codices read *sensum*; *secundum* is Loserth's (490.2).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 485: *laicis* (folio mark 195c glued)
  - 485: *ut* (print (ut; 15 is the line number)
  - 485: *III°*
  - 485: ∅)
  - 486: *11*
  - 486: *apostolus*
  - 486: *II°*
  - 486: *Iam* [NW]

- **486: *estis* (30 is the line number)**
- **487: *Christus***
- **487: *Christus***
- **487: *Iª***
- **487: *II°* (35 is the line number)**
- **488: *ultimo* (print: et ultimo (line end) before ita; main has no ultimo token)**
- **488: *34***
- **489: *diligunt***
- **489: *Ideo* (30 is the line number)**
- **490: *enim***
- **488: *filii* (italic) [-MARK]**
- **489: *et* (196ª folio mark dropped; et (italic) is missing from output) [-MARK]**
- **485: *31* (verse 31 split 3|1 by the scan (agent 11))**

Part 5: The reward of the valiant woman, and the plan of the song (Prov. 31:31)

Loserth pp. 490.5–490.34

¶1 490.5–490.34

490.6 *Verse 31. Her labour in life shall be rewarded by rest in heaven.*

[490] **Unde quia talem vitam laboriosam imperfectam oportet habere finaliter complementum, ideo quarto et ultimo sic infertur: Date ei de fructu manuum suarum: et laudent eam in portis opera sua. Quia nunquam in cursu vie in qua oportuit matrem nostram de nocte consurgere, pannum texere, egentes pascere et cetera opera misericordie secundum vitam activam perficere, non potest esse talis successiva continuacio in eternum, ideo precipit sponsus pro die finalis iudicii ut filii ecclesie reciproce dent sibi in quiete perpetua de fructu operum; quod est premium beatificum meritorum. Nam Luce VI°, 38 scribitur: Mensuram bonam et confectam et coagitatam et supereffluentem dabunt in sinum vestrum. Beati enim dant beatitudinem essencialem in via iniciative ex vi communionis reciproce promerendo, et dant beatitudinem accidentalem in patria obiective de sua gloria reciproce congaudendo, et sic finaliter laus erit unicuique a Deo secundum numerum meritorum; proporcionaliter enim ut predestinatus ex maiori gracia plus proficit ecclesie, habebit in portis nedum in die iudicii sed toti mundo perpetuo patulo gloriam ampliorem. Sicut enim opera dampnatorum erunt in die iudicii et post patulo toti mundo ad sui confusionem, sic opera beatorum erunt perpetuo mundo patencia ad sui glorificacionem. Et patet in parte sentencia huius Cantici continentis viginti duas proposiciones secundum numerum literarum alphabeti ebraici, cuius primus binarius hic in quatuor est divisus. Inter alia interlocutoria aspersi quod in preceptis neutris christiane fidei legimus tale.**

Hence, since such a laborious and imperfect life must finally have its completion, therefore fourthly and lastly it is inferred thus: "Give her of the fruit of her hands: and let her works praise her in the gates."[1] Since never, in the course of the way in which our mother had to rise by night, weave cloth, feed the needy and perform the other works of mercy according to the active life, can there be such a successive continuity for eternity, therefore the bridegroom commands, for the day of the final judgment, that the sons of the church in return give to her, in perpetual rest, of the fruit of [her] works; which is the beatific reward of merits.[2] For in Luke 6:38 it is written: "Good measure and pressed down and shaken together and running over shall they give into your bosom." For the blessed give essential blessedness on the way, by way of beginning, by meriting for one another by force of the communion; and they give accidental blessedness in the homeland, as its object, by rejoicing with one another in their glory; and so finally "every man shall have praise from God" according to the number of [his] merits.[3] For in proportion as a predestinate [person] profits the church more out of greater grace, he will have in the gates a fuller glory, not only on the day of judgment but openly to the whole world perpetually. For as the works of the damned will be open to the whole world on the day of judgment and after, to their confusion, so the works of the blessed will be perpetually manifest to the world, to their glorification.[4] And the teaching of this song is clear in part, which contains twenty-two propositions according to the number of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, of which the first pair

is here divided into four.[5] Among other interlocutory [remarks] I have sprinkled [in] that in the neutral precepts of the christian faith we read such a thing.[6]

Notes

1. Proverbs 31:31 (Wyclif *opera sua* for the Vulgate's *opera ejus*). C. *Quarto et ultimo*: the fourth and last verse of the third part, the matron's praise (488.19). R. Side-note 490.6.
2. *Quia nunquam ... non potest esse*: the doubled negative is taken as emphatic, "never ... can there be", not as cancelling. *Successiva continuacio*: the succession of labours in time, which cannot go on for ever and must end in rest. *Dent sibi*: give to her, the mother; *date ei* of the verse is addressed to her sons. *Consurgere ... texere ... pascere*: verses 15, 19 and 20.
3. Luke 6:38 (Wyclif *confectam* for the Vulgate's *confertam*). *Laus erit unicuique a Deo*: 1 Corinthians 4:5. C. *Beatitudinem essencialem ... accidentalem*: the scholastic pair, the essential blessedness of the vision of God and the accidental joy added to it. *Iniciative*: by beginning it, through merit on the way; *obiective*: as the object of others' joy in the homeland. R. B in the margin at 490.16: *Nota quod beati* (the codex *bene*) *dant duplicem beatitudinem*.
4. *Patulo*: openly, adverbial. *In portis*: the gates of the verse, the place of judgment (485.19–20). T. The codices read *meritorium*; *meritorum* is Loserth's (490.23).
5. *Sentencia*: the glossary's "teaching", the sense of the song as a whole, not a sentence. *Viginti duas proposiciones*: Proverbs 31:10–31 is an alphabetic song of twenty-two verses. *Primus binarius ... in quatuor est divisus*: the first two verses (31:10–11) are treated as the "fourfold proposition" of the marriage (476.10), so that four, sixteen (488.17) and four propositions make up the twenty-two letters.
6. AA_1 lack *Inter alia ... legimus tale* (490.33); B reads *legius* (490.34). C. The sentence does not construe as printed. *Aspersi* is taken as the first person perfect of *aspergere*, "I have sprinkled [in]"; *in preceptis neutris* may mean precepts that neither command nor forbid. A word may have been lost; the sentence may look forward to the next chapter.

Chapter 21

Part 1: The opponent's "without qualification", and prayer for a damned patron

Loserth pp. 491.2–494.12

¶1 491.2–492.10
491.2 *My opponent says all my arguments fail in matter and form, but he will not meet them.*
491.13 *He says that the King cannot "simply" take away goods from a delinquent clergy; and by "simply" he means: a) the authority must be original;*
491.25 *b) the taking must be complete.*
491.28 *α) According to this only God can do anything simply,*
492.2 *and no one can have made gifts to the Church.*
492.11 *β) God took Christ from the disciples, but not altogether.*
492.23 *Even God can take nothing from man since he must take everything and destroy man.*

[491] **Fortuna non tantum arridet mihi ut valeam facere aliquod argumentum quod visum est in oculis doctoris valere in materia de rectificacione elemosine occupate a clero per dominos temporales, sed breviter quodcunque argumentum quod feceram dicit generaliter deficere tam in materia quam in forma. Sed revera sic dicere non est solvere, quia sic pica posset solvere quelibet argumenta. Quesivi autem si rex Anglie potest auferre licite atque legitime temporalia a clero suo legio delinquente, et dimissa forma illius questionis vecorditer insoluta, convertit more matrone respondentis querenti quantum distat Lincolnia quod sacculum plenum prunis. Rex (inquit) non potest auferre simpliciter aliqua temporalia a clero suo legio delinquente, et quia sensus quem habet de signo isto simpliciter est multis incognitus, ideo specificat eius sensum. Solum (inquit) aufert simpliciter qui auctoritate propria aufert; et quia oportet dicere quod rex habet auctoritatem propriam ad hoc datam sibi a Romano pontifice vel a Deo, ideo oportet ipsum dicere quod solum ille auctoritate propria facit qui non capit illam ab alio. Auctoritas enim que subiectatur appropriate in rege est auctoritas propria, quia aliter nihil sufficeret facere auctoritate propria. Sic (inquit) ille aufert simpliciter bona ab ecclesia qui aufert ab ea omnia bona sua. Rogo videamus primo quam remote dimittitur questio insoluta et videamus secundo quam infundabiliter et extranee fingitur signacio huic signo simpliciter. Nam iuxta hunc sensum nichil potest facere quicquam simpliciter nisi Deus, sed solum secundum quid. Sed cum non sequitur: Creatura facit opus solum secundum quid, ergo facit illud, sed** [492] **sequitur evidenter oppositum propter fallaciam secundum quid, et simpliciter videtur quod non est possibile creaturam facere quicquam bonum vel malum, et per consequens, nullus dominus temporalis dedit ecclesie dominium temporale, et per idem non habet quodvis dominium, quia solum daretur sibi, ut haberet illud secundum quid. Nec valet fingere quod iste terminus simpliciter habet sensum predictum, ubi doctor limitaverit, et alibi habet sensum alium, quia non valeret significacio huiusmodi solum fundabilis ex tali auctore.**

Fortune does not smile on me so far that I can make any argument that has seemed in the doctor's eyes to be valid in the matter of the rectifying, by the temporal lords, of alms occupied by the clergy; but, in short, whatever argument I had made he says fails in general, in matter as much as in form.[1] But in truth to speak so is not to resolve [it], for so a magpie could resolve any arguments. And I asked whether the king of England can lawfully and legitimately take away temporal goods from his liege clergy when it transgresses; and, leaving the form of that question faint-heartedly unresolved, he turned aside in the manner of the matron who answers someone asking how far off Lincoln is that [it is] a sack full of plums.[2] "The king," he says, "cannot take away without qualification any temporal goods from his liege clergy when it transgresses"; and since the sense he has for this sign "without qualification" is unknown to many, he therefore specifies its sense. "He alone," he says, "takes away without qualification who takes away by his own authority"; and since one must say that the king has his own authority for this, given to him by the Roman pontiff or by God, he must therefore say that he alone acts by his own authority who does not take it from another. For the authority that inheres properly in the king is his own authority, since otherwise nothing would suffice to act by its own authority.[3] "So," he says, "he takes away goods without qualification from the church who takes away from it all its goods." I ask that we see, first, how remotely the question is left unresolved, and see, second, how groundlessly and strangely a signification is feigned for this sign "without qualification". For according to this sense nothing can do anything without qualification except God, but only in a certain respect. Now since it does not follow, "A creature does a work only in a certain respect, therefore it does it," but [492] **the opposite evidently follows, because of the fallacy of "in a certain respect", it also seems that without qualification it is not possible for a creature to do anything good or bad;[4] and in consequence no temporal lord gave the church temporal lordship, and by the same token it does not have any lordship whatever, since it would be given to it only so that**

¶2 492.11–494.12
493.4 *Rulers may take away "secundum quid", as the goods were given;*
493.19 *indeed we may come to the logical conclusion, that all taking from the clergy is right.*
493.28 *My opponent says that a priest may pray for a patron whom he knows to be damned.*
494.5 *This would be praying for a devil.*

[492]**Item, iuxta fidem scripture ante ascensionem fuit verum quod auferetur ab apostolis Christus qui est sponsus ecclesie (ut patet Marci II°, 20); ex quo oportet consequenter concedere quod Deus pater abstulit simpliciter ab apostolis Christum suum, quia auctoritate propria. Quod videtur nimis extraneum, cum solum ad tempus abstulit eis Christum et solum secundum humanitatem vel partes eius, cum mansit cum apostolis perpetuo non ablatus secundum divinitatem que est tota personalitas sua; ideo secundum modos loquendi philosophorum talis foret ablacio secundum quid, licet fuit vera ablacio. Item, iuxta, istam descripcionem nec homo nec Deus posset auferre simpliciter aliquod bonum ab homine; homo non, quia tunc auctoritate propria et non auctoritate Dei sic faceret, quod esse non potest, sicut nemo potest habere auctoritatem ad peccandum. Deus autem si auferret ab homine omnia bona sua, tunc illa ablacione annichilaret ablatarium, quia remanente eo oporteret remanere aliquod bonum suum. Quomodo ergo bonitatem essencialem posset Deus auferre a bono? Per illam Deus ergo non posset auferre bona ab ecclesia** [493]**vel alia creatura; et revera fingere talem significacionem infundabilem ad cecandum regem et regnum quod non possunt quicquam auferre a subditis, foret nimis supina stulticia, nam ignorancia est percepta. Sic enim dicerent domini quod non auferunt simpliciter sed secundum quid, proporcionaliter ut dederunt, nec foret alicubi periculum, quia illa bona non fuerunt sua sed solum secundum quid. Melius ergo fuisset descripsisse veritatem catholicam et defensionem pertinacem, ut declaretur si poterit quod non verificatur de rege et regno descripcio predicta de heresi, sed ad tedium scole fugitur per ambages. Melius tamen foret studere logicam et dicere quomodo debet intelligi iste articulus fidei catholice ecclesiam sanctam catholicam, tunc enim non dicerentur tot sentencie heretice et sibi ipsis contrarie, ut puta, quod ecclesia que ante mortem Christi fuit synagoga cepit post mortem Christi. Ista enim non est logica huius mundi quod ante mortem Christi non fuit ecclesia et sic de multis aliis erroribus. O quam gloriosa foret conclusio quod nemo potest quicquam auferre a clerico nisi iuste, nemo enim potest quicquam auferre a clerico nisi auferat illud simpliciter, sed nemo potest quidquam auferre simpliciter nisi iuste, ergo conclusio. Si enim quis aufert aliquid auctoritate propria, cum nemo potest habere it should have it in a certain respect. Nor does it avail to feign that this term "without qualification" has the aforesaid sense where the doctor has assigned [it], and elsewhere has another sense; for a signification of this kind, groundable only from such an author, would not avail.**[5]

Again, according to the faith of scripture, it was true before the ascension that Christ, who is the bridegroom of the church, would be taken away from the apostles (as is clear from Mark 2:20); from which one must consequently grant that God the Father took his Christ away from the apostles without qualification, since [he did so] by his own authority. Which seems too strange, since he took Christ away from them only for a time and only according to the humanity or its parts, since he remained with the apostles perpetually, not taken away, according to the divinity, which is his whole personality; therefore according to the philosophers' ways of speaking such a taking-away would be in a certain respect, although it was a true taking-away.[6] **Again, according to this definition neither man nor God could take away any good from a man without qualification: not man, since then he would do so by his own authority and not by the authority of God, which cannot be, just as no one can have authority to sin. And God, if he took away from a man all his goods, would by that taking-away annihilate the one from whom it is taken, since while he remained some good of his would have to remain. How then could God take away essential goodness from a good [being]? By that [definition], then, God could not take away goods from the church** [493] **or another creature; and in truth to feign such a groundless signification so as to blind the king and the kingdom, [into thinking] that they cannot take anything away from their subjects, would be too supine a folly, for the ignorance has been perceived.**[7] **For so the lords would say that they do not take away without qualification but in a certain respect, proportionally as they gave; nor would there be danger anywhere, since those goods were not theirs except in a certain respect. It would therefore have been better to have defined catholic truth and pertinacious defence, so that it might be shown, if it can be, that the aforesaid definition of heresy is not verified of the king and the kingdom; but to the weariness of the school he flees by circumlocutions. Yet it would be better to study logic and to say how this article of the catholic faith, "the holy catholic church", ought to be understood; for then there would not be uttered so many heretical teachings, contrary to themselves, as, for instance, that the church which before Christ's death was the synagogue began after**

auctoritatem ad peccandum, sequitur quod nemo potest auferre quidquam auctoritate propria nisi iuste. Sed ulterius multiplicando inconveniencia dicitur quod clericus sciens patronum suum esse dampnatum debet orare pro eo, ut mitiget eius penam, et allegantur ad hoc dicta doctorum Prepositivi, Altissidorensis, [494]Hostiensis in Summa, et specialiter doctoris Bonaventure super IV° Sentenciarum, et ita (ut prius dogmatizatum est) quod privilegia et possessiones ecclesie debent in casu defendi per mendacia, ita modo dicitur quod debet eorum possessio continuari per suffragia dyabolica. Constat quidem ex fide evangelii quod Iudas est dyabolus, et per idem quilibet perpetuo dampnatus. Sicut ergo suffragia specialiter facta pro mortuis sunt suffragia mortuorum, sic suffragia facta specialiter pro dyabolis sunt suffragia dyabolorum. Unde percipiatis quomodo mendax allegacio induxit ad interpellandum pro dyabolo dampnato speciali suffragio.

Christ's death. For it is not the logic of this world that before Christ's death there was no church; and so of many other errors.[8] O how glorious would be the conclusion that no one can take anything away from a cleric except justly! For no one can take anything away from a cleric unless he takes it away without qualification; now no one can take anything away without qualification except justly; therefore the conclusion. For if anyone takes away something by his own authority, since no one can have authority to sin, it follows that no one can take away anything by his own authority except justly.[9] But, multiplying absurdities further, it is said that a cleric who knows his patron to be damned ought to pray for him, to mitigate his punishment; and the sayings of the doctors Prepositivus, [William of] Auxerre, [494]Hostiensis in the *Summa*, and especially of the doctor Bonaventure on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*, are alleged for this;[10] and so, as it was dogmatized before that the privileges and possessions of the church ought in a given case to be defended by lies, so now it is said that the possession of them ought to be continued by diabolical suffrages.[11] It is evident indeed from the faith of the gospel that Judas is a devil, and by the same token everyone perpetually damned. As, then, suffrages made especially for the dead are suffrages of the dead, so suffrages made especially for devils are suffrages of devils. Hence you may perceive how a lying allegation has led to interceding with a special suffrage for a damned devil.[12]

Notes

1. ***Doctor***: Wyclif's opponent, unnamed here and throughout the chapter (side-note 491.2, "my opponent"). ***Rectificacione elemosine occupate a clero***: the temporal lords' correcting of the alms the clergy hold, that is, taking them back (A in the margin at 491.21: *De ablacione temporalium*). R. Side-note 491.2.
2. ***Legio***: "liege", the clergy as the king's liegemen. ***Convertit***: he turned [the question] aside. The matron's answer, "a sack full of plums" to "how far is it to Lincoln?", is a tale Wyclif tells more fully in *De veritate sacrae scripturae* c. 13 (ed. Buddensieg, I, 288–289): a deaf old woman carrying plums, asked how many miles to the next city, answers that she carries a sack full of plums. ***Vecorditer***: the glossary's medieval sense, "faint-heartedly". T. The apparatus at 491.14–15 gives a variant *plenum pravis* without a legible siglum; the print's *plenum prunis* is translated.
3. ***Signum***: the logicians' word for a term such as *simpliciter*; the glossary's "without qualification" is kept for it throughout, because the argument turns on its opposition to *secundum quid*. The opponent glosses it twice: by one's own authority, and taking away everything (side-notes 491.13, 491.25). ***Oportet ipsum dicere***: Wyclif draws out what the opponent must say, given that the king's authority is received from pope or God. ***Auctoritas enim ...*** is taken as Wyclif's rejoinder: authority that has the king as its proper subject (***subiectatur***) is the king's own even though it was given him, or no creature (***nihil***) could act by its own authority. It may instead be read as part of the opponent's account. T. AA_1 *qui auferret* (491.26); B *tens oportet* (491.21), not clear.
4. ***Fallaciam secundum quid***: the fallacy *secundum quid et simpliciter*, passing from "in a certain respect" to "without qualification". ***Et simpliciter videtur***: ***simpliciter*** is taken with the infinitive (a creature cannot do anything without qualification); it may instead strengthen *videtur*, "it seems outright". T. AA_1 *sed bonum secundum* (491.31–32); the apparatus does not make clear which words this replaces. R. Side-notes 491.28, 492.2.
5. ***Nec valet fingere ... non valeret***: impersonal, "it avails", in both places; the opponent's reply takes *valet* personally, "I am able" (499.21–24, chunk 21-c). ***Limitaverit***: the glossary's "to assign", the sense the doctor fixed for the term. T. B *vel haberet* (492.6); B *valeret signacio* for *significacio* (492.9–10); A *ex tali ex auctore* and (the apparatus prints "A" twice) *ex tali exactore* (492.10).
6. Mark 2:20, in Wyclif's own words (Vulgate *cum auferetur ab eis sponsus*, DR "when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them"). C. ***Personalitas***: the divinity is the whole of Christ's person; in the logicians' terms (*secundum modos loquendi philosophorum*) the removal is *secundum quid*, though true. T. B *secundum deitatem* (492.19–20). R. Side-note 492.11; A in the margin at 492.11 and 492.16: *De ablacione temporalium*; *De illa diccione simpliciter quomodo debet intelligi*.

7. ***Descripcio***: the opponent's definition of taking away without qualification (taking everything). ***Per illam***: by that [definition]. ***Bonitatem essencialem***: the goodness a creature has by being, which cannot be taken without annihilating it. ***Nam ignorancia est percepta*** is short and odd; it is taken as "the ignorance has been seen through". ***Supina***: as in the canonists' ***ignorancia supina***, culpable ignorance. T. B ***signacionem*** (493.1). R. Side-notes 492.23, 493.4.
8. ***Veritatem catholicam et defensionem pertinacem***: the terms of the definition of heresy (pertinacious defence of what is contrary to catholic truth), which the opponent had applied to king and kingdom; Wyclif asks him to define them, so that the charge can be tested. ***Ecclesiam sanctam catholicam***: the article of the Creed, in its accusative ("[I believe] the holy catholic church"). The opponent's thesis that the church began after Christ's death returns at 499.15–17 (chunk 21-c). ***Non est logica huius mundi***: not even worldly logic says that there was no church before Christ's death.
9. A mock syllogism: the major uses the opponent's sense (taking without qualification is taking by one's own authority), the minor follows from "no one can have authority to sin". T. AA_1 lack ***quis*** (493.24). R. Side-note 493.19.
10. ***Inconveniencia***: CONTEXTUAL; here the absurdities of argument. S. Prepositivus: Praepositinus of Cremona, chancellor of Paris, as Loserth identifies him (493.31, "Praepositivus ... anno 1207"). Altissidorensis: Loserth notes only that several decretists and theologians bore the name; William of Auxerre, author of the ***Summa aurea***, is meant: at 498.19 Wyclif gives his opinion as Thomas reports it, ***In IV Sent.*** d. 45 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 1 (***suffragia prosunt damnatis ... per confortationem patientis; sicut si homo portaret grave onus***). Hostiensis: Henry of Segusio, ***Summa aurea*** V, ***De poenitentiis et remissionibus***, § ***Quibus mortuis suffragia***. Bonaventure, ***In IV Sent.*** d. 46. T. The codices spell ***Altisiodorensis*** (493.31). R. Side-note 493.28.
11. ***Et ita (ut prius dogmatizatum est) quod ... ita modo dicitur***: the first ***ita*** is taken as "as", answering the second. The earlier dogma, that the church's privileges may be defended by lies, is the opponent's, set out in chapter 8 (159, 08-a: ***multo magis debuerunt mentiri pro illis privilegiis conservandis***). ***Continuari***: the patron's possession is kept up by prayers for his soul.
12. Judas a devil: John 6:70–71. C. ***Suffragia dyabolorum***: on the pattern of ***suffragia mortuorum***, the suffrages for the dead. R. Side-note 494.5; A in the margin at 494.11: ***Suffragia pro mortuis si et quomodo prosunt***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 491: ***CAP. XXI.***
  - 491: ***habet***
  - 491: ***signo***
  - 491: ***specificat***
  - 491: ***fingitur***
  - 492: ***evidenter***
  - 492: ***oppositum***
  - 492: ***secundum*** (print secun-|dum; main token holds the whole word (no separate dum token))
  - 492: ∅)
  - 492: ***facere***
  - 492: ***habet*** (5 is the line number)
  - 492: ***sic*** (print: sic faceret; main has no sic token)
  - 492: ***faceret***
  - 492: ***quid,*** (quid split qui|d (agent 11))

Part 2: Bonaventure against suffrages for the damned

Loserth pp. 494.13–498.29

¶1 494.13–496.12
494.13 *He alleges the authority of Bonaventura, who is against him.*
495.25 *Damnation is used in two senses and may be only to pain in purgatory,*
496.13 *Argument from a saying of Augustine's;*
496.23 *from the Church's praying for all the departed.*

[494]Rogo notetis quomodo allegatur doctor Bonaventura super IV° Sentenciarum procurasse effectualiter pro hac parte; scribit enim super distinccionem XLVI^{am} libri quarti sub hac forma: Videtur, inquit, quod per suffragia aliqua mitigacio fiat dampnatis et faciendo quinque raciones pro parte illa recitat tres responsiones quas reprobat. Prima dicit quod suffragia ecclesie prosunt dampnatis, non tamen omnibus, quia non valde malis, et istam dicit fuisse magistri Prepositivi. Sed ista dimissio pene est solum ad tempus (ut quidam dicunt quod omni die Pasche habent omnes dampnati remissionem pene). Secundi dicunt quod fit remissio simpliciter non

I ask you to note how the doctor Bonaventure on the fourth [book] of the *Sentences* is alleged to have acted effectually for this side; for he writes on the forty-sixth distinction of the fourth book in this form: "It seems," he says, "that some mitigation is made for the damned through suffrages"; and making five arguments for that side, he recites three answers, which he rejects.[1] The first says that the suffrages of the church profit the damned, yet not all, since not the very evil; and this, he says, was Master Prepositivus's. But this remission of punishment is only for a time (as some say that on every Easter day all the damned

secundum proporcionem arismetricam sed geometricam (ut dicitur de indulgenciis), ita quod non quelibet operacio eque meritoria eque diminuit de pena eterna, sed quelibet operacio ecclesie eque meritoria diminuit proporcionaliter de pena quam invenit, ut si meritum ecclesie, ut quatuor diminuit centesimam partem [495]qualitativam pene, tunc quodcunque meritum domini diminuit proporcionaliter centesimam partem pene quam invenit, et ita superest semper divitibus occasio impetrandi indulgencias, tam pro vivis quam mortuis, tam existentibus in purgatorio quam dampnatis. Tercia opinio dicit quod suffragia ecclesie non prosunt dampnatis vel ad liberacionem totalis pene nec ad ablacionem partis pene diminuendo vel mitigando, puniens ne tantum puniatur, sed fortificando punitum ut melius et tollerabilius sustineat. Sed reprobatis hiis tribus opinionibus sequitur doctoris sentencia in hec verba: Ideo, inquit, est aliorum opinio communior et verior quod suffragia dampnatis non prosunt, nec ecclesia intendit orare pro eis. Et si sophista instet quod quelibet istarum opinionum est tunc vera, patet quod doctor intelligit quod quelibet aliarum est vera secundum partem, vel negative non est vera. Ista vero eis contradictoria est vera totaliter. Et consequenter respondet ad quinque argumenta facta in oppositum: Primum est ex dicto beati Augustini, Enchiridion CX°, dicentis quod quibus mortuis prosunt suffragia ecclesie vel prosunt ut plena fiat remissio vel ut tolleracior fiat eis dampnacio. Ex quo videtur quod pena dampnati poterit mitigari. Dicendum, inquit, quod non intelligitur de dampnacione facta in inferno, ubi nulla est redempcio, sed in purgatorio, ubi dupliciter illis prosunt: vel statim liberando, ut eos qui parum habent de cremabili vel mitigando quoad eos qui gravius peccaverunt. Et eandem responsionem tenet sanctus Thomas super [496]IV°, distinccione XLVI[a], questione prima. Dampnacio, inquit, quandoque large accipitur pro deputacione ad penam quancunque, ut Luce XXIII°, 40 dicit beatus Latro, tu in eadem dampnacione es; quandoque vero accipitur stricte pro deputacione ad penam perpetuam, ut Matthei XXV°, 46: Ibunt hii in supplicium eternum; et ista significacio est famosior. Et istam responsionem tenet Ostiensis in Summa sua, libro quinto, De Penitenciis et Remissionibus, secundum quod anime defunctorum, et exponitur dictum Augustini, XIII[a], q. II[a] Tempus. Glossa autem que dicit quod papa dispensat contra Deum male exponit contrarie Hostiensi.

have remission of punishment).[2] The second say that remission is made without qualification, not according to arithmetical but according to geometrical proportion (as is said of indulgences), so that not every equally meritorious work diminishes the eternal punishment equally, but every equally meritorious work of the church diminishes proportionally the punishment it finds; so that if the merit of the church, as four, diminishes a hundredth [495]qualitative part of the punishment, then any merit of the lord diminishes proportionally a hundredth part of the punishment it finds; and so there always remains to the rich occasion to obtain indulgences, for the living as much as for the dead, for those in purgatory as much as for the damned.[3] The third opinion says that the suffrages of the church do not profit the damned either for deliverance from the whole punishment or for the taking-away of part of the punishment, by diminishing or mitigating, the one punishing [acting] so that [the sufferer] is not punished so much, but by strengthening the one punished, so that he may bear it better and more tolerably.[4] But, these three opinions having been rejected, there follows the doctor's teaching in these words: "Therefore," he says, "the opinion of others is more common and truer, that suffrages do not profit the damned, nor does the church intend to pray for them." And if a sophist should object that each of these opinions is then true, it is clear that the doctor understands that each of the others is true in part, or, negatively, is not true; but this one, contradictory to them, is true wholly.[5] And consequently he answers the five arguments made for the opposite. The first is from the saying of blessed Augustine, *Enchiridion* 110, who says that to those dead whom the suffrages of the church profit, they profit either so that remission may be full or so that damnation may become more tolerable for them. From which it seems that the punishment of a damned man can be mitigated. "It must be said," he says, "that this is not understood of damnation made in hell, where there is no redemption, but in purgatory, where they profit them in two ways: either by freeing them at once, as those who have little of what is burnable, or by mitigating, as regards those who have sinned more gravely."[6] And Saint Thomas holds the same answer on the [496]fourth [book], distinction 46, question 1. "Damnation," he says, "is sometimes taken broadly for deputation to any punishment whatever, as in Luke 23:40 the blessed Thief says, 'thou art under the same condemnation'; but sometimes it is taken strictly for deputation to perpetual punishment, as in Matthew 25:46: 'These shall go into everlasting punishment'; and this signification is the best-known."[7] And

¶2 496.13–498.7

497.1
4. Voluntary atonement is better than involuntary; so the suffrages of the pious atone more than the pains of hell.
497.14
5. God accepts the atonement.
497.17 *Answer: The profit is to the Church, not to the damned.*
497.21 *The doctor argues that God's mercy extends to the damned.*
498.6 *God's mercy works in fixing their punishment, not in lessening it afterwards.*
498.19 *St. Thomas also declares the damned to be beyond our aid.*

[496]Secundo arguit doctor ex alio dicto beati Augustini dicentis de pena Arrii quod non est determinata, quia augetur secundum quod peccatores suo errore multiplicantur, sed Deus pronior est ad miserendum quam ad puniendum. Ergo si in statu dampnacionis potest eorum pena augeri, potest et minui. Dicendum, inquit, quod non est simile, quia remissio debet fundari in fundamento caritatis, sed Arrius continue habet malam voluntatem sed non caritatem. Tercio arguit sic: Impossibile est multorum preces non exaudiri, sed ecclesia orat pro omnibus fidelibus qui moriuntur; de quibus constat multos dampnari. Ergo si ecclesia non frustra orat, oportet omnes fideles salvari. Dicendum, inquit, quod si constaret ecclesie aliquem esse dampnatum, non oraret pro eo. Et quantum ad formam ac materiam ulteriorem istius argumenti patet inferius. Quarto arguit doctor sic: Plus placet Deo pena quam quis sustinet voluntarius quam alia [497]quam quis sustinet invitus, sed dampnatus penam sustinet invitus. Sed vir iustus in casu penam sustinet voluntarius pro dampnato, ergo vir iustus superstes plus solvit Deo pro dampnato voluntarie paciendo, quam dampnatus sufficeret solvere pro se ipso. Ergo si Dei iusticie satisfactum est pro eo quod minus placet, Dei misericordia acquiretur pro eo quod magis placet. Dicendum, inquit, quod verum est, cum Deus remunerat virum iustum qui pie et condicionaliter orat pro defuncto dampnato. Sed (ut dicam posterius) talis orat realiter pro se ipso et solum pro capacibus. Ideo dicit doctor, eo quod pena voluntaria non potest assumi nec acceptari pro eo qui non habet caritatem. Quinto arguit doctor sic: Talis iustus punit se meritorie pro dampnato, ergo Deus acceptat hanc penam pro illo. Sed Deus non bis punit in id ipsum, ergo oportet quod dampnatus habeat mitigacionem pene. Patet ex significacione proximi argumenti quod iustus punit se pro merito suo atque ecclesie et non pro salvacione talis dampnati. Sed ulterius querit doctor utrum fiat mitigacio pene dampnatorum ex pietate misericordie divine. Et arguit primo quod sic per illud Psalmi LXXVI, 10: Numquid obliviscetur misereri Deus aut continebit in ira sua misericordias suas? Secundo per hoc quod peccans mortaliter offendit Deum a quo est omne bonum, ergo meretur amittere omne bonum; cum ergo Deus non adnichilat eum, videtur quod Deus misericorditer punit eum. Tercio per hoc quod, eo

Hostiensis holds this answer in his *Summa*, book five, *On Penances and Remissions*, under "That the souls of the departed", and the saying of Augustine is expounded at [Causa] 13, q. 2, [c.] *Tempus*. But the Gloss that says that the pope dispenses against God expounds badly, contrary to Hostiensis.[8]

Secondly the doctor argues from another saying of blessed Augustine, who says of the punishment of Arius that it is not determined, since it is increased according as sinners are multiplied by his error; now God is more inclined to have mercy than to punish. Therefore if in the state of damnation their punishment can be increased, it can also be lessened. "It must be said," he says, "that it is not alike, since remission must be founded on the foundation of charity, now Arius continually has an evil will, but not charity."[9] Thirdly he argues thus: It is impossible that the prayers of many should not be heard; now the church prays for all the faithful who die, of whom it is evident that many are damned. Therefore if the church does not pray in vain, all the faithful must be saved. "It must be said," he says, "that if it were evident to the church that someone was damned, it would not pray for him." And as to the form and the further matter of this argument, it is clear below.[10] Fourthly the doctor argues thus: The punishment one bears willingly pleases God more than another [497]which one bears unwillingly; now the damned man bears his punishment unwillingly. Now a just man, in a given case, bears punishment willingly for the damned man; therefore the surviving just man pays more to God for the damned man by suffering willingly than the damned man would be able to pay for himself. Therefore if satisfaction has been made to God's justice by what pleases less, God's mercy will be gained by what pleases more. "It must be said," he says, "that it is true," since God rewards the just man who piously and conditionally prays for a dead man who is damned. But (as I shall say later) such a man really prays for himself and only for those capable [of it]. So the doctor says [it], because voluntary punishment cannot be taken on or accepted for one who does not have charity.[11] Fifthly the doctor argues thus: Such a just man punishes himself meritoriously for the damned man; therefore God accepts this punishment for him. Now God does not punish twice for the same thing; therefore the damned man must have mitigation of punishment. It is clear from the signification of the previous argument that the just man punishes himself for his own merit and the church's, and not for the salvation of such a damned man.[12] But further the doctor

ipso quo quis peccat offendit in ordinem, et per consequens meretur statim ordinari ad penam, cum ergo Deus expectat eius conversionem et non statim [498] dampnat eum, videtur quod pietas Dei se extendit ad dampnabilem. Quarto per hoc quod peccans offendit in infinitum bonum, ergo meretur infinitam penam, quam cum Deus non infligit, sequitur quod Deus misericorditer punit quemlibet peccatorem. Sed doctor respondet concedendo consequens: Dicendum, inquit, quod mitigacio pene dampnatorum dupliciter

asks whether mitigation of the punishment of the damned comes about from the piety of the divine mercy. And he argues first that it does, by that [verse] of Psalm 76:10: "Will God forget to shew mercy? or will he in his anger shut up his mercies?"[13] Secondly, by this: that one who sins mortally offends God, from whom is every good; therefore he deserves to lose every good; since, then, God does not annihilate him, it seems that God punishes him mercifully. Thirdly, by this: that by the very fact that someone sins he offends against order, and in consequence deserves to be ordered at once to punishment; since, then, God awaits his conversion and does not at once [498] damn him, it seems that the piety of God extends to the damnable. Fourthly, by this: that one who sins offends against an infinite good; therefore he deserves infinite punishment; and since God does not inflict it, it follows that God punishes every sinner mercifully. But the doctor answers by granting the consequent: "It must be said," he says, "that mitigation of the punishment of the damned can in two ways

¶3 498.8–498.29

[498] potest intelligi, aut quantum ad taxacionem et inflicionem pene; et sic indubie est pene mitigacio in inferno, quia illa mitigacio non est nisi mitis et misericors perpetue pene deputacio. Sed secundo modo potest intelligi mitigacio post pene taxacionem et inflicionem, et hoc modo nulla cadit mitigacio a divina misericordia. Et rogo scolam hic vigilanter attendere si non sit fictum mendacium adducendo testimonium huius doctoris in aliquo, cum tam manifeste contrariatur dicenti quod ecclesia debet orare pro dampnatis in inferno, ut pena eorum fiat remissior. Unde sanctus Thomas (ubi supra) recitando tres opiniones erroneas imponit terciam Altissidorensi dicenti quod dampnati non suffragantur per diminucionem vel interrupcionem pene, sed per confortacionem pacientis, sicut si homo portaret grave onus et facies sua perfunderetur aqua, confortaretur, licet onus in nullo sit levius. Est, inquit sanctus, predicta opinio presumptuosa, ut puta, sanctorum dictis contraria et vana, nulla auctoritate fulcita et nihilominus irracionabilis, quia dampnati in inferno sunt extra vinculum caritatis, secundum quam opera vivorum continuantur defunctis.

be understood: either as to the assessment and infliction of the punishment, and in this way without doubt there is mitigation of punishment in hell, since that mitigation is nothing but a mild and merciful deputation to perpetual punishment. But in the second way mitigation can be understood after the assessment and infliction of the punishment, and in this way no mitigation falls from the divine mercy."[14] And I ask the school here to attend vigilantly whether it is not a feigned lie to bring forward the testimony of this doctor in anything, since he so manifestly contradicts one who says that the church ought to pray for the damned in hell so that their punishment may become more remiss. Hence Saint Thomas (in the place cited above), reciting three erroneous opinions, imputes the third to [William of] Auxerre, who says that the damned are aided by intercession not by diminution or interruption of punishment but by comforting of the sufferer; as if a man were carrying a heavy load and his face were bathed with water, he would be comforted, although the load is in no way lighter. "The aforesaid opinion," says the saint, "is presumptuous, that is, contrary to the sayings of the saints, and empty, supported by no authority, and nonetheless irrational, since the damned in hell are outside the bond of charity, according to which the works of the living are joined to the dead."[15]

Notes

1. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.* d. 46, a. 1, q. 1 (Loserth, 494.16; the page number is lost from the foot). C. *Procurasse effectualiter pro hac parte*: ironic; Wyclif goes on to show that Bonaventure argues the other way. *Tres responsiones*: the three rejected answers (*opiniones* below); Bonaventure's own makes a fourth (A in the margin at 494.16: *Quadruplex opinio*). T. B *Beneventure* (494.13). R. Side-note 494.13.
2. *Non valde malis*: the "not very bad", Augustine's class (*Enchiridion* 110). *Omni die Pasche*: "on every Easter day". Prepositivus: as at 493.31. T. The codices read *istum* for *istam* (494.21).
3. *Secundi*: the holders of the second opinion. Geometrical proportion: each equal merit removes the same fraction (a hundredth) of whatever punishment remains, so that the punishment never reaches nothing and the rich always have reason to obtain more indulgences. *Ut quatuor*: the merit valued at four. *Meritum domini*: printed so; the sense wants "any [equal] merit", and *domini* may be corrupt. *Partem qualitativam*: printed so (the plate confirms the token); the argument wants *quantitativam*, a quantitative part.
4. *Puniens ne tantum puniatur* does not construe as printed; it is taken as describing the kind of mitigation the third opinion denies (the punisher lessening what he inflicts). The opinion is that suffrages strengthen the sufferer and do not lessen the pain; Thomas attributes it to William of Auxerre (498.19–21). T. AA$_1$ *diminuende vel mitigande* (495.8), agreeing with *pene*.
5. *Si sophista instet*: the comparatives *communior et verior* imply that the rejected opinions are also true; Wyclif answers that each is true in part, or not true at all, and only Bonaventure's contradictory is wholly true. *Sentencia*: "teaching", the position he holds.
6. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 110 (the codices *CXII*; Loserth, 495.21); Bonaventure, ibid., Opp. IV, p. 1019 (Loserth, 495.21). C. *Ubi nulla est redempcio*: the liturgical *quia in inferno nulla est redemptio*; *redempcio* here is release from the penalty, not the buying off of a sentence. *De cremabili*: of what can be burnt (cf. 1 Corinthians 3:12–15). R. Side-note 495.25; A in the margin at 495.25: *Responsio*.
7. Thomas, *In IV Sent.* d. 45 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 1 ad 2 (= *Suppl.* q. 71 a. 5 ad 2), *damnatio in verbis illis large accipitur pro quacumque punitione*; Wyclif's "distinction 46, question 1" and Loserth's d. 46 q. 2 (496.1) are wrong, and the two texts and *famosior* are Wyclif's expansion. Luke 23:40 and Matthew 25:46 (DR). C. *Dampnacio*: "damnation" throughout; DR's "condemnation" in Luke 23:40 renders the same word, and the broad sense is the point of the citation. *Deputacio*: "deputation", the assigning of someone to a punishment. T. A *ut eis* (495.28); B *ista signacio* (496.7). R. A in the margin at 495.28: *Dampnacio capitur dupliciter*.
8. Hostiensis (printed *Ostiensis* here, *Hostiensis* at 494.1), *Summa aurea* bk 5, *De penitentiis et remissionibus*, § *Quibus mortuis suffragia*, which opens *Hoc sciendum est quod anime defunctorum quatuor beneficiis adiuvantur*. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.23 *Tempus* (Loserth, 496.10, "Decr. sec. pars, causa XIII, q. II, cap. XXIII"; the modern form is ours). C. *Secundum quod anime defunctorum*: the § *Quibus mortuis suffragia* cited by its opening words, *secundum* perhaps standing for a printed §; it does not construe as "according as". *Glossa*: presumably the ordinary gloss on that canon, which lets alms lessen by proportion the pain of the *mediocriter mali* who died in mortal sin and applies this to indulgences; the words "dispenses against God" are not in it (the gloss's formula elsewhere is *papa dispensat contra Apostolum*, D. 34 c. 18).
9. Augustine on the punishment of Arius growing with his followers' error: the argument and its answer are Bonaventure's, *In IV Sent.* d. 46 a. 1 q. 1, arg. 2 and ad 2, followed nearly word for word (Loserth 496.18); the saying is not found in Augustine. R. Side-note 496.13; A in the margin at 496.18: *Responsio. Argumenta quod omnes salvabuntur et soluciones*.
10. *Impossibile est multorum preces non exaudiri*: Ambrosiaster on Romans 15:30, *multorum preces impossibile est ut non impetrent* (PL 17:177D), carried by the Gloss (PL 114:517C) and Lombard (PL 191:1526D). C. *Patet inferius*: Wyclif will answer the argument later in the chapter. T. A *quis tinet* (496.30, 497.1) for *quis sustinet*. R. Side-note 496.23; A in the margin at 496.26: *Responsio*.
11. *Solvit*: "pays", the satisfaction rendered to God's justice. *Dicendum ... verum est*: Bonaventure grants the premiss; *cum Deus remunerat ...* and the parenthesis *ut dicam posterius* are taken as Wyclif's gloss, and *Ideo dicit doctor* resumes Bonaventure's reason (voluntary punishment cannot be accepted for one without charity). Where Bonaventure's words end is not certain. *Pro capacibus*: for those capable [of being helped]. S. Bonaventure, ibid., p. 1021 (Loserth, 497.8). R. Side-note 497.1; A in the margin at 497.8: *Responsio*.
12. *Deus non bis punit in id ipsum*: the maxim drawn from Nahum 1:9. T. B *signacione* (497.18). R. Side-notes 497.14, 497.17; A in the margin at 497.19: *Responsio*.
13. Psalm 76:10 (Wyclif *Numquid ... aut* for the Vulgate's *aut ... aut*). Bonaventure's second question, ibid., pp. 1021–1022, "with some words changed" (Loserth, 497.21–22). C. *Pietas*: "piety", kept apart from *misericordia* "mercy". R. Side-note 497.21; A in the margin at 497.21: *Questio bona*.
14. *Concedendo consequens*: Bonaventure grants that God punishes the damned mercifully, in the first of his two senses. *Taxacio*: the assessment, the fixing of the penalty's measure. The sentence runs across the paragraph division at 498.7–8. T. B *sequitur Deus* (498.4); A and B in the margin at 498.5: *Mitigacio pene dampnatorum dupliciter accipitur*. S. Bonaventure, ibid., pp. 1021–1022 (Loserth, 498.6). R. Side-note 498.6.
15. Thomas, *In IV Sent.* d. 45 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 1 co. (= *Suppl.* q. 71 a. 5), quoted closely; Wyclif's *ubi supra* points to his citation at 496.1, which is the same article (qc. 1 ad 2); the third opinion assigned to William of Auxerre (the codices *Altissiodorensi*, 498.20). C. *Suffragantur*: passive, the damned "are aided by intercession". *Continuantur*: are joined; the works of the living reach the dead through the bond of charity. *Ut puta*: "that is", introducing the counts of the charge. R. Side-note 498.19.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 494: ∅ (the is from the English side-note "He alleges the"; print has Rogo)
  - 494: *hac*
  - 494: *XLVI^{am}* (superscript am)
  - 495: *qualitativam* (folio mark 196d glued)
  - 495: *CX°*
  - 496: *XLVI^{a}*
  - 496: *XIII^{a}* (10 is the line number)
  - 496: *II^{a}*

- **497: *quam* (folio mark 197a glued)**
- **497: *iustus* [NW]**
- **497: *sufficeret***
- **497: *Ergo***
- **497: *Et***
- **498: *dupliciter***
- **498: *potest intelligi* (print: potest intelligi; main has no potest token, appended in print order)**
- **498: *ubi* (print (ubi supra))**
- **498: *Dicendum,* (italic; 1 is a margin numeral) [-MARK]**

Part 3: The lying witnesses: Bonaventure on the character of every order

Loserth pp. 498.30–502.9

¶1 498.30–500.2
499.12 *My opponent's arguments are frivolous.*
499.27 *He alleges the authority of Bonaventura as to the "stamp" of priesthood.*
500.3 *But Bonaventura rejects two forms of his theory as to orders,*
500.19 *and favours a contrary view.*
500.26 *Bonaventura's opinions shown by quotations.*

[498]**Et post respondet ad quintuplex argumentum per quod probaretur ficta sentencia, et patet primum commentum mendacii et repugnancia testium adductorum.** [499]**Si (inquam) liceret de testibus mendacibus colare commentum in quo erraverint, patet quod sentencia summe heretica posset colligi nedum ex sentencia dyaboli et membrorum suorum, sed ex sentencia doctorum catholicorum. Dyabolus enim ex arte mendacii inmiscet sepe cum mendaciis veritatem, igitur quando rite capitur unus doctor in testem, supponi debet quod non sit contrarius illi in eodem libro et eadem materia cuius sentenciam testaretur, etsi arguatur quod ego sim in eadem dampnacione, cum allego pro una supposicione quam supposui totum mundum, et constat quod mundus est mendax et proditor. Talia autem argumenta non sunt digna ut remittantur in vicum scolarum examinanda sophistis, sicut conclusio supradicta que ponit quod eadem ecclesia in numero que ante mortem Christi fuit synagoga incepit post mortem Christi, sed brasiatricibus Oxoniensibus mittenda est ista argucia examini concludens ex particularibus particulare eis impertinens, sicut replicacio qua dictum est quod non valet fingere hoc vel illud mitti debet grammaticis. Ego, inquit, valeo hoc fingere (nam sicut sunt multi mundi, sic valet) est equivocum iuxta grammaticos sic loquentes: Qui valet ille potest, et qui valet hic validus est; impersonale nunc personale notatur. Quid ergo totum genus hominum iudicare potest de istis arguciis? Secundum commentum mendacii est de caractere ordinis quod solum sacerdotibus imprimatur, et allegatur in testimonium huius ficticie Bonaventura super dist. XXIV[a] quarti Sentenciarum; et per illud mendacium dicit se tollere supposicionem quam supposui** [500] **describendo clericum. Ostenditur autem illud mendacium ex veritate scripture doctorum.**

And afterwards he answers the fivefold argument by which the feigned teaching would be proved; and so the first fabrication of the lie, and the conflict of the witnesses brought forward, is clear.[1] [499]**If (I say) it were permitted to strain out of lying witnesses the fabrication in which they have erred, it is clear that a most heretical teaching could be gathered not only from the teaching of the devil and his members, but from the teaching of catholic doctors. For the devil, by the art of lying, often mingles truth with lies; therefore, when one doctor is duly taken as a witness, it ought to be supposed that he is not contrary, in the same book and the same matter, to that [teaching] to which he would be bearing witness;**[2] **even if it should be argued that I am under the same condemnation, since for one supposition that I made I allege the whole world, and it is evident that the world is a liar and a traitor.**[3] **And such arguments are not worthy to be sent back to the street of the schools to be examined by sophists, as [neither is] the conclusion stated above, which holds that the church which before Christ's death was the synagogue, the same in number, began after Christ's death; but this quibble, inferring from particulars a particular irrelevant to them, is to be sent to the Oxford alewives for examination;**[4] **just as the rejoinder about what was said, that "it does not avail to feign this or that", ought to be sent to the grammarians. "I," he says, "am able to feign this" (for just as there are many worlds, so it avails): it is equivocal, according to the grammarians who speak thus: "He who *valet* is able, and he who *valet* is strong; now the impersonal is marked, now the personal."**[5] **What then can the whole race of men judge of these quibbles? The second fabrication of the lie is about the character of order, that it is imprinted only on priests; and Bonaventure on distinction 24 of the fourth [book] of the *Sentences* is**

¶2 500.3–500.25

[500]Querit autem primo utrum in omnibus ordinibus caracter imprimitur et, probando quod sic, per quadruplex argumentum recitat duas opiniones quas reprobat; quarum prima dicit quod caracter in solo ordine sacerdotali imprimitur, in ordinibus autem inferioribus solum fit disposicio ad sacerdotalem caracterem, sed hoc dicit esse falsum. Cum in ordinibus sacris inferioribus fiat segregacio perpetua clericorum a laycis, ideo manifestum est quod limitacio in illis ordinibus est vel requirit clericalem caracterem. Secunda opinio quam reprobat est quod caracter imprimitur in omnibus ordinibus sacris, sed non in inferioribus, quia isti et non alii possunt laicis commisceri; sed cum nullus ordo sit iterabilis et quilibet habeat aliquid de racione sacramenti, videtur quod in quolibet sit aliquid quod habeat racionem rei et signi perpetui; hoc autem caracterem dicimus. Ideo est tercia opinio probabilior quod in omnibus ordinibus caracter imprimitur sicut raciones ostendunt expresse. Cum enim caracter sit signaculum expressum, distinctivum et perpetuum et Christo configurativum, et hoc est in omnibus ordinibus, non dubitandum est in omnibus caracterem imprimi.

alleged in testimony of this fiction; and by that lie he says he disposes of the supposition that I supposed [500]in defining the cleric.[6] And that lie is shown [to be one] from the truth of the doctors' writing.

And he asks first whether a character is imprinted in all orders and, proving that it is by a fourfold argument, he recites two opinions, which he rejects. The first of them says that a character is imprinted in the priestly order alone, while in the lower orders there is made only a disposition to the priestly character; but this he says is false. Since in the lower sacred orders there is made a perpetual separation of the clergy from the laity, it is therefore manifest that the assignment in those orders is, or requires, a clerical character.[7] The second opinion, which he rejects, is that a character is imprinted in all the sacred orders but not in the lower ones, since these and not the others can mingle with lay people; but since no order is repeatable and each has something of the nature of a sacrament, it seems that in each there is something that has the nature of a thing and of a perpetual sign; and this we call a character.[8] Therefore the third opinion is more probable, that a character is imprinted in all orders, as the reasons show expressly. For since a character is a seal that is express, distinctive and perpetual and configuring to Christ, and this is so in all orders, it is not to be doubted that a character is imprinted in all.[9]

¶3 500.26–502.9

[500]Et consequenter respondet ad obiectum quadruplicem. Ad primum quo sic arguitur: Caracter est signaculum spirituale, ergo in illis solis imprimitur in quibus datur aliqua potestas nova et spiritualis, sed potestas omnium ordinum inferior est corporalis, ut aperire ostium vel custodire, prophetias dicere, candelabra [501]deferre, ergo in istis nullo modo imprimitur caracter. Dicendum, inquit, quod omnibus ordinibus datur potestas vel spiritualis de se vel ad spiritualem ordinans. Unde potestas hostiarii est ad admittendum homines ad divinum sacrificium, potestas lectoris non solum ad excitandum auditorem exteriorem, verum eciam interiorem, et sic de aliis. Secundo sic arguitur: Caracter est signaculum quod respicit vel habet imprimi in ymagine ad configurandum ipsam Deo; sed actus quorundam ordinum solum sunt circa ministeria inferiora, ergo cum talia non spectant ad configuracionem huius, videtur quod in illis nullus caracter imprimitur. Dicendum, inquit, quod caracter ordinis ut conservativus animam configurat Deo secundum ymaginem quasi assimilatam Deo, quod potissime fit in ordine supremo, vel dicendum

And consequently he answers the fourfold objection. To the first, by which it is argued thus: A character is a spiritual seal; therefore it is imprinted only in those in which some new and spiritual power is given; now the power of all the lower orders is bodily, as to open a door or guard it, to speak prophecies, to [501]carry candlesticks; therefore in these a character is in no way imprinted. "It must be said," he says, "that in all orders a power is given that is either spiritual in itself or ordering to the spiritual. Hence the power of the porter is for admitting men to the divine sacrifice; the power of the lector is not only for rousing the outward hearer but also the inward; and so of the others."[10] Secondly it is argued thus: A character is a seal that regards, or is to be imprinted in, the image, to configure it to God; now the acts of some orders concern only lower ministries; therefore, since such things do not pertain to the configuring of this [image], it seems that in them no character is imprinted. "It must be said," he says, "that the character of order, as preservative, configures the soul to God according to the image, as

quod magis proprie configuratur tale signaculum Christo. Unde cum Christus triplex habuerit officium, scilicet ministri in agendo, pugilis in paciendo, redemptoris in moriendo, triplex fuit sacramentum secundum quod homo configuratur sic Christo tripliciter; unde tantum est triplex sacramentum in quo fit caracteris impressio. Nam baptismus configuratur morienti et redimenti, unde sepelitur homo in mortem. Confirmacio vero configuratur pacienti et pugnanti, ideo signum crucis fit in fronte. Sed ordo configuratur ministranti et operanti, sicut magister ostendit in litera, et quia in omnibus ordinibus configuratur clericus Christo secundum plus et minus, ideo in omnibus illis caracter imprimitur. Tercio sic [502] arguitur: Caracter est signum indelebile; ergo si collocat hominem in aliquo statu, impossibile est ab illo statu recedere, quin fiat contumelia sacramento, sed in minoribus ordinibus constituti possunt licite redire ad laycum, ergo in eis caracter non imprimitur. Dicendum, inquit, quod caracter omnium ordinum manet in anima sive revertentis ad laicatum sive morientis ut signaculum distinctivum et hoc vel ad gloriam si bene usus est, vel ad ignominiam si male.

[a soul] made like to God, which is done most of all in the highest order; or it must be said that such a seal is more properly configured to Christ.[11] Hence, since Christ had a threefold office, namely of minister in acting, of champion in suffering, of redeemer in dying, there was a threefold sacrament according to which a man is thus configured to Christ in three ways; hence there is only a threefold sacrament in which the impression of a character is made. For baptism is configured to the one dying and redeeming; hence a man is buried into death. And confirmation is configured to the one suffering and fighting; therefore the sign of the cross is made on the forehead. But order is configured to the one ministering and working, as the Master shows in the text;[12] and since in all orders a cleric is configured to Christ more or less, therefore in all of them a character is imprinted." Thirdly [502] it is argued thus: A character is an indelible sign; therefore if it places a man in some state, it is impossible to withdraw from that state without an insult being done to the sacrament; now those placed in the minor orders can lawfully return to the lay [state]; therefore in them a character is not imprinted. "It must be said," he says, "that the character of all orders remains in the soul, whether of one returning to the lay state or of one dying, as a distinctive seal, and this either to glory, if he has used it well, or to ignominy, if badly."[13]

Notes

1. ***Quintuplex argumentum***: the five arguments for mitigation, which Bonaventure answers (495.20–497.20, chunk 21-b). ***Primum commentum mendacii***: the first of the opponent's fabrications, that Bonaventure taught prayer for the damned; the second follows at 499.27. ***Repugnancia testium***: the witness alleged contradicts the one who alleges him. ***Sentencia***: "teaching", here the opponent's.
2. ***Colare commentum***: to strain out of a witness the one point on which he erred, and cite him for it. ***Contrarius illi … cuius sentenciam testaretur***: ***illi*** is taken as the teaching for which the doctor is cited. ***Membrorum suorum***: the devil's members, as the predestinate are Christ's.
3. ***In eadem dampnacione***: the Thief's words in Luke 23:40 (cited at 496.3), turned on himself. C. Wyclif grants that he too might be said to cite an unreliable witness, since for his supposition about the cleric (cap. 19, p. 441) he appealed to the usage of the whole world. T. The apparatus at 499.21 reads "In codd.: in quia"; it does not show which printed words this replaces.
4. ***In vicum scolarum***: the street of the schools, Oxford's ***vicus scolarum***. ***Brasiatricibus***: alewives, the women who brewed ale. ***Conclusio supradicta***: the opponent's thesis that the church began after Christ's death (493.15–17, chunk 21-a). ***Ex particularibus particulare***: from particular premisses alone nothing follows, still less a conclusion irrelevant to them. T. The codices read ***Oxon.*** (499.18); ***Oxoniensibus*** is Loserth's expansion. R. Side-note 499.12.
5. Wyclif had written ***Nec valet fingere*** (492.7–8), impersonal, "it avails"; the opponent answered ***Ego valeo hoc fingere***, personal, "I am able". ***Replicacio qua dictum est***: literally "the rejoinder by which it was said"; taken as the rejoinder made to that saying. ***Nam sicut sunt multi mundi, sic valet***: a sarcastic aside, as if it "avails" in the way there are many worlds. The verse (***Qui valet ille potest, et qui valet hic validus est; impersonale nunc personale notatur***) is a grammarians' mnemonic for the senses of ***valet***; ***valet*** is left in Latin because the pun does not pass into English. T. AA, ***validus sit***; B ***validus fit*** (499.24).
6. Bonaventure, ***In IV Sent.*** d. 24, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1 (Opp. IV, p. 650; Loserth, 499.30). Wyclif's supposition defining the cleric: cap. 19, p. 441 (Loserth, 499.27). C. ***Caracter ordinis***: the character of the sacrament of order. ***Ex veritate scripture doctorum***: from the truth of what the doctors wrote, here Bonaventure's own text, not holy scripture. R. Side-note 499.27; A in the margin at 499.27: ***Secundum commentum***.
7. Bonaventure, ibid. (Loserth, 500.6: what follows is drawn from Bonaventure on book IV of the ***Sentences***). C. ***Limitacio***: "assignment", the deputing of the cleric to an office by the lower sacred orders. R. Side-note 500.3; A in the margin at 500.5, 500.6, 500.9: ***Duplex opinio***; ***De caractere ordinis***; ***Bonaventura***.

8. ***Isti ... possunt laicis commisceri***: those in the lower orders can mix with the laity. ***Iterabilis***: repeatable. ***Racionem rei et signi perpetui***: the nature of the scholastic ***res et sacramentum***, at once a reality and a lasting sign.
9. The codices read ***distinctum ... configuratum*** (500.22); Loserth prints ***distinctivum ... configurativum***, apparently after Bonaventure, and the print is translated. C. ***Signaculum***: "seal", the mark impressed. R. Side-note 500.19.
10. ***Obiectum quadruplicem***: the genders do not agree (***obiectum*** neuter, ***quadruplicem*** not); taken as "the fourfold objection". ***Potestas omnium ordinum inferior***: taken as the power of the lower orders. The offices named: porter (the door), lector (the prophecies), acolyte (the candles). R. Side-note 500.26; A and B in the margin at 500.26: ***Quadruplex argumentum***; A at 501.2: ***Responsio***.
11. Bonaventure reads ***ut est conservantis animam*** (Loserth, 501.14). C. ***Respicit vel habet imprimi in ymagine***: the image of God in the soul. ***Configuracionem huius***: of this [image]. ***Quasi assimilatam***: taken with ***animam***. R. A in the margin at 501.15: ***Responsio***.
12. ***Sepelitur homo in mortem***: Romans 6:4 ("buried together with him by baptism into death"). ***Magister ... in litera***: Peter Lombard, in the text of the ***Sentences*** (IV d. 24). T. The codices read ***habuit*** (501.18), Loserth ***habuerit***; Bonaventure has ***sicut recte ostendit*** for ***sicut magister ostendit*** (501.27–28). R. A in the margin at 501.22: ***Tantum in tribus sacramentis caracter imprimitur***.
13. AA$_1$ ***signaculum destitutum***, B ***distinctum*** (502.8); the print's ***distinctivum*** is translated. C. ***Laycum, laicatum***: the lay state. R. A in the margin at 501.28: ***Utrum in singulis ordinibus caracter imprimitur***; at 502.6: ***Responsio***.
How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 498: ***adductorum*** (print adduc-|torum; main token holds the whole word with folio mark 197b glued)
  - 499: ***commentum***
  - 499: ***eadem***
  - 499: ∅) [NW]
  - 500: ∅ (print men-|dacium; main has mendacium whole at pos 5)
  - 500: ***fit***
  - 500: ***Caracter***
  - 499: ***ordinis*** (ordinis split ordi|nis (agent 11))

Part 4: The second fabrication: Bonaventure on distinct characters in the several orders

Loserth pp. 502.10–506.30

¶1 502.10–503.31

[502]Quarto arguitur per hoc quod caracter est signaculum perpetuum, manens in anima separata, ergo non debet imprimi nisi ad actum perpetuum; sed actus ministerialis istorum ordinum inferiorum non est perpetuus. Ergo etc. Dicitur, inquit, quod non oportet ut maneat semper quantum ad usum ministerii quod iste usus vel abusus convertitur in premium vel mercedem. Unde secundo querit et tenet quod in diversis ordinibus diversi imprimuntur caracteres distincti, et hoc specifice, sicut ordines, ut oportet eum dicere, et arguendo quadrupliciter ad oppositum respondet. Dicendum, inquit, quod inter opinantes in omnibus ordinibus esse caracterem duplex opinio esse consuevit. Quidam enim dicere volunt quod omnes ordines in uno caractere uniuntur; differunt tamen secundum maiorem implecionem et minorem, sicut si sigillum imprimatur in cera tenui, deinde forcius vel amplius, paulative procedendo secundum plus et plus quousque perveniatur ad statum perfectum. Si autem queras que sit racio talis impressionis, respondeo breviter quod hoc est propter [503]caracteris imperfeccionem; et

Fourthly it is argued by appeal to this: "that a character is a perpetual seal, remaining in the separated soul; therefore it ought not to be imprinted except for a perpetual act; now the ministerial act of these lower orders is not perpetual." Therefore etc. "The answer is," he says, "that it need not remain always as to the use of the ministry, [but in this,] that this use or abuse is turned into reward or wage."[1] Hence he asks secondly, and holds, that "in diverse orders diverse distinct characters are imprinted, and this specifically, as the orders [are], as he must say"; and, having argued in four ways to the opposite, he answers.[2] "It must be said," he says, "that among those who hold that there is a character in all orders there have customarily been two opinions. For some wish to say that all the orders are united in one character, yet differ according to a greater and a lesser filling, as if a seal were impressed in wax lightly, then more strongly or more fully, proceeding little by little by more and more until the perfect state is reached. And if you ask what is the reason of such an impression, I answer briefly that this is on account of the [503]imperfection of the

tripliciter reprobat istam opinionem satis vivaciter. Primo, inquit, si hoc esset, tunc esset impossibile promoveri ad sequentem ordinem dimisso priori; quod est contra iura. Item, tunc non esset differencia inter ordines nisi secundum maius et minus; quod est manifeste falsum, cum potestates in diversis ordinibus sunt ad diversa ordinate. Et tercio, si caracter sic susciperet magis, per idem posset suscipere minus, et per consequens foret delebilis, et per idem caracteres aliquorum sacramentorum magis et minus reciperent, ut dicatur baptizatus vel confirmatus magis et minus; quod est omnino inconveniens. Ergo et posicio. Alia possunt fieri argumenta quod per idem caracter baptismi crescere posset ad qualemcunque caracterem. Oportet enim in casu concedere quod duorum acolitorum caracter sacerdotalis fuit impressus in uno, et in alio non, posito quod alter cresceret in posterum in sacerdotem et alter maneat tantum acolitus, et foret confusio in sacerdocio secundum magis et minus. Ideo dicit secunda opinio melius quod in diversis ordinibus imprimuntur diversi caracteres, eo quod non solum qui ad Dei cultum assumuntur, distinguuntur ab aliis, ymmo inter ministrantes est ordo atque distinccio, et ulterius gradus illi et potestates ministrandi, si simul dantur, nunquam auferuntur, eciamsi ad alcius ministerium elevatur qui in minori ministraverat; et ideo in diversis ordinibus diversa sigilla debent imprimi secundum que nobis diversitas potestatum ministrandi et perpetuitas innotescat; tale autem signaculum est caracter.

character."[3] And he rejects this opinion in three ways, quite vigorously. "First," he says, "if this were so, then it would be impossible to be promoted to the following order with the earlier passed over; which is against the laws. Again, then there would be no difference between the orders except according to greater and less; which is manifestly false, since the powers in diverse orders are ordered to diverse things. And thirdly, if the character thus admitted more, by the same token it could admit less, and consequently would be delible; and by the same token the characters of some sacraments would receive more and less, so that a man might be called more or less baptized or confirmed; which is an utter absurdity." Therefore the position [is absurd] too.[4] Other arguments can be made, that by the same token the character of baptism could grow into any character whatever. For in the case [put] one would have to grant that, of two acolytes, the priestly character was imprinted in the one and not in the other, supposing that the one should grow afterwards into a priest and the other remain only an acolyte; and there would be confusion in the priesthood according to more and less.[5] Therefore the second opinion says better that "in diverse orders diverse characters are imprinted, because not only are those who are taken up to the worship of God distinguished from the others, but indeed among those who minister there is order and distinction; and further, those grades and powers of ministering, if they are given together, are never taken away, even if one who had ministered in a lesser [ministry] is raised to a higher ministry; and therefore in diverse orders diverse seals ought to be imprinted, by which the diversity of the powers of ministering, and their perpetuity, may become known to us; now such a seal is a character."[6]

¶2 504.1–506.12
505.19 *These quotations enable us to estimate our Opponent's power of lying.*
505.28 *Bonaventura either contradicts himself; or is falsely alleged.*
506.1 *In either case he is valueless as an authority.*

[504] Ideo in diversis ordinibus imprimuntur diversi caracteres, et concedende sunt raciones hoc ostendentes. Ad primum in oppositum quo sic arguitur: in sacramento baptismi non imprimitur nisi unus caracter; similiter in sacramento confirmacionis, ergo pari racione in sacramento ordinis. Dicendum, inquit, quod non est simile pro eo quod non ponit ita diversitatem, sicut ponit ordinis sacramentum quod de sui racione implicat diversitatem graduum. Ad secundum quo sic arguitur sacramentum ordinis essencialius respicit caracterem quam aliquod aliud sacramentum in quo caracter imprimitur; si ergo ordo unum est sacramentum quantumcunque plurificetur, videtur quod unus caracter in eo imprimitur. Dicendum quod verum est, sed nonnisi prout comparatur ad ulterius signaculum. Sicut ergo una litera est scripta et due et tres et quattuor, et tamen multarum

[504] "Therefore in diverse orders diverse characters are imprinted, and the reasons showing this are to be granted. To the first in opposition, by which it is argued thus: In the sacrament of baptism only one character is imprinted; likewise in the sacrament of confirmation; therefore by parity of reason in the sacrament of order. It must be said," he says, "that the case is not alike, because it does not posit diversity in the way that the sacrament of order posits it, which by its own nature implies a diversity of grades.[7] To the second, by which it is argued thus: The sacrament of order regards the character more essentially than any other sacrament in which a character is imprinted; if then order is one sacrament, however much it be multiplied, it seems that one character is imprinted in it. It must be said that this is true, but only as it is compared to a further

literarum aggregacio ad unam sentenciam exprimendam non est nisi una scriptura: sic in proposito intelligitur quod omnis talis figuracio ordinatur ad hoc quod ei inscribatur signaculum secundum quod homo Dei minister perfectus esse iudicatur, et cum sacramentum dicat quid ad alterum, et eciam caracteres uniuntur secundum quid ad alterum, ideo plures caracteres unum faciunt sacramentum. Tercio sic arguitur: Si plures caracteres in eadem anima imprimuntur, aut ergo differunt specie vel solum numero; non secundo modo, quia oportet recipiens denudari a natura rei recepte, nec primo modo, quia ex diversis secundum formam et speciem manentibus non fit unum nisi unum materiale. Ad illud dicendum, inquit, quod dupliciter est loqui de [505] caracteribus vel in se vel prout uniuntur in unitate et integritate subiecti. Si in se, sic differunt, sicut diverse species numeri, si secundo modo, tunc sicut binarius et quaternarius constituunt senarium et habent racionem partis constitutive et complementum ponitur in senario, sic intelligendum est in proposito suo modo, licet non sit omnino simile. Quarto arguitur per hoc quod natura non facit per plura quod facere potest per unum, ergo autor nature non imprimit in ordinato multos caracteres, cum solum unus sufficit, sicut evenit in baptismo. Que ergo necessitas ponendi in ordine tam distinctos caracteres? Dicendum, inquit, quod hoc verum est, quando aliquid potest per unum ita complete fieri ut per plura; hoc autem non fit in proposito pro eo quod oportet ordinatos non solum distingui ab aliis, sicut fit caracter baptismi, sed oportet ipsos distingui plus quam materiali differencia in se ipsis. Expergiscat rogo auditorium et consideret si iste locus et sermo doctorum dat efficax testimonium ad fantasiandum quod solum in ordine sacerdotali caracter imprimitur, cum tam spissim manifeste testatur oppositum. Et revera homo cui ars menciendi non foret laudabilis verecundaretur de tam patente mendacio. Ille autem qui vel intenderit omnia dicta sua capi yronice vel mendacium sibi ascriberet ad honorem, daret occasionem ut non credatur amplius allegacioni vel testimonio suo eciam quicquid iuraverit. Ex primo igitur commento colligitur quod doctor iste vel falsificat multipliciter testem suum, vel quod testificacio sequens sit omnino mendosa et nimis inutilis, cum ipse et testis suus tam crebro et tam patule contradicunt. Quomodo queso invocarem racionabiliter suffragium testimonii [506] doctoris in eadem opinione et eodem libro quem in eadem opinione implico cencies esse mendacem? per inde quidem foret allegandus dyabolus in testem sentencie, cum notum sit quod ex cautela et subtilitate ingenii plurima vera dicit. Et hec racio quare quietor in allegacione scripture que mentiri non poterit et sanctorum doctorum quorum sentenciam volo ex integro sustinere.

seal. Just as, then, one letter is written, and two, and three, and four, and yet the aggregate of many letters for expressing one sentence is only one writing: so in the matter at hand it is understood that every such figuring is ordered to this, that there be inscribed in it the seal according to which a man is judged to be a perfect minister of God; and since a sacrament signifies something relative to another, and the characters too are united as something relative to another, therefore several characters make one sacrament."[8] Thirdly it is argued thus: "If several characters are imprinted in the same soul, then either they differ in species or only in number. Not in the second way, since the recipient must be stripped of the nature of the thing received; nor in the first way, since from things that remain diverse in form and species nothing one is made except a material one.[9] To that," he says, "it must be said that there are two ways of speaking of [505] characters: either in themselves, or as they are united in the unity and integrity of the subject. If in themselves, then they differ as diverse species of number; if in the second way, then, just as two and four make up six, and have the nature of a constitutive part, and the completion is placed in the six, so it is to be understood in the matter at hand in its own way, though it is not altogether alike."[10] Fourthly it is argued by appeal to this: "that nature does not do by many what it can do by one; therefore the author of nature does not imprint many characters in one who is ordained, since one alone suffices, as happens in baptism. What need is there, then, of positing such distinct characters in order? It must be said," he says, "that this is true when something can be done as completely by one as by many; but this is not so in the matter at hand, because the ordained must not only be distinguished from others, as is done by the character of baptism, but they must be distinguished among themselves by more than a material difference."[11] Let the audience wake up, I beg, and consider whether this passage and discourse of the doctors gives effectual testimony for fantasizing that a character is imprinted only in the priestly order, since it testifies the opposite so thickly and so manifestly.[12] And truly a man to whom the art of lying were not praiseworthy would be ashamed of so open a lie. And he who either should intend all his sayings to be taken ironically, or should ascribe a lie to himself as an honour, would give occasion that no more credit be given to his allegation or testimony, whatever he may swear. From the first fabrication, therefore, it is gathered that this doctor either falsifies his witness in many ways, or that the testimony that follows is altogether lying and quite useless, since he and his witness contradict each other so often and so openly.[13] How, I

Alios autem doctores nolo sic allegare nisi arguendo ad hominem, cui foret talis doctoris testificacio argumentum, et sic allegarem contra mendacem oratorem dyaboli ipsum patrem mendacii, sed non ut sit mihi testis ydoneus.

ask, could I reasonably invoke the aid of the testimony [506] of a doctor, in the same opinion and the same book, whom in the same opinion I convict a hundred times of being a liar? On the same footing, indeed, the devil would have to be alleged as a witness to a teaching, since it is known that from wile and subtlety of wit he says very many true things. And this is the reason why I rest in the allegation of scripture, which cannot lie, and of the holy doctors, whose teaching I wish to sustain in its entirety. But other doctors I will not allege in this way except by arguing to the man, for whom such a doctor's testimony would be an argument; and so I might allege against the devil's lying advocate the father of lies himself, but not so that he should be a fit witness for me.[14]

¶3 506.13–506.20

[506] In isto autem secundo commento absque tergiversacione patet primo mendacium allegantis; patet secundo quod non solvitur argumentum quod feci supponendo descripcionem clerici, per hoc quod mendaciter allegatur quod solum in sacerdocio caracter ordinis imprimatur; et tercio quod ista sentencia conviccionis mendacii foret medium doctori isti mihi et aliis cavendi caucius de mendosis allegacionibus in futurum.

And in this second fabrication, without evasion, there is clear, first, the lie of the one who alleges; it is clear, secondly, that the argument I made by supposing the definition of the cleric is not answered by the lying allegation that the character of order is imprinted only in the priesthood; and thirdly, that this sentence of conviction for lying would be a means for this doctor, for me and for others, of being more wary of lying allegations in future.[15]

¶4 506.21–506.30

[506] Scola quidem mendacii est per se a Deo et tota ecclesia detestanda dicente venerabili Anshelmo primo: Cur Deus homo cap. XII°: Non, inquit, sequitur si Deus vult mentiri, iustum est mentiri (supple si non ex possibili), sed pocius sequitur dominum illum non esse. Nam nequaquam potest velle mentiri voluntas, nisi in qua corrupta est veritas, ymmo que deserendo veritatem corrupta est. Quid ergo sequitur ex ista responsione mendacii? Revera mendacium mendacio cumulatum.

The school of lying is indeed in itself to be detested by God and the whole church, as the venerable Anselm says, [book] I of *Cur Deus homo*, chapter 12: "It does not follow," he says, "if God wills to lie, that it is just to lie" (supply: if not from a possible [antecedent]), "but rather it follows that that Lord does not exist. For in no way can a will will to lie, except one in which truth is corrupted, indeed one which by deserting truth has been corrupted." What then follows from this answer of the lie? Truly, lie heaped upon lie.[16]

Notes

1. Bonaventure's fourth objection to his first question and its answer, continuing 500.26–502.9 (chunk 21-c). *Premium vel mercedem*: reward (of those who used the order well) or wage (of those who abused it), as at 502.8–9. T. As printed, *non oportet ut maneat ... quod iste usus ... convertitur* does not construe; the print shows no loss and Loserth marks none; a word such as *sed* is wanted before *quod*, and "[but in this,]" is our supply. B *ministralis* for *ministerialis* (502.13). R. A in the margin at 502.14: *Responsio*.
2. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.* d. 24, p. 2, a. 1, whether diverse characters are imprinted in diverse orders (Loserth, 503.23: "Bonav. l. c. pag. 652 seqq."). C. *Specifice, sicut ordines*: the characters differ in species, as the orders do. *Ut oportet eum dicere*: italic in the print, so Loserth takes it as Bonaventure's own words ('as one must say' of him who holds it). The print's italics run on through *et*. *Arguendo quadrupliciter ad oppositum*: Bonaventure sets out four arguments for the opposite and answers them (504.2–505.17). T. B *diversis imprimuntur* (502.18). R. A in the margin at 502.17: *Opinio*.
3. *Opinantes in omnibus ordinibus esse caracterem*: the holders of the third opinion of the first question (500.19–25). *Secundum maiorem implecionem et minorem*: by a greater and a lesser filling-up, as the impression of the seal grows. *Respondeo*: the first person is that of the first opinion as Bonaventure reports it. T. Bonaventure reads *complexionem* (Loserth, 502.25). R. A in the margin at 502.23 and 502.25: *Duplex opinio*; *Prima*.

4. ***Dimisso priori***: with the earlier order passed over, as in ordination to a higher order without the lower. ***Contra iura***: against the canons. ***Inconveniens***: "absurdity", the absurd consequence in argument (CONTEXTUAL row). ***Ergo et posicio***: elliptical, "therefore the position [is absurd] too". T. AA_1 lack ***satis vivaciter*** (503.2); B lacks ***reciperent ... minus*** (503.11).
5. Wyclif's own addition to Bonaventure's three arguments: the print sets it in roman (plate n0540). ***In casu***: in the case supposed. The point: if characters differed only by degree, the acolyte's character would already be the priestly one in whichever acolyte later became a priest.
6. Bonaventure, ibid.. C. ***Secundum que***: by which [seals]. T. ***Si simul dantur***: B ***sed simul***, AA_1 ***licet semel*** (503.26); the codices read ***eciamsi alterius***, which Loserth corrected to ***alcius*** (503.26). The print is translated in both places. R. A in the margin at 503.21: ***Secunda opinio***.
7. ***Non est simile***: the case of baptism and confirmation is unlike that of order; the subject of ***non ponit*** is taken to be either of those sacraments. ***De sui racione***: by its own nature. R. A in the margin at 504.6: ***Responsio***.
8. ***Prout comparatur ad ulterius signaculum***: order is one only as it is related to a further seal, the priestly character, which completes the minister. ***Sentencia***: here a "sentence" of writing, not a teaching (CONTEXTUAL row). ***Dicat quid ad alterum ... secundum quid ad alterum***: a sacrament signifies something relative, and the characters are one by relation; ***secundum quid*** here is not the opposite of ***simpliciter***. T. B ***purificetur*** for ***plurificetur*** (504.13–14). The codices read ***sciencie figuracio*** (504.20) and ***Sed quidem ad alterum*** (504.23), and AA_1 lack ***secundum quid ... caracteres***; the print is translated. The page foot also reports ***Operatur*** and ***si ergo*** in the codices at 504.16, without showing which printed words they answer. R. A in the margin at 504.15: ***Responsio***.
9. ***Oportet recipiens denudari a natura rei recepte***: the recipient must lack the nature of what it receives, so one soul cannot receive two characters of the same species. ***Nisi unum materiale***: only a material unity, a heap. T. AA_1 ***ac ergo*** (504.27); B ***unum sit*** (504.31); the codices ***Ad aliud*** for ***Ad illud*** (504.31–32). R. A in the margin at 504.32: ***Responsio***.
10. ***Binarius et quaternarius constituunt senarium***: two and four make six; each is a constitutive part, and the completion lies in the six. T. The codices read ***ternarius*** (505.4), which does not make six with two; Loserth's ***quaternarius*** is translated. AA_1 ***sicut intelligendum*** (505.6).
11. ***Natura non facit per plura quod facere potest per unum***: the principle that nature does nothing superfluous. ***Plus quam materiali differencia***: by more than difference in number. Bonaventure's text is taken to end with ***in se ipsis***. T. The codices read ***distigui*** (505.16). R. A in the margin at 505.13: ***Responsio***.
12. ***Expergiscat ... auditorium***: Wyclif turns from Bonaventure's text to his hearers. ***Locus et sermo doctorum***: the passage of Bonaventure just cited, which the opponent alleged (499.27–30). ***Spissim***: thickly, i.e. again and again. T. AA_1 ***logicus et sermo*** for ***locus et sermo*** (505.20). R. Side-note 505.19.
13. ***Ex primo ... commento***: so printed (B ***primo ergo***, 505.28), though the fabrication in hand is the second (499.27, 506.13); ***primo*** may refer back to the first fabrication as already showing the method, or be a slip. ***Doctor iste***: the opponent; ***testem suum***: Bonaventure, his witness. ***Testificacio sequens***: the testimony that follows from such a witness. ***Intenderit***: of purpose, "intend". R. Side-note 505.28 makes Bonaventure the one who contradicts himself; the Latin has the opponent and his witness contradict each other. Side-note 506.1.
14. ***Implico ... esse mendacem***: I entangle [him] in being a liar, i.e. convict him. ***Per inde***: ***perinde***, on the same footing. ***Sentencie ... sentenciam***: here "teaching" (CONTEXTUAL row). ***Sanctorum doctorum***: the holy doctors, set against ***alios doctores***, the modern ones. ***Arguendo ad hominem***: arguing from what the opponent himself accepts. ***Oratorem***: "advocate", one who pleads a cause, here the devil's, not "bedesman" (CONTEXTUAL row). ***Patrem mendacii***: the devil, after John 8:44.
15. ***Supponendo descripcionem clerici***: Wyclif's definition of the cleric (cap. 19, p. 441; cf. 499.30–500.1). ***Sentencia conviccionis mendacii***: a judicial "sentence" convicting of lying, not a teaching (CONTEXTUAL row). ***Doctori isti mihi et aliis***: three datives without a connective, taken as a list. ***Cavendi caucius***: to beware more warily, a figure of repetition.
16. Anselm, ***Cur Deus homo*** I.12 (Loserth, 506.22: ***Anselmi Opp.*** I, p. 80; PL 158 reads ***Deum illum***, and Anselm's own gloss is ***de duobus impossibilibus***); the codices read ***cap. X*** (506.22). The quotation is taken to end with ***corrupta est***. T. ***Supple si non ex possibili*** is Wyclif's gloss; Loserth's note reads "recte: ***si ex non possibili***", "if from an impossible [antecedent]" (506.24–25). The print is translated; on either reading the conditional holds only on an impossible antecedent. ***Dominum illum***: so printed. C. ***Responsione mendacii***: the opponent's lying answer. R. A in the margin at 506.22: ***Anselmus***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 502: ***Quidam***
  - 503: ***caracteris*** (folio mark 197d glued)
  - 503: ***imperfeccionem***
  - 504: ***arguitur***
  - 504: ***figuracio*** (20 is the line number)
  - 505: ***quaternarius***
  - 505: ***rogo***
  - 505: ***locus*** (20 is the line number)
  - 505: ***suffragium***
  - 506: ***quorum***
  - 506: ∅ (print tergiver-|sacione; main has tergiversacione whole at pos 96)

Part 5: The third fabrication: Aquinas, and the senses of order

Loserth pp. 506.31–510.26

¶1 506.31–510.8

507.1 *Again my opponent quotes St. Thomas who is also adverse to him.*

507.20 *These doctors are alleged against me, but I do not admit their authority.*

508.7 *The "stamp" or character is not a thing, but a relation. Every rank has its character.*

508.21 *Yet three sacraments: baptism, confirmation and orders imprint the character in a special way.*

509.1 *Difficulties as to the grades of orders.*

509.13 *Either all orders are identical, or there are numerous orders specifically distinct.*

509.25 *I think orders may be taken in three senses; a) as the position which God assigns to each thing.*

510.9 *b) as a rank assigned by God to clerics for ministering sacramentally;*

510.22 *and such orders are in the soul.*

[506] **Tercium commentum est ficcio testimonii sancti Thome quod in solo ordine sacerdocii vel suo subdito** [507] **caracter ordinis est impressus, et limitatur locus super distinccione XXIV^a^ quarti Sentenciarum; et indubie tractat istam sentenciam ibidem, questione secunda, articulo tercio, recitandoque tres opiniones, ut doctor Bonaventura; quarum prima dicit quod in solo ordine sacerdotali caracter inprimitur; secunda quod in solis sacris ordinibus, sed hoc, inquit, iterum nichil est. Unde, inquit, cum caracter sit signum distinctivum ab aliis, oportet quod in omnibus ordinibus imprimatur, cuius eciam signum est quod oportet quod caracteres perpetuo maneant et nunquam revertentur. Et respondet ad tria argumenta in oppositum, sicut supra. Et patet quod nec hoc est conveniens testimonium ad probandum solum in ordine sacerdotali caracterem esse impressum, cum militat directe in oppositum; et revera cum mendacium in castris armorum corporalium tamquam eis contrarium sit oditum, (ut patet Machabeorum VII°), multo magis in castris scolasticis in quibus militarent solum pugiles veritatis. Sed instatur tripliciter: Videtur enim primo quod uterque istorum doctorum ponat caracterem omnino indelebilem, ego autem dixi superius quod caracter aliquis est tantummodo temporalis. Hic dico quod neuter eorum est mihi autenticus. Ideo non allego eos nisi arguendo ad hominem. Dico tamen quod glossari possunt intelligendo per caracterem esse vel fuisse deputatum ad aliquod sacrum ministerium in sancta ecclesia, et hoc non potest desinere esse, et ideo dicit prior doctor quod caracter manet perpetuo in officio vel premio; nam in predestinatis manet post miliciam quod illi fuerunt deputati ad officium** [508] **temporale propter cuius complecionem perpetuo premiantur, sicut in prescitis manet perpetuo quod ipsi perpetuo puniuntur propter abusum sui officii, et ad istum sensum omnis caracter manet perpetuo in officio vel mercede. Ego autem loquebar de caractere ut dicit simpliciter deputacionem ad officium, nec credo quod ex scriptura vel racione improbabitur sensus iste. Non enim est caracter talis una res que poterit per se esse, sed subiectum taliter se habere. Sed secundo videtur quod in omni homine, et per consequens in omni ordine caracter imprimitur, et sic reges et milites haberent gloriosum caracterem correspondenter ad suum ordinem. Hic dico quod extense loquendo de caractere (ut supra) est conclusio concedenda, nam omni homini deputat Deus officium ad profectum ecclesie. Ideo cum oportet omnem hominem esse servum Christi vel agendo vel paciendo, omnem hominem oportet portare de secta sua uno modo vel alio. Nec credo aliquem**

The third fabrication is the fiction of St Thomas's testimony, that in the order of priesthood alone, or in the one subject to it, [507] **the character of order is imprinted; and the place is assigned on distinction 24 of the fourth [book] of the *Sentences*. And without doubt he treats this teaching there, in the second question, third article, reciting three opinions, as the doctor Bonaventure [does]; of which the first says that a character is imprinted in the priestly order alone; the second, that [it is imprinted] in the sacred orders alone; "but this too," he says, "is nothing. Hence," he says, "since a character is a sign that distinguishes from others, it must be imprinted in all orders; and a sign of this too is that the characters must remain perpetually and never revert."[1] And he answers three arguments to the opposite, as above. And it is clear that this is no fitting testimony either for proving that a character is imprinted only in the priestly order, since it fights directly for the opposite;[2] and truly, since a lie is hated in the camps of bodily arms as contrary to them (as is clear in Maccabees 7), much more [so] in the camps of the schools, in which only champions of truth should fight.[3] But it is objected in three ways. For it seems, first, that each of these doctors posits the character as altogether indelible, whereas I said above that some character is only temporal. Here I say that neither of them is authentic for me. Therefore I do not allege them except in arguing to the man.[4] Yet I say that they can be glossed by understanding by "character" being, or having been, deputed to some sacred ministry in holy church; and this cannot cease to be; and therefore the earlier doctor says that the character remains perpetually in office or in reward. For in the predestinate there remains, after their soldiering, [the fact] that they were deputed to a temporal** [508] **office, for the fulfilment of which they are perpetually rewarded; just as in the foreknown there remains perpetually [the fact] that they are perpetually punished for the abuse of their office; and in this sense every character remains perpetually in office or in wage.[5] But I was speaking of the character as it signifies, without qualification, deputation to an office; nor do I believe that this sense will be disproved from scripture or reason. For such a character is not one thing that could exist by itself, but the subject's being disposed in such a way.[6] But secondly it seems that a character is imprinted in every man, and consequently in every order; and so kings and knights would have a glorious character corresponding to their order. Here I say that, speaking of character broadly (as above), the conclusion is to be granted, for God deputes to every man an office for the profit of the church.**

infringere quin, sicut milites spirituales Christi habent caracterem sui officii, sic et reges ac milites corporales (ut patet inferius). In tribus tamen sacramentis specialiter caracter imprimitur, scilicet baptismo, confirmacione et ordine, que tria sacramenta sunt initerabilia ut officia caracterum indelebilia quoad effectum vel fructum. Nam in baptismo recipit servus Christi distinccionem ab omnino infidelibus, in confirmacione roboracionem sue milicie, in ordine vero recipit singularem limitacionem supra laicos ad ministerium sacramenti. Et ita doctores palliant descripciones et applicant scripturam ad sensum quem asserunt, ut patet de caractere, de ordine et ceteris que vix habent corticem apparencie ex scriptura, ut ordinem militarem dicunt non habere caracterem, quia ille ordo non limitatur ad differenter a laicis ministrandum ecclesiastica sacramenta (de quo alibi). [509]Sed tercio dubitatur quomodo illi caracteres ordinum unum constituunt. Et dicunt doctores predicti, quod nec sunt partes quantitative ordinis nec partes subiective sed partes potestative, ut patet prioris doctoris super d. XXIV[a], ita quod ordines inferiores habent potestatem a sacerdocio ad quod finaliter ordinantur. Sicut ergo senarius constat ex partibus suis aliquotis que non sunt partes eius quantitative, sic sacramentum ordinis constat ex suis partibus, sed illud latinum videtur multis difficile. Nam signato Petro qui vicissim assumpsit septem ordines et maneat modo cum illis omnibus, patet quod si quilibet eorum fuit sacramentum quia ordo, per idem quilibet eorum est modo sacramentum quia ordo. Nam eiusdem racionis est quilibet eorum cuius foret quilibet huiusmodi per se sumptus, sed tunc foret ordo et sacramentum, ergo et modo. Si enim quilibet eorum sit ordo, ergo vel idem ordo in numero qui posterior, vel alius non idem in numero, quia sic foret ydemptificacio numeralis, et si alius, tunc forent septem ordines, et per consequens, cum quelibet multitudo priorum constituit unum ordinem, forent quatuordecim vel plures ordines distincti specifice. Nam sicut ordo inferior et ordo superior sunt disparis speciei, sic ordo sacerdocii constans ex sex ordinibus precedentibus et ordo sacerdocii simplex non habens partes vel causas huiusmodi forent disparis speciei, sicut simplex et compositum. In isto videtur mihi primo notandum quod ordo sumi potest tripliciter satis equivoce. Primo analogice pro gradu in quo Deus ordinat quicquam constitui ad pulchritudinem universi, et sic quelibet res habet suum ordinem in tantum quod necesse est [510]peccatores ex hoc quod dissolvunt ordinem debitum ad quem ex institucione primaria ordinantur subire ordinem puniendi, sic quod (ut multis videtur) peccatum in quantum bonum habet racionem ordinis quoad penam, quia ordo et bonum

Therefore, since every man must be a servant of Christ, either by doing or by suffering, every man must bear [the mark] of his sect in one way or another.[7] Nor do I believe that anyone can break [this point], that just as the spiritual soldiers of Christ have the character of their office, so too do kings and bodily knights (as is clear below). Yet in three sacraments a character is imprinted specially, namely in baptism, confirmation and order; and these three sacraments are unrepeatable, as the offices of the characters are indelible as to effect or fruit. For in baptism the servant of Christ receives distinction from those who are altogether unbelievers; in confirmation, the strengthening of his soldiering; but in order he receives a singular assignment above the laity to the ministry of the sacrament.[8] And so the doctors cloak their definitions and apply scripture to the sense they assert, as is clear of character, of order and of the rest, which have scarcely a rind of appearance from scripture; as they say that the order of knighthood has no character, because that order is not assigned to ministering the church's sacraments differently from the laity (of which elsewhere).[9] [509]But thirdly it is doubted how those characters of the orders make up one. And the doctors aforesaid say that they are neither quantitative parts of order nor subjective parts, but potestative parts, as is clear [from the words] of the earlier doctor on d. 24, so that the lower orders have power from the priesthood, to which they are finally ordered. Just as, then, six is made up of its aliquot parts, which are not its quantitative parts, so the sacrament of order is made up of its parts. But that Latin seems difficult to many.[10] For, taking the case of Peter, who took the seven orders in turn, and let him now remain with all of them, it is clear that if each of them was a sacrament because [it was] an order, by the same token each of them is now a sacrament because [it is] an order. For each of them is of the same nature as each such would be if taken by itself; now it would then be an order and a sacrament; therefore now too. For if each of them is an order, then it is either the same order in number as the later one, or another; not the same in number, since so there would be a numerical identification; and if another, then there would be seven orders; and consequently, since any multitude of the earlier ones makes up one order, there would be fourteen or more orders distinct in species.[11] For just as a lower order and a higher order are of unlike species, so the order of priesthood consisting of the six preceding orders, and the simple order of priesthood having no such parts or causes, would be of unlike species, as simple and compound [are]. In this it seems to me first to be noted that order can be taken in three ways, quite equivocally. First,

quoad consequenciam convertuntur, unde congregaciones hominum in quibus ordinacior est unio vocantur ordines secundum quandam excellenciam inferioribus exemplarem (ut dixi alias).

analogically, for the grade in which God ordains anything to be set for the beauty of the universe; and so each thing has its order, to such an extent that it is necessary that [510] sinners, from the fact that they dissolve the due order to which they are ordered by their first institution, undergo the order of being punished; so that (as it seems to many) sin, insofar as it is good, has the nature of order as regards punishment, since order and good are convertible as to inference; whence the congregations of men in which the union is more ordered are called orders, by a certain excellence that is an exemplar to lower ones (as I have said elsewhere).[12]

¶2 510.9–510.26

[510] Secundo modo accipitur ordo pro gradu a Deo limitato clerico ad differenter a laycis sacramentaliter ministrandum, et sic sunt septem ordines scilicet hostiarius, ceroferius, lector, exorcista, subdyaconus, dyaconus et sacerdos (de quibus dixi superius). Illi autem ordines quandoque sumuntur limitate pro caracteribus subiectatis in anima et quandoque respiciunt signacula sensibilia extrinsecus distincta, cuiusmodi sunt rasio capitis et barbe cum similibus signis humanitus institutis. Isti autem sensibiles caracteres non sunt ordo clericalis, quia sic continue variarentur ordines ad crementum, decrementum vel aliam variacionem istorum signorum, et barbitonsor vel alius laycus frequencius conferret ordines; quod foret ridiculum. Ideo necessitantur loquentes ponere ordines subiectari in anima. Ex quo patet quod anima est persona que est ordinatus, ut puta, diaconus vel sacerdos. Iste ergo ordo manet quietus in anima corrupto episcopo.

In the second way order is taken for a grade assigned by God to a cleric for ministering sacramentally, differently from the laity; and so there are seven orders, namely porter, taper-bearer, lector, exorcist, subdeacon, deacon and priest (of which I have spoken above). And these orders are sometimes taken, in a restricted sense, for the characters subjected in the soul, and sometimes they regard perceptible seals outwardly distinct, such as the shaving of head and beard, with similar signs instituted by men. And these perceptible characters are not the clerical order, since so the orders would continually vary with the increase, decrease or other variation of those signs, and a barber or other layman would confer orders more often [than a bishop]; which would be ridiculous. Therefore those who speak [of order] are compelled to posit that orders are subjected in the soul. From which it is clear that the soul is the person who is ordained, say a deacon or a priest. This order, then, remains at rest in the soul when the bishop has perished.[13]

Notes

1. Thomas Aquinas, *In IV Sent.* d. 24, which Wyclif cites as q. 2, a. 3 (Loserth, 506.32: *Thomae lib. IV Sent.*, Opp. X, p. 442). C. *Commentum*: the opponent's third "fabrication" (row). *Vel suo subdito*: taken as "or in [the order] subject to it", the diaconate. *Limitatur locus*: the opponent assigns the passage. *Ut doctor Bonaventura*: Thomas, like Bonaventure (502.15–503.6), recites the opinions. *Revertentur*: so printed; the sense wanted is "are never repeated" (as if *reiterentur*), but the print is translated. T. AA$_1$ *quod careat; careat extinctum* (507.10); the OCR of the page foot does not show which printed words this answers. R. Side-note 507.1; A in the margin at 506.32: *S. Thomas*.
2. *Sicut supra*: as Bonaventure answered his objections (504.2–505.17). *Militat directe in oppositum*: Thomas's text fights for the opposite; the military figure runs on into *castris* and *pugiles*. *Nec hoc*: no more than Bonaventure's.
3. *Machabeorum VII°*: most likely 1 Maccabees 7, where the enemy twice speaks *verbis pacificis in dolo* (7:10, 27) and the deceit is detested (7:18, 30). C. *Militarent*: subjunctive, "should fight". *Pugiles veritatis*: champions of truth.
4. *Instatur tripliciter*: three objections against Wyclif's own position, answered in turn (507.20–510.26). *Caracter aliquis ... tantummodo temporalis*: Wyclif's earlier statement, 444 (the ecclesiastical character in the foreknown is delible, *solummodo temporale*). *Autenticus*: carrying authority for him. *Arguendo ad hominem*: arguing from what the opponent accepts. R. Side-note 507.20; A in the margin at 507.20: *Triplex obieccio. Responsio. Auctoris sentencia*.
5. *Prior doctor*: Bonaventure, whose words *caracter ... manet ... vel ad gloriam ... vel ad ignominiam* (502.6–9) and *in premium vel mercedem* (502.12) Wyclif here glosses. *Post miliciam*: after their earthly service, the Pauline figure of the soldier (row *milicia; milites*). *Prescitus*: the foreknown, those whom God foreknows will be damned.

6. ***Ut dicit simpliciter deputacionem***: as it signifies the bare deputation to office, not a quality added to it. ***Subiectum taliter se habere***: the character is a manner in which the subject stands, not a thing; side-note 508.7 calls it "a relation". R. Side-note 508.7.
7. ***Extense***: in the broad sense. ***Vel agendo vel paciendo***: by doing (as the just serve) or by suffering (as the punished serve). ***Portare de secta sua***: to bear [something] of his sect, i.e. to wear Christ's following as a retainer wears his lord's (row *secta*, "sect"). R. A in the margin at 508.13: ***Responsio***.
8. ***Infringere***: to break, refute. ***Milites spirituales ... milites corporales***: "soldiers" in the Pauline figure, "knights" for the estate (row *milicia; milites*). ***Initerabilia ut officia caracterum indelebilia***: the three sacraments cannot be repeated, as the characters' offices cannot be blotted out as to effect or fruit. ***Limitacio***: "assignment" to office. T. A *indelibilia* (508.24). R. Side-note 508.21; A in the margin at 508.21: ***In tribus sacramentis caracter imponitur***.
9. ***Palliant descripciones***: they cloak their definitions. ***Corticem apparencie***: a rind (bark) of plausibility. ***Ordinem militarem***: the order of knighthood, the estate. ***De quo alibi***: not identified.
10. ***Prioris doctoris super d. XXIV^{a}***: Bonaventure, ***In IV Sent.*** d. 24 p. 1 a. 2 q. 4 (Quaracchi IV, 618–619: *partes potestativae*, and the parts of six); Loserth gives no reference; cf. Thomas, ibid. (Loserth, 509.5: "Thomae lib. IV. Sent. l. c. pag. 424"). C. ***Partes subiective***: the species under a genus; ***partes potestative***: the parts of a power, the scholastic potential parts. ***Partibus suis aliquotis***: the parts that divide six evenly (one, two, three). ***Illud latinum***: that statement. T. As printed (nothing lost on the plate), ***ut patet prioris doctoris*** lacks a governing word (such as *ex dictis*); "[from the words]" is our supply. AA$_1$ lack ***ut ... potestatem*** (509.4). R. Side-note 509.1; A in the margin at 509.7: ***Hec est sentencia auctoris de potestate et caractere ordinis continue infra***.
11. ***Signato Petro***: Peter taken as the case (A in the margin at 509.10: *Casus*). ***Vicissim***: in turn. ***Vel alius non idem in numero***: punctuated after *alius*, taking *non idem in numero* as the rejection of the first limb; the print's comma could instead join *alius non idem in numero*. The argument: if each order was a sacrament when received, it still is; then either each lower order is numerically the priesthood (impossible), or there are seven orders and, with the priesthood made up of them, fourteen or more. R. Side-note 509.13.
12. ***Satis equivoce***: the three senses share little more than the name. ***Ordinem puniendi***: the order of being punished. ***Ordo et bonum ... convertuntur***: order and good are convertible, each following from the other. ***Exemplarem***: serving as an exemplar to lower congregations; the religious orders take their name from this. ***Ut dixi alias***: not identified. T. B *obligantur* for *ordinantur* (510.1); B *habet ordinem* (509.31). R. Side-note 509.25; A and B in the margin at 509.29: ***Nota quod ordo tripliciter accipitur***.
13. ***Ceroferius***: the taper-bearer, the acolyte. ***Limitate***: in a restricted sense. ***Subiectatis in anima***: having the soul as their subject. ***Rasio capitis et barbe***: the tonsure and the shaving of the beard. ***Frequencius conferret ordines***: "[than a bishop]" supplied for sense. ***Corrupto episcopo***: taken as "when the bishop [who ordained him] has perished", so that the order does not depend on the ordaining bishop's continuing; it may instead mean "when the bishop's [body] has decayed", his own order remaining in his soul. R. Side-notes 510.9, 510.22.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 506: ***subdito*** (print sub-|dito; main token holds the whole word with folio mark 198b glued (no separate dito token))
  - 507: ∅)
  - 507: ***indubie*** [NW]
  - 507: ***oditum*** [NW]
  - 508: ***vel agendo*** (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 508: ***imprimitur***
  - 508: ***scilicet***
  - 508: ∅ (English side-note word "confirmation"; print text line has baptismo, confirmacione (pos 170-171))
  - 507: ***XXIV^{a}*** (XXIV^{a} split XXI|V^{a} (agent 11))

Part 6: Order as perceptible sacrament, and the many characters in one order

Loserth pp. 510.27–514.34

¶1 510.27–512.25
510.27 *c) as the sensible sacrament of ordination by the bishop.*
511.5 *God gives the grace of the sacrament unless hindered by unworthiness in the recipient.*
511.18 *The purpose of formal ordination is to exclude unworthy pretenders.*
511.26 *As outward orders are conferred by several*

[510]Sed tercio modo sumitur ordo pro sacramento sensibili quod est ordinancia episcopi ad sacrum officium supra laycos in ecclesia ministrandi, et si res abscondita huius sensibilis sacramenti est ordo vel caracter insensibiliter subiectatus in anima, et ordo est opus sensibile ab episcopo celebratum quod in verborum sacramentalium prolacione, in ritus, tactus aut unccionis ministracione et in circumcisione extrinsece, ut loci, [511]temporis, persone ordinande et superiorum licencie attencione. Unde dicitur communiter quod regulariter in celebracione ordinum rite facta Deus graciose coassistit dando graciam. Et ideo necesse est peccatorem ordinandum conteri

But in the third way order is taken for the perceptible sacrament, which is the ordination by a bishop to the sacred office of ministering in the church above the laity; and if the hidden reality of this perceptible sacrament is order or character imperceptibly subjected in the soul, [then] order is also a perceptible work celebrated by the bishop, which [consists] in the utterance of the sacramental words, in the ministering of rite, touch or anointing, and outwardly in the circumscribing [of it], as by attention to place, [511]time, the person to be ordained and the licence of superiors.[1] Hence it is commonly said that, as a rule, in a celebration

rites, but are finally one, so spiritual orders are such powers as are gradually or at once given by God;
512.2 *who also gives a power which makes the ministration of the ordained effectual.*
512.11 *This variety of characters is declared in Scripture.*

de peccatis. Deus enim dans potestatem ad ministrandum dat eciam graciam ad officium exequendum nisi indisposicio ordinati prepediat. Unde in baptismo et quocunque alio sacramento subducta assistencia Christi dantis graciam, que sit res sacramenti, fit ex indisposicione suscipientis sacramentum equivoce. Verumptamen Deus post sacracionem episcopi sepe facit ordinem reminiscere, ipse enim dat regulariter rem sacramenti, et sic facit sepe ordines nobis incognite. Unde vacuum videtur mihi quod sollicitemur ad querendum quando, qualiter et quibus verbis Deus ordinavit apostolos vel beatum Paulum aut alios discipulos. Cavere tamen debemus solicite ne pseudoclerici fingant se esse ordinatos a Deo ad tale officium clericatus. Ad hoc enim ordinatur ordinandi examinacio, episcopi celebracio et signorum sensibilium figuracio, ut sic innotescat ecclesie discolorum exclusio; utrobique tamen sepe contingit illusio. Et (ut sepe dixi) credendum est precipue operi legitimo ordinati. Istis premissis videtur mihi quantum ad primam conclusionem quod, sicut ordo acceptus tercio modo est aggregatum ex multis signis sensibilibus, eciam paulatim in diversis et intercisis temporibus celebratis: sic ordo superior acceptus secundo modo est aggregatum ex diversis caracteribus sive signaculis; quos Deus dat appropriate simul vel intercise, et sunt eius partes quantitative non quoad molem, sed quoad potestatem, ita quod, quotquot actus legitimos quis sufficit facere, tot caracteres habet datos a Deo compositos [512] proporcionaliter cum se ipsis. Sed ne subditus diffidat de potestate sui prepositi, cum in cessacione cuiuscunque officii unus caracter extinguitur, Deus dedit caracterem superiorem, qui est limitacio ad sufficienciam dati generis ministerii indistincte, et talem caracterem non potest ordinatus deserere, quamdiu manet in eo potencia ad signa sensibilia ministrandum. Suspendi tamen potest a superiori propter causam racionabilem, ne ordinatus ponat tunc caracterem in effectum. Et si queratur necessitas ponendi tot caracteres, dicitur quod admissa significacione quid nominis, et supposita ordinacione divina de dividendo diversis hominibus diversas gracias officii gratis datas, sequitur inevitabiliter predicta diversitas caracterum. Unde ad fundandum istam sentenciam oportet primo supponere fidem scripture Iª Cor. XII°, 4—7: Divisiones graciarum sunt, idem autem spiritus; et divisiones ministracionum sunt, idem autem dominus, et divisiones operacionum sunt, idem autem Deus qui operatur omnia in omnibus. Unicuique autem datur manifestacio spiritus ad utilitatem. Et post in corpore ecclesie explicat novem gradus. Nec licet denegare talem ordinem concedendo corpus ecclesie vel eius ministros secundum iura canonica.

of orders rightly performed God graciously assists together, giving grace. And therefore it is necessary that a sinner who is to be ordained be contrite for his sins. For God, giving power to minister, gives also grace for carrying out the office, unless the unfitness of the ordained hinders [it]. Hence in baptism and in any other sacrament, when the assistance of Christ giving grace, which is to be the reality of the sacrament, is withdrawn, the sacrament is made equivocally, through the unfitness of the one receiving it.[2] Nevertheless God, after the bishop's consecrating, often makes the order revive; for he regularly gives the reality of the sacrament; and so he often makes orders in a way unknown to us.[3] Hence it seems to me vain that we should be anxious to inquire when, how and with what words God ordained the apostles, or blessed Paul, or other disciples. Yet we must carefully beware lest false clerics feign that they are ordained by God to such an office of the clerical state. For to this end are ordered the examination of the one to be ordained, the bishop's celebration and the figuring of perceptible signs, that thus the exclusion of the froward may become known to the church; yet on both sides illusion often happens.[4] And (as I have often said) one must believe chiefly the lawful work of the ordained. These things premised, it seems to me, as to the first conclusion, that, just as order taken in the third way is an aggregate of many perceptible signs, celebrated even little by little at diverse and interrupted times: so higher order taken in the second way is an aggregate of diverse characters or seals, which God gives as is fitting, together or at intervals; and they are its quantitative parts, not as to bulk but as to power; so that as many lawful acts as a man suffices to do, so many characters he has, given by God, compounded [512] proportionally with one another.[5] But lest a subject should distrust the power of his superior, since at the ceasing of any office one character is extinguished, God has given a higher character, which is an assignment to sufficiency for a given kind of ministry, without distinction; and such a character the ordained cannot desert so long as there remains in him the power to minister the perceptible signs. Yet he can be suspended by a superior for reasonable cause, lest the ordained should then put the character into effect.[6] And if the need of positing so many characters is asked, the answer is that, granted the signification of what the name means, and supposing the divine ordinance of dividing diverse graces of office, freely given, among diverse men, the aforesaid diversity of characters follows inevitably.[7] Hence, to ground this teaching, one must first suppose the faith of scripture, 1 Corinthians 12:4–7: "There are diversities of graces,

but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but the same God, who worketh all in all. And the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit." And afterwards he sets out nine grades in the body of the church. Nor is it lawful to deny such an order while granting the body of the church, or its ministers according to the canon laws.[8]

¶2 512.26–513.21
513.6 *Every cleric has a duty assigned by God according to his degree,*
513.12 *and this is what I call his "character".*
513.22 *There are seven orders, but they all combine to make one order.*

[512] Unde notanda est trimembris divisio textus apostoli. Aliqua enim donat Deus predestinatis que vocat gracias a spiritu sancto datas, quia predestinatis timentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum. Unde quia cum istis donis stat mortale secundum presentem iusticiam, ideo vocantur gracie gratis date ex benevolencia spiritus predestinantis. Ministraciones autem sunt in qualibet creatura racionali predestinata [513] vel prescita, quam oportet servire domino libere vel coacte; ideo adiungit apostolus illud secundum membrum ad dominum. Sed tercio omnis natura creata saltem per se existens habet apud creatorem suum officium operandi. Ideo notat illud tercium generale sub habitudine ad Deum creantem. Istis suppositis patet quod omnis clericus habet a Deo secundum suum gradum limitacionem officii ministrandi, et illam voco ego caracterem quem oportet omnem fidelem admittere cuicunque membro ecclesie et nullum alium. Quod autem alii capiunt terminum striccius in uno sensu et alii largius in alio, non est magna vis, cum sit terminus magistralis, verumptamen loquendum est (ut plures loquentes scripture et racioni conformius), et patet responsio quomodo aliquis caracter cessat completo officio, et talis dividitur proporcionaliter ut eius officium. Et ille vocatur caracter in actu, et alius caracter dicit potestatem ad confuse faciendum ministerium, sive sequatur sive non, et ille non dependet ab opere sed a sufficiencia operis quoad speciem terminantis, et iste modus loquendi videtur facilior.

Hence the threefold division of the apostle's text is to be noted. For some things God gives to the predestinate, which he calls graces given by the Holy Spirit, because to the predestinate "that fear God all things work together unto good". Hence, since mortal [sin] stands with these gifts according to present justice, they are therefore called graces freely given, from the benevolence of the predestinating Spirit.[9] And ministries are in every rational creature, predestinate [513] or foreknown, which must serve the Lord freely or by compulsion; therefore the apostle joins that second member to the Lord. But thirdly every created nature, at least one existing by itself, has from its creator its office of operating. Therefore he marks that third, general [member] under the condition toward God creating.[10] These things supposed, it is clear that every cleric has from God, according to his grade, an assignment of the office of ministering; and this I call the character, which every believer must grant to any member of the church whatever, and no other.[11] And that some take the term more strictly in one sense and others more broadly in another is no great matter, since it is a masters' term; nevertheless one must speak (as the majority [do], speaking more conformably to scripture and reason); and the answer is clear, how some character ceases when the office is completed, and such [a character] is divided proportionally, as its office [is]. And that is called the character in act; and the other character signifies the power to perform the ministry indistinctly, whether [the act] follows or not; and that does not depend on the work but on sufficiency for the work as to the species of what terminates it; and this way of speaking seems easier.[12]

¶3 513.22–514.20
514.1 *Ordination to the priesthood confers the power of performing all spiritual ministrations.*
514.20 *As the various orders are combined in one, so the grace of each*

[513] Ulterius patet quod est dare septem ordines secundo modo dictos, distinctos specifice, sed nullus eorum est sensibile sacramentum, sed res vel fructus eius. Sacramentum autem ordinis quod sacerdos celebrat est quodammodo unum secundum magnam partem sui subiectatum in ordinante, quia finis a quo capitur eius unitas est totum sacerdocium tocius sacerdotis ecclesie, nec resisto quin

Further, it is clear that there are seven orders taken in the second way, distinct in species; but none of them is the perceptible sacrament, but its reality or fruit. And the sacrament of order which the priest celebrates is in a way one, subjected for a great part of it in the one ordaining, since the end from which its unity is taken is the whole priesthood of the whole priest of the church; nor do I resist [the view] that there are diverse

sacrament combines with the rest.
514.31 *We are apt to attend too much to the outward sign.*

sunt diversi ordines distincti specifice tam sacramenta quam res sacramenti; omnes tamen illi ordines sunt unus ordo, et sic sunt tantum septem sacramenta, licet sit tantum unum sacramentum, sicut Crisostomus, Omelia prima, dicit de septem ecclesiis. [514] Et patet primo quod ordinans hominem primo et immediate in sacerdotem eo ipso dat sibi vel ministerialiter signo sacramentali ostendit quod habet septem ordines sive caracteres. Patet ex hoc quod eo ipso limitatur ad potestatem septemplicem quod est ordo. Non enim foret sacerdos univoce nisi haberet potestatem ad ministrandum quamcunque speciem spiritualis ministerii quo sufficit ministrare clericus graduatus inferior. Immo quot sunt species officii in quas graduatus potestative sufficit, tot sunt ordines sive caracteres. Omnes tamen sunt unus ordo cuius partes integrales vocari possunt partes potestative, sicut pars senarius communis ad quamcunque unitatem eius vocatur prima pars eius aliquota, et pars eius communis ad quemcunque eius binarium vel ternarium vocatur secunda et tercia pars eius aliquota, ex quibus adequate constat senarius. Unde si Deus per impossibile daret clerico potestatem conficiendi et non absolvendi, ille non foret sacerdos, si non equivoce, et patet secundo quod

orders distinct in species, sacraments as well as reality of the sacrament; yet all those orders are one order; and so there are only seven sacraments, though there is only one sacrament, as Chrysostom, in the first homily, says of the seven churches.[13] [514] And it is clear, first, that he who ordains a man first and immediately into a priest by that very fact gives him, or ministerially shows by a sacramental sign, that he has seven orders or characters. It is clear from this, that by that very fact he is assigned to a sevenfold power, which is order. For he would not be a priest univocally unless he had power to minister every species of spiritual ministry that a cleric of lower grade suffices to minister. Indeed, as many as are the species of office to which one who holds a grade suffices in power, so many are the orders or characters.[14] Yet all are one order, whose integral parts can be called potestative parts; as the part of six common to any unit of it is called its first aliquot part, and its part common to any two or three of it is called its second and third aliquot part, of which six is adequately made up. Hence if God, by an impossible supposition, were to give a cleric power of consecrating and not of absolving, he would not be a priest, if not equivocally; and it is clear, secondly, that[15]

¶4 514.21–514.23

[514] sicut res sacramenti ordinis, sic res diversorum sacramentorum sese essencialiter consequuntur. Nam oportet

as with the reality of the sacrament of order, so the realities of the diverse sacraments follow one upon another essentially. For it is necessary[16]

¶5 514.24–514.31

[514] recipientem efficaciter ordinem prius baptizari baptismo flaminis, sicut oportet eum confirmari aliquo gradu divine confirmacionis, sponsari capiti ecclesie, habere fructum penitencie, unionem eucaristie et unccionem gracie consummate. Verumptamen in sacramentis nostris sensibilibus est ordo per accidens ex institucione ecclesie, ad quem ordinem magis appreciando

that one who receives order effectually be first baptized with the baptism of the Spirit, as it is necessary that he be confirmed in some degree of divine confirmation, be espoused to the head of the church, have the fruit of penance, the union of the eucharist and the anointing of consummated grace. Nevertheless in our perceptible sacraments there is an order by accident, from the institution of the church, to which order, in valuing [them], we[17]

¶6 514.32–514.34

[514] intendimus quam ad rem vel fructum sacramenti sensibilis, et ista irregularitas qua magis attendimus

attend more than to the reality or fruit of the perceptible sacrament; and this irregularity, by which we attend more[18]

Notes

1. ***Ordinancia episcopi***: "ordination", the sacramental act (row ***ordinacio; ordinancia***). ***Res abscondita***: the hidden reality (***res sacramenti***) beneath the visible sign. ***Insensibiliter***: imperceptibly. T. As printed, the period has no apodosis after ***et si ... in anima***, and the clause ***quod in ... prolacione ...*** has no verb; "[then]" and "[consists]" are our supply. ***In circumcisione extrinsece***: so the codices and the print; Loserth notes "rectius ***et intercisione***", "and in the interruption [of times]", comparing 511.29 and 511.31 (510.34). The print is translated, taking ***circumcisio*** as the circumscribing of the rite by its outward conditions. R. Side-note 510.27.

2. ***Regulariter***: as a rule. ***Coassistit***: assists together [with the minister]. ***Conteri***: to be contrite. ***Que sit res sacramenti***: grace, which is to be the reality of the sacrament. ***Sacramentum equivoce***: a sacrament in name only. R. Side-note 511.5.
3. ***Reminiscere***: so printed; "makes the order remember" gives no sense here. Translated "revive", as if ***reviviscere***, the term for a sacrament that takes effect once the obstacle is removed (our emendation; the plate confirms *reminiscere* and Loserth has no note). C. ***Post sacracionem episcopi***: after the bishop's consecrating act. ***Incognite***: in a way unknown to us. R. A in the margin at 511.15: ***Nota***.
4. ***Pseudoclerici***: false clerics. ***Discolorum***: of the froward (1 Pet. 2:18). ***Utrobique ... illusio***: deception happens on both sides, in God's ordaining as men judge it and in the bishop's rite. R. Side-note 511.18.
5. ***Quantum ad primam conclusionem***: as to the first of the three doubts (509.1), how the characters make one order. ***Appropriate***: as is fitting, not the canon-law *appropriare*. ***Partes quantitative ... quoad potestatem***: Wyclif grants the characters to be quantitative parts in power, against the doctors' denial (509.3). ***Compositos proporcionaliter cum se ipsis***: compounded in proportion to one another. R. Side-note 511.26; A in the margin at 511.26: ***Responsio***.
6. ***Caracterem superiorem***: the higher character, a general assignment to a kind of ministry, which outlasts the ceasing of any single act. ***Indistincte***: without distinction of particular acts. ***A superiori***: by a superior in office. T. B *in ea* (512.7). R. Side-note 512.2.
7. ***Admissa significacione quid nominis***: granted the signification of the word "character" as defined (what the name means). ***Gracias officii gratis datas***: graces of office freely given, the scholastic *gratiae gratis datae*. T. B *signacione* (512.12), the same word (row *signacio / significacio*). ***Sentencia*** (512.16): CONTEXTUAL (the glossary): here the position taught, so 'teaching'. R. Side-note 512.11; A in the margin at 512.11: ***Questio***.
8. 1 Corinthians 12:4–7: Wyclif has no *vero* in v. 4 (the Douay–Rheims "Now" is therefore dropped) and *autem* for *vero* in v. 6. ***Novem gradus***: the nine set in the church at 1 Corinthians 12:28 (apostles, prophets, doctors, miracles, healings, helps, governments, tongues, interpretations). C. ***Supponere fidem scripture***: to take as premiss what scripture teaches. ***Nec licet ... secundum iura canonica***: taken to mean that whoever grants the body of the church, or its ministers as the canons define them, may not deny such an order.
9. Romans 8:28: Wyclif has *timentibus Deum* ("that fear God") for the Vulgate *diligentibus Deum* ("to them that love God"); *predestinatis* is roman in the print, his own application; his Latin is translated (Loserth, 512.29: Rom. VIII, 28). C. ***Trimembris divisio***: graces, ministries, operations (1 Cor. 12:4–6). ***Mortale***: mortal [sin]. ***Secundum presentem iusticiam***: as against predestination; since these gifts can stand with mortal sin, they are graces freely given, not the grace that makes pleasing.
10. ***Libere vel coacte***: willingly or under compulsion, as the predestinate and the foreknown serve. ***Ad dominum***: to "the same Lord" of v. 5; ***ad Deum creantem***: to "the same God" of v. 6. ***Per se existens***: existing by itself, a substance. ***Habitudo***: "condition toward", a relation (row).
11. ***Illam voco ego caracterem***: Wyclif's own definition, the character as the assignment of office (***limitacio***, as above). ***Quem***: agrees with *caracterem*. ***Et nullum alium***: and no other character. T. B lacks *ministrandi*, and AA_1 lack *ego* (513.8–9). R. Side-notes 513.6, 513.12; A and B in the margin at 513.7: ***Quid est caracter***.
12. ***Terminus magistralis***: a term of the masters, of the schools rather than of scripture (row). ***Ut plures loquentes***: the verb is understood, "as the majority [do]". ***Caracter in actu***: the character answering to an office actually performed; ***alius caracter***: the standing power. ***Confuse***: "indistinctly", without determination to any one act (row). ***Quoad speciem terminantis***: as to the species of the act in which the power terminates.
13. Pseudo-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 1 (PG 56:620): the churches are numberless yet called seven *propter Spiritus septem*, John and Paul writing to seven *quasi ad omnes*; Loserth gives no reference. C. ***Quod sacerdos celebrat***: so printed, though the one who ordains is the bishop. ***Subiectatum in ordinante***: having its subject in the one ordaining. ***Tocius sacerdotis ecclesie***: taken as Christ, the whole priest of the church; it may mean every priest of the church. ***Tantum septem ... tantum unum***: the first *tantum* sits awkwardly ("only seven" and yet "only one"). R. Side-note 513.22; A in the margin at 514.1: ***Crisostomus***.
14. ***Primo et immediate in sacerdotem***: ordained priest directly, without the lower orders (cf. 503.2–3). ***Quod est ordo***: taken as "which is order", the sevenfold power; it may instead mean "by the very fact that [this] is order". ***Univoce***: in the same sense as other priests. ***Graduatus***: one who holds a grade of order, not an academic graduate. T. B *quamcunque spem* for *quamcunque speciem* (514.7–8). R. Side-note 514.1; A in the margin at 514.1: ***Prima conclusio***.
15. ***Partes integrales ... potestative***: the potestative parts may be called integral parts. ***Pars senarius***: taken as *senarii*, "of six". The aliquot parts of six are one, two and three, which add to six. ***Per impossibile***: by an impossible supposition. ***Conficiendi ... absolvendi***: of consecrating [the eucharist] and of absolving. ***Si non equivoce***: except equivocally. The sentence runs on at 514.21.
16. ***Sicut res sacramenti ordinis***: as the orders' characters are bound into one, so the realities (the graces) of the several sacraments entail one another. T. B *consequentur* (514.22). R. Side-note 514.20; A in the margin (Loserth's foot keys it to 514.17; the conclusion opens at 514.20): ***Secunda conclusio***.
17. ***Baptismo flaminis***: the baptism of the Spirit, as against that of water; cf. Wyclif, *Trialogus*, p. 285 (Loserth, 514.24). C. The six realities answer to baptism, confirmation, matrimony (*sponsari capiti ecclesie*), penance, the eucharist and extreme unction, with order the seventh. ***Ordo per accidens***: an order (a sequence) by accident, set by the church's institution. T. AA_1 *fructum finem* (514.26); B *gracie confirmate* for *consummate* (514.27).
18. ***Appreciando***: with *intendimus*, "in valuing [them]". ***Intendimus***: "we attend", of purpose, not the scholastic "maintain". The sentence continues at 515.1. R. Side-note 514.31.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 511: *temporis* (folio mark 198c glued)
  - 511: *officium*
  - 512: *Iª*
  - 514: *appreciando*
  - 514: ∅ (duplicate: baptismo already at 161) [DELX]

Part 7: Order conferred by degrees, and the cleric's propertyless life

Loserth pp. 515.1–517.26

¶1 515.1–515.11

[515] **ad folia quam ad fructus creditur facere in oculis Dei sacramenta nostra vilescere. Sic enim fuit tempore cessacionis legalium multipliciter ritibus humanitus adinventis, et patet via ad solvendum difficultatem qua queritur utrum, dyacono recipiente ab episcopo potestatem absolvendi et non conficiendi vel econtra per mortem aut infirmitatem episcopi vel causam aliam, utrum sit plene sacerdos. Dicitur enim communiter quod non imprimitur caracter sacerdocii ante complecionem verborum sacramentalium**

to the leaves than to the fruits, is believed to make our sacraments grow cheap in the eyes of God. For so it was at the time when the legal precepts were ceasing, rites having been devised by men in many ways; and the way is clear to resolving the difficulty in which it is asked whether, when a deacon receives from the bishop the power of absolving and not of consecrating, or the reverse, through the death or infirmity of the bishop or some other cause, whether he is fully a priest.[1] For it is commonly said that the character of priesthood is not imprinted before the completion of the sacramental words,

¶2 515.12–515.13

[515] **sed veritas est quod ignoramus quando et qualiter Deus imprimit sacerdotalem caracterem**

but the truth is that we are ignorant of when and how God imprints the priestly character;

¶3 515.14–515.19

[515] **nec habent evidencie facte ex legibus ecclesie et scriptura vix corticem coloris (ut patet alibi). Ex istis tercio potest convinci quomodo interpolata celebracio sacramenti ordinis potest sive bene fieri sive male. Nam in primitiva ecclesia Christus immediate fecit apostolos suos sacerdotes, hoc est, episcopos, et post ascensionem**

nor have the evidences drawn from the laws of the church and from scripture more than barely the rind of colour (as is clear elsewhere). From these, thirdly, it can be shown conclusively how an interrupted celebration of the sacrament of order can be done either well or badly. For in the primitive church Christ immediately made his apostles priests, that is, bishops; and after the ascension,[2]

¶4 515.20–516.12
516.9 *and should not be distrusted without reason.*
516.13 *It is a "character" of the clergy to live in poverty.*
516.26 *This is proved by the Old Testament as interpreted by Christ's acts.*

[515] **tempore apostolorum constituerunt dyaconos, nec alios ordines clerici seorsum exhibitos legi illas columpnas ecclesie celebrasse. Et Deus scit utrum ritus ille foret hodie solempnior, facilior et ecclesie Christi utilior. Omnia enim que faciunt clerici inferioris ordinis possunt clerici ex vi potestatis sacerdotalis perficere et a probabili efficacius et humilius quam fiunt modo. Christus enim summus sacerdos exercuit omnia ista officia (ut alias explanavi). Ideo videri posset quod foret ad alleviamen ecclesie non habere tot ritus sacramentales et tot leges de clericis ordinatis per saltum, cum hoc quod foret ecclesie efficacius et brevius ministratum. Ex alio autem latere posset contingere quod episcopi postposito fastu de excellencia sui ordinis et cupiditate questus de sua preeminencia et necessitate ad regulandum** [516] **ecclesiam in oculo puro et simplici considerent quod sincerius ministraretur ecclesie ordinatis clericis paulative. Sic enim foret examinacio discrecior, examinati appropriacio ex conversacione experta securior et omnino expulsio persone inhabilis et acceptacio persone habilis ad utilitatem ecclesie foret facilior.**

in the time of the apostles, they appointed deacons; nor have I read that those pillars of the church celebrated other orders of the clergy conferred separately.[3] And God knows whether that rite would today be more solemn, easier and more useful to the church of Christ. For all the things that clerics of a lower order do, clerics can perform by force of the priestly power, and probably more effectually and more humbly than they are done now. For Christ, the high priest, exercised all these offices (as I have explained elsewhere). Therefore it might seem that it would be for the relief of the church not to have so many sacramental rites and so many laws about clerics ordained *per saltum*, with this besides, that the church would be ministered to more effectually and more briefly. But on the other side it could happen that the bishops, setting aside pride in the excellence of their order and the greed of gain from their pre-eminence and from their necessity for ruling the [516] **church, would consider with a pure and simple eye that the church would be more sincerely ministered**

Illam autem potestatem ordinandi habent superiores prepositi ex dicto Apostoli, Romanorum XIV°, 19: Que edificacionis sunt invicem custodiamus. Debet autem supponi in istis prepositorum discrecio et per consequens acceptari eorum ordinacio, nisi fuerit ad oppositum vehemens suspicio.

to by clerics ordained by degrees. For so the examination would be more discerning, the appropriation of the one examined, from his manner of life tried by experience, more secure, and altogether the expulsion of an unqualified person and the acceptance of a qualified person would be easier, to the benefit of the church.[4] And this power of ordaining the higher superiors have from the saying of the apostle, Romans 14:19: "let us keep the things that are of edification, one towards another." Now in these matters the discretion of superiors ought to be supposed, and consequently their ordination accepted, unless there should be a strong suspicion to the contrary.[5]

¶5 516.13–517.26
517.6 *The moral laws of the O. T. are binding,*
517.15 *and we assert them for our tithes.*

[516] Quarto ex predictis potest colligi quomodo nomen clerici superaddit caracterem ordinis conversacionem exproprietariam. Nam habentes ordines inferiores coniugati et conversantes seculariter sunt laici, licet ex favore regni nostri habeant privilegium clericatus, et per consequens non sunt simul cum hoc clerici, cum status illi ex opposito distinguuntur (ut docet Hugo, De Sacramentis, libro secundo parte septima). Et potest confirmari ex decreto beati Jeronimi posito XII^{a}, q. I. Clericus, et infra, et I^{a}, q. II. Si quis et Sacerdos, cum multis legibus eis similibus. Et valet ad idem testimonium beati Bernardi libro ad papam Eugenium et testimonia sanctorum alibi sepius allegata. Sed efficacissime videtur mihi valere quadruplex testimonium de clericis veteris testamenti allegatum XIII° capitulo huius libri. Nec valet fingere quod leges veteris testamenti non obligant nos in novo; primo quia ille qui venit non legem solvere sed implere, cuius factum est optimus interpres quomodo vetus testamentum debet intelligi et servari, docuit [517] quomodo ipse, sui apostoli et eorum vicarii debent vivere pauperem vitam exproprietarie; quod duravit per trecentos annos et amplius usque ad venenosam dotacionem cesaream, ad cuius crementum proporcionaliter decrevit possessionata ecclesia in virtute. Secundo confirmatur ex hoc quod omnia moralia iudicialium vel cerimonialium legis veteris sunt pro tempore legis gracie observanda; cum ergo conversacio pauper et exproprietaria sit moralis, videtur quod post Christum pauperem debet a suis clericis observari; sicut enim mater ecclesia est senior, sic debet esse specialiter in clero religiosior, et per consequens deserendo mundum sponso proprinquior. Tercio confirmatur per deducens ad inconveniens vel per locum a simili; nam decimas et illa que sonant in lucrum clericis accipimus non expressa auctoritate legis nove sed veteris; cum ergo amplectimus minus religiosum legis veteris, videtur sequi quod magis religiosum sit servandum nobis ex integro vel minus

Fourthly, from what has been said it can be gathered how the name of cleric adds to the character of order a propertyless manner of life.[6] For those holding the lower orders who are married and live in a secular manner are laymen, although by the favour of our realm they have the privilege of the clerical state; and consequently they are not at the same time clerics as well, since those states are distinguished as opposites (as Hugh teaches, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 7).[7] And it can be confirmed from the decree of blessed Jerome placed at C. 12 q. 1 *Clericus*, and further on, and C. 1 q. 2 *Si quis* and *Sacerdos*, with many laws like them. And to the same purpose avails the testimony of blessed Bernard in the book to Pope Eugenius, and the testimonies of the saints alleged elsewhere quite often. But most effectual of all, it seems to me, is the fourfold testimony about the clerics of the old testament alleged in the thirteenth chapter of this book.[8] Nor does it avail to pretend that the laws of the old testament do not bind us in the new; first, because he who came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it, whose deed is the best interpreter of how the old testament ought to be understood and kept, taught [517] how he himself, his apostles and their vicars ought to live a poor life without property; which lasted for three hundred years and more, up to the venomous caesarean endowment, in proportion to whose increase the possessioned church decreased in virtue.[9] Secondly, it is confirmed from this, that all the moral elements of the judicial or ceremonial precepts of the old law are to be observed in the time of the law of grace; since, then, a poor and propertyless manner of life is moral, it seems that after the poor Christ it ought to be observed by his clerics; for as mother church is older, so she ought to be, especially in her clergy, more religious, and consequently, by forsaking the world, nearer to the bridegroom.[10] Thirdly, it is confirmed by [an argument] leading to an absurdity, or by

religiosum sic racionabiliter auferendum. Non enim licet nobis modo paganico colare nobis placitum de utroque testamento et abicere quod visum est nobis durum, per quod ut clavem Christi religio servaretur et potissime periclitante mundo per venenum avaricie. Sic enim introducta est ex consilio Sergii monachi secta nepharia Machometi.

the topic from likeness; for we take tithes and the things that make for gain to clerics on the express authority not of the new law but of the old; since, then, we embrace what is less religious in the old law, it seems to follow that what is more religious is to be kept by us in its entirety, or else that the less religious is on the same ground reasonably to be taken away. For it is not lawful for us, in a pagan manner, to strain out for ourselves what pleases us from each testament and to cast away what has seemed hard to us, through which, as by a key, the religion of Christ would be kept, and most of all when the world is imperilled by the venom of avarice. For so the abominable sect of Mahomet was introduced on the counsel of Sergius the monk.[11]

Notes

1. The sentence began at 514.32: the irregularity "by which we attend more to the leaves than to the fruits" (the outward rite rather than the reality of the sacrament) "is believed to make our sacraments grow cheap". *Tempore cessacionis legalium*: when the legal precepts of the old law were about to cease; the ablative absolute *multipliciter ritibus humanitus adinventis* gives the like cause then, rites multiplied by human invention. The second *utrum* repeats the first after the long participial clause and is kept. *Potestatem absolvendi et non conficiendi*: the power of absolving but not of consecrating the eucharist; *vel econtra*, the reverse, the rite having been broken off by the bishop's death, infirmity or another cause. R. In the margin (the siglum is lost in the OCR of the page foot): *Questio*.
2. *Nec ... vix*: the negative is doubled, "nor ... more than barely". *Corticem coloris*: the rind of colour, the outer husk of a plausible ground (row *color*). *Interpolata celebracio*: the sacrament of order conferred in stages, at intervals, rather than all at once. *Convinci*: to be shown conclusively. T. B *corticem colorum* (515.14). R. A in the margin at 515.15: [*Tercia*] *conclusio* (the OCR of the page foot gives only *conclusio*).
3. *Legi*: "I have read" (perfect, first person), governing *illas columpnas ecclesie celebrasse*; the pillars are the apostles. *Ordines clerici seorsum exhibitos*: the orders below the priesthood, each conferred separately. The subject of *constituerunt* is the apostles. *A probabili*: probably. *Ut alias explanavi*: not located. T. B *fuit modo* for *fiunt modo* (515.25–26).
4. *Per saltum*: "by a leap", ordination to a higher order without the lower ones. *Alleviamen*: relief. *Cum hoc quod*: "with this besides, that". *Ex alio ... latere*: on the other side of the question. *Fastu de excellencia*: pride in the excellence. *Questus*: gain. *Paulative*: by degrees, through the orders in turn. *Examinati appropriacio*: the assigning of the examined candidate to the grade fitted to him, not the annexing of a church to a house (row *appropriare; appropriacio*, whose English is kept).
5. Romans 14:19: Wyclif quotes only the second half and has *invicem* for the Vulgate *in invicem*. C. *Superiores prepositi*: the higher superiors, the bishops. *Ordinacio*: their ordaining of clerics, the sacrament (row: "ordination"). T. The codices read *debent*; the print has *Debet* (516.10). R. Side-note 516.9.
6. *Superaddit caracterem ordinis conversacionem exproprietariam*: taken as "adds to the character of order a propertyless manner of life"; it might be read "adds the character of order and a propertyless manner of life". T. B reads *quomodo nulla clerici* (516.13–14). R. Side-note 516.13; A in the margin at 516.13: *Quarta conclusio*.
7. *Privilegium clericatus*: the privilege of the clerical state, which the realm allowed to married men in lower orders. *Ex opposito distinguuntur*: are distinguished as opposites, clergy against laity. S. Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II, "part 7"; the passage is II.2.3 (PL 176), the clergy and laity *quasi duo latera corporis unius*.
8. Decretum C.12 q.1 c.5 *Clericus* and C.1 q.2 cc.8–9 *Si quis*, *Sacerdos* (Loserth, 516.22; the modern form is ours). Bernard, *De consideratione*, addressed to Pope Eugenius III; cf. II.6.10 (*Argentum et aurum non est mihi*) and IV.2–3. The fourfold testimony: chapter 13, which Loserth locates at p. 284 above (516.28). T. The OCR of the page foot appears to give A *22 cap.*, corrected to 13 (516.28).
9. Matthew 5:17: Wyclif has *non legem solvere sed implere* for the Vulgate *non veni solvere, sed adimplere*; the Douay–Rheims "destroy ... fulfil" is kept. C. *Cuius factum est optimus interpres*: Christ's deed is the best interpreter of the old law. *Trecentos annos*: down to Constantine. *Venenosam dotacionem cesaream*: Constantine's endowment of the church, at which, by the legend, a voice was heard in the air: *Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei* (Higden, *Polychronicon* IV, RS V, p. 130; Wyclif cites "Cestrensis" for it in *De potestate pape* c. 6). R. Side-note 516.26; A in the margin at 516.30: *Ficcio*.
10. *Moralia iudicialium vel cerimonialium*: the moral content of the judicial and ceremonial precepts, on the scholastic division of the old law into moral, judicial and ceremonial; the moral binds under the law of grace. *Mater ecclesia est senior*: the church is now older, grown from her youth; it may mean older than the synagogue. *Proprinquior*: so printed, for *propinquior*. R. Side-note 517.6.
11. *Per deducens ad inconveniens*: so printed; *per* has no noun, and "[an argument]" is our supply (perhaps for *per deducere* or *deducendo*). *Inconveniens*: here the absurd consequence of a premiss (row, CONTEXTUAL). *Que sonant in lucrum*: that tend to gain. *Colare*: to strain out, to pick. *Per quod ut clavem*: so printed; *ut clavem* does not construe easily after *per quod*, and

"as by a key" renders the print (*ut clavum*, "as by a helm", is possible). S. Sergius, the monk who in medieval polemic counselled Muhammad (Higden, *Polychronicon* V.14); Wyclif makes the same charge of culling from both testaments in *De blasphemia* ch. 5 and *De ver. s. script.* I, 250. R. Side-note 517.15.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **515: *in oculis* (print: in oculis Dei; main has no tokens for in oculis)**
  - **515: *legalium***
  - **515: *multipliciter* (print multi-|pliciter; main has multi- here and no pliciter token (pos 17 is the English side-note Question), missing half appended)**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note word "Question")**
  - **515: *solvendum* (main token is the English side-note "ordination"; print at this slot has 5 solvendum)**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note word "bishop")**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note word "is")**
  - **515: *sacramentalium* (print: verborum / sacramentalium, sed; main has no token)**
  - **515: *ignoramus***
  - **515: *quando* (main token is the English side-note "We"; print at this slot has quando (next line))**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note word "not")**
  - **515: *et* (print: ecclesie et scriptura; main has no et token)**
  - **515: ∅ (main "it" is English side-note; matt "5" is the line number 15)**
  - **515: *Ex* (main token is English side-note "would"; print at this slot has Ex)**
  - **515: *istis* (main token is English side-note "be"; print at this slot has istis)**
  - **515: *male* (main token is English side-note "have"; print has sive / male.)**
  - **515: *Nam* (main token is English side-note "no"; print has Nam)**
  - **515: *apostolos* (main token is English side-note "Scripture."; print has apostolos)**
  - **515: *ascensionem* (print: et post ascensionem tempore; main has no token)**
  - **515: *nec alios* (print: dyaconos, nec alios ordines; main has no tokens)**
  - **515: *illas* (print: legi illas columpnas; main has no token)**
  - **515: *ritus ille* (print: utrum ritus ille foret; main has no tokens)**
  - **515: *Christi* (print: ecclesie Christi utilior; main has no token)**
  - **515: *perficere* (print per-|ficere et a probabili; main token perprobabili fuses per- with probabili, ficere et a lost; slot = perficere, rest in GAP pos 168)**
  - **515: *et a probabili* (print l.25: ficere et a probabili efficacius) [GAP]**
  - **515: *ista officia* (print: omnia / ista officia (ut; main has no tokens)**
  - **515: *eccle-* (hyphen half, line ends eccle-)**
  - **515: *sie* (English side-note "This" in slot of Latin sie (second half of eccle-sie))**
  - **515: *non* (English side-note "would" in slot of Latin non)**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note "relief")**
  - **515: *de* (English "to" in slot of Latin de (line begins 30 de clericis))**
  - **515: *clericis* (English "the" in slot of Latin clericis)**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note "bishops")**
  - **515: *ecclesie* (English "may" in slot of Latin ecclesie (line begins ecclesie efficacius))**
  - **515: *efficacius***
  - **515: *alio***
  - **515: *fastu* (print: posito fastu de excellencia)**
  - **516: *Iª* (superscript a; comma dropped per superscript rule)**
  - **517: *quomodo* (199c is the glued folio mark)**
  - **517: *Secundo* (2 is the margin argument numeral)**
  - **517: *cerimonialium* [NW]**
  - **516: *sed* (199ᶜ folio mark and 1 margin numeral dropped) [-MARK]**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note "has" (agent 11))**
  - **515: ∅ (English side-note "do" (agent 11))**
  - **515: *sive* (English side-note "which" glued on (agent 11))**

Chapter 22

Part 1: The fourth lie: Hostiensis on suffrages for the damned

Loserth pp. 517.28–520.14

¶1 517.28–519.13
517.28 *The fourth false quotation, of Hostiensis.*
518.1 *What the teaching of Hostiensis really is. He recites two opposed views;*
518.10 *a) of the theologanis, b) of the canonists,*
519.6 *and declares himself unable to decide;*
519.11 *but leans to the theologians.*
519.26 *The doctor is angry because I have laughed at him.*

[517]Quartum mendacium est ficcio testimonii Hostiensis in Summa de oracionis suffragio pro dampnatis. Scribit enim in libro V°, De Penitenciis et Remissionibus, [518]capitulo Quibus mortuis suffragia ecclesia prosunt, quod quatuor beneficiis specialiter adiuvantur, scilicet missarum celebracionibus, sanctis oracionibus, amicorum elemosinis et ieiuniis cognatorum. Sed quibus mortuis prosunt hec suffragia scolastici varie opinantur. Quidam enim dicunt quod nullis qui sunt in inferno prosunt penitus vivorum suffragia, sed tantum hiis qui sunt in purgatorio. Secundi dicunt quod prosunt omnibus regeneratis qui dum viverent meruerunt ut eis mortuis prodessent suffragia; et quia non sufficimus discernere qui meruerunt et qui non, qui decesserunt in mortali et qui non, ideo oramus generaliter pro omnibus regeneratis. Et valet eciam pro dampnatis quodammodo, cum pro valde bonis sunt graciarum acciones, pro mediocriter bonis et malis sunt propiciaciones, pro valde malis prosunt ut tollerabilior sit eis dampnacio. Prima autem est opinio theologorum et secunda doctorum canonum; que licet sit magis pia, prima tamen est magis catholica. Hugucius tamen dicit quod opinio theologorum parum distat ab heresi, cum de quatuor generibus defunctorum eundem constituat simul et semel bonum et malum. Ideo dicunt decretiste quod Augustinus intellegit in illa divisione quadrimembri per excellenter bonos eos qui sunt in celo, per mediocriter bonos salvandos ad tempus spectantes in purgatorio, per mediocriter malos dampnatos leviter in inferno, et per excellenter malos dampnatos gravius. Et duobus [519]generibus prosunt suffragia in tantum quod Judas in die dominico quievit a pena, licet non sit valde autenticum. Et sic nunquam dimittitur dampnatis pena simpliciter, sed proporcionaliter secundum partem cotam non quantam, et sic glossant dicta sanctorum quod dampnatis non prosunt suffragia, scilicet excellenter malis. Et post sequitur Hostiensis sentencia in hec verba: Non est mihi tanta copia ut ista diffiniam quid debeat teneri precise. Nec Innocencius III. qui tantus erat voluit diffinire sed reliquit disputacioni et discrete investigacioni (ut patet in De Celebracione misse, Cum Marthe). Tamen sentencia theologorum est celebrior et verior videtur.

The fourth lie is the fiction of a testimony of Hostiensis in the ***Summa***, on the suffrage of prayer for the damned.[1] For he writes in book 5, ***On Penances and Remissions***, [518]in the chapter "To which of the dead the suffrages of the church profit", that they are helped especially by four benefits, namely by the celebrations of masses, by holy prayers, by the alms of friends and by the fasts of kinsfolk.[2] But as to which of the dead these suffrages profit, the schoolmen hold various opinions. For some say that the suffrages of the living profit none at all of those who are in hell, but only those who are in purgatory. Others say that they profit all the regenerate who, while they lived, merited that suffrages should profit them when dead; and because we are not able to discern who merited and who did not, who died in mortal sin and who did not, therefore we pray generally for all the regenerate. And it avails even for the damned in a certain way, since for the very good they are thanksgivings, for the moderately good and bad they are propitiations, for the very bad they profit so that their damnation may be more tolerable.[3] And the first is the opinion of the theologians, and the second that of the doctors of the canons; and though this is more pious, yet the first is more catholic. Yet Huguccio says that the opinion of the theologians is little distant from heresy, since of the four kinds of the dead it makes the same one at once and together good and bad.[4] Therefore the decretists say that Augustine, in that fourfold division, understands by the excellently good those who are in heaven, by the moderately good those to be saved, waiting for a time in purgatory, by the moderately bad those lightly damned in hell, and by the excellently bad those more heavily damned. And to two [519]kinds suffrages profit, to such a degree that Judas rested from punishment on the Lord's day, though this is not very authentic.[5] And so punishment is never remitted to the damned without qualification, but proportionally, according to a proportional part, not a quantity; and so they gloss the sayings of the saints that suffrages do not profit the damned, namely the excellently bad.[6] And afterwards follows the teaching of Hostiensis in these words: "I have not so great a store as to define these things, what

¶2 519.14–520.14
520.4 *I have the precedent of Elijah;*

[519] Volve itaque et revolve sentenciam huius doctoris magni in iure canonico et vide si sit testis ydoneus ad confirmandum quod sunt facienda suffragia pro dampnatis ad penam perpetuam. Unde videtur mihi quod totum genus humanum debet concorditer detestari huiusmodi mendacia et dampnare istam blasphemiam quod licitum est mentiri. Cum enim mentiri sit ex equo peccare (ut dicunt sancti), si licet mentiri, sic licitum est peccare, sed dare illam licenciam non subest potestati divine. Quis ergo blasphemus extolleret se super omne quod dicitur Deus, quod ipse habet privilegium vel licenciam menciendi? Unde graviter fert doctor cum suis quod irridebam istam sentenciam dicendo me nescire quam laudem talis mentitor egregius reportaret, nisi forte ut pre omnibus aliis ferat cotem. Cum enim Deus non potest per se vel alium facere tam solempne mendacium, videtur quod omnes discipuli veritatis debent acui [520] contra illos, et cum ille qui habitat in celis irridebit eos omnes, sui debent irrisione, exprobracione vel racione, ut Deus donaverit confundere istam scolam. Sic enim legitur III° Regum XVIII° quod Helias canus irrisit quadringentos sacerdotes Baal qui seduxerunt populum suis mendaciis; nam illis paciscentibus cum consensu populi quod credatur illi Deo qui fecerit ignem descendere super bovem divinitus comburendum, et cum prophete Baal invocassent nomen Baal de mane usque ad meridiem, et non erat vox que eis responderet, post meridiem illudebat eis Helias dicens: Clamate voce maiori: Deus enim vester est et forsitan cum alio loquitur, aut in diversorio est, aut in itinere, aut certe dormit, ut excitetur.

ought to be held precisely." Nor did Innocent III, who was so great, wish to define it, but left it to disputation and discreet investigation (as is clear in *On the Celebration of Mass*, *Cum Marthe*). Yet the teaching of the theologians is more renowned, and seems truer.[7]

Turn over, then, and turn over again the teaching of this doctor, great in canon law, and see whether he is a fit witness to confirm that suffrages are to be made for those damned to perpetual punishment. Hence it seems to me that the whole human race ought with one accord to detest lies of this kind and to condemn this blasphemy, that it is lawful to lie. For since to lie is equally to sin (as the saints say), if it is lawful to lie, then it is lawful to sin; but to give that licence does not lie within the divine power.[8] What blasphemer, then, would lift himself up above all that is called God, holding that he has a privilege or licence of lying? Hence the doctor with his men takes it hard that I mocked this teaching, saying that I did not know what praise so egregious a liar would carry off, unless perhaps that he should bear the whetstone before all others. For since God cannot, by himself or by another, make so solemn a lie, it seems that all disciples of truth ought to be whetted [520] against them; and since he that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them all, his own ought, by mockery, reproach or reason, as God shall grant, to confound this school.[9] For so it is read in 3 Kings 18 that the grey-haired Elijah mocked the four hundred priests of Baal who had seduced the people by their lies; for when they had covenanted, with the consent of the people, that that God should be believed who should make fire come down upon the bullock, to be burned by divine power, and when the prophets of Baal had called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, and there was no voice to answer them, after noon Elijah jested at them, saying: "Cry with a louder voice: for he is your god, and perhaps he is talking with another, or is in an inn, or on a journey; or perhaps he is asleep, and must be awaked."[10]

Notes

1. ***Quartum mendacium***: the fourth of the opponent's lies, numbered from chapter 21. ***Ficcio testimonii***: a feigned testimony, Hostiensis being cited for what he does not teach (row *ficcio*). ***De oracionis suffragio***: on the suffrage of prayer. S. Hostiensis (Henry of Segusio), ***Summa aurea*** V, ***De poenitentiis et remissionibus***, § ***Quibus mortuis suffragia***, quoted closely. R. Side-note 517.28.
2. The four benefits: Decretum C.13 q.2 c.22 ***Animae*** (Loserth, 517.30; the modern form is ours). T. ***Suffragia ecclesia***: so printed; taken as ***ecclesie***, "of the church". B ***sacris oracionibus*** (518.3). R. Side-note 518.1; A in the margin at 518.5: ***Oracionum suffragia an dampnatis prosunt***.
3. ***Secundi***: the second party. ***Regeneratis***: the baptized. ***Graciarum acciones ... propiciaciones***: Augustine's terms for what the church's offerings are for each kind of the dead. S. Augustine, ***Enchiridion*** 29.110; Loserth gives "cap. CIX" (Opp. VI, p. 238) and Decretum C.13 q.2 c.23 ***Tempus*** at 518.23 (the modern form is ours). R. Side-note 518.10.

4. The codices read *prima inquit*; *prima tamen* is the print's (518.17). C. *Que licet sit magis pia*: the second, the canonists' view. *Eundem constituat … bonum et malum*: the same person, the soul in purgatory, is counted at once among the moderately good and the moderately bad. S. Huguccio of Pisa, the decretist; Loserth refers to p. 225 above, to Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina* VI, p. 283, and to Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen* I, pp. 156–170, and for Hostiensis ibid. II, pp. 123–129 (518.20). R. A in the margin at 518.20: *Hugucius*.
5. *Decretiste*: the commentators on the Decretum. *Duobus generibus*: the two middle kinds, the moderately good and the moderately bad. S. Judas's Sunday respite from hell is the tale of the *Navigatio sancti Brendani* (c. 25); Wyclif has it from the canonists.
6. *Secundum partem cotam non quantam*: Loserth notes "*cotam*, id est *quotam*". The remission is by a proportional part, a fraction of what remains, not by a fixed quantity, so that it never brings the punishment to an end. *Glossant*: the decretists gloss. T. A_1 *totam* (519.5). R. Side-note 519.6.
7. Innocent III, *Cum Marthe*, X 3.41.6 (Loserth, 519.10; the modern form is ours). C. *Copia*: store of learning. The print's italics end the verbatim quotation of Hostiensis at *precise*; the rest is reported. R. Side-note 519.11; A in the margin at 519.7: *Hostiensis*.
8. A and A_1 *Volve et revolve itaque* (519.14). C. *Ex equo*: equally, on the same footing. *Ut dicunt sancti*: not located. *Non subest potestati divine*: God himself cannot license sin.
9. 2 Thessalonians 2:4: *extolleret se super omne quod dicitur Deus*, after the Vulgate *extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus* (Douay "is lifted up above all that is called God"). Psalm 2:4, Douay–Rheims. C. *Quod ipse habet*: "holding that he has", giving the content of the self-exaltation. *Cum suis*: with his followers. *Ferat cotem*: bear off the whetstone, the mock prize of the greatest liar; *acui*, "whetted", takes up the figure, and it returns at 520.17. *Sui*: God's own, the disciples of truth. R. Side-note 519.26; A in the margin at 519.23: *Nota quomodo mendaces sunt irridendi*.
10. 3 Kings 18 (1 Kings 18 in modern numbering): the prophets of Baal were four hundred and fifty, with four hundred prophets of the groves (v. 19); Wyclif has four hundred. Verses 26–27 are paraphrased; in v. 27 he has *Deus enim vester est et forsitan cum alio loquitur* for the Vulgate *deus enim est, et forsitan loquitur*, translated as his. C. *Canus*: grey-haired; doubtful, since scripture says nothing of Elijah's age here. *Paciscentibus*: covenanting (v. 24). R. Side-note 520.4; A in the margin at 520.5: *Quomodo irrisit Elias quadringentos sacerdotes Baal*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 517: *CAP. XXII.*
  - 518: *ieiuniis*
  - 519: *Et*
  - 520: *III°*

Part 2: The art of mockery, Hostiensis on the keys, and the fifth lie

Loserth pp. 520.15–524.17

¶1 520.15–522.31
520.15 *and, like Elijah, I challenge my opponent to shew the Divine sanction for his teaching,*
520.23 *for God never approves lies.*
521.11 *The objection of Hugucius is of no weight.*
522.7 *Hostiensis tells us that indulgences cannot absolve in purgatory,*
522.23 *since the power of the keys extends only to the militant Church.*

[520]Et correspondenter potest dici doctori mendacii cum omnibus suis complicibus quod scrutetur testimonia omnium scripturarum, ut lumen sciencie et fervor caritatis descendat ut ignis ad istam sentenciam mendacii illustrandam, et certus sum quod licet incidant se cultris et lanceolis quantumcunque super cotem acutis, donec perfundantur sanguine, ut ibi dicitur de sacerdotibus Baal, non invenient conveniens testimonium ad suum mendacium colorandum, solum in quantum unum adductum testimonium ex Psalmo V°, 7: Perdes omnes qui loquuntur mendacium. Et quia testimonium illud non est conveniens, ideo in dolo allegatur Augustinus pro indole (ut alias diffuse exposui). Sic eciam Jesus noster exprobrat scribas et phariseos Ve octuplici verbis asperis et irrisoriis, ut patet Matthei XXII°, ex cuius doctrina sumpsit Apostolus disciplinam ad dicendum principi sacerdotum: Percuciet te Deus, paries dealbate Act. XXIII°, 3, unde utile foret introducere et docere [521]artem irridendi et exprobrandi, cum in illo homo potest nunc superhabundare, nunc deficere et nunc tenere medium virtuosum; non sic autem in arte mendacii. Quando autem quis ex caritate ad vindicandum Dei

And correspondingly it can be said to the doctor of the lie, with all his accomplices, that he should search the testimonies of all the scriptures, so that the light of knowledge and the fervour of charity may come down like fire to illuminate this teaching of the lie; and I am certain that, although they cut themselves with knives and lancets however sharpened on the whetstone, till they are covered with blood, as is said there of the priests of Baal, they will not find a fitting testimony to give colour to their lie, save only insofar as one testimony is brought from Psalm 5:7: "Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie."[1] And because that testimony is not fitting, therefore Augustine is alleged in guile on "promise" (as I have expounded at length elsewhere).[2] So also our Jesus reproaches the scribes and Pharisees with an eightfold Woe, in harsh and mocking words, as is clear in Matthew 22, from whose doctrine the apostle took the lesson for saying to the chief of the priests: "God shall strike thee, thou whited wall", Acts 23:3; whence it would be useful to introduce and teach [521] the art of mocking and reproaching, since in it a man can now exceed,

iniuriam et ad excludendum errores a sancta ecclesia prorumpit in verba exprobratoria et irrisoria subducto zelo vindicte et laudis proprie, fit opus laudabile quod si integre sensero in me ipso, dicerem ironice cum Apostolo, IIª Corinth. XII° cap., 13: Donate mihi istam iniuriam. Quantum ad exprobracionem Hugucii, patet quod fuit ignarus logice, philosophie et veritatis fidei, ideo non mirum si intulit contumelias veritatis catholice professori. Unde Hostiensis respondet ad obiectum suum fatuum: Hii, inquit, qui sunt in purgatorio possunt dici boni et mali diversis respectibus. Boni vero sunt qui salvabuntur, mali autem sunt qui mala sustinent. Nec dubium theologo quin idem in numero sit simul bonum bonitate nature et malum malicia culpe. Ymmo eadem persona est bona bonitate purgacionis sive iusticie et cum hoc mala malicia pene. Unde Augustinus Enchiridion XIV°, 17°: Quapropter in hiis contrariis que bona et mala vocantur illa dialecticorum regula deficit qua dicunt nulli rei simul inesse duo contraria. Cum, inquit, bona et mala nullus ambigat esse contraria, non solum simul esse possunt, sed eciam mala omnino sine bonis et nisi in bonis esse non possunt, quamvis econtra bonum poterit sine malo. Constat quidem philosophis quod bonum et malum nunc dicuntur analogice, nunc equivoce et nunc contrarie, privative aut positive. Unde illi fuerunt ignari dyalectici de secta Manichei de quibus loquitur Augustinus. Contingit [522] enim specialiter sic sumere bonum et malum quod sint sibi ipsis contraria incompossibilia, ut loquitur propheta Isaie V° cap., 20: Ve qui dicunt bonum malum et malum bonum. Illi enim qui dicunt in facto bonitatem moralem esse maliciam viciosam sunt in illa maledicione prophetica. Item, Hostiensis infra, De Remissionibus, capitulo Quibus prosunt, loquens de indulgenciis episcoporum dicit quod mortuis in purgatorio caritate continuatis corpori Christi prosunt ad suffragia merita militantis ecclesie, sed non secundum racionem absolvendi. Potestas, inquit, clavium non habet ibi locum, nec obstat quod ecclesia post mortem ligat et solvit XXIVª, q. IIª. Sane. Nam ibi fit absolucio ad consolacionem vivorum fidelium et confusionem infidelium, et ut ecclesia oret pro mortuo absoluto, sic et equivoce absolvitur mortuus, id est, antequam morietur, absolutus fuisse contricione monstratur, et sic quoad mortuos nihil iam operatur. Nam ubi te invenero, ibi te iudicabo, et sive arbor cadat ad austrum sive ad aquilonem, ibi erit; sed ecclesia militans sepe fallit et fallitur, ut dicit decretalis, De Sentencia Excommunicacionis, A nobis. Nam non mortuos sed vivos astringit potestas clavium, cum solum illi subsunt ecclesie militanti; et sequitur in fine tituli diffinicio doctoris. In inferno vero nihil operantur iste indulgencie, quia ibi nulla est redempcio. Non enim est

now fall short, and now keep the virtuous mean; but not so in the art of lying.[3] And when someone out of charity, to avenge the injury done to God and to shut errors out of holy church, breaks out into reproachful and mocking words, the zeal of revenge and of his own praise being withdrawn, a praiseworthy work is done; and if I should feel this wholly in myself, I would say ironically with the apostle, 2 Corinthians 12:13: "Pardon me this injury."[4] As to the reproach of Huguccio, it is clear that he was ignorant of logic, philosophy and the truth of the faith; therefore it is no wonder if he brought insults upon a professor of catholic truth.[5] Hence Hostiensis replies to his foolish objection: "Those," he says, "who are in purgatory can be called good and bad in different relations: good indeed, in that they will be saved; bad, in that they suffer evils." Nor is it doubtful to a theologian that the same thing in number is at once good with the goodness of nature and bad with the badness of guilt. Indeed, the same person is good with the goodness of purgation or justice, and with this bad with the badness of punishment.[6] Hence Augustine, *Enchiridion* 14, 17: "Wherefore in these contraries which are called good and evil that rule of the dialecticians fails, by which they say that two contraries are present to no thing at once. For although," he says, "no one doubts that goods and evils are contraries, not only can they be at once, but evils can by no means be without goods, nor except in goods, though conversely good can be without evil." It is evident indeed to philosophers that good and evil are said now analogically, now equivocally and now contrarily, privatively or positively. Hence those of the sect of Manichaeus of whom Augustine speaks were ignorant dialecticians.[7] For one can [522] take good and evil in a special way, so that they are contraries incompossible with each other, as the prophet speaks, Isaiah 5:20: "Woe to them that call good evil, and evil good." For those who say that in deed moral goodness is vicious badness are under that prophetic curse.[8] Again, Hostiensis below, *On Remissions*, in the chapter *Quibus prosunt*, speaking of the indulgences of bishops, says that to the dead in purgatory, continued by charity with the body of Christ, the merits of the church militant profit by way of suffrages, but not by way of absolving.[9] "The power of the keys," he says, "has no place there; nor does it stand in the way that the church binds and looses after death (C. 24 q. 2 *Sane*)." For there absolution is done for the consolation of the living faithful and the confusion of unbelievers, and so that the church may pray for the dead man absolved; and thus the dead man too is absolved equivocally, that is, he is shown to have been absolved by contrition before he died; and so

ibi aliquod bonum quoad penam sed omne malum. Ibi enim non est pena meritoria nec purgatoria nec transitoria sed tantum punitoria et eterna. Hugucius tamen dicit quod ibi est alleviacio pene,

as regards the dead it now effects nothing. For 'where I find thee, there will I judge thee', and 'whether the tree fall to the south or to the north, there it shall be'; but the church militant often deceives and is deceived, as the decretal says, ***On the Sentence of Excommunication***, ***A nobis***. For the power of the keys binds not the dead but the living, since only they are subject to the church militant.[10] And at the end of the title follows the doctor's definition: in hell, however, these indulgences effect nothing, because there is no redemption there. For there is there no good as to punishment, but all evil. For there the punishment is not meritorious nor purgatorial nor transitory, but only punitive and eternal. Huguccio, however, says that there is there an alleviation of punishment;

¶2 523.1–524.17
523.3 *The fifth and last false allegation is of Augustine.*
524.1 *The decretal forbids praying for suicides, and even for those slain when drunk.*

[523]in paradiso autem nihil operantur, quia anime ibi existentes non egent nostris suffragiis sed econtra. Quintum et ultimum mendacium est accepcio testimonii Augustini de refrigerio dampnatorum et primo per illud Enchiridion CX°, ubi dicit quod mediocriter malis qui sunt dampnati prosunt suffragia, et glossa exponit istam quadrimembrem divisionem quod non est orandum pro valde bonis nec valde malis; non pro valde bonis, quia statim advolant et (ut dicitur libro III°, De Celebracionibus Missarum, Cum Marthe) iniuriam facit martiri qui orat pro martire; nec pro valde malis, quia non meruerunt sic iuvari. Mediocriter vero bonis prosunt, ut cicius liberentur ab igne purgatorio et mediocriter malis prosunt ut micius puniantur, nunquam tamen liberabuntur. Ex quo patet quod orandum est specialiter pro illis qui decesserunt in mortali, dummodo non sint valde mali vel summe mali. Sed dictum est superius in quarto commento mendacii quomodo doctores tam theologi quam iuris canonici exponunt utrumque membrum mediocriter bonorum et malorum de predestinatis in purgatorio penitenciam expectantibus. Quamvis enim omnes illi sint tam boni quam mali et ad penam temporalem dampnati, tamen alia est racio qua sunt boni, et alia racio qua sunt mali, sicut alia est racio qua simpliciter liberantur et alia racio qua micius puniuntur. Nec valet dicta logica glosse communis, cum nihil sit summe malum nisi peccatum, vel forte primus apostata cum omnibus membris suis; quod si non sit orandum pro istis, non est orandum pro prescito; et idem apparet in eadem questione cap. Pro obeuntibus, ubi sub auctoritate beati Gregorii decretum sic loquitur: Congruit ut pro mortuis catholicis sacerdos memoriam faciat et [524]intercedat, non tamen pro impiis (quamvis christiani fuerint) tale quid agere licebit. Super quo dicit eadem glossa: Si est evidens aliquem decessisse in mortali, ut cum quis suspendit se vel

in paradise, however, they effect nothing, since the souls existing there do not need our suffrages, but the reverse.[11] The fifth and last lie is the taking of Augustine's testimony on the refreshment of the damned; and first through that text, ***Enchiridion*** 110, where he says that suffrages profit the moderately bad who are damned; and the gloss expounds this fourfold division thus: that one is not to pray for the very good nor for the very bad; not for the very good, because they fly off at once, and (as is said in book 3, ***On the Celebrations of Masses***, ***Cum Marthe***) he does injury to a martyr who prays for a martyr; nor for the very bad, because they did not merit to be so helped. To the moderately good, however, they profit, that they may be freed more quickly from the fire of purgatory, and to the moderately bad they profit, that they may be punished more mildly; yet they will never be freed.[12] From which it is clear that one is to pray specially for those who died in mortal sin, provided they are not very bad or supremely bad. But it was said above, in the fourth fabrication of the lie, how the doctors, theologians as well as those of canon law, expound each member, of the moderately good and of the moderately bad, of the predestinate awaiting penance in purgatory. For although all of them are both good and bad, and condemned to temporal punishment, yet one is the ground on which they are good and another the ground on which they are bad, just as one is the ground on which they are freed without qualification and another that on which they are punished more mildly. Nor does the said logic of the common gloss avail, since nothing is supremely bad except sin, or perhaps the first apostate with all his members; and if one is not to pray for these, one is not to pray for one foreknown;[13] and the same appears in the same question, chapter ***Pro obeuntibus***, where the decree, under the authority of blessed

precipitat aut alio modo se interficit, pro eo non est orandum, ut XXIII[a], q. V°, Placuit, et q. VIII[a], Quicunque clericus. Secus est, si est dubium: unde pro occiso in ebrietate non oratur (ut Extra., De Reliquiis, Audivimus). Quomodo queso ordinarentur tot leges ad non orandum pro mortuo in mortali secundum suspicionem fallibilem, si debemus specialiter orare pro illo quem scimus dampnatum perpetuo? vel quomodo specificaret ecclesia oracionem pro mortuis in missa dicendo: Memento domine famulorum tuorum qui nos precesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in sompno pacis, si generaliter orandum est pro illis quibus pax ex perpetuitate vermis consciencie est incompossibilis?

Gregory, speaks thus: "It is fitting that the priest make remembrance of the catholic dead and [524] intercede for them; yet it will not be lawful to do any such thing for the impious (although they were Christians)." On which the same gloss says: "If it is evident that someone has died in mortal sin, as when someone hangs himself or throws himself down or kills himself in some other way, one is not to pray for him, as C. 23 q. 5 *Placuit*, and q. 8 *Quicunque clericus*. It is otherwise if it is doubtful: hence one does not pray for one slain in drunkenness (as Extra, *On Relics*, *Audivimus*)."[14] How, I ask, would so many laws be ordained against praying for one dead in mortal sin on a fallible suspicion, if we ought specially to pray for him whom we know to be damned forever? Or how would the church specify its prayer for the dead in the mass, saying: "Remember, O Lord, thy servants who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace", if one is generally to pray for those with whom peace is incompossible because of the perpetuity of the worm of conscience?[15]

Notes

1. 3 Kings 18:28 (1 Kings 18:28): Wyclif adapts *incidebant se ... cultris et lanceolis, donec perfunderentur sanguine* (Douay "cut themselves ... with knives and lancets, till they were all covered with blood"); *super cotem acutis* is his, taking up the whetstone of 519.30. Psalm 5:7, Douay–Rheims. C. *Doctori mendacii*: the opponent. *Descendat ut ignis*: as the fire came down on Elijah's sacrifice (3 Kings 18:38). *Colorare*: give colour to (row). T. A *inscidant* (520.20). R. Side-notes 520.15, 520.23.
2. *In dolo ... pro indole*: a pun. Augustine is alleged "in guile" (*in dolo*) on the word *indoles*, "promise", in the argument from the midwives (row *indoles*, where Comestor reads *de dolo*); Loserth refers to pp. 163–164 above (520.27).
3. The eight woes are Matthew 23:13–29; the print gives chapter XXII. Acts 23:3, Douay–Rheims; Paul spoke to the high priest Ananias (Acts 23:2). C. *Ex cuius doctrina*: from Christ's doctrine. *Principi sacerdotum*: the singular, the high priest. *Medium virtuosum*: the mean of virtue, between excess and defect. T. A and B *octiplici* (520.29); A and B *deus peries* for *Deus, paries* (520.32).
4. 2 Corinthians 12:13: Wyclif has *istam* for the Vulgate *hanc*. C. *Subducto zelo vindicte et laudis proprie*: ablative absolute, the zeal for revenge and for one's own praise being removed. *Si integre sensero in me ipso*: if I found this wholly so in myself, that is, if my motive were pure. *Ironice*: Paul's words are ironic.
5. *Exprobracio Huguccii*: Huguccio's reproach that the theologians' opinion is close to heresy (518.20). *Veritatis catholice professori*: taken as the theologian who teaches catholic truth, the theologians' party; it may be Augustine, whose division they follow. R. Side-note 521.11; A in the margin at 521.11: *An dampnatis prosunt suffragia*.
6. *Obiectum*: Huguccio's objection (row *instancia; objectum*). *Qui salvabuntur ... qui mala sustinent*: the relatives are causal, "in that". The quotation of Hostiensis is ended at *sustinent* by sense. *Idem in numero*: numerically the same. *Bonitate nature ... malicia culpe*: good by nature, bad by guilt. T. *Persona*: Loserth's expansion, with a query; the codices have *pe.* (521.20).
7. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 4.14 (PL 40); the codices give "XVII" (521.22), and the print's "17°" is not explained. The Manichees are named only in the heading of ch. 10, not here. C. *Analogice ... contrarie, privative aut positive*: good and evil are said as analogues, as equivocals, or as contraries, and as contraries either by privation or positively. *Unde illi fuerunt ignari dyalectici ...*: taken as "those of the sect ... were ignorant dialecticians"; it may be read "those ignorant dialecticians of whom Augustine speaks were of the sect of Manichaeus". R. B in the margin at 521.29: *Bonum accipitur tripliciter*.
8. Isaiah 5:20: Wyclif has *dicunt bonum malum et malum bonum*, third person and the pair reversed, for the Vulgate *dicitis malum bonum, et bonum malum*; his Latin is translated. C. *Contingit*: it is possible. *Incompossibilia*: that cannot be together (cf. row *compossibilis*). *In facto*: in deed, by what they do.
9. Hostiensis, *Summa aurea* V, *De remissionibus*, § *Quibus prosint* (*nec mortuis prosunt remissiones huiusmodi ... potestas clavium non habet ibi locum*). C. *Caritate continuatis corpori Christi*: joined by charity in continuity with the body of Christ. *Ad suffragia*: by way of suffrages, as intercession; *secundum racionem absolvendi*, by way of the act of absolving. R. Side-note 522.7.
10. Decretum C.24 q.2 c.6 *Sane* (Loserth, 522.14). *Ubi te invenero, ibi te iudicabo*: a saying ascribed to the Lord, not in the Vulgate; current in the twelfth century. Ecclesiastes 11:3, paraphrased (Loserth: "Comp. Eccles. XI, 3", 522.20). *A nobis*, X 5.39.28 (Loserth, 522.23). The modern forms are ours. C. *Equivoce absolvitur*: absolved in name only, the absolution showing what

contrition had already done. The print's italics end the verbatim quotation at *Sane*; the rest is reported. T. B *moriretur* (522.17). R. Side-note 522.23; A in the margin at 522.23: *Ecclesia militans sepe fallit et fallitur*.

11. *Diffinicio doctoris*: Hostiensis's determination at the end of the title (row *diffinicio*). *Redempcio*: here release from punishment, as in the saying "in hell there is no redemption". The definition and the sentence on Huguccio are reported, not quoted (roman in the print). R. A in the margin at 522.31: *Hugucius*.

12. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 29.110; the codices read "CXXIV" (523.5); the passage is *Ench.* 110 in PL 40. The gloss: the *Glossa ordinaria* on C.13 q.2 c.23 *Tempus*, v. *pro valde*, which Wyclif follows point by point, *Cum Marthe* and *iniuriam facit martyri* included (glossed Decretum, 1588). *Cum Marthe*, X 3.41.6 (Loserth, 519.10). *Iniuriam facit martiri qui orat pro martire*: a saying of Augustine's sermons, cited by Innocent III; Augustine, *Sermo* 159.1 (*Injuria est pro martyre orare*), the form being the glossators'. C. *Accepc*: so printed, taken as *accepcio*, "taking". *Refrigerium*: refreshment, relief. *Advolant*: they fly off to heaven. R. Side-note 523.3; A in the margin at 523.4: *Augustinus*.

13. *Ex quo patet*: Wyclif draws the consequence of the gloss's reading. *In quarto commento mendacii*: 518–519 above. *Penitenciam expectantibus*: waiting out their penance. *Dampnati*: here "condemned", to temporal punishment (row *dampnacio* is the noun). *Racio*: ground, not the technical "aspect". *Primus apostata*: the devil, whose members are the foreknown, so that the gloss's own exclusion of the supremely bad excludes them.

14. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.21 *Pro obeuntibus* (Loserth, 523.31; the modern form is ours); Friedberg ascribes it to Gregory III, to Boniface. The gloss *Pro impiis* on that chapter: Loserth corrects the codices from it, citing the Decretum with glosses (Venice 1605) (524.3). C.23 q.5 c.12 *Placuit*; C.23 q.8 c.4 *Quicunque clericus*; X 3.45.1 *Audivimus*: from the gloss. T. The codices read *glossa. Est evidens* and *suspendat*; *Si est evidens* and *suspendit* are Loserth's corrections from the gloss (524.3). The codices read *tale in quid* (524.2). C. *Secus est, si est dubium*: as printed, the case of one slain in drunkenness follows the doubtful case; the logic seems to want it under the evident one. R. Side-note 524.1.

15. The Canon of the Mass, *Memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum … qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis* (Sarum, Legg p. 223; Gregorian Sacr., PL 78:28A); Wyclif quotes it short, *Memento domine famulorum tuorum*. C. *Quibus pax … est incompossibilis*: the damned, whose undying worm of conscience excludes peace. The sentence runs on at 524.18.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 521: *artem* (199d is the glued folio mark)
  - 521: *irrisoria* (200a is the glued folio mark)
  - 521: *II^{a}*
  - 521: *Hugucii,*
  - 521: *17°* (degree sign; colon dropped per superscript rule)
  - 522: *loquitur*
  - 522: ∅ (English side-note "tells"; Latin Item, is the next token)
  - 522: *caritate*
  - 522: *XXIV^{a}*
  - 522: *II^{a}*
  - 523: *CX°*
  - 524: *interficit,*
  - 524: *XXIII^{a}*
  - 524: *VIII^{a},* (italic) [-MARK]
  - 520: *XXII°,* [-VERSE]

Part 3: Praying for the damned: Augustine, Gregory and the reason against it

Loserth pp. 524.18–528.17

¶1 524.18–526.31

524.18 *Augustine asks if we are to pray for the damned, why not for the devil?*

526.1 *We ought not to pray for what we know God will not grant.*

526.32 *All right prayers are for the fulfilment of God's will,*

[524]Item, Augustinus XXI° De Civitate Dei, capitulo XXIV°, tractans istam eandem materiam ponit primo evidencias discipulorum Origenis arguencium si ex precepto domini homines debent in via diligere et orare pro inimicis (ut patet Mathei V°): multo magis beati in maiori caritate plus exaudibiles orabant pro illis continue, et per consequens oportet quod sint finaliter exauditi. Unde totam scripturam de dampnacione perpetua glossant quod homines digni sunt pati talia, si non assit Dei misericordia, non (inquiunt)

Again, Augustine, *City of God* 21, chapter 24, treating this same matter, first sets out the evidences of the disciples of Origen, who argue: if by the Lord's precept men on the way ought to love and pray for their enemies (as is clear in Matthew 5), much more the blessed, in greater charity and more fit to be heard, were praying for them continually; and consequently they must finally be heard.[1] Hence they gloss all scripture on perpetual damnation to mean "that men are worthy to suffer such things if God's

quod passuri sunt talia, sed sicut nemo sane fidei hoc dixit, sic nec dicturus est. Alioquin, inquit, nulla foret nunc causa, cur non eciam nunc pro dyabolo [525]et angelis eius oret ecclesia. Hec ergo causa qua fit ut nunc ecclesia non oret pro malis angelis quos suos novit esse inimicos; eadem ipsa causa est qua fiet ut in illo tunc iudicio eciam pro hominibus eterno igni cruciandis, quamvis homo perfecta sit sanctitate, non oret. Nunc enim propterea pro eis orat quos in genere humano habet inimicos, quia tempus est penitencie fructuose. Unde orat (sicut dicit Apostolus), ut Deus det illis penitenciam et resipiscant de dyaboli laqueis a quo captivi tenentur secundum ipsius voluntatem. Denique, inquit, de aliquibus ita certa esset, ut qui sint illi nosset, qui licet in hac vita constituti sunt, tamen predestinati ire in ignem eternum cum dyabolo; tam pro eis non oraret quam nec pro ipso. Ex istis patet quod nemo oraret pro illo specialiter quem scit perpetualiter ante tempus oracionis esse dampnatum perpetuo. Item, beatus Gregorius XXXIV° Moralium capitulo— dicit eandem sentenciam cum Augustino: Ubi est, inquiunt, quod sunt sancti, si pro inimicis suis quos ardere viderint non orabunt. Sed respondemus: Orant pro inimicis suis eo tempore quo possunt ad fructuosam penitenciam eorum corda convertere. Sed quomodo tunc pro illis orabitur, quando iam non possunt ab iniquitate ad iusticie opera conmutari? Eadem itaque causa est, cur tunc non oretur pro hominibus istis dampnatis, que causa est nunc ut non oretur pro ipso dyabolo. Et multa similia ibi infert. Racio autem omnium istorum sanctorum doctorum stat in isto: Nemo debet orare Deum specialiter pro [526]aliquo impetrando, quod scit tunc fore irracionabile Deum sibi concedere et impossibile sibi ipsum adquirere, sed sic foret de quolibet scienter orante pro beatificacione hominis quem scit Deum ad dampnacionem perpetuam ordinasse; ergo conclusio. Minor patet ex hoc quod orans nedum sciret oracionem huiusmodi fore frustra, sed foret scienter contrarius voluntati divine, et per consequens ineptus ad dicendum ex animo oracionem quam Christus docuit Matthei VI°, 10: Fiat voluntas tua in celo et in terra. Quomodo queso subicit ipse humiliter voluntatem suam voluntati divine qui videt clare quod sit pulchrum et utile ut sic fiat ex ordinacione divina, et oppositum foret dampnosum et turpe, et tamen instat ut Deus faciat illud quod de facto foret irracionabile. Nam proinde foret ac si rogaret Deum mutare suum propositum et ordinacionem eternam vel meliorare mundum in infinitum ultra quam decrevit, vel orare ut Deus non permittat aliquod malum fieri quod iam est preteritum. Sed Petrus Matthei XVI°, 23 propter talem adversam peticionem vocatus est Sathanas ab illo qui Johannis XVII°, 9 dicit: Non pro mundo

mercy be not present, not (they say) that they are going to suffer such things; but as no one of sound faith has said this, so neither will anyone say it."[2] "Otherwise," he says, "there would now be no reason why the church should not now pray also for the devil [525]and his angels. This therefore the reason by which it comes about that the church does not now pray for the evil angels, whom it knows to be its enemies: that same reason is the one by which it will come about that in that judgment, then, it does not pray even for men to be tormented with eternal fire, although a man be of perfect holiness. For it now prays for those whom it has as enemies in the human race for this reason, that it is the time of fruitful penance. Hence it prays (as the apostle says) that God may give them repentance, and they may recover themselves from the snares of the devil, by whom they are held captive according to his will."[3] "Finally," he says, "were it so certain about some that it knew who they are who, although they are set in this life, are yet predestined to go into the eternal fire with the devil, it would no more pray for them than for him." From these it is clear that no one would pray specially for one whom he knows to be, perpetually before the time of the prayer, damned forever.[4] Again, blessed Gregory, *Morals* 34, chapter —, says the same teaching as Augustine: "Where is it, they say, that they are saints, if they will not pray for their enemies whom they see burning? But we answer: they pray for their enemies at the time when they can turn their hearts to fruitful penance. But how will prayer then be made for them, when they can no longer be changed from iniquity to the works of justice? There is therefore the same reason why prayer is not made then for these damned men as there is now why prayer is not made for the devil himself." And he infers many like things there.[5] And the reason of all these holy doctors stands in this: no one ought to pray God specially to obtain something which he knows it would then be unreasonable for God to grant him and impossible for him to acquire for himself; now so it would be with anyone knowingly praying for the beatification of a man whom he knows God has ordained to perpetual damnation; therefore the conclusion.[6] The minor is clear from this, that the one praying would not only know such a prayer to be in vain, but would be knowingly contrary to the divine will, and consequently unfit to say from the heart the prayer which Christ taught, Matthew 6:10: "Thy will be done in heaven and on earth." How, I ask, does he humbly subject his will to the divine will, who sees clearly that it is fair and useful that it be done so by divine ordinance, and that the opposite would be harmful and shameful, and yet presses that God

rogo (hoc est, pro prescitis quorum dampnacio est cum mundo), et a quo Johannes dicit: Est peccatum ad mortem, non pro eo dico, ut roget quis, Iª Johannis ultimo 16. Et hec racio, quare beati non rogant nisi pro dignis quos intuentur Deum velle iuvare; aliter enim forent miserrimi vel languide a peticione sua frustrati, vel aliter orarent frustra contra voluntatem suam pro illo quod de appetunt; quod foret in eis magna duplicitas.

should do that which in fact would be unreasonable?[7] For it would be just as if he asked God to change his purpose and eternal ordinance, or to better the world infinitely beyond what he has decreed, or as if he were to pray that God not permit some evil to be done which is already past. But Peter, Matthew 16:23, was called Satan for such a contrary petition by him who says, John 17:9: "I pray not for the world" (that is, for the foreknown, whose damnation is with the world), and from whom John says: "There is a sin unto death. For that I say not that any man ask", 1 John, last chapter, 16.[8] And this is the reason why the blessed ask only for the worthy, whom they behold God wills to help; for otherwise they would be most wretched, or languidly frustrated of their petition, or else they would pray in vain, against their own will, for that which they [...] desire; which would be a great doubleness in them.[9]

¶2 526.32–528.17
527.1 *and are really thanksgivings.*
527.10 *God distributes our suffrages as he sees fit.*
528.1 *We pray for the foreknown while alive, but this is quite different from praying for the damned.*

[526]Ideo patet quod quidquid fidelis rite oraverit effectualiter ad hoc tendit quod Deus faciat in omnibus illud quod sibi videbitur expedire. Et sic omnes [527]debite oraciones sunt realiter graciarum acciones quibus confitentes inmensitatem sue misericordis benevolencie dicimus: Fiat voluntas tua undique. Nec aliud licet nobis petere nisi si et quatenus tibi placuerit. Et hec racio, quare bona vita est optima oracio; Deus enim non potest expergisci vel precibus nostris flecti, ideo necessarium est orare pro vivis et mortuis, ut ex caritate mereamur nobis ipsis et dignificemur communicare meritum nostrum aliis. Deus autem distribuit secundum capacitatem eorum et non secundum limitacionem nostram, cum sepe oratur pro mortuis non ex hoc suffragium participantibus sed punitis, ut patet de multis prepositis ecclesie legem sacerdotum vetantibus, sicut innuit decretum, XXIª, q. IIIª, Ciprianus, ubi sic dicitur: Si hoc fecisset quis, non oretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormicione eius celebretur. Neque enim ante altare Dei merentur nominari in sacerdotum prece qui ab altari sacerdotes et ministros volunt advocare. Nec valet glossa dicens: hoc esse dictum tantummodo ad terrorem, quia sic diceretur ad omnem legem que in penam sonuerit. Ideo caveant episcopi et domini qui vel omissione correpcionis vel commissione continuacionis trahunt sacerdotes a vita clericali ad seculum, cum decedentes sine satisfaccione non debent redimi, eciamsi habuerint quotlibet cantarias, dicente decreto Jeronymi XIIª, q. IIª, In presenti seculo: Cum, inquit, ante tribunal Christi venerimus, nec Job nec Daniel nec Noe rogare posse pro quoquam sed unumquemque oportet portare onus suum. [528]Sed ut clarius pateant sanctorum sentencie in parte, obicitur multipliciter quod orandum est specialiter pro

Therefore it is clear that whatever the faithful man has duly prayed tends effectually to this, that God do in all things that which will seem expedient to him. And so all [527]due prayers are really thanksgivings, by which, confessing the immensity of his merciful benevolence, we say: "Thy will be done everywhere. Nor is it lawful for us to ask anything else, except if and insofar as it shall please thee."[10] And this is the reason why a good life is the best prayer; for God cannot be awakened or bent by our prayers; therefore it is necessary to pray for the living and the dead, so that out of charity we may merit for ourselves and be made worthy to share our merit with others. And God distributes according to their capacity and not according to our assignment, since prayer is often made for dead men who do not share in the suffrage from it but are punished,[11] as is clear of many superiors of the church who forbid the law of priests, as the decree hints, C. 21 q. 3 *Ciprianus*, where it is said thus: "If anyone had done this, let no prayer be made for him, nor let the sacrifice be celebrated for his falling asleep. For they do not deserve to be named in the prayer of the priests before the altar of God who wish to summon priests and ministers from the altar."[12] Nor does the gloss avail that says this was said only to terrify, because so it would be said of every law that sounds a penalty. Therefore let the bishops and lords beware who, by omission of correction or by commission of continuity, draw priests from the clerical life to the world, since those who die without satisfaction ought not to be redeemed, even if they had any number of chantries;[13] as the decree of Jerome says, C. 12 q. 2 *In presenti seculo*: "When," he says, "we come before the tribunal of Christ, neither Job nor Daniel nor Noah [can] ask

dampnatis. Primo quia orandum est pro istis viventibus prescitis, sive sint amici in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam sive inimici secundum iniusticiam presentem dampnabiles. Cum ergo illi pro suo tempore sunt dampnati, videtur quod oportet orare pro dampnatis, eciam licet scitur eos esse tales, tum quia orans scit omnia in communi, tum eciam quia scit in particulari pro suo tempore quod prescitus huiusmodi est dampnatus. Sed illud sophisma non solvit difficultatem qua queritur utrum viator orans pro mortuis debet pro eodem tempore orare pro dampnato pro quo tempore scit particulariter et distincte quod ille tunc sit dampnatus ad penam perpetuam. Et contra hoc vadunt raciones et sophisticantur evidencie ad eiusdem oppositum colorandum.

for anyone, but every one must bear his own burden."[14] [528] But that the teachings of the saints may appear more clearly in part, it is objected in many ways that one is to pray specially for the damned. First, because one is to pray for these living foreknown, whether they are friends in grace according to present justice or enemies, damnable according to present injustice. Since therefore they are damned for their time, it seems that one must pray for the damned, even though they are known to be such, both because the one praying knows all things in general, and also because he knows in particular, for its time, that such a foreknown man is damned.[15] But that sophism does not solve the difficulty in which it is asked whether a wayfarer praying for the dead ought to pray, for the same time, for one damned, for which time he knows particularly and distinctly that he is then damned to perpetual punishment. And against this the reasons go, and evidences are counterfeited to give colour to its opposite.[16]

Notes

1. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.24; the codices give "XXII ... cap. XXIII" (524.18), and the print's XXI, 24 is Loserth's (Aug. Opp. VII, 641–642). Matthew 5:44. C. The Origenists' argument is reported, not quoted: *si ... debent* is the antecedent, *multo magis beati ... orabant* the consequent. *Orabant*: imperfect as printed (the codices *orabat*, 524.23); a future would be easier; the print is translated. *Exaudibiles*: apt to be heard. *In via*: on the way, still wayfarers. R. Side-note 524.18; A in the margin at 524.18: *Argumentum pro salvacione omnium*.
2. *Glossant quod*: they gloss it to mean that. *Homines digni sunt ... dicturus est*: italic in the print and Augustine's own words (*De civ. Dei* 21.24, *Quod nemo sanae fidei dixit, nemo dicturus est*), so the quotation runs through *dicturus est*.
3. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.24; the wording, from *Alioquin* to *voluntatem*, is close; Augustine has no *homo* (*quamvis perfecta sit sanctitate*, the church as subject). 2 Timothy 2:25–26 (Loserth, 525.11): Wyclif has *ut Deus det* for the Vulgate *nequando Deus det*, omits *ad cognoscendam veritatem*, and has *de* for *a* and *secundum* for *ad*; his Latin is translated, the Douay–Rheims wording kept where it agrees. C. *Hec ergo causa qua fit*: no verb; "is" is understood. *Quamvis homo perfecta sit sanctitate*: so printed; in Augustine the subject is the church ("although it be of perfect holiness"), and *homo* is translated as it stands. *In illo tunc iudicio*: in that judgment, then. *Penitencia*: "penance", but "repentance" in the verse, with the Douay.
4. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.24. C. *De aliquibus ita certa esset*: an unreal condition without *si*; the church is the subject. *Predestinati ire in ignem*: Augustine's use, of being destined to the fire; it is not Wyclif's technical term for the predestinate, and is left untagged. *Perpetualiter ... perpetuo*: so printed; the first adverb is taken with *ante tempus oracionis*, but it may simply double the second.
5. Gregory, *Moralia* 34.19 (Loserth, 525.18: "XXXIV, cap. XIX [vet. XIII] in cap. XLI b. Job"). The codices leave a gap for the chapter number (525.18), which the print marks with a dash. Wyclif adapts the ending (*pro hominibus istis dampnatis ... pro ipso dyabolo*); Gregory's own wording is *pro diabolo angelisque ejus aeterno supplicio deputatis*. T. *Quando iam non possunt* is Loserth's correction from Gregory; the codices read *qui iam non* (525.24). B lacks *quod ... suis* (525.19). C. *Ubi est ... quod sunt sancti*: "where is [the truth] that they are saints". R. A in the margin at 525.18: *Gregorius*.
6. The *racio* is a syllogism: major *Nemo debet ...*, minor *sed sic foret ...* (*sed* marking the minor), conclusion *ergo conclusio*. *Sibi*: in *Deum sibi concedere*, the man prayed for; in *sibi ipsum adquirere* the same man, *ipsum* being the thing asked; *sibi* may instead be the one praying. *Beatificacio*: being made blessed. R. Side-note 526.1; A in the margin at 525.29: *Racio. Non est orandum pro dampnatis perpetue*.
7. Matthew 6:10: Wyclif has *in celo et in terra* for the Vulgate *sicut in celo et in terra*; his Latin is translated. C. *Instat ut*: presses, urges; not the objection formula. *Ex animo*: from the heart. T. A and A_1 *dicendum quod animo* (526, about l. 10).
8. Matthew 16:23 (Peter rebuked as Satan for resisting the passion); John 17:9; 1 John 5:16, Douay–Rheims (Wyclif *pro eo* for the Vulgate *pro illo*). C. *Talem adversam peticionem*: a petition contrary to God's ordinance. *Quorum dampnacio est cum mundo*: whose damnation goes with the world's. *A quo Johannes dicit*: so printed, "from whom John says", that is, having it from Christ. T. A and B *didicit* (526.22): "from whom John learned", the easier sense; the print is translated.
9. *Quod de appetunt*: Loserth notes that a word seems to have fallen out after *de* (526.31); the gap is marked [...] and nothing is supplied. *De facto*, "in fact", would fit. C. *Languide ... frustrati*: feebly balked of their petition. *Duplicitas*: doubleness, between will and petition.
10. *Fiat voluntas tua undique*: the third petition of the Lord's Prayer in Wyclif's words ("everywhere" for "on earth as in heaven"). The quotation is closed after *placuerit*, since *tibi* continues the address to God; it may close at *undique*. *Graciarum acciones*: thanksgivings. R. Side-notes 526.32, 527.1.

11. ***Expergisci*: to be woken, as from sleep: prayer does not rouse God. *Mereamur ... communicare meritum*: prayer is merit, which charity shares. *Limitacio*: our assignment of a prayer to a person (row); God distributes by the capacity of those prayed for (*eorum*). *Non ex hoc suffragium participantibus sed punitis*: dead men who do not share in the suffrage by it, but are punished. R. Side-note 527.10.**
12. **Decretum C.21 q.3 c.4 *Ciprianus* (Loserth, 527.15; the modern form is ours), from Cyprian, Ep. 1, on a man who named a priest guardian in his will. T. Loserth notes that the canon reads *non offeretur* (527.16). B *avocare*, "call away" (527.19); the print's *advocare* is translated "summon ... from". C. *Legem sacerdotum vetantibus*: who forbid priests their law, that is, keep priests from their rule of life by drawing them into secular business, as in Cyprian's case. *Prepositi ecclesie*: superiors of the church generally (row *prepositi*). *Pro dormicione eius*: for his falling asleep, his death.**
13. ***Glossa*: the ordinary gloss on C. 21 q. 3 c. 4, v. *pro dormitione*, *Dicunt tamen quidam hoc esse dictum ad terrorem* (glossed Decretum, 1588). *In penam sonuerit*: sounds (threatens) a penalty. *Commissione continuacionis*: taken as keeping priests continually in secular service, the counterpart of *omissione correpcionis*; *continuacio* is "continuity" (row). *Redimi*: be redeemed by prayers and masses. *Quotlibet cantarias*: chantries founded for their souls. T. A and A_1 *etsi habuerint* (527.26). R. A in the margin at 527.26: *Arguitur quod orandum est pro dampnatis et dissolvitur*.**
14. **Decretum C.13 q.2 c.20 *In presenti seculo* (Loserth, 527.27: "causa XIII, q. II, cap. XX"; the modern form is ours); the print's *XII^a* disagrees with Loserth's own reference. Jerome, on Galatians 6, is its author (Friedberg). Ezekiel 14:14 names Noah, Daniel and Job; Galatians 6:5, Douay "every one shall bear his own burden", here *unumquemque oportet portare*, "every one must bear". T. "[can]" is our supply: *rogare posse* hangs on a governing verb of Jerome's sentence not quoted. B *posset* (527.29).**
15. ***Pro suo tempore sunt dampnati*: the foreknown are damned "for their time", that is, it is true now that they will be damned; the objection treats the living foreknown as already damned. *Secundum iniusticiam presentem dampnabiles*: damnable by their present injustice, the counterpart of *secundum presentem iusticiam*. *Scit omnia in communi*: knows all in general (that some are foreknown). *In parte*: taken as "in part"; it may mean "on this side [of the question]". T. A and A_1 *scit impertiri* (528.10). R. Side-note 528.1; A in the margin at 528.2: *Obiectus*.**
16. ***Sophisma*: the argument just given, which shows only that the foreknown are damned "for their time"; the real question is praying for one known, at the time of the prayer, to be damned already. *Contra hoc vadunt raciones*: the arguments that follow (528.18 ff.) go against the answer that one may not so pray. *Sophisticantur evidencie*: evidences are counterfeited (row *sophisticare*). T. B *salutat solvit*; A *salutat* corrected to *solvit*; A_1 *salutat* (528.12).**
How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **524: ∅ (asks is the English side-note; Item, already present at pos 132)**
  - **524: *assit* [NW]**
  - **524: *dyabolo*) [NW]**
  - **525: *fit***
  - **526: *foret***
  - **526: *I^a***
  - **526: *illud***
  - **527: *tua***
  - **527: *placuerit.* (5 is the line number)**
  - **527: *XXI^a***
  - **527: *XII^a***
  - **527: *II^a***
  - **528: *in* (200d folio mark and margin letter G glued)**

Part 4: Three distinctions of prayer, and the case of Gregory and Trajan raised

Loserth pp. 528.18–532.20

¶1 528.18–530.1
528.18 *It is argued that our prayers must cease if we may not pray for the damned.*
529.4 *Distinctions In prayer:*
529.7
1. general or distinct;
529.12
2. absolute or conditioned;

[528]**Sed secundo arguitur quod oportet orare pro dampnatis perpetuo, quia de dampnatis temporaliter ad penam purgatorii non dubium quin debemus pro eis specialiter exorare, nam debemus orare pro omnibus christianis conviventibus nobiscum, et multi eorum sunt dampnati perpetuo quoad Deum; ergo conclusio. Aliter enim nullus oraret pro aliquo fratre suo, cum ignorat utrum sit predestinatus vel prescitus. Et eadem est consideracio de defunctis. Nam recepcio sacramentorum, manifestacio signorum et testificacio**

But secondly it is argued that one must pray for the perpetually damned, because of those damned temporally to the punishment of purgatory there is no doubt that we ought to pray specially for them; for we ought to pray for all Christians living with us, and many of them are damned forever as regards God; therefore the conclusion.[1] For otherwise no one would pray for any brother of his, since he is ignorant whether he is predestinate or foreknown. And the consideration is the same about the

529.20 *3. for bliss or for less good.*
529.27 *We may pray for good less than bliss on behalf of the foreknown;*
530.1 *but if we knew they were in hell our prayers would be useless.*
530.7 *We do best to pray generally and conditionally.*
530.23 *The Church prays for all men, but her prayers are effectual only for the elect.*

astancium in fine vite iam morientis, non faciunt nisi levem evidenciam topicam quod decessit in gracia. Quomodo ergo orarent sacerdotes annales pro suis mortuis vel religiosi possessionati pro suis patronis, si non liceret orare pro dampnatis? Unde Augustinus, XXI° De Civitate Dei, capit. XXIII° [529] **(ubi supra) sic loquitur: Quia ecclesia de nullo certa est, orat pro omnibus; sic enim orat in die Parasceues pro perfidis Iudeis, paganis et aliis cunctis barbaris. Hic dico supponendo sensum proximo limitatum quod trimembris est distinccio oracionis ad propositum. Alia enim est oracio confusa et alia distincta, quod oportet mensurare penes suum primum subiectum, vel secundarium pro quo oratur; ut orando distincte pro cunctis animabus in purgatorio oratur confuse pro Petro vel alio inibi ignorato; et sic dicunt logici quod eadem oracio est respectu diversorum simul confusa et distincta. Secunda distinccio oracionis est quod alia est absoluta et alia condicionata. Absoluta qua beati petunt illud quod intuentur in verbo esse ab eis petendum et a domino concedendum, nam sic Christus et angeli necessitati sunt petere pro membris Christi viantibus et sunt regulariter exauditi. Oracio autem condicionata est oracio qua nos ignari petimus quod reputamus esse nobis utile subintelligendo condicionem, si Deo placeat. Tercia distinccio oracionis capitur penes illud pro quo oratur, ut alia est oracio pro beatitudine et alia oracio pro bono aliquo citra ipsam, sive fuerit perpetuum, sicut est remissio pene eterne, sive bonum aliquod temporale; sed oracio pro homine quoad Deum sumitur communiter pro primo membro famosiori. Istis premissis dico quod orare debemus isto ultimo modo pro prescitis nobiscum conviventibus, intendendo illis bonum in communi, quod secundum illum modum ultimum contingit nos eis mereri, cum contingit nos inorare eorum demeritum et, sic quoad eos nec nostra racio nec nostra correpcio foret cassa; verum tamen scito a nobis distincte ante oracionem quod forent** [530] **tunc mortui eternis ignibus deputati cessaret pro eis tunc**

departed. For the reception of the sacraments, the showing of signs and the testimony of those standing by at the end of the life of one now dying make only a light topical evidence that he died in grace.[2] How then would annual priests pray for their dead, or the possessioned religious for their patrons, if it were not lawful to pray for the damned?[3] Hence Augustine, *City of God* 21, chapter 23 [529] **(where above), speaks thus: "Because the church is certain of no one, it prays for all; for so it prays on the day of the Preparation for the faithless Jews, the pagans and all other barbarians."[4] Here I say, supposing the sense limited just now, that the distinction of prayer to the purpose is threefold. For one prayer is indistinct and another distinct, which must be measured by its first subject, or the secondary one for which prayer is made; as, in praying distinctly for all the souls in purgatory, one prays indistinctly for Peter or another there unknown; and so the logicians say that the same prayer is at once indistinct and distinct with respect to different things.[5] The second distinction of prayer is that one is absolute and another conditional. Absolute prayer is that by which the blessed ask that which they behold in the Word to be asked by them and granted by the Lord; for so Christ and the angels are necessitated to ask for the members of Christ on the road, and are regularly heard. And conditional prayer is prayer by which we, the ignorant, ask what we reckon useful to us, understanding as implied the condition "if it please God".[6] The third distinction of prayer is taken by that for which prayer is made: as one prayer is for blessedness and another for some good short of it, whether it be perpetual, as is the remission of eternal punishment, or some temporal good; but prayer for a man as regards God is commonly taken for the first, best-known member.[7] With these premised, I say that we ought to pray in this last way for the foreknown living with us, intending good for them in general, because in that last way it is possible for us to merit for them, since it is possible for us to lessen their demerit; and so, as regards them, neither our reasoning nor our correction would be void;[8] but yet, were it known to us distinctly before the prayer that they were** [530] **then dead and assigned to eternal fires, there would cease for them then**

¶2 530.2–532.20
531.6 *It is said that we may pray generally but with a special intention for a friend, who may be damned.*

[530] **efficacia deprecandi, et ita, sicut ignoramus qualiter oremus pro vivis ex ignorancia qualitatis sui exitus, sic ignoramus qualiter oremus pro iam mortuis propter ignoranciam conformem. Ideo optimum est nobis sacerdotibus vivendo sancte porrigere Deo oraciones generales et condicionales pro nostris benefactoribus, quia**

the efficacy of entreating; and so, as we do not know how we should pray for the living, from ignorance of the quality of their end, so we do not know how we should pray for those already dead, because of a like ignorance.[9] Therefore it is best for us priests, living holily, to offer to God general and conditional prayers for our benefactors, because such, out of

531.15 *The example of Gregory and Trajan is cited,*
531.23 *and it is urged that even the devils profit by Christ's merit.*
532.12 *I reply that in the case put the intention is for the man if he is capable.*
532.19 *All prayers are conditioned by the divine will and the capacity of the subject.*

tales ex maiori caritate plus eis proderunt si capaces fuerint (ut patet in De Consecratione d. Vª Non mediocriter); et supposita eorum incapacitate plus proderunt ecclesie et oranti. Nec est licitum orare pro vivis vel mortuis, specialiter condicione orandi exposita pretermissa. Ille ergo qui orat specialiter absolute pro beatificacione patroni sui iam mortui cum hoc quod iam revelatum sit sibi ipsum iam eternis ignibus mancipari, et hoc propter cupidinem temporalium, debet eis privari tamquam orator inutilis, cum debet congaudere cum Deo et beatis in celo de iusto Dei iudicio et materiali gaudio beatorum, eciamsi fuerit alter parentum carnalium vel specialissimus amicorum, quia, sicut non rogamus Deum ut revocet tempus preteritum, sic nec rogamus eum ut revocet tale iudicium. Et quantum ad dictum Augustini, patet quod intelligitur ecclesiam rite orare pro omnibus capacibus, de quanto sunt tales. Unde iste textus suus orat pro omnibus dumtaxat hominibus, inimicis suis in hoc corpore constitutis, nec tamen pro omnibus exauditur; pro hiis enim solis exauditur qui etsi adversantur ecclesie, ita sunt tamen predestinati ut filii efficiantur ecclesie. Si qui autem usque ad mortem habebunt cor impenitens nec ex inimicis convertentur in filios, non pro talium defunctorum spiritibus orat ecclesia, quia in parte iam diaboli [531]computatur, qui cum esset in corpore non est translatus ad Christum. Eadem itaque causa est cur non oretur tunc pro hominibus eternaliter puniendis, que causa est ut non oretur neque nunc neque tunc pro malis spiritibus. Sed tercio principaliter arguitur per hoc quod homo potest meritorie orare generaliter pro defunctis, immiscendo intencionem orandi specialiter pro patrono vel alio amico cum hoc quod ipse sit dampnatus, in quo casu orat licite pro dampnato, ergo hoc licet. Confirmatur tripliciter: Primo per hoc quod oracio condicionata est oracio qualem oportet concedere esse licitam pro dampnato, cum sit ex gracia, et per consequens necessitat ad orandum pro talibus. Secundo confirmatur per hoc quod beatus Gregorius oravit specialiter pro Traiano quem scivit esse dampnatum, quia Johannis III°, 18: Qui non credit iam iudicatus est. Imperator autem Traianus fuit infidelis decedens in mortali, ergo cum beatus Gregorius fuit pro illo exauditus a domino, videtur quod pro talibus licitum est orare; ergo sanctus potest mereri ut tales resuscitentur, potest mereri ut salventur. Tercio confirmatur per hoc quod licet orare pro quolibet cui oracio foret utilis vel malum tolleret, sed sic est de omni merito militantis ecclesie quoad dampnatos, ergo licet orare pro illis saltem tollendo magis malum quod eis aliter eveniret. Nam sepe dictum est quod totus mundus adquirit perfeccionem secundam ex merito Christi, cum aliter forent dyaboli penalius

greater charity, will profit them more if they are capable (as is clear in *De consecratione* d. 5 *Non mediocriter*); and, their incapacity supposed, they will profit the church and the one praying more.[10] Nor is it lawful to pray for the living or the dead specially with the condition of praying set out above passed over. He, therefore, who prays specially and absolutely for the beatification of his patron, now dead, granted that it has already been revealed to him that the patron has already been consigned to eternal fires, and this for greed of temporal goods, ought to be deprived of them as a useless bedesman, since he ought to rejoice with God and the blessed in heaven over the just judgment of God and the material joy of the blessed, even if it were one of his fleshly parents or the most special of his friends; because, as we do not ask God to recall time past, so neither do we ask him to recall such a judgment.[11] And as to the saying of Augustine, it is clear that it is understood that the church rightly prays for all who are capable, insofar as they are such. Hence this text of his: "It prays for all men only, its enemies set in this body; and yet it is not heard for all. For it is heard only for those who, although they oppose the church, are yet so predestined that they are made sons of the church. But if any will have an impenitent heart until death and will not be converted from enemies into sons, the church does not pray for the spirits of such dead, because he is now [531]reckoned in the devil's part who, while he was in the body, was not translated to Christ. There is therefore the same reason why prayer is not made then for men to be punished eternally as there is why prayer is made neither now nor then for the evil spirits."[12] But thirdly it is principally argued, by appeal to this: that a man can meritoriously pray generally for the departed, mingling in the intention of praying specially for a patron or another friend, granted that he is damned; in which case he prays lawfully for one damned; therefore this is lawful.[13] It is confirmed in three ways. First, by this, that conditional prayer is prayer of a kind which must be granted to be lawful for one damned, since it is from grace; and consequently it necessitates praying for such. Secondly, it is confirmed by this, that blessed Gregory prayed specially for Trajan, whom he knew to be damned, because, John 3:18: "He that doth not believe is already judged." Now the emperor Trajan was an unbeliever, dying in mortal sin; therefore, since blessed Gregory was heard by the Lord for him, it seems that it is lawful to pray for such; therefore a saint can merit that such be raised again, can merit that they be saved.[14] Thirdly, it is confirmed by this, that it is lawful to pray for anyone to whom prayer would be useful or would take away evil; now

cruciati, eo quod aliter haberent maius consorcium conpunitum, plus demerentur amplius seducendo, et careret perfeccione secunda, qua modo consolacione sanctorum misericorditer [532] sunt puniti. Bonum ergo quod dyabolus facit predestinatis per accidens fit in virtute meriti Christi; quod videtur de tanto illis proficere. Et per idem videtur quod viator de quanto victoriose resistit dyabolo, confortando fratres ecclesie, mitigat de eius malo, et per consequens facit ut tolleracior sit eius dampnacio et de tanto effectualiter orat pro illo; membra enim sua maxime nocent sibi, quia sicut timentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum, sic prescitis omnia cedunt in malum, et potissime que videntur eis magis utilia. Hic dico quod minor est falsa, nam in casu posito homo intendit orare pro dato mortuo, sed non orat pro eo ex eius incapacitate, sed intencio sicut oracio generalis est in casu meritoria. Unde ad hoc quod quis oret Deum pro aliquo requiritur eius capacitas, ut puta, quod sit creatura racionalis, capax boni pro quo racionabiliter oratur. Et ad primam confirmacionem dico quod contingit intelligere oracionem condicionatam dupliciter; vel quoad

so it is with every merit of the church militant as regards the damned; therefore it is lawful to pray for them, at least by taking away the greater evil that would otherwise befall them. For it has often been said that the whole world acquires its second perfection from the merit of Christ, since otherwise the devils would be tormented more painfully, because otherwise they would have a greater fellowship punished with them, would demerit more by seducing further, and it would lack the second perfection, by which they are now, with the consolation of the saints, mercifully [532] punished.[15] Therefore the good which the devil does to the predestinate by accident is done in virtue of the merit of Christ; which seems to profit them to that extent. And by the same token it seems that a wayfarer, insofar as he victoriously resists the devil, strengthening the brothers of the church, mitigates something of his evil, and consequently brings it about that his damnation is more tolerable, and to that extent effectually prays for him; for his members harm him most, because as to them that fear God all things work together unto good, so to the foreknown all things turn out for evil, and most of all those which seem to them more useful.[16] Here I say that the minor is false; for in the case put a man intends to pray for the given dead man, but he does not pray for him, because of his incapacity; but the intention, like the general prayer, is meritorious in the case. Hence, for someone to pray God for another, that other's capacity is required, for instance, that he be a rational creature, capable of the good for which prayer is reasonably made.[17] And to the first confirmation I say that conditional prayer can be understood in two ways: either as regards

Notes

1. The argument: we pray specially for those in purgatory and for all Christians living with us; but many of these are damned forever "as regards God" (*quoad Deum*), in God's knowledge though not in ours. *Dampnati temporaliter*: condemned to temporal punishment (row *dampnacio*). T. B *ergo orare* (528.30). R. Side-note 528.18.
2. *Consideracio*: the reasoning. *Manifestacio signorum*: the signs of a good death. *Evidencia topica*: probable, not demonstrative, evidence (row). T. *Morientis* is Loserth's conjecture (528.28); A *iam mori*, the place damaged by erasure; B *utor iam mori*; A_1 *vita sine moritis*.
3. *Sacerdotes annales*: priests paid to sing masses for a soul through a year or on its anniversary (English "annuellers"). *Religiosi possessionati*: endowed religious, bound to pray for their founders and patrons (row *patronus*).
4. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.24, the passage of 524.18; the print's "XXIII" here (with *ubi supra*) stands against Loserth's correction there. *Quia ecclesia de nullo certa est, orat pro omnibus* compresses Augustine's *quia de nullo certa est, orat pro omnibus*; the Good Friday clause is not in Augustine, though the print sets the whole run in italics. The Good Friday solemn prayers, *Oremus et pro perfidis Judaeis ... Oremus et pro paganis* (Gelasian Sacramentary I.41, PL 74:1105B). C. The quotation is closed at *barbaris*, where the print's italics end. *Parasceue*: the Preparation, Good Friday.
5. *Supponendo sensum proximo limitatum*: supposing the sense limited just above (528.12–16), of one known, at the time of the prayer, to be damned; *limitare* here restricts (row). *Ad propositum*: for the present purpose. *Confusa / distincta*: indistinct and distinct (row *confuse*): a prayer for all the souls in purgatory names its first subject distinctly and covers an unknown Peter only indistinctly, as in the logicians' confused supposition. *Primum subiectum, vel secundarium*: what the prayer is for first, or what it is for through that. R. Side-notes 529.4, 529.7; A in the margin at 529.5: *Responsio. Nota trimembrem distinccionem oracionis.*

6. ***In verbo***: in the Word, the Son, in whom the blessed see what is to be asked. ***Necessitati sunt petere***: Christ and the angels are bound to ask, since they see God's will. ***Regulariter exauditi***: heard as a rule. ***Viantes***: those on the road (row), kept apart from ***viator***. ***Nos ignari***: we who do not know God's ordinance. R. Side-note 529.12.
7. ***Citra ipsam***: short of blessedness (cf. row ***citra fidem***). ***Remissio pene eterne*** as a perpetual good short of blessedness: so printed; the lessening of eternal punishment may be meant (cf. ***ut micius puniatur***, 532.29). ***Oracio pro homine quoad Deum***: prayer for a man before God is commonly taken for the first member, prayer for his blessedness. R. Side-note 529.20.
8. ***In-orare*** (529.30–31, so on the plate) is not a word; we translate ***minorare***, "lessen" (our emendation), which fits the mitigation argued below (532.4–7); ***ignorare***, "be ignorant of", is possible. B ***cum continue*** for ***cum contingit*** (529.30); B ***an oracionem*** (529.33). C. ***Quod secundum illum modum***: ***quod*** causal. ***Racio***: so in the print, "reasoning"; ***oracio***, "prayer", would sit more easily beside ***correpcio*** and may have lost its initial ***o***. ***Correpcio***: fraternal correction. R. Side-note 529.27; A in the margin at 529.27: ***Quomodo est orandum pro mortuis continue infra***.
9. ***Qualitas sui exitus***: the quality of their end, whether they die in grace. ***Sicut ignoramus qualiter oremus***: cf. Romans 8:26, "we know not what we should pray for as we ought". R. Side-note 530.1.
10. Decretum, ***De consecratione*** D.5 c.24 ***Non mediocriter*** (Loserth, 530.10: "Decreti tercia pars, dist. V, cap. XXIV"; the modern form is ours). C. ***Si capaces fuerint***: if they are capable of being helped. ***Plus proderunt ecclesie et oranti***: if the benefactor is incapable, the prayer profits the church and the priest. R. Side-note 530.7.
11. ***Specialiter condicione ... pretermissa***: ***specialiter*** taken with ***orare***; it may qualify the omission. ***Cum hoc quod***: granted that (as at 531.9). ***Eis privari***: be deprived of them, the temporal goods for which he prays. ***Orator***: bedesman (row), the priest paid to pray for his patron. ***Materiali gaudio beatorum***: the print's ***gaudio*** is Loserth's correction; the codices read ***gaudii*** (530.19), "the material of the joy of the blessed", that is, God's judgment as the matter of their joy, which may be the sense. ***Alter parentum carnalium***: one of his parents in the flesh. T. B lacks ***cum hoc ... mancipari*** (530.15).
12. Augustine, ***De civitate Dei*** 21.24, continuing the passage of 524.18–525.10, quoted closely (***Sed quia de nullo certa est, orat pro omnibus dumtaxat hominibus inimicis suis in hoc corpore constitutis***), though the print sets it in roman. C. ***Iste textus suus***: "this text of his" introduces the quotation, whose subject is the church. ***Dumtaxat hominibus***: men only, not devils. ***Computatur ... qui***: Augustine passes to the singular. T. A ***in hoc in hoc*** (530.27); B ***isti sunt tamen*** (530.29); A and A_1 ***eternaliter promerendis*** for ***eternaliter puniendis*** (531.3). R. Side-note 530.23.
13. ***Immiscendo intencionem***: mixing into the general prayer an intention for one person. ***Cum hoc quod ipse sit dampnatus***: granted that he is damned, the case where the friend is in fact damned. ***Ergo hoc licet***: so praying for the damned is lawful. R. Side-note 531.6.
14. The legend of Gregory's prayer for Trajan: John the Deacon, ***Vita Gregorii*** 2.44, and later the ***Legenda aurea***; John says that Gregory only wept, and that Trajan was freed from the torments of hell. John 3:18, Douay–Rheims; Wyclif omits ***autem***. C. ***Quia***: the ground on which Gregory knew Trajan damned. ***Potest mereri ut tales resuscitentur, potest mereri ut salventur***: two clauses without a connective; it may be read as a condition, "if a saint can merit that such be raised again, he can merit that they be saved". T. B lacks ***infidelis*** (531.19); the codices ***resuscitnr*** (531.22). R. Side-note 531.15.
15. ***Perfeccio secunda***: the world's second perfection, which it has from Christ's merit; the reference to what "has often been said" is to be traced. ***Penalius***: more painfully. ***Maius consorcium conpunitum***: a larger company punished with them. ***Plus demerentur***: so printed, an indicative among subjunctives; ***demererentur*** would be expected. ***Careret***: subject the world (B: ***scil. mundus***). ***Qua ... sunt puniti***: subject the devils (B: ***scil. diaboli***); ***qua*** may instead agree with ***consolacione***, "by which consolation of the saints they are now mercifully punished". T. Loserth judges the passage "without doubt corrupt" (531.32). R. Side-note 531.23; A in the margin at 531.27: ***Nota causam. Christi passio perficit omnia***.
16. Romans 8:28 (Loserth, 532.9): Wyclif has ***timentibus***, "to them that fear", for the Vulgate ***diligentibus***, "to them that love"; his Latin is translated, the Douay–Rheims wording kept otherwise. C. ***Per accidens***: incidentally, against the devil's intention. ***Illis proficere***: taken as profiting the devils; it may be the predestinate. ***Mitigat de eius malo***: lessens something of the devil's evil. ***Membra sua ... sibi***: the devil's members, the foreknown, harm him most; ***sibi*** may be "themselves". T. A and A_1 lack ***quod*** (532.1); B ***de quarto viatori*** (532.4); A and A_1 ***qui videntur*** (532.10–11).
17. ***Minor est falsa***: the minor of the third argument, ***in quo casu orat licite pro dampnato*** (531.9). ***Pro dato mortuo***: for the dead man in question. ***Ex eius incapacitate***: because of his incapacity. ***Capax boni***: capable of the good asked. The answer to the first confirmation runs on at 532.21. R. Side-notes 532.12, 532.19; A in the margin at 532.11: ***Responsio***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 528: ***pro*** (b and margin letter H glued)
  - 529: ***(ubi*** (200d is the glued folio mark)
  - 529: ***trimembris*** (5 is the line number)
  - 529: ***petimus*** (201a is the glued folio mark)
  - 529: ***illum***
  - 530: ***Deo*** (English side-note "to" glued)
  - 530: ***Vª***
  - 531: ***specialiter*** [NW]
  - 531: ***sit*** (English side-note "may be damned" glued in other scans)
  - 531: ***III°***
  - 531: ***18:***
  - 531: ***Qui***
  - 532: ***incapaci-*** (hyphen half; tate, follows at pos 106)

Part 5: Conditional prayer, prayer for the damned in name only, and Gregory and Trajan answered

Loserth pp. 532.21–535.2

¶1 532.21–533.23
533.14 *Prayers should be said generally for the souls in purgatory and the special intention would profit no less.*
533.24 *As to the example I say that Trajan was predestined to be saved by the intercession of Gregory.*

[532] **voluntatem divinam, ponendo in eius voluntate quid et qualiter decreverit succurrendum, et talis debet esse oracio viatorum; vel secundo quoad capacitatem subiecti pro quo orare intenditur, et sic supposita eius incapacitate ipsum subiectum non est persona pro qua sic oratur, sed vel ipse orans vel alia capax persona ecclesie. Quod autem vulgariter dicitur orari pro tali intento suffragari, licet sit inhabilis, equivocatur in nominetenus oracione, sicut forte oracio indigni non est aput Deum univoce oracio pro quocunque; licet ergo orare pro viatore prescito, cum sit capax meriti ut micius puniatur, sicut est de prescitis qui ad oracionem alterius faciunt nedum** [533] **multa bona de genere, sed meritoria secundum presentem iusticiam, racione cuius micius dampnabuntur et interim ecclesie merebuntur. Sed cum certum sit quod dampnati sunt, amplius orare pro illis foret omnino inutile, ymmo oracio catholici non est pro illis, cum impossibile sit ipsam illis proficere; contendens vero quod ipse orat pro tali mortuo potest mortificare oracionem propriam contendendo. Nec contendo contra volentem defendere quod licet particulariter orare pro dampnato, dum tamen orator hoc ignoraverit, quia talis oracio nonnisi equivoce est pro illo, sed intendens quod sit pro illo faciliter meretur veniam; nec valet iuramentum oratoris, quo obligat se ad orandum annaliter temporaliter pro defuncto, sed amici defuncti debent appetere quod generaliter oretur pro mortuis in purgatorio, et talis oracio tantum vel plus sibi valet sicut oracio specialis, supposito quod sit ibi; et nulla oracio valet sibi dummodo sit dampnatus. Ideo utrimque non mediocriter peccant qui errando postponunt melius et eligunt minus bonum. Quando ergo dicitur quod oratur pro dampnato, intelligitur quod pretenditur orare pro eo, quod fit nunc licite et nunc male.**

the divine will, placing in his will what he has decreed to succour and how; and such ought to be the prayer of wayfarers; or secondly as regards the capacity of the subject for whom one intends to pray; and so, his incapacity supposed, that subject is not the person for whom prayer is so made, but either the one praying himself or another capable person of the church.[1] And as to what is commonly said, that one prays for such a one, intending to aid him by intercession, although he is unqualified, there is equivocation on a prayer in name only; as perhaps the prayer of an unworthy man is not before God univocally a prayer for anyone.[2] It is lawful, therefore, to pray for a foreknown wayfarer, since he is capable of merit, so that he may be punished more mildly; as is the case with the foreknown who at another's prayer do not only many things [533] **good in kind, but meritorious according to present justice, by reason of which they will be damned more mildly and meanwhile will merit for the church.[3] But since it is certain that they are damned, to pray further for them would be wholly useless; indeed the prayer of a catholic is not for them, since it is impossible that it profit them; and one who contends that he prays for such a dead man can mortify his own prayer by contending.[4] Nor do I contend against one who wishes to defend that it is lawful to pray particularly for one damned, provided only that the one praying is ignorant of it, because such prayer is only equivocally for him; but one maintaining that it is for him easily merits pardon. Nor does the oath of the bedesman avail, by which he binds himself to pray yearly, for a term, for the departed; but the friends of the departed ought to desire that prayer be made generally for the dead in purgatory, and such prayer avails him as much as, or more than, special prayer, supposing that he is there; and no prayer avails him if he is damned.[5] Therefore those on both sides sin not moderately who in error put the better after and choose the lesser good. When therefore it is said that prayer is made for one damned, it is understood that one professes to pray for him, which is done now lawfully and now wrongly.[6]**

¶2 533.24–534.9
534.4 *Men may be Catholics whom we judge to be outside.*

[533] **Ad secundum confirmacionem admitto cronicam et dico quod nec beatus Gregorius nec Deus ipse scivit Traianum fuisse dampnatum ad penam perpetuam, quia Deus eternaliter predestinavit Traianum**

To the second confirmation I admit the chronicle, and I say that neither blessed Gregory nor God himself knew Trajan to have been damned to perpetual punishment, because God eternally predestined Trajan to

534.18 *It may be right for a man to ask what God will not grant.*

ad gloriam; et sicut eternaliter ordinavit eum ad penam purgatoriam, sic eternaliter ordinavit quod mediante intercessione beati Gregorii salvaretur, quia debemus credere quod nec beatus Gregorius nec beatus in celo potest mutare divinum consilium vel per preces mutare vel flectere suum propositum (ut dicit decretum beati Jeronimi [534] ubi supra). Et patet quod Traianus decessit in gracia predestinacionis, nec audivi suasum quod non decessit in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam. Multi enim extra iudaismum erant catholici (ut patet de Job, de Nabugodonosor et eis similibus), et sic est de multis quos propter solempnitatem ritus nostri decernimus esse foris. Nam corde creditur ad iusticiam, et in tali iusticia decedens est vere ecclesie filius et flamine baptizatus.

glory; and as he eternally ordained him to the punishment of purgatory, so he eternally ordained that by means of the intercession of blessed Gregory he would be saved; for we ought to believe that neither blessed Gregory nor any blessed one in heaven can change the divine counsel or by prayers change or bend his purpose (as the decree of blessed Jerome says, [534] where above).[7] And it is clear that Trajan died in the grace of predestination; nor have I heard it made persuasive that he did not die in grace according to present justice. For many outside Judaism were catholics (as is clear of Job, of Nebuchadnezzar and those like them), and so it is with many whom, because of the solemnity of our rite, we judge to be outside. For with the heart we believe unto justice, and one dying in such justice is truly a son of the church and baptized by the Spirit.[8]

¶3 534.10–535.2

[534] Nec vidi suasum quod beatus Gregorius peccavit in quantum hoc peciit, cum factum Dei in concedendo ostendit hoc fuisse iustum et Deo beneplacitum. Ideo si sanctus papa peccavit in sic orando, hoc fuit quia defecit in modo, ut puta, affeccione singulari suum studium occupando, suffragia ecclesie magis utilia dimittendo, vel in alia tali circumstancia, propter quod ad sui meritum temporaliter est punitus. Unde sepe contigit hominem mereri in volendo et orando pro illo quod Deus non vult fieri, ut patet de stimulo carnis pro cuius decessu apostolus rogavit ter dominum (ut patet II^{a} Cor. XII°), et sepe contingit hominem laborare, orare et facere illud quod Deus vult fieri, et tamen peccare graviter propter defectum modi agendi, sicut meminit Augustinus, XXII° De Civitate Dei, capit. II°: Multa, inquit, volunt fieri sancti eius ab illo inspirata sancta voluntate, nec fiunt; sicut orant pro quibusdam pie sancteque, et quod orant non facit, cum ipse in eis hanc orandi voluntatem sancto spiritu suo fecerit. Et videtur equivocando de velle, Deum velle in aliis quod non vult in se ipso. Movet ergo Deus corda hominum ad nunc modeste orandum pro illo quod ipse vult fieri, et nunc pro illo quod ipse non vult fieri; [535] semper tamen talis oracio habet fructum suum et est peticio racionalis ac voluntati divine conformis.

Nor have I seen it made persuasive that blessed Gregory sinned in asking this, since God's deed in granting it showed it to have been just and well-pleasing to God. Therefore if the holy pope sinned in praying so, this was because he failed in the manner, for instance by occupying his zeal with a singular affection, by setting aside the more useful suffrages of the church, or in some other such circumstance; for which he was punished temporally, to his merit.[9] Hence it has often happened that a man merits in willing and praying for that which God does not will to be done, as is clear of the sting of the flesh, for whose departure the apostle besought the Lord thrice (as is clear in 2 Corinthians 12); and it often happens that a man labours, prays and does that which God wills to be done, and yet sins gravely through a defect in the manner of acting, as Augustine recalls, *City of God* 22, chapter 2:[10] "Many things," he says, "his saints will to be done, by a holy will inspired by him, and they are not done; as they pray for some piously and holily, and what they pray for he does not do, although he himself has made in them, by his Holy Spirit, this will to pray." And it seems, equivocating on "to will", that God wills in others what he does not will in himself.[11] God therefore moves the hearts of men to pray modestly, now for that which he wills to be done, and now for that which he does not will to be done; [535] yet such prayer always has its fruit, and is a reasonable petition and conformable to the divine will.

Notes

1. The answer to the first confirmation (532.20): a conditional prayer is conditional either on God's will (*quoad voluntatem divinam*) or on the capacity of the one prayed for. *Ponendo in eius voluntate*: leaving it to his will. *Quid et qualiter decreverit succurrendum*: what help he has decreed, and how. *Ipsum subiectum non est persona pro qua sic oratur*: if he is incapable, the prayer is not for him, but profits the one praying or another member of the church.

2. ***Vulgariter***: commonly, in ordinary speech. ***Orari pro tali intento suffragari***: taken as "that one prays for such a one, intending to aid him"; ***intento*** may instead be "the person intended", "for such an intended one, to aid him". ***Equivocatur in nominetenus oracione***: "prayer" is used equivocally of a prayer in name only (cf. row ***nominetenus clerici***). ***Aput Deum***: before God. ***Oracio indigni***: the prayer of one unworthy, in mortal sin.
3. ***Capax meriti ut micius puniatur***: capable of merit, to the end that he be punished more mildly. ***Bona de genere***: good in kind, by the object of the act, as against meritorious. ***Secundum presentem iusticiam***: by their present justice, though not predestinate (row). ***Ecclesie merebuntur***: they will earn merit for the church.
4. ***Ymmo***: indeed, correcting upward: the prayer is not merely useless, it is not for them at all. ***Mortificare oracionem propriam***: make his own prayer dead, without merit (cf. row ***mortificacio***, of a privilege).
5. ***Nec contendo contra volentem defendere***: Wyclif leaves the point to one who holds it. ***Dum tamen orator hoc ignoraverit***: so long as the one praying (***orator***) does not know that the man is damned. ***Intendens quod sit pro illo***: one who maintains (row ***intendere***) that it is for him errs pardonably (***faciliter meretur veniam***). ***Iuramentum oratoris***: the bedesman's (row ***orator***) oath to say a year's or a term's masses for one soul. ***Annaliter temporaliter***: yearly, for a term of time; perhaps a doubled adverb. T. ***Quod sit*** is Loserth's correction; the codices ***quo sit*** (533.12). R. Side-note 533.14.
6. ***Utrimque***: on both sides, the friends who want special prayers and the priests who swear to say them. ***Non mediocriter***: not moderately, echoing the canon ***Non mediocriter*** (530.10). ***Postponunt melius***: put the better after (cf. row ***proponere***). ***Pretenditur orare***: one professes to pray.
7. The decree of Jerome, Decretum C.13 q.2 c.20 ***In presenti seculo***, cited at 527.27; the canon says only that before Christ's tribunal no one can pray for another, not that the saints cannot change God's counsel. C. ***Admitto cronicam***: I accept the chronicle's account of Gregory and Trajan. ***Secundum confirmacionem***: so printed, for ***secundam***. ***Predestinavit ... ordinavit***: Trajan's salvation through Gregory's intercession was itself eternally ordained, so the prayer changed nothing in God's counsel. T. A and B ***sic eternaliter*** (533.28). R. Side-note 533.24; A in the margin at 533.24: ***Nota de Traiano quem Deus per oracionem Gregorii de dampnacione liberavit***.
8. Romans 10:10, Douay–Rheims (Wyclif omits ***enim***). C. ***Suasum***: shown persuasively. ***Gracia predestinacionis*** and ***gracia secundum presentem iusticiam***: final grace and present grace. ***Catholici***: members of the true church. ***Solempnitas ritus nostri***: the formal observance of our rite (baptism by water). ***Flamine baptizatus***: baptized with the baptism of the Spirit (row ***baptismus flaminis***). R. Side-note 534.4.
9. The tradition that Gregory, offered the choice, accepted bodily sickness as the penalty of his prayer for Trajan: ***Legenda aurea***, c. 46, ***De sancto Gregorio*** (ed. Graesse, p. 197); John the Deacon mentions no punishment of Gregory. C. ***Factum Dei in concedendo***: God's act in granting the prayer. ***Affeccione singulari***: by a private affection for one man. ***Ad sui meritum***: to his merit, the punishment itself being meritorious.
10. 2 Corinthians 12:7–8: "a sting of my flesh ... For which thing thrice I besought the Lord, that it might depart from me" (Douay–Rheims). C. ***Mereri in volendo ... pro illo quod Deus non vult fieri***: Paul merited in asking what God did not grant. T. B lacks ***II*** (534.21). R. Side-note 534.18; A in the margin at 534.25: ***Augustinus***.
11. Augustine, ***De civitate Dei*** 22.2 (Loserth, 534.25: Aug. Opp. VII, 656). C. The quotation is closed at ***fecerit***; the next sentence is taken as Wyclif's summary of the chapter, where Augustine says ***ut ipsum dicamus velle, qui ut velint isti facit***. ***Equivocando de velle***: taking "to will" equivocally. ***Modeste***: with restraint. T. B ***non faciunt*** (534.28).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 532: ***oracio*** (30 is the line number) [NW]
  - 533: ***multa*** (201b is the glued folio mark)
  - 533: ***omnino*** (5 is the line number)
  - 533: ***obligat*** (201c is the glued folio mark)
  - 533: ***generaliter***
  - 533: ***Gregorius***
  - 533: ∅)
  - 533: ***fuisse***
  - 533: ***Traianum*** (agent 12))
  - 534: ***gracia*** (201c folio mark and margin letter L glued)
  - 534: ***de***
  - 534: ***II***^{a}
  - 534: ***II***° (colon dropped per superscript rule)
  - 535: ***semper*** (201c is the glued folio mark)
  - 533: ***Traianum*** (Traianum split 1|raianum (agent 12))
  - 533: ∅ (joined at 197 (agent 12))

Part 6: The third confirmation answered: mercy in the punishment of the damned, Augustine against the merciful, and the four kinds of the dead

¶1 535.3–538.2
535.3 *Prayer may profit those for whose intention it was not made.*
535.25 *Augustine says that God punishes the damned mercifully,*
536.5 *but he abhorred the notion that there would be an end to the punishment of the damned.*
537.1 *Christians will be punished more severely than others.*
538.3 *We may see how the world is deceived,*
538.8 *as to perpetual alms,*

[535] **Ad terciam confirmacionem negetur assumptum, cum multe oraciones tollunt mala de bestiis pro quibus non orant homines Deum suum. Ymmo si fiat oracio pro omnibus melioratis occasione illius, tunc oraciones sanctorum pro adventu Christi in carne fierent pro toto mundo, nedum pro omnibus bestiis et dampnatis, ymmo pro cunctis inanimatis et singulis creaturis. Omnia enim ista recipiunt perfeccionem et melioracionem, ymmo et ipsum peccatum virtute passionis Christi, et tamen theologi non tam extense loquuntur sicut nec scriptura sacra, ut dicant orandum esse pro talibus ut percipientibus fructum oracionis intentum, licet posset dici eos orare pro talibus tamquam per accidens consequentibus ad fructum per se intentum. Conceditur ergo quod dyabolus et omnes dampnati recipiunt quoddam bonum ex merito ecclesie; videtur tamen mihi quod non sit bonum eis expediens vel utile, sed bonum tollens eis fugibile; dampnacio enim tollit quodlibet bonum honestum et utile in dampnato. Conceditur tamen (ut tangitur in secundo commento mendacii) quod Deus misericorditer punit dampnatos. Et notat Augustinus XXI°, De Civitate Dei, cap. XXIV°. Sic enim secundum Augustinum Deus non continet in ira sua miseraciones suas eciam dampnatis, sed facit eos non tanta quanta digni sunt penarum atrocitate puniri, non ut eas penas vel nunquam subeant vel ante finiant, sed ut eas miciores quam merita sunt eorum levioresque paciantur; sic enim ira Dei manebit et in ipsa ira sua miseraciones** [536] **suas non continebit. Sed quia dixit sacrum Psalmum intelligere de membris suis predestinatis in quibus peccatum est mutacio dextere excelsi, ideo prosequitur dicens: Hoc quidem non ideo confirmo, quoniam non resisto. Hoc autem utrobique detestatur iste sanctus cum aliis quod vel pena membrorum dyaboli pro instanti temporis finiatur, vel postquam fuit intensior per ecclesie suffragia remittatur, licet credi posset probabiliter quod omne peccatum est minus malum et minus punibile propter meritum Jesu Christi. Unde quia Augustinus, cap. XVII°, libri XXI[i], recitat quomodo quidam commendant istam sentenciam, quia pia, sed (ut arguit, cum non habet auctoritatem ex scriptura sed eius oppositum), tunc foret melior et verior, si misericordior. Extendatur ergo fons huius misericordie ad dampnatos quoslibet quod punientur pena solummodo temporali, vel dicatur misericordius quod pena illa erit brevissima, vel tercio misericordissime quod omnino non erit alia pena post mortem, sed tota scriptura est in ista parte conminatoria sed non vera. Si quis, inquit, audeat ista asserere, tanto invenitur**

To the third confirmation, let the assumption be denied, since many prayers take away evils from beasts, for which men do not pray to their God. Indeed, if prayer is made for everything bettered by occasion of it, then the prayers of the saints for the coming of Christ in the flesh would be made for the whole world: not only for all the beasts and the damned, but indeed for all inanimate things and every single creature.[1] For all these receive perfection and betterment, indeed even sin itself does, by virtue of the passion of Christ; and yet theologians do not speak so broadly, as neither does holy scripture, as to say that one must pray for such things as receiving the intended fruit of prayer; although it could be said that men pray for such things as following by accident upon the fruit intended of itself. It is granted, therefore, that the devil and all the damned receive a certain good from the merit of the church; yet it seems to me that it is not a good expedient or useful to them, but a good that takes away from them something to be shunned; for damnation takes away every honourable and useful good in the damned man.[2] Yet it is granted (as is touched on in the second fabrication of the lie) that God punishes the damned mercifully. And Augustine notes it, *City of God* 21, chapter 24. For so, according to Augustine, God does not shut up his mercies in his anger even toward the damned, but "makes them to be punished, not with such atrocity of punishments as they deserve: not so that they should either never undergo those punishments or end them early, but so that they should suffer them milder and lighter than their deserts; for so the anger of God will remain, and in that very anger he will not shut up his [536] **mercies."[3] But because he said that the sacred psalm is to be understood of his predestinate members, in whom sin is "the change of the right hand of the most High", therefore he goes on, saying: "This indeed I do not therefore affirm, because I do not resist it." But this the saint, with others, detests on both counts: that either the punishment of the devil's members should end at some instant of time, or that, after it has been more intense, it should be remitted through the suffrages of the church; although it could probably be believed that every sin is less evil and less punishable because of the merit of Jesus Christ.[4] Hence because Augustine, in chapter 17 of book 21, recounts how some commend this teaching because it is pious; but (as he argues, since it has no authority from scripture, but its opposite has) it would then be better and truer if it were more merciful. Let the fount of this mercy, then, be extended to any of the damned**

errare deformius et contra recta Dei verba perversius, quanto videtur sentire sibi clemencius. Non seducat nos ergo ceca pietas que, cum sit veritati et fonti iusticie ac pietatis contraria, est blasphema impietas; nam per eius oppositum fides catholica integratur, conversacio militantis ecclesie timore pene melioratur et spes maioris beatitudinis confirmatur; et correspondenter illi qui videntur magis placere dyabolo magis nocent, et hinc indubie possunt expectare amplius nocumentum. Non ergo oramus pro dyabolo vel sibi [537] proficimus quamvis per accidens facimus sibi bonum; nec valet fingere quod nulli christiani sencient istam penam, quia (ut dixi secundum sentenciam beati Gregorii) illi sunt pessimi. Unde Augustinus, XXI° De Civitate Dei, XXV° cap. dicit quod a sana doctrina foret nimis contrarium ut heresiarche qui receperunt in ecclesia baptismum, eucaristiam et alia carismata, post vero ingrate acucius impugnant ecclesiam quam alii infideles, quia non adeo sunt ingrati. Peior, inquit, est desertor fidei et ex desertore obpugnator eius effectus, quam ille qui non deseruit quam nunquam tenuit. Ex istis potest colligi alius sensus dictorum beati Augustini Enchiridion CX°, que ponuntur in decretis XIII^{a}, q. II^{a}. Tempus. Ponit enim primo quod in hoc meditulio temporis inter mortem hominis et diem iudicii contingit mereri vel iuvare spiritus defunctorum. Ponit secundo quod eis prosunt suffragia qui, cum viverent hec sibi ut postea possent prodesse meruerunt. Tercio dicit quod de quatuor generibus mortuorum merita superstitum sunt pro valde bonis graciarum acciones, pro mediocriter bonis propiciaciones, pro valde malis sunt vivencium consolaciones, sed mediocriter malis faciunt dampnaciones tollerabiliores, sic quod utrobique valent pie oraciones intente pro mortuis, quia beatis vertuntur in graciarum acciones, purgandis in propiciaciones, dampnatis vero licet non sint adiumenta, prosunt tamen ecclesie militanti et dampnatis qui [538] superstites per bona opera meruerunt sunt causa quare micius puniuntur (ut tetigi ultimo capitulo libri V^{ti}).

whatever: that they will be punished with a punishment only temporal; or let it be said more mercifully that that punishment will be very brief; or thirdly, most mercifully, that there will be no other punishment at all after death, but that the whole of scripture is in this part threatening but not true. "If anyone," he says, "should dare to assert these things, he is found to err the more hideously, and the more perversely against the right words of God, the more mercifully he seems to himself to think."[5] Let not a blind piety, then, seduce us, which, since it is contrary to truth and to the fount of justice and of piety, is a blasphemous impiety; for by its opposite the catholic faith is made whole, the manner of life of the church militant is bettered by the fear of punishment, and the hope of greater blessedness is confirmed; and correspondingly those who seem to please the devil more do more harm, and hence can without doubt expect greater harm.[6] We do not, therefore, pray for the devil or [537] profit him, although by accident we do him good; nor does it avail to feign that no Christians will feel this punishment, because (as I said, according to the teaching of blessed Gregory) they are the worst. Hence Augustine, *City of God* 21, chapter 25, says that it would be very contrary to sound doctrine that heresiarchs [be freed] who received in the church baptism, the eucharist and other gifts of grace, but afterwards ungratefully attack the church more sharply than other unbelievers, since these are not so ungrateful. "Worse," he says, "is the deserter of the faith, and one made from a deserter into its assailant, than he who has not deserted what he never held."[7] From these another sense can be gathered of the sayings of blessed Augustine, *Enchiridion* 110, which are set in the Decretum, C.13 q.2, *Tempus*.[8] For he lays down first that in this middle space of time between a man's death and the day of judgement it is possible to merit or to help the spirits of the departed. He lays down secondly that suffrages profit those who, while they lived, merited that these might afterwards be able to profit them. Thirdly he says that, of the four kinds of the dead, the merits of the survivors are, for the very good, thanksgivings; for the moderately good, propitiations; for the very bad they are consolations of the living; but for the moderately bad they make their damnations more tolerable: so that on every side pious prayers intended for the dead avail; for to the blessed they are turned into thanksgivings, to those to be purged into propitiations; and to the damned, although they are not helps, yet they profit the church militant; and for the damned who, [538] while they survived, merited by good works, they are the cause why they are punished more mildly (as I touched on in the last chapter of book 5).[9]

¶2 538.3–538.13

[538]**Ex istis potest colligi quantum mundus decipitur in elemosinis perpetuis et exequiis ac ritibus solempnibus mortuorum de perpetuacione elemosine; dictum est hoc cap. XVI° et XXII° cap. libri V[i]. Ymmo cum debet esse certum catholico quod modus quo Christus fecit et fieri precepit elemosinas sit quocunque alio modo elemosinandi perfeccior, et est undiquaque facilior, patet quod non mediocriter peccant sed ex superbia et negligencia se accusant qui contempnunt sermonem Christi et adherent prudencie proprie et opinioni seculi. De exequiis vero et**

From these it can be gathered how much the world is deceived in perpetual alms and in exequies and solemn rites for the dead. Of the perpetuating of alms this has been said in chapter 16 and in chapter 22 of book 5.[10] Indeed, since it ought to be certain to a catholic that the manner in which Christ made alms, and commanded them to be made, is more perfect than any other manner of almsgiving, and is in every way easier, it is clear that they sin not moderately, but convict themselves of pride and negligence, who despise the word of Christ and cling to their own prudence and to the opinion of the world. But as to exequies and[11]

Notes

1. The third confirmation (part 4 of this chapter): it is lawful to pray for anyone to whom prayer is useful or from whom it takes away evil, and every merit of the church militant does this for the damned. Wyclif denies the assumption: prayers take evils from beasts, and no one prays for beasts. *Pro omnibus melioratis occasione illius*: for everything bettered by occasion of the prayer. *Nedum ... ymmo*: not only ... but indeed.

2. *Ymmo et ipsum peccatum*: even sin is bettered, in that Christ's passion turns it to good. *Non tam extense*: not so broadly. *Per accidens consequentibus ad fructum per se intentum*: things that follow by accident upon the fruit the prayer intends of itself. *Bonum tollens eis fugibile*: a good that consists only in taking something to be shunned away from them, as against a good *expediens vel utile*. *Bonum honestum et utile*: two of the three kinds of good, the honourable and the useful (the pleasurable, *delectabile*, at 544). R. A in the margin at 535.23: *Huius contrarium habetur in decalogo*, "the contrary of this is held in the Decalogue".

3. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.24 (Loserth, 535.25: Aug. Opp. VII, 640). "Shut up his mercies" is Psalm 76:10 (Douay–Rheims), which Augustine is expounding; Wyclif has *miseraciones* for the Vulgate's *misericordias*. *Secundo commento mendacii*: the matter is at 497–98 (chapter 21, 21-b), where Bonaventure argues from Psalm 76:10 that *Deus misericorditer punit* the damned and concedes it; Wyclif there calls that discussion the first *commentum* (498), so the ordinal does not match. T. *Ante finiant*: AA$_1$ *antea finiant*; Augustine *aliquando*, "at some time" (Loserth, 535.25). The print's *ante* is translated. C. The quotation is taken to begin at *non tanta*; Wyclif's opening clause paraphrases Augustine. R. Side-note 535.25; A in the margin there: *Augustinus*.

4. Psalm 76:11 (Douay–Rheims). *Hoc quidem non ideo confirmo, quoniam non resisto*: Augustine in the same chapter (*Quod quidem ...*). C. *Dixit sacrum Psalmum intelligere*: the infinitive has no expressed subject; taken as "said that the psalm is to be understood" (of the predestinate, not of the damned). *Utrobique*: on both counts, an end of the punishment or its remission. *Pro instanti temporis*: at any instant of time. R. Side-note 536.5; A in the margin at 536.12: *Contra sentenciam que ponit nullum perpetue dampnari*.

5. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.17 (Wyclif's "chapter 17 of book 21"); Loserth gives no reference. The paraphrase and *Si quis ... clemencius* rework *De civ. Dei* 21.17 (*Verum si aliquis audet ... quanto sibi videtur sentire clementius*), though the print sets them in italics. C. The sentence opened by *Unde quia* has no main clause: Wyclif runs on into Augustine's argument (if the opinion is good because it is merciful, it would be the better the more merciful it were), which *Extendatur ergo* carries to its absurd end. Only *Si quis ... clemencius* is marked as quotation; the rest is taken as paraphrase. *Conminatoria*: threatening only. T. *Alia* is Loserth's correction: A *aliter*, A$_1$ *alicui*, B *alie* (536.20). B *contra recia* (536.23); B *sibi sor*, followed by a lacuna (536.24).

6. *Ceca pietas*: a blind piety, the merciful opinion. *Per eius oppositum*: by the opposite teaching, eternal punishment. *Illi qui videntur magis placere dyabolo magis nocent*: taken as "those who seem to please the devil more (with this teaching) do more harm (to the church)", and so may expect greater punishment; it could instead mean that they harm the devil more, though they seem to please him.

7. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.25 (Loserth, 537.4: the codices read cap. XXIV, corrected by him; Aug. Opp. VII, 646). *Ut dixi secundum sentenciam beati Gregorii*: not located; perhaps 523–24 (22-b), the decree under Gregory's name forbidding intercession *pro impiis (quamvis christiani fuerint)*. T. "[be freed]" is our supply: the clause *ut heresiarche ... impugnant* has no verb of its own, and a word may be lost in the print near 537.5–7. C. *Quia non adeo sunt ingrati*: the other unbelievers are not so ungrateful. *Carismata*: gifts of grace, the sacraments. *Quam nunquam tenuit*: the faith he never held. R. Side-note 537.1.

8. Augustine, *Enchiridion* 110, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.23 *Tempus* (Loserth, 537.14: *Decreti sec. pars, causa XIII, q. II, c. XXIII*; the form is ours). T. AA$_1$ *sensus doctorum*, "the sense of the doctors" (537.13). R. A in the margin at 537.13: *Augustinus*.

9. *In hoc meditulio temporis*: in this middle space of time. *Contingit mereri vel iuvare spiritus defunctorum*: "to merit" has no object; taken as "one may merit, or help the spirits", or, if *iuvare* stands for *iuvari*, "the spirits may merit or be helped". *Utrobique*: on every side. The last clause is taken as: for the damned who did good works while they survived, the prayers are the cause of their milder punishment. S. The canon as Loserth gives it (537.22) has three classes: *pro valde bonis graciarum acciones sunt, pro non valde malis propiciaciones sunt, pro valde malis, eciamsi nulla sunt adiumenta mortuorum, tamen vivorum consolaciones sunt*. Wyclif's fourth, damnations made more tolerable, is Augustine's closing clause (*ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio*),

not a fourth class in *Enchiridion* 110. "The last chapter of book 5": *De civili dominio* III c. 27 (Society ed. IV, 640–41: *meritum ecclesie facit, quod micius puniuntur*, on *Enchiridion* 110). R. A in the margin at 537.22: *Nota quomodo et quibus mortuis prosunt suffragia*.

10. The semicolon is printed after *elemosine*; *de perpetuacione elemosine* is taken with *dictum est*. Chapter 16 is of this work (the passage is at p. 370.4); "chapter 22 of book 5" is a cross-reference in Wyclif's own works, not identified. T. AA$_1$ read *Dictum est hoc cap et 22* (538.6). R. Side-notes 538.3, 538.8; A in the margin at 538.4: *Exequie pro mortuis quomodo prosunt et quomodo nocent illis*.

11. *Modus quo Christus fecit et fieri precepit elemosinas*: the manner of almsgiving Christ used and commanded, against perpetual alms. *Ex superbia et negligencia se accusant*: taken as "convict themselves of pride and negligence"; it could be "accuse themselves out of pride and negligence". *De exequiis vero et*: the sentence runs on into part 7.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 535: *ante* (print: ante finiant, ; finiant, was main pos 216 (iiniant), DEL-accepted)
  - 537: *sensus* (202a is the glued folio mark)
  - 537: *XIII^{a}*
  - 538: *V^{ti}* (print: Vti). ; punctuation dropped per superscript rule)
  - 535: *finiant,* (print: ante finiant, (was DEL-accepted) (agent 12))

Part 7: Exequies: what reaches the dead, Gregory, Chrysostom and Cyprian against mourning, and Augustine on the care of the dead

Loserth pp. 538.14–542.18

¶1 538.14–540.16

538.14 *and as to funeral ceremonies.*
538.21 *False works injure the dead as good works profit them.*
539.6 *Hence the folly of those who care more for solemn rites than true prayers.*
540.5 *Cyprian tells us that we ought not to mourn for those who have gone before.*
540.26 *Yet the Church teaches us to care for the dead,*

[538]aliis ritibus factis pro mortuis patet quod vel sunt purgandis contraria vel neutra vel minus utilia; contraria si sapiunt peccatum, minus utilia si in istis omissis contraria magis profecerint, et neutra supposito quod neque sint bona neque mala moraliter. Primum et tercium fiunt communius, unde prima particula ex hoc patet quod, sicut omnia meritorie facta pro mortuis capacibus eis prosunt, sic omnia demeritoria pretensa pro ipsis fieri profectui suo obsunt; non enim prodest corpori mortuo talis solempnitas, cum deficiat sibi sensus, nec prodest anime nisi sub racione qua meritum; aliter enim foret profectui suo indifferens, sicut est indifferens utilitati dyaboli vel beati. Illud ergo suppono ut maximam, et patet per Augustinum in De Cura agenda pro mortuis, et ponitur in decretis XIII^{a}, q. II^{a}: Non estimemus, inquit, ad mortuos pro quibus curam agimus pervenire nisi quod pro eis sive altaris sive oracionis sive elemosinarum sacrificiis supplicamus. [539]Et sequitur: Corpori autem humando quidquid inpenditur, non est presidium salutis sed humanitatis officium. Sed et idem videtur per se notorium considerando quomodo proveniret profectus corpori mortuo vel spiritui separato. Et ex isto sequitur vivorum stulticia qui magis dolent pro morte corporali quam pro morte anime per peccatum, magis solicitantur pro solempnitate exequiarum proximi vel amici quam pro assiduitate conversacionum meritoriarum per quas solum suffragia insunt sibi. Unde decretum beati Gregorii XIII^{a}, q. II^{a}, Anime defunctorum. Curacio, inquit, funeris, condicio sepulture, pompa exequiarum magis sunt vivorum solacia quam subsidia mortuorum. Si aliquid prodest impio sepultura preciosa, oberit pio vilis aut nulla. Crisostomus super epistolam

other rites performed for the dead, it is clear that they are either contrary to those who are to be purged, or neutral, or less useful: contrary, if they savour of sin; less useful, if, these being omitted, their contraries would have profited more; and neutral, supposing that they are neither good nor evil morally.[1] The first and the third occur more commonly. Hence the first part is clear from this: that, as all things done meritoriously for the dead who are capable profit them, so all demeritorious things that are pretended to be done for them hinder their profit; for such solemnity does not profit the dead body, since it lacks sense, nor does it profit the soul except in so far as it is merit; for otherwise it would be indifferent to the soul's profit, as it is indifferent to the advantage of the devil or of one of the blessed.[2] This, then, I suppose as a maxim; and it is clear through Augustine in *On the Care to Be Had for the Dead*, and it is set in the Decretum, C.13 q.2: "Let us not think," he says, "that anything reaches the dead for whom we have care, except what we supplicate for them by the sacrifices either of the altar, or of prayer, or of alms." [539]And it follows: "But whatever is spent on the body to be buried is not a safeguard of salvation but an office of humanity."[3] But the same also seems evident of itself, considering how profit could come to a dead body or to a separated spirit. And from this follows the folly of the living, who grieve more for bodily death than for the death of the soul through sin, and are more anxious about the solemnity of the exequies of a neighbour or friend than about constancy in meritorious manners of life, through which alone

ad Hebreos, ut ibi exponitur: Ubicunque sepeliamur, domini est terra et plenitudo eius; secundum quod oportet fieri efficiatur. Lugere autem, deplorare et lamentari eos qui de hac vita decedunt ex pusillanimitate contingit. Hoc autem ex desperacione future resurreccionis intelligitur. Unde Apostolus non simpliciter ait: Nolumus vos ignorare de dormientibus, ut non contristemini, sed addit: Sicut et ceteri qui spem non habent. Et eadem sentencia patet in duobus capitulis sequentibus. Item, videtur quod murmur tale sit contra dominum quem debemus credere omnem hominem velle mori, sed voluntati Dei non est licitum taliter contrariare. Si enim scio quod est de Dei beneplacito et sic iustum, faciens ad ordinem [540]et pulchritudinem universi quod Petrus nunc per dominum occidatur, quomodo licet mihi remurmurare contra istam iusticiam et pulchritudinem que adeo placet Deo. Unde XIII^{a}, q. II^{a} sub auctoritate Cypriani sic scribitur: Quam preposterum est, quamque perversum, ut cum Dei voluntatem fieri postulemus, quando evocat nos et accersit de hoc mundo, non statim voluntatis eius imperio pareamus et pervicacium more servorum ad conspectum domini cum tristicia et merore perducimur, exeuntes isthinc necessitatis vinculo, non voluntatis obsequio, quomodo volumus ab eo premiis celestibus honorari ad quem venimus inviti. Preceptum est, inquit, a domino ut contester assidue et publice predicarem fratres non esse lugendos accersione divina de seculo liberatos, cum sciamus non amitti sed premitti, recedentes de seculo.

suffrages belong to him.[4] Hence the decree of blessed Gregory, C.13 q.2, *Anime defunctorum*: "The care of the funeral," he says, "the condition of the burial, the pomp of the exequies, are rather solaces of the living than aids of the dead. If a costly burial profits the impious at all, a mean one or none will harm the pious."[5] Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews, as it is set out there: "Wherever we are buried, the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; let it be done as it ought to be done. But to mourn, to bewail and to lament those who depart from this life comes from faint-heartedness. And this is understood to arise from despair of the future resurrection. Hence the Apostle does not say without qualification, 'We will not have you ignorant concerning them that are asleep, that you be not sorrowful', but adds: 'even as others who have no hope.'" And the same teaching is clear in the two chapters following.[6] Again, it seems that such murmuring is against the Lord, whom we must believe to will every man to die; but it is not lawful so to oppose the will of God. For if I know that it is of God's good pleasure, and so just, and makes for the order [540] and beauty of the universe, that Peter should now be slain by the Lord, how is it lawful for me to murmur back against this justice and beauty which so pleases God?[7] Hence in C.13 q.2 it is written thus under the authority of Cyprian: "How preposterous it is, and how perverse, that while we ask that God's will be done, when he calls us forth and summons us from this world we do not at once obey the command of his will, and like stubborn servants are brought into the Lord's presence with sadness and grief, departing hence by the bond of necessity, not by the obedience of the will: how do we wish to be honoured with heavenly rewards by him to whom we come unwilling? It has been commanded," he says, "by the Lord, that I should constantly bear witness and publicly preach that the brethren freed from the world by the divine summons are not to be mourned, since we know that, departing from the world, they are not lost but sent before."[8]

¶2 540.17–542.18
541.13 *and to pray for all the faithful.*
542.3 *Burial of the dead may be done in a wrong way,*

[540]In isto dicto videtur innuere triplicem racionem: Prima ex hoc quod nemo debet orare sibi ipsi contrarie, sed oramus Deum: Fiat voluntas tua undique, ideo non debemus velle huic contrarie. Secunda racio est ex hoc quod oportet salvandum meritorie et per consequens voluntarie pati mortem. Tercia racio stat in isto quod diligens se vel alterum debet gaudenter acceptare accessum eius proprium, sicut est mors cuilibet salvando, et prescito eciam est ad bonum, cum continue plus nocet ecclesie et amplius demeretur. In oppositum

In this saying he seems to hint at a threefold reason. The first, from this: that no one ought to pray contrary to himself; now we pray God, "Thy will be done" everywhere; therefore we ought not to will contrary to this. The second reason is from this: that one who is to be saved must suffer death meritoriously, and consequently willingly. The third reason consists in this: that one who loves himself or another ought joyfully to accept his own advancement, as death is to everyone who is to be saved; and for the foreknown also it is for good, since he continually harms

sunt consuetudo et leges ecclesie de cura agenda pro mortuis et ecclesiastica sepultura, unde oblaciones Jude Machabei laudat ecclesia, Machabeorum XII°, et sepultura mortuorum computatur inter opera misericordie, pro [541] quo laudatur Tobias Tobie. Unde decretum recitat Augustinus De Cura agenda pro mortuis sub hiis verbis: Quamvis cure pro mortuis non pro omnibus pro quibus fiunt prosint, sed hiis tantum pro quibus dum viverent ut prosint meruerant; sed quia non discernimus qui sint illi, oportet illa pro regeneratis omnibus facere. Et assignat causam eius triplicem: Prima est profectus mortuorum capacium, secunda est excitacio affectus superstitum, et tercia est naturalis instinctus et meritorius, dum fuerit caritate formatus curam talem agencium. Pro prima sic scribit: Melius enim supererunt ista hiis quibus nec obsunt nec prosunt, quam eis deerunt quibus prosunt. Vult dicere quod oportet intendere orare generaliter pro cunctis fidelibus, subintelligendo et Deo limitante suffragium capacibus. Pro secunda causa patet quod ex hoc excitatur devocio superstitum et provocatur occupacio circa actum meritorium. Unde Augustinus: Diligencius facit hoc quisque pro amicis suis, ut pro illo fiat similiter. Et quoad terciam causam patet, cum necesse sit evacuare cadavera bestiarum, multo magis cadavera hominum, magis carorum et plus inficiencium. Unde Augustinus: Humanitatis, inquit, hoc est officium secundum affectum quo nemo unquam carnem suam odio habet. Unde oportet ut quam potest pro carne proximi curam gerat, cum spiritus inde recesserit qui hoc gerebat. Et si hoc faciunt qui carnis resurreccionem non credunt, quanto magis [542] debent facere qui credunt ut corpori resurrecturo et eternaliter mansuro impensum officium sit quodammodo evidens eiusdem fidei testimonium. Et patet cum talis operacio non sit per se virtuosa, sed valde per accidens quod contingit eam nunc bene nunc male fieri. Cavere autem debemus de malicia ne fastui seculi principaliter intendamus, nec magis necessarium omittamus; nichil enim est magis necessarium obsequium agendum pro mortuis quam vivere virtuose. Ille ergo inordinate agit curam corporalem pro suo mortuo qui plus attendit ad illam quam ad superhabundanciam virtutis in animo. Vis ergo affectuose proficere anime defunctorum, exercita te ipsum in scola virtutum; quod quanto plus feceris, tanto cum paribus facis mortuis plus profectum; oportet ergo iuxta caritatis regulas quod superstes misereatur anime proprie placens Deo, et ad illud consequitur efficacissime suffragium mortuorum.

the church more and demerits further.[9] On the opposite side are the custom and laws of the church about the care to be had for the dead and about ecclesiastical burial: hence the church praises the offerings of Judas Maccabeus, Maccabees 12, and the burial of the dead is counted among the works of mercy, for [541] which Tobias is praised in Tobias.[10] Hence the decree cites Augustine, *On the Care to Be Had for the Dead*, in these words: "Although the cares taken for the dead do not profit all for whom they are made, but only those who, while they lived, had merited that they should profit them; yet because we do not discern who these are, it is fitting to do them for all the regenerate."[11] And he assigns a threefold cause of it: the first is the profit of the dead who are capable; the second is the stirring of the affection of the survivors; and the third is the natural instinct, meritorious when it has been formed by charity, of those who take such care. For the first he writes thus: "For it is better that these things be superfluous to those whom they neither harm nor profit, than that they be lacking to those whom they profit." He means that one must intend to pray generally for all the faithful, understanding the condition as implied, and with God assigning the suffrage to those who are capable.[12] For the second cause, it is clear that by this the devotion of the survivors is stirred and their occupation with a meritorious act is called forth. Hence Augustine: "Each one does this more diligently for his friends, so that it may be done likewise for him." And as to the third cause it is clear, since it is necessary to clear away the carcasses of beasts, much more the corpses of men, who are dearer and infect more. Hence Augustine: "This," he says, "is an office of humanity, according to the affection by which no one ever hated his own flesh. Hence it is fitting that one take what care one can for a neighbour's flesh, when the spirit that took this care has departed from it. And if those do this who do not believe the resurrection of the flesh, how much more [542] ought those to do it who believe, so that the office spent on a body that will rise again and remain eternally may be in a way a manifest testimony of that same faith."[13] And it is clear, since such a work is not virtuous of itself but very much by accident, that it happens to be done now well, now badly. And we must beware of malice, lest we aim principally at the pomp of the world, and lest we omit what is more necessary; for there is no more necessary duty to be done for the dead than to live virtuously. He therefore takes bodily care for his dead inordinately who attends more to that than to the superabundance of virtue in the soul.[14] Do you wish, then, with affection to profit the soul of the departed? Exercise yourself in the school of the virtues; and the more

you do this, the more profit, other things being equal, you make for the dead. It is needful, therefore, according to the rules of charity, that the survivor "have pity on his own soul, pleasing God"; and on that follows most effectually the suffrage of the dead.[15]

Notes

1. The sentence begins at the end of part 6 (*De exequiis vero et*). *Purgandis*: the souls to be purged, in purgatory. *Contraria ... neutra ... minus utilia*: three possibilities; *contraria magis profecerint*: if the contrary acts, the good works omitted, would have profited more. T. B lacks *et neutra ... unde* (538.17). R. Side-note 538.14.
2. *Primum et tercium*: the contrary and the less useful, the first and third in Wyclif's list. *Prima particula*: the first part, that such rites can be contrary. *Pretensa pro ipsis fieri*: professed to be done for them. *Sub racione qua meritum*: only in so far as it is merit. *Utilitati dyaboli vel beati*: a devil or a blessed soul, who can gain nothing from it. R. Side-note 538.21.
3. Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 18.22, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.19 (Loserth, 538.29: *Decr. sec. pars, causa XIII, q. II, cap. XIX*; the form is ours). The second sentence, *Corpori autem humando ...*, is in the same chapter. T. AA_1 lack *humanitatis ... corpori* (539.2).
4. *Per se notorium*: evident of itself. *Spiritui separato*: the soul separated from the body. *Per quas solum suffragia insunt sibi*: *sibi* taken of the dead neighbour or friend; it may refer to the living ("belong to them"). R. Side-note 539.6; A in the margin there: *Correlarium*.
5. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.22 *Anime defunctorum* (Loserth, 539.11; the form is ours). Loserth notes that *Curacio ... nulla* (539.12–16) is from Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 2. T. The codices read *XII* (539.11). A *pompe* (539.13).
6. Chrysostom on Hebrews, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.26 (Loserth, 539.17: *ibid. cap. XXVI*); the two following chapters are c.27 *Habent forsitan* and c.28 *Qui divina* (Loserth, 539.23). Psalm 23:1 (Douay–Rheims); 1 Thessalonians 4:12 (Douay–Rheims, without "brethren"). C. *Ut ibi exponitur*: as it is set out there, in the canon. The quotation is closed after the Apostle's words; *Et eadem sentencia ...* is Wyclif's. T. B *efficaciter* (539.17); the lemma is not legible in the page foot, perhaps *efficiatur*.
7. *Murmur tale*: grumbling grief at a death. *Quem debemus credere omnem hominem velle mori*: God wills every man to die. *Petrus*: any man, the schools' stock name. *Faciens ad ordinem*: contributing to the order.
8. Cyprian, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.25 (Loserth, 540.4: *Cap. XXV*); the words are from his *De mortalitate* 18 and 20 (PL 4), which read *contestarer*. T. A *accerscit*; Loserth notes the subject *Deus*, as in the decree, which reads *et volumus* for *quomodo volumus* (540.7). The decree reads *ut contestarer assidue ut publice predicarem* (540.13), where the print has *ut contester ... predicarem*; the print is translated as one clause. The decree adds *precedere* after *recedentes* (540.16), "that departing they go before". R. Side-note 540.5.
9. Matthew 6:10 (Douay–Rheims); *undique*, "everywhere", is Wyclif's. C. *Sibi ipsi contrarie*: against what he himself prays. *Accessum eius proprium*: his own approach, his passage to God. *Prescito ... est ad bonum*: death is a good even for the foreknown, since by living longer he harms the church more and adds to his demerit. R. A and B in the margin at 540.19: *Nota contra lugentes mortuos*.
10. 2 Maccabees 12:43: the print has "Maccabees 12" without the book's number, and A lacks *XII* (540.30). Tobit (Tobias in the Douay–Rheims) 12:12, "when thou ... didst bury the dead"; the codices give no chapter (541.1). C. *In oppositum*: on the opposite side, the church's practice against the authorities just cited. R. Side-note 540.26.
11. Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 18.22, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.19 (Loserth, 541.3: Aug. Opp. VI, 530). T. A *quamvis cura ... prosunt* (541.3); the decree reads *Quibus dum vivunt cooperantur ut prosint* (541.4). *Discernimus* and *sint* are Loserth's: AA_1 *decernimus*, B *decrevimus*; the codices *qui sunt* (541.6). C. *Decretum recitat Augustinus*: *Augustinus* is nominative in the print; taken as "the decree cites Augustine".
12. *Melius ... prosunt*: *De cura* 18.22. C. *Naturalis instinctus et meritorius*: an instinct that is natural, and meritorious when formed by charity. *Subintelligendo et Deo limitante suffragium capacibus*: the general prayer carries an implied condition, and God assigns its benefit to those capable of it. R. Side-note 541.13.
13. *Diligencius ... similiter* and *Humanitatis ... testimonium*: Augustine, *De cura* 18.22. Ephesians 5:29 (Douay–Rheims), "no man ever hated his own flesh". C. The quotation is closed at *testimonium*. *Magis carorum et plus inficiencium*: men are dearer to us and infect more than beasts. *Evacuare*: to clear away. R. A in the margin at 541.18: *Augustinus*; at 541.24: *Nota pro sepultura proximi si et quomodo obligamur*.
14. *Per se ... per accidens*: of itself, by accident. *Fastui seculi*: the pomp of the world. *Obsequium*: "duty", the service done for the dead. *Superhabundanciam virtutis in animo*: virtue abounding in the survivor's soul. R. Side-note 542.3.
15. Ecclesiasticus 30:24, "Have pity on thy own soul, pleasing God" (Douay–Rheims). C. *Cum paribus*: taken as *ceteris paribus*, "other things being equal" (as 548.22); the print may have lost *ceteris*. *Misereatur anime proprie*: by living well the survivor helps the dead most. R. A in the margin at 542.13: *Nota efficacissimum suffragium mortuorum*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 538: *et* (print: vero / et aliis ritibus)
  - 538: *XIII[a]*
  - 538: *II[a]*
  - 539: *XIII[a]*)
  - 539: *II[a]*

- **540: *XIII*[a])**
- **540: ∅)**
- **540: *II*[a]**
- **540: *racionem:* (margin letter Q follows)**
- **541: *quo* (202b is the glued folio mark)**
- **541: ∅ (previous page's closing text at page top; laudatur already at pos 1)**
- **542: *debent***
- **540: *XII*°, [-VERSE]**
- **539: ∅ (joined at 72 (agent 12))**
- **539: ∅ (joined at 72 (agent 12))**

Part 8: The objections answered: burial in holy places, mourning, three conclusions on rites for the dead, and gilds and costly tombs

Loserth pp. 542.20–548.35

¶1 542.20–548.35

542.29 *as by too much care for show.*
543.7 *Solemn burial in holy places may do good or harm.*
544.1 *As to grief for the dead we must distinguish between natural affection and deliberate judgment.*
544.19 *Natural grief should be controlled by reason.*
545.2
1. *The clergy should thus teach about funeral rites.*
545.18 *They must not let the desire of gain outweigh the desire to benefit souls.*
545.23
2. *All rites approved by the Church agree with this rule.*
546.6 *Reasons for various observances.*
547.3
3. *It would be better to aim wholly at a virtuous life and give up these ceremonies,*
547.10 *which bring in gilds and other causes of mischief.*
548.2 *The example of Simon Maccabeus cannot outweigh that of Christ.*

[542]**Ad primum obiectum patet quod beatus Gregorius intendit quod talia obsequia non prosunt mortuis nisi forte per accidens. Unde sequitur in textu Gregorii: Nec ideo tamen contempnenda et abicienda sunt corpora defunctorum maximeque iustorum, ex quo illud salubriter discitur quanta possit esse remuneracio pro elemosinis; quas viventibus et sencientibus exibemus, sed neque hoc apud Deum perit quod ex animis hominum membris officii diligencia persolvatur. Ex quo videtur quod racione elemosine prosunt defunctis talia obsequia, et obsunt eis de quanto excitant affectantes ad affectandum splendenciam in mundi gloria, accusantque mortuos, de** [543]**quanto ostendunt illos affectos ad secularia desideria. Et quoad dictum Crisostomi, patet quod ipse intendit istam eandem sentenciam, unde sequitur in textu suo: Pietatis namque affectu et humanitatis intuitu mortuos lugere non prohibemur, sicut nonnullos sanctorum aliorum exequiis legimus pias lacrimas impendisse. Unde quod quis sepelitur iuxta martirem in ecclesia vel ubicunque solempniter, nunc obest et nunc prodest, sed tantum per accidens obest, si accumulant peccata originata ex mortuo decedente in mortali. Prodest, si sit occasio diligencius orandi pro mortuo in gracia decedente, unde decretum (ubi supra) sub auctoritate sanctorum Augustini et Gregorii sic loquitur: Quibus peccata dimissa non sunt, a sacris locis post mortem adiuvari non possunt, quia quos peccata graviora deprimunt, si in sacris locis sepeliri se faciunt, restat ut de sua presumpcione iudicentur, quia eos sacra loca non liberant, sed culpa temeritatis accusat. Et quoad secundum partem sequitur decretum beati Gregorii: Cum gravia peccata dimissa sunt et non deprimunt, tunc prodest mortuis si in ecclesia sepeliantur, quia eorum proximi, quociens ad eadem loca veniunt, suorum quoque sepulturam aspiciunt, recordantur et pro eis domino preces fundunt. Nam quos**

To the first objection it is clear that blessed Gregory maintains that such duties do not profit the dead, except perhaps by accident. Hence there follows in Gregory's text: "Yet the bodies of the departed, and most of all of the just, are not on that account to be despised and cast away; from which this is wholesomely learned, how great can be the reward for the alms which we show to the living and those who feel; but neither does that perish before God which is paid, by the diligence of duty, to the lifeless members of men."[1] From which it seems that such duties profit the departed by reason of alms, and harm them insofar as they stir those who desire them to desire splendour in the glory of the world; and they accuse the dead, insofar [543]**as they show them to have been attached to worldly desires.[2] And as to Chrysostom's saying, it is clear that he maintains this same teaching; hence there follows in his text: "For we are not forbidden, out of the affection of piety and in regard of humanity, to mourn the dead, as we read that not a few of the saints shed pious tears at the exequies of others."[3] Hence that someone is buried beside a martyr in a church, or anywhere with solemnity, now harms and now profits; but it harms only by accident, if they heap up sins originating from the dead man departing in mortal sin. It profits, if it is an occasion of praying more diligently for a dead man departing in grace; hence the decree (where above) speaks thus under the authority of Saints Augustine and Gregory: "Those whose sins have not been remitted cannot be helped by holy places after death; for those whom graver sins weigh down, if they have themselves buried in holy places, it remains that they be judged for their presumption, because the holy places do not free them, but the guilt of their rashness accuses them."[4] And as to the second part, there follows the decree of blessed Gregory: "When grave sins have been remitted and**

peccata gravia deprimunt, ad maiorem cumulum dampnacionis pocius quam absolucionem eorum corpora in ecclesiis reponuntur. Quantum ad racionem terciam, quomodocunque glossamus, non dubium quin murmuraciones plurime pro mortuis sunt inique; [544]dicitur enim quod alius est amor vel affeccio naturalis, quali Christus voluit vivere et non mori, cum Matthei XXVI° dicit: Verumptamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu vis. Et tali affeccione naturali doluit mater eius pro morte filii naturalis. Nec evidens quod in hoc peccavit, sicut nec Christus, quando pro Lazaro ploravit. Alia autem est affeccio deliberativa qua non est dolendum sed gaudendum de mortibus propinquorum. Sic enim Christus, sic Paulus et ceteri martires gaudebant de pena et morte propria, et sic oportet omnem salvandum gaudere. Ideo necessarium est christianis discere quomodo debent mori; quando ergo quis plus dolet propter amissionem boni utilis vel boni delectabilis temporalis in morte proximi quam propter amissionem boni utilis anime defuncti et utilitatis ecclesie, tunc peccat indubie plus vel minus, sicut ille peccat gravius qui propter amissionem amoris quem habet ad seculum dolet de morte propria. Et patet quod debemus secundum racionem superare impetum anime naturalem, sicut est mihi verisimile quod mater domini mitigavit ex integro, et Christus non directe ploravit pro morte Lazari quem necessitavit ad gloriam suam mori, sed doluit pro peccato humani generis, pro quo oportuit talia et tot pati. Unde ex concilio Toletano Qui divina sic scribitur: Prohibet nos sanctus Apostolus dicens: De dormientibus nolo vos contristari sicut et ceteri qui spem non habent. Et dominus Joh. XI° non flevit Lazarum mortuum, sed ad huius vite erumpnas ploravit resuscitandum. Si autem potest hoc episcopus omnibus christianis prohibere, non moretur. [545]Ex istis colligo conclusionem triplicem mihi notabilem: Prima quomodo ista sentencia est a prepositis populo predicanda, eo quod instruit eum in moribus, evacuat errorem fidei et precipitur ab ecclesia fieri. Quod si multiplicamus leges de sepulturis et eas solempnizamus atque pro porcionibus et substancia defuncti contendimus et illud cum aliis suffragiis defunctorum omittimus, quis dubitat quin Deus huius seculi usque ad infidelitatem cecavit oculos mentis nostre? Et cum in vigilia Pentecostes post communionem concinimus quod Deus per os omnium prophetarum docuit nos temporalia relinquere, et alibi cantantes oramus ut Deus doceat nos terrena despicere, quia certum est quod spiritus sanctus effugit cohabitare cum spiritu hominis sic affeccione temporalium deturpato. Ad probandum autem si sumus huiusmodi, sollicitudines nostre cum actibus sequentibus iudicabunt. Nam pater spiritualis qui animo preponderat oracionis

do not weigh down, then it profits the dead if they are buried in the church, because their neighbours, as often as they come to those same places, see also the burial-place of their own, remember them, and pour out prayers to the Lord for them. For those whom grave sins weigh down, their bodies are laid in churches for a greater heap of damnation, rather than for absolution."[5] As to the third reason, however we gloss it, there is no doubt that very many murmurings for the dead are wicked; [544]for it is said that one thing is love or natural affection, with which Christ willed to live and not to die, when he says, Matthew 26: "Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." And with such natural affection his mother grieved for the death of her natural son. Nor is it evident that in this she sinned, as neither did Christ when he wept for Lazarus. But another is deliberative affection, by which one is not to grieve but to rejoice at the deaths of kinsfolk. For so Christ, so Paul and the other martyrs rejoiced in their own pain and death; and so every one who is to be saved must rejoice.[6] Therefore it is necessary for Christians to learn how they ought to die. When, therefore, someone grieves more, in the death of a neighbour, for the loss of a useful good or of a pleasurable temporal good than for the loss of the useful good of the departed's soul and of the advantage of the church, then without doubt he sins, more or less; as he sins more gravely who grieves at his own death for the loss of the love that he has for the world.[7] And it is clear that we ought, according to reason, to overcome the natural impulse of the soul, as it is likely to me that the mother of the Lord wholly assuaged that impulse; and Christ did not weep directly for the death of Lazarus, whom he made it necessary to die for his own glory, but grieved for the sin of the human race, for which such things and so many had to be suffered. Hence from the Council of Toledo, *Qui divina*, it is written thus: "The holy Apostle forbids us, saying: 'Concerning them that are asleep I will not have you sorrowful, even as others who have no hope.' And the Lord, John 11, did not weep for Lazarus dead, but wept for him who was to be raised again to the hardships of this life. But if the bishop can forbid this to all Christians, let him not delay."[8] [545]From these I gather a threefold conclusion, notable to me. The first: how this teaching is to be preached to the people by superiors, because it instructs them in morals, empties out an error of faith, and is commanded by the church to be done. But if we multiply laws about burials and solemnize them, and contend for the portions and substance of the dead man, and omit it along with the other suffrages of the departed, who doubts that the god of this world

suffragia et elemosinas providas faciendas pro mortuis plus quam lucri temporalis commoda, manifeste demonstrat quod plus amat temporalia defuncti quam anime sue spirituale suffragium. Secunda conclusio: Nullus ritus ecclesie ab eius capite approbatus de suffragiis vel memoriis faciendis pro mortuis repugnat sentencie supradicte. Patet ex hoc quod nulla veritas repugnat veritati. Procuret ergo homo, quantum prudenter sufficit, per se vel alium, remedium animarum in purgatorio oblacionibus vel stipendiis annalibus sacerdotum aut precibus sanctorum, aut carorum elemosinis aut ieiunio cognatorum et secundum supradictam Dei sentenciam approbatur. [546] Et hiis quatuor modis secundum decretum beati Gregorii, XIII^{a} q. II, Anime defunctorum, contingit animabus in purgatorio suffragari, ymmo (ut sepe dixi) per omnem vitam vel operam meritoriam viatoris. Unde ritus quem approbat beatus Ambrosius in De Officiis, positus in conclusione predicta, plurimum est laudandus. Quia, inquit, alii tercium diem, alii septimum diem, alii tricesimum, alii quadragesimum observare consueverunt in officiis mortuorum, quid doceat leccio consideremus. Defuncto quidem Jacob precipit Joseph pueris suis ut sepelirent eum et sepelierunt sepultores Israel, et completi sunt quadraginta dies luctus, ut patet Genesis L°. Sed eciam in Deuteronomio, capitulo ultimo, et Numeri XX scriptum est: Quia planxerunt filii Israel Moysen triginta diebus et consummati sunt dies luctus. Illi autem qui servant diem tercium respiciunt trinitatem vel triduum resurreccionis Christi; qui autem observant septimum observant perpetuam quietem anime, que est tercia cum copulacione corporis, quod est quatuor; ex quibus autem constant septem; qui autem observant trigenarium considerant quomodo ex duobus quindenariis secundum corpus et animam ille constat, quindenarius autem resultat ex septenario patrum legis veteris et octonario legis nove: Nam hos duos numeros quadam proprietate colunt specialiter isti patres. Qui autem observant quadrigenarium expectant fructum resurreccionis per mortem Christi qui totidem horis dicitur fuisse mortuus, licet arca triginta sex horas iacuit in sepulcro, et sic de quinquagenario, centenario vel anniversario secundum racionem cui devocio populi est affecta. [547] Omnes enim affectant suis mortuis beatitudinem circularem, ut notat Hostiensis in Summa (ubi supra). Tercia conclusio: Dimissis istis ritibus foret purgandis animabus utilius, populo superstite dante sollicitudinem et operam ex integro ad virtutes. Patet ex hoc quod ista variacio rituum fuit omissa a Christo et suis apostolis; ymmo precepit Matthei VIII°, 22: Dimitte mortuos sepelire mortuos suos et in moribus sequi ipsum. Ista autem variacio introducit sectas et gildas et consequenter errores multiplices,

has blinded the eyes of our mind even to unbelief?[9] And since on the vigil of Pentecost, after communion, we sing together that God by the mouth of all the prophets taught us to leave temporal goods, and elsewhere, singing, we pray that God may teach us to despise earthly things: because it is certain that the Holy Spirit flees from dwelling together with the spirit of a man thus defiled by affection for temporal goods.[10] And to prove whether we are of this sort, our anxieties, with the acts that follow, will judge. For a spiritual father who in his mind weighs the suffrages of prayer and provident alms to be made for the dead more heavily than the advantages of temporal gain manifestly shows that he loves the temporal goods of the departed more than the spiritual suffrage of his soul.[11] The second conclusion: no rite of the church approved by its head concerning suffrages or memorials to be made for the dead is repugnant to the teaching stated above. It is clear from this, that no truth is repugnant to truth. Let a man therefore procure, as far as prudently suffices, by himself or by another, a remedy for the souls in purgatory: by oblations or annual stipends of priests, or by the prayers of saints, or by the alms of dear ones, or by the fasting of kinsfolk; and according to the aforesaid teaching of God it is approved.[12] [546] And in these four ways, according to the decree of blessed Gregory, C.13 q.2, *Anime defunctorum*, it is possible to aid souls in purgatory by intercession; indeed (as I have often said) by every meritorious life or work of a wayfarer.[13] Hence the rite which blessed Ambrose approves in *De officiis*, set down in the aforesaid conclusion, is very greatly to be praised. "Since," he says, "some are accustomed to observe the third day, some the seventh day, some the thirtieth, some the fortieth in the offices of the dead, let us consider what the reading teaches. When Jacob had died, Joseph commanded his servants to bury him, and the buriers buried Israel, and the forty days of mourning were fulfilled, as is clear in Genesis 50. But also in Deuteronomy, in the last chapter," and Numbers 20, "it is written that the children of Israel mourned Moses thirty days, and the days of mourning were completed."[14] And those who keep the third day look to the Trinity, or to the three days of Christ's resurrection; and those who observe the seventh observe the perpetual rest of the soul, which is three, with the coupling of the body, which is four; and of these seven is made up; and those who observe the thirtieth consider how it is made up of two fifteens, according to body and soul; and fifteen results from the seven of the fathers of the old law and the eight of the new law: for these fathers honour these two numbers specially, by a certain propriety. And those who observe the fortieth await

mundialibus infideliter opinantibus quod proporcionaliter habent ipsi suffragia singulariter a se ipsis et beatis in patria, sicut ipsi coniunguntur federe temporali, et sic credunt de suis mortuis quoad ipsa suffragia que impendunt. Illud autem improbatum est hic et capitulo ultimo libri quinti. Omnes enim predestinati vivi vel mortui citra beatitudinem constituti participant suffragiis utriusque ecclesie precise secundum quod digni sunt meritis quoad Deum. Tales ergo lige superfluunt et periculose seminant dogma falsum sepeque gignunt sedicionem in populo. Nec moveat quod sepe bonum ex ipsis evenit, quia Deus non sineret dyabolos vel aliud nefandum collegium congregari, nisi exinde disponeret utilitatem ecclesie provenire. Et sic dicitur de sepulcris et aliis construccionibus sumptuosis quod bonum exinde evenit, ut puta, devocio confluencium, sustentacio egenorum et multa bona similia; malum eciam communius, ut puta, distraccio et ocium sensus hominis dissoluti et inordinata conglobacio tam temporalium quam eciam personarum, et difficile foret iudicare quid istorum foret matri nostre utilius, si facta et dicta Christi et [548] apostolorum suorum non darent fidem de inutilitate fundamenti. Non enim est causa evidens: Si Symon, summus sacerdos construxit sibi et suis edificium altum super sepulchrum eorum et mirabiliter sumptuosum (ut patet I Macchabeorum XIII°), ergo bene, sicut est evidens: Si Christus et eius apostoli illud omiserant, ergo bene; nam regimen illorum sacerdotum fuit presagium destruccionis synagoge que fuit ecclesia Judeorum; et fundamentum aliud cum suis domesticis fuit indefectivum principium perpetue ecclesie christiane; nichil ergo valet nobis fidelibus nisi de quanto fuerit fundabile ex lege Christi; sed cum ex lege Christi et lege ecclesie patet quod observancie de quanto plus accedunt ad statum innocencie et minus intricantur cum mundo, imitantes voluntatem Dei, direccius preponderantes in amore bonum communius, patet quod observancia opposita ritui quem mundus in istis exigit est ipso melior. Unde (ut tetigi) talia memorialia post mortuos derelicta vel nocent eis vel minus eis proficiunt quam purgandis pauperibus in gracia ampliori, ymmo minus quam ceteris paribus eorum destruccio. Si enim tales mortui sunt presciti, tunc talia memorialia derelicta sunt fructus peccati sui in spiritum sanctum; si sunt predestinati, tunc sunt fructus sue affeccionis proprietarie expurgande, et indubie pauper decedens in maiori gracia, cum melius usus fuit temporalibus istis quibus verius dominatus est, plus participabit in purgatorio eorum fructu, dominio devoluto ab utroque ad dominum, aput quem non potest esse accepcio personarum. Quomodo excusatur peccatum quo propter affeccionem mundialem vel affeccionem proprietariam carnalem ritus

the fruit of the resurrection through the death of Christ, who is said to have been dead for as many hours, although the ark lay thirty-six hours in the tomb; and so of the fiftieth, the hundredth or the anniversary, according to the reason to which the devotion of the people is attached.[15] [547] For all desire for their dead a circular blessedness, as Hostiensis notes in the *Summa* (where above).[16] The third conclusion: if these rites were set aside, it would be more useful to the souls to be purged, the surviving people giving their care and labour wholly to the virtues. It is clear from this, that this variety of rites was omitted by Christ and his apostles; indeed he commanded, Matthew 8:22, "Let the dead bury their dead", and to follow him in morals.[17] And this variety brings in sects and gilds, and consequently manifold errors, worldly men faithlessly supposing that they themselves have suffrages singularly, from themselves and from the blessed in the homeland, in proportion as they are joined by a temporal compact; and so they believe of their dead as regards the very suffrages which they bestow.[18] But this has been disproved here and in the last chapter of the fifth book. For all the predestinate, living or dead, who are placed short of blessedness, share in the suffrages of both churches precisely according as they are worthy by their merits as regards God. Such leagues, therefore, are superfluous, and dangerously sow false dogma, and often beget sedition among the people.[19] Nor let it move anyone that good often comes of them, for God would not allow devils or any other abominable college to be gathered unless he disposed that advantage to the church should come of it. And so it is said of tombs and other sumptuous constructions that good comes of them, for instance, the devotion of those who flock together, the sustenance of the needy, and many like goods; evil also, more commonly, for instance, the distraction and idleness of the sense of a dissolute man, and the disordered heaping together of temporal goods as well as of persons; and it would be hard to judge which of these would be more useful to our mother, if the deeds and words of Christ and [548] of his apostles did not give faith concerning the uselessness of the foundation.[20] For it is not an evident cause: if Simon the high priest built for himself and his own a lofty building over their sepulchre, and wonderfully sumptuous (as is clear in 1 Maccabees 13), therefore it is well, as it is evident: if Christ and his apostles omitted it, therefore it is well; for the rule of those priests was a presage of the destruction of the synagogue, which was the church of the Jews; and the other foundation, with his household, was the unfailing beginning of the perpetual Christian church. Nothing therefore avails us faithful except

talis preponitur et modus faciendi exproprietarie vivencium, et bonum communius plus diligencium stulte postponitur?

insofar as it can be founded on the law of Christ; now since from the law of Christ and the law of the church it is clear that observances, the more they approach the state of innocence and the less they are entangled with the world, imitating the will of God, more directly weighting in love the more common good, [the better they are], it is clear that the observance opposite to the rite which the world demands in these things is better than it.[21] Hence (as I have touched on) such memorials left behind after the dead either harm them, or profit them less than they profit poor men in ampler grace who are to be purged; indeed less, other things being equal, than their destruction would.[22] For if such dead men are foreknown, then such memorials left behind are fruits of their sin against the Holy Spirit; if they are predestinate, then they are fruits of their proprietary affection, which is to be purged out; and without doubt the poor man dying in greater grace, since he made better use of these temporal goods, over which he more truly exercised lordship, will share more in their fruit in purgatory, the lordship having devolved from both to the Lord, with whom there can be no respect of persons.[23] How is the sin excused by which, out of worldly affection or carnal proprietary affection, such a rite is put before, and the manner of doing of those who live without property, and who love the more common good more, is foolishly put after?[24]

Notes

1. ***Ad primum obiectum***: Wyclif now answers the authorities of part 7 that seemed to deny any profit from care of the dead: first Gregory's decree (***Curacio funeris ...***, 539), then Chrysostom, then the third of the reasons drawn from Cyprian. ***Talia obsequia***: such duties, the funeral observances. S. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.22, under Gregory's name (Loserth, 542.23; the form is ours); the words are Augustine's, ***De cura pro mortuis gerenda*** 3.5. T. "Lifeless" translates ***exanimis***, our emendation of the print's ***ex animis***, which does not construe with ***hominum membris***; Augustine (PL 40) and Friedberg's apparatus read ***exanimis***. The decree reads ***diligentiaeque persolvitur*** (542.28); B ***salubriter dimittitur*** (542.25). The print's semicolon after ***elemosinis*** is read across, ***quas*** taking ***elemosinis*** as antecedent. R. Side-note 542.29; A in the margin at 542.20: ***Nota pro exequiis et sepultura circa ecclesias***.
2. ***Racione elemosine***: in so far as the funeral expenses are alms. ***Excitant affectantes ad affectandum splendenciam***: they stir those who desire them to desire splendour (row ***affectare***). ***Accusant mortuos***: the pomp accuses the dead of worldly desires.
3. Chrysostom, as Decretum C.13 q.2 c.26 (Loserth, 543.3). T. AA_1 ***nonnullorum*** (543.5). C. ***Humanitatis intuitu***: in regard of humanity. ***Nonnullos sanctorum aliorum exequiis***: some saints at the exequies of others.
4. Decretum C.13 q.2 cc.16–17 (Loserth, 543.13; the form is ours). T. A ***sp sepelitur***, A_1 ***semper sepelitur***; Loserth notes that A_1 copied A's scribal error (543.7). The decree reads ***quoniam eos*** (543.18). C. ***Si accumulant peccata***: the subject of ***accumulant*** is unexpressed; taken as the solemn rites, which heap up the sins of one who died in mortal sin. ***Ubi supra***: the canons cited in part 7. R. Side-note 543.7.
5. The same canons. T. The decree reads ***in ecclesiis*** (543.22). C. ***Secundum partem***: so printed, for ***secundam*** (as ***secundum confirmacionem***, 533.24): the second part of the answer, that burial in church can profit. ***Suorum ... sepulturam aspiciunt***: they see the burial-place of their own.
6. ***Quantum ad racionem terciam***: the third of the three reasons drawn from Cyprian (540.17–25, part 7). ***Alius est amor vel affeccio naturalis ... alia autem est affeccio deliberativa***: natural affection, which shrinks from death, against deliberative affection, which follows reason. ***Filii naturalis***: her son by nature. S. Matthew 26:39 (Douay–Rheims; Wyclif ***sicut tu vis***, the Vulgate ***sicut tu***); John 11:35, "Jesus wept". T. A ***quod aliquis*** (544.1); A ***et sicut*** (544.11). R. Side-note 544.1; A in the margin at 543.28: ***Nota quomodo licet deplangere*** (with ***flere***, i.e. ***deflere***, written above) ***mortuum et quomodo***.

7. ***Bonum utile … bonum delectabile***: the useful and the pleasurable good (cf. 535, ***bonum honestum et utile***). ***Propter amissionem amoris quem habet ad seculum***: for the loss of what he loves in the world. ***Plus vel minus***: more or less gravely.
8. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.28 ***Qui divina*** (Loserth, 544.26; the form is ours), from a council of Toledo; Friedberg: Toledo III (589), c. 22. 1 Thessalonians 4:12: the Douay–Rheims has "we will not have you ignorant … that you be not sorrowful"; the canon's ***nolo vos contristari*** is translated. The decree reads ***agere non moretur*** (544.31). C. ***Quem necessitavit ad gloriam suam mori***: whom he made it necessary to die, for his glory (John 11:4). ***Ad huius vite erumpnas ploravit resuscitandum***: he wept for Lazarus as one to be raised again to the hardships of this life. T. A ***nunciavit ad gloriam*** (544.23–24). R. Side-note 544.19; A and B in the margin at 544.22: ***Nota de fletu Christi***.
9. ***Mihi notabilem***: notable to me. ***Prepositis***: superiors, here those set over the people (row). ***Evacuat errorem fidei***: clears away an error of faith. ***Precipitur ab ecclesia fieri***: as the Toledo canon commands. ***Pro porcionibus et substancia defuncti***: Loserth glosses ***porcio*** as ***pensio annua***, a yearly payment (545.6). S. 2 Corinthians 4:4, "the god of this world hath blinded the minds of unbelievers" (Douay–Rheims); Wyclif's ***oculos mentis nostre*** is translated. R. Side-note 545.2; A in the margin at 545.1: ***Contra avariciam cleri. Prima conclusio***.
10. The sentence has no main clause: ***Et cum … concinimus … et … oramus*** is followed directly by ***quia certum est***; it is translated as it stands. ***Cohabitare***: cf. row ***cohabitacio***. S. The postcommunion chant of the vigil of Pentecost (***per os omnium prophetarum … temporalia relinquere***) and the prayer ***ut … terrena despicere*** are the collect of the Saturday before Pentecost in the Gregorian Sacramentary (***Deus, qui nobis per prophetarum ora praecepisti, temporalia relinquere***) and a common postcommunion (***doceas nos terrena despicere***), PL 78.
11. As printed, the spiritual father weighs the suffrages for the dead above temporal gain, and yet is said to love the dead man's goods more than his soul; the argument and Loserth's side-note ("They must not let the desire of gain outweigh the desire to benefit souls", 545.18) need the reverse. The print, which the plate confirms, is translated; an inversion of the two terms or a lost negative is possible. ***Pater spiritualis***: the dead man's confessor or priest. ***Anime sue***: the dead man's soul, or the father's own. R. Side-note 545.18.
12. ***Ab eius capite***: by its head, taken as Christ. ***Nulla veritas repugnat veritati***: truth does not contradict truth. ***Quantum prudenter sufficit***: as far as prudence allows. ***Et secundum supradictam Dei sentenciam approbatur***: the closing clause has no expressed subject; taken as "and such provision is approved". S. The four ways are those of Decretum C.13 q.2 c.22 ***Anime defunctorum***, under Gregory's name (Loserth, 546.2); ***vel stipendiis annalibus***, the stipends of annual priests (row ***sacerdotes annales***), is Wyclif's addition: the canon has oblations, prayers, alms and fasts. R. Side-note 545.23; A in the margin at 545.23: ***Secunda conclusio. De variis ritibus approbatis in suffragiis et memoriis mortuorum***.
13. ***Contingit animabus … suffragari***: it is possible to aid the souls by intercession (row). ***Per omnem vitam vel operam meritoriam viatoris***: by any meritorious life or work of one still on the way.
14. Decretum C.13 q.2 c.24 ***Quia alii*** (Loserth, 546.2; the form is ours), under Ambrose's name and, in Wyclif, his ***De officiis***; the words are from Ambrose, ***De obitu Theodosii*** 3 (PL 16), and Wyclif's ***De officiis*** is a misattribution; the print's italics take in ***Genesis L°*** and ***Deuteronomio, capitulo ultimo***, but not ***Numeri XX***. Genesis 50:2–3 and Deuteronomy 34:8 are given in the canon's wording, which is translated: in the Vulgate the physicians embalm Jacob and "there passed forty days" (Douay–Rheims). Numbers 20:30 is the mourning for Aaron, not Moses. T. A and B lack ***sepultores*** (546.12). ***Ut patet Genesis L°*** and ***capitulo ultimo, et Numeri XX*** are not in the decree (546.12, 546.15) and are left outside the quotation marks. C. ***Positus in conclusione predicta***: taken as "set out in support of the conclusion just stated"; the ***ritus*** is the custom of the third, seventh, thirtieth and fortieth days. R. Side-note 546.6; A in the margin at 546.5: ***Ambrosius***.
15. The quotation is closed at ***luctus***; the reasons for the numbers are taken as Wyclif's. ***Que est tercia***: the soul, taken as threefold, which with the body's four makes seven; ***tercia*** may stand for ***trina***. ***Septenario … octonario***: the sabbath of the old law and the eighth day, the resurrection, of the new. ***Licet arca triginta sex horas iacuit in sepulcro***: the print, checked on the plate, reads ***arca***, "the ark"; ***circa***, "although he lay about thirty-six hours", would give a plainer sense. ***Secundum racionem cui devocio populi est affecta***: according to the reason to which the people's devotion attaches each day.
16. Hostiensis, ***Summa aurea*** (cited in part 1 of this chapter); the place for ***beatitudo circularis*** is § ***Quibus mortuis suffragia***: those who keep the anniversary ***optant mortuis vitam aeternam … et quasi annus in se revolvitur***. C. ***Beatitudinem circularem***: a blessedness that comes round as a circle, the year returning on itself in the anniversary.
17. Matthew 8:22 (Douay–Rheims "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead"); Wyclif puts ***Dimitte mortuos …*** first and gives ***Sequere me*** as ***in moribus sequi ipsum*** (Loserth, 547.7). C. ***Dimissis istis ritibus***: if these rites were set aside. ***Ista variacio rituum***: this variety of days and rites. R. Side-note 547.3; A in the margin at 547.3: ***Tercia conclusio. Contra ritus supra positos***.
18. ***Sectas et gildas***: the religious orders (row ***secta***) and the gilds, with their fraternities of prayer. ***Proporcionaliter … sicut ipsi coniunguntur federe temporali***: in proportion to their membership in a worldly compact; ***singulariter***: as their own, apart from the rest of the church. ***Infideliter***: against the faith. T. B ***lidere*** (547.13); the lemma is not legible in the page foot, perhaps ***fedele***. R. Side-note 547.10.
19. ***Hic et capitulo ultimo libri quinti***: in this chapter and in the last chapter of the fifth book, ***De civili dominio*** III c. 27 (Society ed. IV, 644–46: the rich err in thinking they will have suffrage ***singulariter***; all in purgatory share ***proporcionabiliter secundum suam capacitatem***). ***Citra beatitudinem***: short of blessedness (cf. row ***citra fidem***): the living and those in purgatory. ***Utriusque ecclesie***: of both churches, the militant and the sleeping. ***Lige***: leagues, the gilds and fraternities. T. A ***p"***, A_1 ***pe***, for ***precise*** (547.18).
20. ***Dyabolos vel aliud nefandum collegium***: the gilds set beside a gathering of devils. ***Malum eciam communius***: evil also, and more commonly. ***Fundamenti***: the foundation, the endowment of tombs and memorials. ***Darent fidem***: gave assurance. R. A in the margin at 547.16: ***De solempni sepultura et sumptuosis sepulcris***.
21. 1 Maccabees 13:27, Simon's monument, paraphrased. C. ***Non enim est causa evidens***: it is not an evident ground for the inference. ***Fundamentum aliud cum suis domesticis***: the other foundation, Christ (cf. 1 Corinthians 3:11), with his household. T. "[The better they are]" is our supply: the clause ***observancie de quanto plus accedunt …*** has no main verb and ***de quanto*** no correlative. B ***tam evidens*** (548.2); B lacks ***ergo … omiserant*** (548.5); B ***regnum illorum fuit*** (548.7). An ***ex*** at 548.12 is Loserth's supply, lacking in the codices. R. Side-note 548.2.
22. ***Memorialia post mortuos derelicta***: tombs and memorials left by the dead. ***Purgandis pauperibus in gracia ampliori***: poor men in purgatory with greater grace, who share in the fruit (next sentence). ***Eorum destruccio***: the destruction of the memorials.

23. Romans 2:11, "there is no respect of persons with God" (Douay–Rheims), in Wyclif's words. C. ***Peccati sui in spiritum sanctum***: their sin against the Holy Spirit. ***Cum melius usus fuit temporalibus istis quibus verius dominatus est***: the poor man in grace used these temporal goods better and was more truly their lord. ***Dominio devoluto ab utroque ad dominum***: the lordship having passed back from both to God. T. B lacks *expurgande … fuit* (548.26).
24. ***Preponitur … postponitur***: put before … put after (cf. row *proponere*). ***Modus faciendi exproprietarie vivencium***: the way of acting of those who live without property (row *exproprietarie*). The chapter ends here.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 542: *Gregorius* (a is a margin letter)
  - 544: *Verumptamen*
  - 544: *ego*
  - 545: *animo* (203a is the glued folio mark)
  - 546: *XIII*^{a})
  - 546: ∅)
  - 546: *plurimum* [NW]
  - 546: *alii*
  - 547: *purgandis* (main token holds whole word (pur- / gandis))
  - 547: *lige* [NW]
  - 548: *edificium*

Chapter 23

Part 1: Indulgences: what the word means, and the canonists' limits on who may grant them

Loserth pp. 549.2–550.23

¶1 549.2–550.23
549.2 *Indulgence to sinners belongs to God alone.*
549.15 *The canonists have given it another sense: of remission of punishment.*
550.1 *Such indulgences are reserved to prelates under certain limitations.*

[549]Restat consequenter tractare de indulgenciis et absolucionibus a pena et culpa, in quibus videtur esse error apud simplices istam materiam ignorantes. In primis ergo suppono significacionem quid nominis huius signi indulgencia. Est enim omnis indulgencia actus indulgentis, ita quod indulgencia non sit aliud nisi habentem ad hoc potenciam indulgere, et est indulgere gratis concedere, operam dare sive remittere, et componitur de inde et algere (quod est frigere vel mortificari), sicut est de commissis oblivioni traditis quoad expeticionem vindicte. Et sic loquitur scriptura Judith VIII°, 14: Indulgenciam domini cum lacrimis postulemus, et sic sumitur Isaie XXVI°, LXI° et LXIII°. Sic autem indulgere peccatoribus est Deo proprium, sicut et peccata dimittere (ut patet capitulo ultimo quinti libri); sed ab istis sensibus extractus est terminus et baptizatus in sensum alium partim per doctores theologie et partim per canonistas; quandoque enim secundum eos connotat remissionem pene, ut secunda questione tercio capitulo Indulgencie, ut notat Archidiaconus, quod quandoque signat active concessionem, ut dominus papa indulsit subdito hoc vel illud, id est, concessit; aliquando autem signat dispensacionem, aliquando ius, ut notat Johannes, XXXIII, q. IIª. Interfectores; et aliquando accipitur pro remittere vel condonare, in De Penitenciis [550]et Remissionibus, cap. Indulgencie in principio per Archidiaconum; unde omnes istas indulgencias trahunt et limitant ad prelatos ecclesie. Unde statuunt sibi pro regula quod solus papa potest dare quoad locum et tempus indulgencias generales, episcopi autem habent potestatem limitatam faciendi indulgencias. Nam cum dedicant ecclesias, non extenditur eorum indulgencia ultra annum, eciamsi a pluribus episcopis dedicetur. In aliis autem ultra numerum quadraginta dierum non potest episcopus indulgere, verumptamen episcopus confirmatus antequam sit sacerdos, sicut et legati non sacerdotes faciunt indulgencias, quia hec potestas magis eis ex iurisdiccione quam ex ordine. Inferiores autem ut abbates et presbiteri non possunt indulgencias tales concedere publice ex auctoritate iurisdicionis, sed private in foro penitencie (ut patet in De Penitenciis et Remissionibus, capitulo Indulgencie); super vero conceduntur per

It remains next to treat of indulgences and of absolutions from punishment and guilt, in which there seems to be error among simple people who are ignorant of this matter.[1] First, then, I suppose the signification of this sign *indulgencia*, what the name means. For every indulgence is an act of one who indulges, so that indulgence is nothing other than one who has the power for it indulging; and to indulge is to grant freely, to give one's effort, or to remit; and it is compounded of *inde* and *algere* (which is to be cold or to be mortified), as is the case with offences handed over to oblivion as regards the seeking of vengeance.[2] And so scripture speaks in Judith 8:14: "Let us with tears beg the Lord's indulgence"; and so it is taken in Isaiah 26, 61 and 63.[3] And to indulge sinners in this sense belongs to God alone, as also to forgive sins (as is clear in the last chapter of the fifth book);[4] but the term has been drawn out of these senses and baptized into another sense, partly by the doctors of theology and partly by the canonists. For sometimes, according to them, it connotes remission of punishment, as in the second question, third chapter, *Indulgencie*, as the Archdeacon notes: that sometimes it signifies actively a grant, as "the lord pope indulged a subject this or that", that is, granted; and sometimes it signifies a dispensation, sometimes a right, as John notes on C.33 q.2 *Interfectores*; and sometimes it is taken for "to remit" or "to pardon", in *De penitenciis* [550]*et remissionibus*, chapter *Indulgencie*, at the beginning, by the Archdeacon.[5] Hence they draw all these indulgences in and limit them to the prelates of the church. Hence they lay down for themselves as a rule that the pope alone can give indulgences general as to place and time, but bishops have a limited power of making indulgences. For when they dedicate churches their indulgence does not extend beyond a year, even if the dedication is made by several bishops; and in other cases a bishop cannot indulge beyond the number of forty days. Nevertheless a bishop confirmed before he is a priest, as also legates who are not priests, make indulgences, because this power is theirs from jurisdiction rather than from order.[6] And inferiors, such as abbots and presbyters, cannot grant such indulgences publicly by

Innocentem et Archidiaconum: licet, inquit, restricta sit potestas de indulgenciis que fiunt publice, non tamen in foro penitenciali in quo sacerdos potest indulgere annos et dies dummodo discrete faciat et penitenciam iniunctam per superiorem non remittat.

authority of jurisdiction, but privately in the court of penance (as is clear in *De penitenciis et remissionibus*, chapter *Indulgencie*); and on the word *conceduntur*, by Innocent and the Archdeacon: "Although," he says, "the power is restricted concerning indulgences which are made publicly, yet not in the penitential court, in which a priest can indulge years and days, provided he does it discreetly and does not remit a penance enjoined by a superior."[7]

Notes

1. A heads the chapter *Cap. XXII.* (549.1). C. *A pena et culpa*: the formula of the plenary indulgence, "from punishment and guilt". *Simplices*: simple people, the unlearned. R. A in the margin at 549.2: *De indulgenciis*.
2. *Significacionem quid nominis huius signi*: Wyclif begins from what the name means (row), as he began from *ecclesia* (5.11). *Indulgencia non sit aliud nisi habentem ad hoc potenciam indulgere*: an accusative and infinitive, "nothing other than one who has the power for it indulging". *Operam dare*: to give one's effort or service, one of the dictionary senses of *indulgere*. The derivation from *inde* and *algere* (to grow cold) is the grammarians' (not found in PL): an offence handed to oblivion grows cold as to the seeking of vengeance. T. B *signacionem* (549.5); B *remittere componitur*, without *et* (549.9–10). R. B in the margin at 549.7: *Quid est indulgencia?* Cf. Hus, *Opera* I, 175 (Loserth, 549.5).
3. Judith 8:14: the Vulgate reads *indulgentiam ejus fusis lacrimis postulemus*, Douay–Rheims "with many tears let us beg his pardon"; Wyclif's *domini ... cum lacrimis* is translated, and "indulgence" kept, since the word is his point. Isaiah 26:15 *Indulsisti genti* (Douay–Rheims "Thou hast been favourable to the nation"), 61:1 *praedicarem captivis indulgentiam* ("to preach a release to the captives"), 63:7 *secundum indulgentiam suam* ("according to his kindness"): Wyclif gives the chapters only; the verses are ours.
4. *Deo proprium*: proper to God, his alone (side-note 549.2). *Capitulo ultimo quinti libri*: *De civili dominio* III c. 27, as at 547.17 (chapter 22, part 8), on suffrages and indulgences (Society ed. IV, 644); that only God remits sin is argued in its c. 26 (608: *hoc solus Deus potest*). R. Side-note 549.2; A in the margin at 549.20: *Nota quid est indulgere vel indulgencia; supra vide*.
5. *Baptizatus in sensum alium*: the term is "baptized" into a new sense (B lacks *baptizatus*, 549.18). *Quod quandoque signat*: taken as reporting the Archdeacon's note. S. *Secunda questione tercio capitulo Indulgencie*: so the codices; Loserth corrects to *Liber Sextus* 5.10.3 *Indulgentiae*, with the gloss of the Archdeacon, Guido de Baysio (Loserth, 549.21; the form is ours). *XXXIII, q. IIª. Interfectores*: Decretum C.33 q.2 c.5, Nicholas I to Archbishop Rodulf of Bourges (Loserth, 549.26; the form is ours). Loserth would read *Nicolaus papa* for *Johannes*, the canon being Nicholas I's; but *ut notat Johannes* names the glossator Johannes Teutonicus: the ordinary gloss on c. 5, v. *Indulgentia*, weighs whether an indulgence is a dispensation or a *ius* (glossed Decretum, 1588), as Wyclif reports, so the emendation is not needed. T. B *convocat* for *connotat* (549.20). R. Side-note 549.15.
6. *Limitant*: "limit", in the sense of restrict (row *limitare*), not "assign". C. *Quoad locum et tempus*: general as to place and time. *Magis eis ex iurisdiccione quam ex ordine*: the verb is understood. S. The year for a dedication and the forty days otherwise are the rule of the Fourth Lateran Council, c. 62, X 5.38.14 *Cum ex eo*. R. Side-note 550.1. A in the margin at 550.3, only partly legible in the page foot: *Indulgencia ... potestas*, with *convenit* added; B in the margin at 550.14: *Potestas indulgendi est ex iurisdiccione et non ex ordine, ut hic patet*.
7. *Super verbo* is our emendation for the print's *super vero*, which does not construe: the canonists cite a gloss "on the word" (cf. *in verbo*, 551.4), and the word glossed is taken as *conceduntur*. B *Inserentes autem* for *Inferiores autem* (550.14); A *discreta* (550.22). C. *In foro penitencie*: the court of penance, the confessional, set against public jurisdiction. *Inquit*: singular, though two glossators are named. The quotation is closed at *remittat*, where the print's italics end. S. Innocent IV and the Archdeacon on *Indulgentiae*, VI 5.10.3; Innocent's apparatus is on the Decretals of Gregory IX, so his gloss may be on X 5.38.14 (not traced: no readable copy of Innocent's or the Archdeacon's apparatus was found on archive.org, and the OCR of the glossed Sext of 1584 is unusable at that place). Sext 5.10.3 has *conceduntur*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 549: *CAP. XXIII.*
  - 549: *consequenter*
  - 549: *Deo* (203c is the glued folio mark)
  - 549: *IIª*
  - 550: ∅ (previous page's closing text at page top)

Part 2: The treasury of merits: the common opinion, its foundation, and Thomas and Bonaventure

Loserth pp. 550.24–554.22

¶1 550.24–554.4
550.24 *So much time of indulgence may mean a) the equivalent of so much temporal penance; b) so much shortening of time in Purgatory.*
551.1 *The latter meaning is favoured by the decretists.*
551.6 *The opinion rests on an invention which supposes a) a store oft supererogatory merits;*
551.13 *b) that the store is inexhaustible and is at the disposal of the Pope;*
551.20 *c) that when the Pope makes over a share in such merit, he gives an indulgence,*
552.1 *St. Thomas says that indulgences are not simply remissions of temporal penance but avail in purgatory.*
554.6 *Bonaventura's opinion.*

[550] **Istis premissis restat videre expressius quid sonat verbum prelati: Remitto tibi tantum tempus indulgencie pro peccatis, et dicitur communiter quod virtute talis indulgencie per tantum tempus minus pacieris in purgatorio, et hoc intelligi potest dupliciter, vel quod indulgencia habeat efficaciam tantam, quantam tantum temporis pro penitencia huius vie quoad statum purgatorii, vel secundo quod de tanto** [551] **brevius pacieris secundum penam purgatorii, et ista glossa est sentencie decretistarum pertinencior et dictis eorum conformior (ut patet in De Penitenciis et Remissionibus; cap. Quod autem) in verbo, sed queres quid sonat? Sumitur autem fundamentum huius sentencie ex ista ymaginacione fantastica: Ponitur enim primo quod sunt supererogata merita sanctorum et specialiter Christi in celis infinita numero et valore, ultra quam requiritur ad eorum beatitudinem, et omnia ista vocantur spiritualis thesaurus ecclesie in capite eius reconditus. Ponitur secundo quod dominus papa, cum sit vicarius Christi in terris, habet plenam potestatem distribuendi thesaurum illum fidelibus, sed quod libuerit plus vel minus, nec licet diffidere quin potestas imperciendi ista spiritualia suffragia remaneat continue inexhausta, quia aliter deficeret Christus dando potestatem clavium suo vicario hic in terris. Tercio dicitur quod quando papa vel suus episcopus dispensat subditis de isto thesauro, commutando meritum beati loco meriti quo peccator mereretur remissionem peccati, tunc concedit indulgenciam plus vel minus. Et ex isto fundamento dicuntur hii vendere peccata sua et isti emere eciam pro pecunia et seductus est populus de cambio impossibili et infundabili propter fastum et questum adquisibilem sacerdoti. Et isti sentencie videtur sanctum Thomam annuere, super Quarto Sentenciarum, distinccione vicesima, questione** [552] **tercia: Ab omnibus, inquit, conceditur indulgencias aliquid valere, quia impium esset dicere quod ecclesia aliquid vane faceret. Sed quidam dicunt quod non valent ad absolvendum a reatu pene quam quis in purgatorio secundum iudicium Dei meretur, sed valent ad solvendum ab obligacione qua sacerdos obligavit penitentem ad penam aliquam vel ad quam eciam ordinatur ex canonum statutis. Sed hec opinio non videtur vera; primo quia est expresse contra privilegium Petro datum, ut quod in terra remitteret et in celo remitteretur, unde remissio que fit quoad forum ecclesie, valet eciam quantum ad forum Dei. Item, ecclesia huiusmodi indulgenciam faciens magis dampnificaret quam adiuvaret, quia remitteret ad graviores penas, scilicet purgatorii, absolvendo a penitenciis iniunctis. Et manifeste patet deduccio, eo quod iuxta opinionem indulgencia**

These things premised, it remains to see more expressly what the prelate's formula means: "I remit to you so much time of indulgence for sins"; and it is commonly said that by virtue of such an indulgence you will suffer so much time less in purgatory. And this can be understood in two ways: either that the indulgence has as much efficacy as so much time of penance in this way has as regards the state of purgatory; or secondly that by so much [551] **you will suffer more briefly in the punishment of purgatory. And this gloss is more pertinent to the teaching of the decretists and more conformable to their sayings, (as is clear in *De penitenciis et remissionibus*, chapter *Quod autem*) at the words "But you will ask what it means".[1] And the foundation of this teaching is taken from this fantastic imagining. For it is supposed, first, that there are supererogated merits of the saints, and especially of Christ, in heaven, infinite in number and value, beyond what is required for their blessedness; and all these are called the spiritual treasury of the church, laid up in its head.[2] It is supposed, secondly, that the lord pope, since he is vicar of Christ on earth, has full power of distributing that treasury to the faithful, but as much as he pleases, more or less; and it is not lawful to doubt that the power of imparting these spiritual suffrages remains continually unexhausted, since otherwise Christ would have failed in giving the power of the keys to his vicar here on earth.[3] Thirdly, it is said that when the pope or his bishop dispenses to subjects from this treasury, exchanging the merit of a blessed one in place of the merit by which the sinner would merit remission of sin, then he grants indulgence, more or less. And on this foundation these are said to sell their sins and those to buy them, even for money; and the people has been seduced by an impossible and groundless barter, for the sake of the pomp and the gain to be acquired by the priest.[4] And Saint Thomas seems to assent to this teaching, on the fourth book of the *Sentences*, distinction 20, question** [552] **3: "It is granted by all," he says, "that indulgences avail something, since it would be impious to say that the church does anything in vain. But some say that they do not avail to absolve from the liability to the punishment which one merits in purgatory according to the judgment of God, but avail to loose from the obligation by which the priest has bound the penitent to some punishment, or to which he is also appointed by the statutes of the canons. But this opinion does not seem true: first, because it is expressly against the privilege given to Peter, that what he remitted on earth should be remitted in heaven; hence the remission which is made as to the**

non facit ad remissionem in purgatorio, sed subducta indulgencia in pleno penitencie faceret ad remissionem in purgatorio, quod foret infinitum prestancius quam aliqua penitencie vie remissio. Ideo iuxta hanc viam omnis indulgencia foret impeditiva fructus penitencie et nociva, ideo prudenter dicunt canoniste quod propter indulgencias non est dimittenda iniuncta penitencia [553]pro peccato, nec haberent colorem indulgencie de multis millibus annorum quoad nudam mitigacionem penitencie hic pro via, cum certi sumus quod non subibitur eciam a Matussale tanta penitencia hic in via. Ideo, inquit doctor, aliter est dicendum quod valent indulgencie et quantum ad forum ecclesie et quantum ad iudicium Dei et quantum ad remissionem pene residue post contricionem, confessionem, absolucionem, sive sit iniuncta sive non. Racio autem quare valere possunt est unitas corporis mistici in qua multi in operibus penitencie supererogaverunt ad mensuram debitorum suorum et eciam multas tribulaciones iniuste sustinuerunt pacienter, per quas multitudo penarum poterat expiari, si eis deberetur. Quorum meritorum tanta est copia quod omnem penam debitam nunc viventibus excedunt et precipue propter meritum Christi; quod et si in sacramentis operatur, non tamen efficacia eius in sacramentis includitur, sed sua infinitate sacramentorum efficaciam excedit. Ideo cum unus pro alio satisfacere potest, sancti autem in quibus superhabundancia operum satisfaccionis invenitur, non determinate pro isto qui non remissionem indiget, huiusmodi opera fecerunt (quia alias absque omni indulgencia remissionem consequeretur) vel communiter fierent pro tota ecclesia, sicut apostolus dicit se implere ea que desunt passioni Christi in corpore suo pro ecclesia, ad quam scribit Corinth. I°. Et sic predicta merita quamvis sint communia tocius ecclesie, tamen papa distribuit ea dispariter, sicut ea que sunt communia alicuius multitudinis distribuuntur singulis de multitudine secundum arbitrium [554]eius qui multitudini preest. Unde si quis consequeretur remissionem pene ac si alius pro eo satisfecisset ita quod satisfaccio alterius sibi per eum qui potest distribuatur; sic de indulgenciis est censendum.

court of the church avails also as to the court of God. Again, the church making an indulgence of this kind would harm more than help, since it would remit them to heavier punishments, namely those of purgatory, by absolving from enjoined penances."[5] And the deduction is manifestly clear, since according to the opinion an indulgence does nothing toward remission in purgatory; but with the indulgence withdrawn, one would work in the fullness of penance toward remission in purgatory, which would be infinitely more excellent than any remission of the penance of the way. Therefore on this view every indulgence would hinder the fruit of penance and be harmful; therefore the canonists prudently say that an enjoined penance [553]for sin is not to be dropped on account of indulgences; nor would indulgences of many thousands of years have colour as to the bare mitigation of penance here on the way, since we are certain that so great a penance would not be undergone even by Methuselah here on the way.[6] "Therefore," says the doctor, "it must be said otherwise: that indulgences avail both as to the court of the church and as to the judgment of God, and as to the remission of the punishment remaining after contrition, confession and absolution, whether it was enjoined or not. Now the reason why they can avail is the unity of the mystical body, in which many in works of penance have paid out beyond the measure of their debts, and have also patiently borne many tribulations unjustly, by which a multitude of punishments could be expiated, if they were owed to them. Of which merits so great is the plenty that they exceed all punishment owed to those now living, and especially on account of the merit of Christ; which, though it works in the sacraments, yet its efficacy is not shut up in the sacraments, but by its infinity it exceeds the efficacy of the sacraments.[7] Therefore, since one can make satisfaction for another, and the saints in whom a superabundance of works of satisfaction is found did such works not determinately for this man who needs remission (for otherwise he would obtain remission without any indulgence), or they were done in common for the whole church, as the apostle says that he fills up those things that are wanting to the passion of Christ in his body for the church, to which he writes, Corinthians 1: so the aforesaid merits, though they are common to the whole church," yet the pope distributes them unequally, as those "that are common to some multitude are distributed to the individuals of the multitude according to the judgment [554]of him who presides over the multitude. Hence, if anyone should obtain remission of punishment as though another had made satisfaction for him, so that the satisfaction of

another is distributed to him by one who is able"; so it is to be judged of indulgences.[8]

¶2 554.6–554.22

[554]Item, doctor Bonaventura super eadem distinccione, questione secunda, primo reprobat opinionem de indulgenciis dicentem quod tantum valent ad forum ecclesie militantis sic quod non ad forum ecclesie triumphantis. Si, inquit, prelatus relaxat et Deus non relaxat, tunc est pocius decepcio quam relaxacio, pocius crudelitas quam pietas. Et patet quod non foret dispensacio sed rebellio. Ideo ad excludendum ab ecclesia Christi fallaciam dicit quod indulgencia sic potest fieri: Obtinemus, inquit, bonum ex triplici merito, scilicet ex merito proprio, ex merito capitis et ex merito ecclesiastice unitatis. Et correspondenter ad istud triplex meritum bonum obtinendi est triplex meritum a malo liberandi, scilicet meritum proprium, ut puta, meritum contricionis, quo meremur liberari a pena eterna et ascribi ad gaudia sempiterna, sic quod hec duo sunt simul, sicut in angelis gracia et gloria.

Again, the doctor Bonaventure, on the same distinction, question 2, first rejects the opinion on indulgences which says that they avail only for the court of the church militant, and so not for the court of the church triumphant. "If," he says, "the prelate relaxes and God does not relax, then it is deception rather than relaxation, cruelty rather than piety." And it is clear that it would not be dispensation but rebellion. Therefore, to exclude fallacy from the church of Christ, he says that an indulgence can be made thus: "We obtain good," he says, "from a threefold merit, namely from our own merit, from the merit of the head, and from the merit of the church's unity. And corresponding to this threefold merit of obtaining good there is a threefold merit of being freed from evil: namely our own merit, for example the merit of contrition, by which we merit to be freed from eternal punishment and to be enrolled for everlasting joys, so that these two are together, as grace and glory in the angels."[9]

Notes

1. ***Quid sonat verbum prelati***: what the prelate's formula means. ***Tantum tempus indulgencie***: so much time, as forty days or a year (part 1). The two readings: an indulgence worth so much penance in this life, or so much time off purgatory (side-note 550.24). ***Huius vie***: of this way, the present life (row ***via***). ***Sed queres quid sonat?***: taken as the words of the gloss at which the matter is treated; it may instead be Wyclif's own question, opening the next sentence. S. X 5.38.4 ***Quod autem*** (Loserth, 551.4; the form is ours). T. ***In verbo*** is Loserth's expansion, queried, of the codices' ***in v.*** (551.4). The print has a closing bracket after ***Quod autem*** with no opening one; it is not carried into the English. B ***Brevius paciens*** (551.1). R. Side-notes 550.24, 551.1. A and B in the margin at 550.24: ***Nota quid sonat*** (B ***hoc***): ***Remitto tibi tantum tempus indulgencie pro peccatis***; B ***Remitto tibi tempus*** (550.25).
2. ***Ymaginacione fantastica***: a fantastic imagining, Wyclif's verdict on the foundation that follows. ***Supererogata merita***: merits paid out beyond what was owed. ***In capite eius reconditus***: laid up in its head, Christ. T. A ***numero et valere*** (551.9). R. Side-note 551.6; A in the margin at 551.6: ***Fundamentum indulgenciarum secundum communem opinionem***; B in the margin at 551.11: ***Spiritualis thesaurus ecclesie***.
3. ***Sed quod libuerit plus vel minus***: so printed, "but as much as he pleases, more or less"; ***sed*** may stand for ***secundum***, "according as he pleases". ***Potestatem clavium***: the power of the keys (Matthew 16:19). T. A ***in terra*** (551.14); A ***remaneant*** (551.17). R. Side-note 551.13.
4. ***Commutando***: "exchanging" (row ***commutacio***); ***cambio***: "barter", untagged, kept apart from ***commutacio***. C. ***Hii vendere ... et isti emere***: the sellers, the clergy, and the buyers, the people; ***peccata sua*** is ambiguous between the buyers' sins and the sellers'. ***Fastum et questum adquisibilem sacerdoti***: the pomp and the gain to be won by the priest. R. Side-note 551.20.
5. Thomas Aquinas, ***In IV Sent.*** d.20 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** IX, 374); the place is q.1 a.3 qc.1, co., = ***Supplementum*** q.25 a.1; the second stretch runs from ***aliter est dicendum*** to ***distribuatur***, with Wyclif's insertions (***papa distribuit ea dispariter***; ***Corinth. I°***, for Col. 1:24; the closing ***sic de indulgenciis est censendum***). The privilege given to Peter is Matthew 16:19. T. ***Indulgencias*** is Loserth's correction of the codices' ***indulgencia*** (552.1). B lacks ***a reatu ... solvendum*** (552.4) and ***ab*** (552.6). C. ***Reatu pene***: liability to punishment. ***Forum ecclesie ... forum Dei***: the court of the church and the court of God. The quotation is closed at ***iniunctis***; what follows, to ***in via***, is taken as Wyclif's comment, until ***inquit doctor*** resumes the quotation. R. Side-note 552.1. A in the margin at 552.4: ***Opinio falsa***; at 552.8: ***Arguitur contra communem opinionem indulgenciarum***. B in the margin at 552.2 sums up Thomas and Bonaventure and objects: ***revera non video quomodo sanctorum communio tantum dependet ex pape voto, cum magnam habuit illa communio efficaciam ante adinvencionem istius distribucionis***.
6. ***Patet deduccio***: Wyclif presses Thomas's second argument: if an indulgence only loosed enjoined penance, the penance it lifted would have done more toward remission in purgatory, infinitely more than any remission of penance in this life. ***In pleno penitencie***: in the fullness of penance; the subject of ***faceret*** is unexpressed. ***Iuxta hanc viam***: on this view (not the ***via*** of the wayfarer). ***Colorem***: colour, a plausible ground (row ***color***). ***De multis millibus annorum***: indulgences of thousands of years, which no penance in this life could match, not even in Methuselah's 969 years (Genesis 5:27). T. B ***quod deduccio*** (552.16).
7. ***Ideo, inquit doctor***: the quotation of Thomas resumes. ***Sive sit iniuncta sive non***: whether the punishment was enjoined by the priest or not. ***Supererogaverunt ad mensuram debitorum suorum***: paid out beyond the measure of their debts. ***Copia***: "plenty", kept apart from ***habundancia***. T. Loserth notes that Thomas reads ***multi operibus***, without ***in*** (553.10–11).

8. ***Non determinate pro isto qui non remissionem indiget*: the second *non* does not construe ("this man who does not need remission"); it is left untranslated (our emendation), as a doubling of *non determinate*; the print has both, without apparatus. *Huiusmodi*: the codices read *huius* here and often below (Loserth, 553.23). A *nihil communiter* (553.25); A A_1 *singularia* (553.31). C. *Vel communiter fierent*: so printed; taken as the alternative to works done for one man, "or rather they were done in common". *Tamen papa distribuit ea dispariter, sicut ea*: roman in the print, Wyclif's words inside Thomas's quotation; the English closes and reopens the quotation there. *Unde si quis consequeretur ...*: the comparison is left incomplete as printed: as one obtains remission when another satisfies for him, so when another's satisfaction is distributed to him. The quotation is closed at *distribuatur*. S. The apostle's words are Colossians 1:24 (Loserth, 553.26), "fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the church" (Douay–Rheims), given in indirect speech; the print cites *Corinth. I°*, A_1 *II. Cor. I.* (553.27).

9. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.* d.20 p.2 a.1 q.2 (Loserth: *Opp.* IV, 556, Venice 1734); the codices lack the number of the distinction (Loserth, 554.6). C. *Tantum ... sic quod non*: only for the court of the church militant, and not for that of the church triumphant. *Et patet quod non foret dispensacio sed rebellio*: taken as Wyclif's comment, outside the quotation. *Ascribi ad gaudia sempiterna*: to be enrolled for everlasting joys. *Sic quod hec duo sunt simul*: freedom from eternal punishment and enrolment for glory come together, as grace and glory in the angels. The quotation continues in the next part. R. Side-note 554.6. B in the margin at 554.6: *Nota quomodo percipias teriam* (sic) *indulgenciarum secundum fautores earum*; A at 554.15: *Bonum obtinemus ex merito proprio, ex merito capitis, ex merito ecclesie unitatis*; A at 554.17: *Bonaventura de indulgenciis*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 550: ∅ (time is English side-note (So much time); Istis already at pos 158)
  - 551: *Quod*
  - 551: *meritum*
  - 553: *pro* (203d is the glued folio mark)
  - 553: *meritorum* (15 is the line number)
  - 553: *sua*
  - 553: *I°* (italic capital I, full height; period dropped per superscript rule)
  - 554: *eius*
  - 551: ∅ (duplicate: glossa already present (tok pos 6 second entry)) [DELX]

Part 3: The treasury of merits in Bonaventure and the decretists; three arguments for the opinion; how one may make satisfaction for another

Loserth pp. 554.23–558.23

¶1 554.23–555.15

555.1 *The commutation of punishment is due to the satisfaction made by Christ.*

555.9 *Indulgences are to be dispensed only by bishops.*

555.18 *Other decretists maintain this opinion of a treasure doled out by Christ's vicar.*

[554]Secundo modo meritum Christi cooperatur in sacramentis et potestate clavium, et per hoc remittitur pars pene. Et tercio modo fit meritum ad fugiendum malum ex vi unitatis ecclesiastice. Et correspondenter fit triplex pene condonacio, ut sic currat misericordia cum iusticia. Et in qualibet tali condonacione est commutacio maioris in minus, unde pena eterna primo [555]mutatur in temporalem in remissione pene et culpe. Secundo pena temporalis magna et supra vires mutatur in penam viribus competentem in sacerdotis absolucione. Tercio vero commutatur pena ad quam pertinet iudicio ecclesie in minorem relaxacionem in virtute residui meritorum ecclesie. Et omnia ista originantur ex merito passionis et satisfaccionis Christi, nullibi preiudicando iusticie. Et ita dicit quod indulgencie fiunt de meritis supererogacionis membrorum ecclesie, quem thesaurum pertinet ad solos episcopos saltem publice dispensare, quia illi sunt vicarii succedentes in loco Christi fratris senioris mortui, ut suscitent semen suum generando sibi filios spirituales. Et uterque istorum doctorum respondet ad obiectus in contrarium.

"Secondly, the merit of Christ cooperates in the sacraments and the power of the keys, and by this a part of the punishment is remitted. And thirdly, merit for fleeing evil arises by virtue of the church's unity. And correspondingly there arises a threefold pardon of punishment, so that thus mercy may run with justice. And in each such pardon there is an exchange of the greater into the less: hence eternal punishment is first [555]changed into temporal in the remission of punishment and guilt; secondly, temporal punishment, great and beyond one's strength, is changed into a punishment suited to one's strength in the priest's absolution; and thirdly the punishment which falls to the judgment of the church is exchanged, by relaxation, into a lesser, in virtue of the residue of the merits of the church." And all these originate from the merit of Christ's passion and satisfaction, nowhere prejudicing justice.[12] And so he says that indulgences are made from the merits of supererogation of the members of the church, which treasury it belongs to bishops alone to dispense, at least publicly, because they are vicars

¶2 555.16–556.4
556.5 *I propose to give 1. Arguments in its favour; 2. Arguments against it; 3. My own judgment.*
556.9 *3, My own judgment.*
556.11 *In its favour:*
556.13 *a) One man may make satisfaction for another.*
556.22 *b) Christ gave to Peter full power of binding and loosing.*
556.30 *c) The Pope's acts shew that he declares it catholic.*

[555] **Et illam sentenciam sepe inculcant doctores decretorum ponentes quod indulgencia est liberalis et graciosa donacio de thesauro ecclesie, facta per vicarium Christi peccatoribus pro suis penis ad quas de iusticia obligantur. Thesaurus iste, inquiunt, est habundancia meritorum que multi sancti ultra mensuram debitorum erogaverunt et tribulaciones quas iniuste sustinuerunt; quorum meritorum tanta est copia quod excedit omnem penam debitam viventibus, et precipue passio et meritum Christi, cuius minima gutta sanguinis vel sudoris sufficeret ad expiacionem omnium peccatorum, hec et cetera bona supererogat, que omnia ponuntur in scrinio pectoris Christi tamquam thesaurus ecclesie. Ista sentencia patet per Willielmum in De Reliquiis et Veneracione Sanctorum, capitulo V°. Et patet** [556] **quomodo a theologis decretiste sumpserunt istam sentenciam que, si sit infundabilis et principium erroris fidelium, patet gravedo peccati in auctoribus illius ficticie.**

succeeding in the place of Christ, the elder brother who died, that they may raise up his seed by begetting spiritual sons for him.[3] **And each of these doctors replies to the objections to the contrary.**

And the doctors of the decrees often inculcate that teaching, holding that an indulgence is a liberal and gracious gift from the treasury of the church, made by the vicar of Christ to sinners for their punishments, to which they are bound in justice. "This treasury," they say, "is the abundance of merits which many saints have paid out beyond the measure of their debts, and the tribulations which they unjustly bore; of which merits so great is the plenty that it exceeds all punishment owed to the living; and especially the passion and merit of Christ, of whom the least drop of blood or sweat would suffice for the expiation of all sins: these and other goods he paid out beyond what was owed, all of which are placed in the coffer of Christ's breast as the treasury of the church."[4] **This teaching is clear from William in *De reliquiis et veneracione sanctorum*, chapter 5. And it is clear** [556] **how the decretists took this teaching from the theologians; and if it is groundless and a principle of error for the faithful, the gravity of the sin in the authors of that fiction is clear.**[5]

¶3 556.5–556.8

[556] **In ista materia sic procedam: Primo fundabo vel colorabo possibilitatem et probabilitatem illius sentencie, secundo obiciam multipliciter contra illam et tercio dicam quid videtur mihi probabiliter sustinendum.**

In this matter I shall proceed thus: first I shall ground, or give colour to, the possibility and probability of that teaching; secondly I shall object in many ways against it; and thirdly I shall say what seems to me probably to be maintained.[6]

¶4 556.9–556.21

[556] **Quantum ad primum sic arguo: Deus nedum potest de sua absoluta potestate quecunque peccata eciam sine satisfaccione remittere, sed unus potest de communi cursu pro alio satisfacere, et per consequens, Deus potest committere suo vicario potenciam contra quecunque peccata taliter dispensandi. Quo habito suadetur tripliciter quod sic facit, primo quia caput ecclesie pro quo Christus oravit Luce XXII°, 32, ut non deficiat fides sua, sic pretendit se facere de facto; sed foret error intollerabilis si in isto a fide exorbitet, sicut maxime dampnabilis fatuitas foret membris ecclesie hoc sibi imponere, ergo presumendum est factum istud esse catholicum.**

As to the first, I argue thus: not only can God, of his absolute power, remit any sins whatever even without satisfaction, but one can, in the common course, make satisfaction for another; and consequently God can commit to his vicar the power of dispensing in this way against any sins whatever. This granted, it is urged in three ways that he does so: first, because the head of the church, for whom Christ prayed (Luke 22:32) that his faith fail not, claims to do so in fact; now it would be an intolerable error if in this he strayed from the faith, just as it would be a most damnable folly for the members of the church to impose this on him; therefore it is to be presumed that this deed is catholic.[7]

¶5 556.22–556.29

[556] **Item, Matthei XVI°, 19 concessit Christus Petro et cuilibet eius vicario singulariter plenitudinem potestatis dicens: Quodcunque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum et in celis, et quodcunque solveris**

Again, in Matthew 16:19 Christ granted to Peter and to each of his vicars singly the plenitude of power, saying: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose

super terram erit solutum et in celis. Cum ergo dominus papa sic solvit et ligat in terris, videtur ex evangelio quod proporcionaliter fit in celis; aliter enim titubaret fides ecclesie.

on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." Since, then, the lord pope so looses and binds on earth, it seems from the gospel that proportionately it is done in heaven; for otherwise the faith of the church would totter.[8]

¶6 556.30–557.2
557.3 *We believe that Christ made satisfaction for all his members.*
557.10 *Since one man's sin may hurt another, one may atone for another.*
557.21 *Even men let one man acquit another's debt, much more will God*

[556]Item, Deus reliquit unum caput in ecclesia pro dubiis decidendis, quod non potest poni nisi Petri vicarius; ergo sibi restat difficultatem istam decidere; sed cum factum suum sit manifestissimus interpres sensus sui, videtur quod in facto docet hoc esse [557]catholicum. Quis rogo iudicaret papam cum conventu suo errare?

Again, God left one head in the church for deciding doubts, who cannot be held to be anyone but Peter's vicar; therefore it remains for him to decide this difficulty; now since his deed is the most manifest interpreter of his meaning, it seems that by the deed he teaches this to be [557]catholic. Who, I ask, would judge the pope with his convent to err?[9]

¶7 557.3–557.32

[557]Assumptum ergo primi argumenti sic docetur: Oportet ex fide credere quod Christus satisfecit pro omnibus membris suis, sicut ex vi communionis sanctorum quodlibet membrum ecclesie satisfecit pro altero, cum apostolus dicat Gallatis VI°, 2°: Alter alterius onera portate; ergo per idem contingit ecclesiam beatam satisfacere pro viante. Item, contingit unum condempnare alterum, ut patet de primis parentibus et multis aliis ex suis capitibus et consociis accusatis. Cum ergo Deus sit pronior ad premiandum quam puniendum, videtur quod contingit unum satisfacere pro alio. Sic enim brachium naturaliter se exponit pro capite; multo magis in corpore Christi mistico, ubi est ligatum forcius, videtur quod unum membrum debet satisfaciendo supportare pondus alterius iuxta istud Apostoli II[a] Corinth. XI°, 29: Quis infirmatur et ego non infirmor? Item, Deus est liberior ad recipiendum satisfaccionem de suis debitoribus quam servus suus de debitoribus suis, sed homo sepe racionabiliter recipit debitum unius per puram satisfaccionem alterius, ergo contingit Deum liberrimum hoc facere. Si ergo creditor benigne accipit talentum debitum a Petro ex pura satisfaccione Pauli hoc solventis pro eo, multo magis Deus misericors. Si ergo unus in gracia impetrat alteri remissionem culpe, quod maius est, ipse evidencius potest impetrare sibi remissionem pene, quod minus est. Pia ergo consolativa fidelium et honorificativa cleri est ista posicio.

The assumption of the first argument, then, is shown thus. It must be believed, as faith teaches, that Christ made satisfaction for all his members, just as by virtue of the communion of saints each member of the church has made satisfaction for another, since the apostle says in Galatians 6:2: "Bear ye one another's burdens"; therefore by the same token it is possible for the blessed church to make satisfaction for one on the road. Again, it is possible for one to bring condemnation on another, as is clear of the first parents and of many others, on account of their heads and associates who were accused. Since, then, God is more prone to reward than to punish, it seems that it is possible for one to make satisfaction for another.[10] For thus the arm naturally exposes itself for the head; much more in the mystical body of Christ, where it is bound more strongly, it seems that one member ought, by making satisfaction, to bear the weight of another, according to that of the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 11:29: "Who is weak, and I am not weak?" Again, God is freer to receive satisfaction from his debtors than his servant from his debtors; now a man often reasonably receives the debt of one by the pure satisfaction of another; therefore it is possible for God, most free, to do this. If, then, a creditor kindly accepts a talent owed by Peter from the pure satisfaction of Paul paying it for him, much more God the merciful. If, then, one in grace obtains for another the remission of guilt, which is greater, he can more evidently obtain for him the remission of punishment, which is less. This position, therefore, is pious, consoling to the faithful and honouring to the clergy.[11]

¶8 557.33–558.21
558.1 *Three kinds of satisfaction: 1. Where one does his separate share. 2.*

[557]Primo ergo concedenda est ista conclusio quod contingit unum satisfacere pro alio. Sed notandum [558]quod hoc intelligi potest

First, then, this conclusion is to be granted: that it is possible for one to make satisfaction for another. But it must be noted [558]that this can be

Where one helps another to do his part. 3. Where one satisfies entirely for another.
558.22 *Christ made satisfaction, but to the profit only of those who join in his work.*

tripliciter, primo participative satisfaciendo pro suo contento, secundo iuvative concausando totam satisfaccionem in omnino altero et tercio per se sine concursu alterius satisfaciendo pro toto debito. Exemplum primi est in assumpcione nature humane per Christum in attomo et complecione primiciarum tocius debiti humani generis pro peccato. Exemplum secundi est quomodo nedum Christus sed alia membra iuvant ad plenam satisfaccionem confratrum; et tercio modo unus satisfacit pro debito particulari alterius particulari creditori. In utraque primarum satisfaccionum oportet debitorem concurrere, ut quamvis Christus fecit se naturam humanam que debuit Deo satisfaccionem pro peccato primi hominis, tamen illa satisfaccio non potuit membris proficere, nisi ex adiutorio capitis se disponentibus active ad suscipiendum medicinam vel saltem ad consolvendum ministracionem debitam, in tantum quod infans unius diei decedens in gracia primo baptizatur flamine, secundo servit Deo meritorie et sic tercio participat fructum celestis medicine.

understood in three ways: first participatively, by making satisfaction for one's own share; secondly helpingly, by co-causing the whole satisfaction in one wholly other; and thirdly of oneself, without the concurrence of the other, by making satisfaction for the whole debt.[12] An example of the first is in the assumption of human nature by Christ in an individual, and the completion of the first-fruits of the whole debt of the human race for sin. An example of the second is how not only Christ but other members help toward the full satisfaction of their brethren; and in the third way one makes satisfaction for the particular debt of another to a particular creditor.[13] In each of the first two satisfactions the debtor must concur; so that, although Christ made himself the human nature which owed God satisfaction for the sin of the first man, yet that satisfaction could not profit the members unless, by the help of the head, they disposed themselves actively to receive the medicine, or at least to pay together the service owed; so much so that an infant of one day, dying in grace, is first baptized by the Spirit, secondly serves God meritoriously, and so thirdly shares in the fruit of the heavenly medicine.[14]

¶9 558.22–558.22

[558] Et patet ad primum quod concedenda est conclusio, sed

And so to the first it is clear that the conclusion is to be granted, but[15]

¶10 558.23–558.23

[558] non credamus quod Christus satisfecit pro debito illius

let us not believe that Christ made satisfaction for the debt of that

Notes

1. The quotation of Bonaventure continues from the previous part (*Obtinemus, inquit …*, 554.15) and is closed at *ecclesie*, where the print's italics end; *Et omnia ista … iusticie* is Wyclif's summary. *Secundo modo … tercio modo*: the merit of the head, then the merit of the church's unity, matching the three merits of obtaining good. *Condonacio*: "pardon", kept apart from *remissio* "remission" (cf. *condonare*, 549.27). *Ut sic currat misericordia cum iusticia*: so that mercy runs together with justice. *Commutacio maioris in minus*: an exchange of the greater into the less (row *commutacio*). R. Side-note 555.1.
2. *Commutatur* is Loserth's correction of the codices' *commutacio*; he suggests reading *commutacio pene* (555.4). C. *Pena ad quam pertinet iudicio ecclesie*: the subject of *pertinet* is unexpressed; taken as the punishment that falls to the church's judgment, the enjoined penance. *In minorem relaxacionem*: literally "into a lesser relaxation"; taken as exchanged, by relaxation, into a lesser punishment. *Residui meritorum ecclesie*: the surplus of the church's merits.
3. Bonaventure, *In IV Sent.* d.20 p.2 q.3 (Loserth, 555.8: *Opp.* IV, 558). The figure is the law of the levirate, Deuteronomy 25:5, "his brother shall take her, and raise up seed for his brother" (Douay–Rheims). C. *Saltem publice*: at least publicly (cf. part 1: inferiors may indulge privately in the court of penance). *Semen suum … sibi*: taken as Christ's seed and sons for Christ; *sibi* may refer to the bishops. *Obiectus*: the objections (row *objectum*). R. Side-note 555.9.
4. *Doctores decretorum*: the decretists. *Ad quas de iusticia obligantur*: to which they are bound in justice. *Habundancia*: "abundance", kept apart from *copia*, "plenty". *In scrinio pectoris Christi*: in the coffer of Christ's breast, the canonists' figure for the pope's *scrinium pectoris*, here given to Christ. The quotation is closed at *ecclesie*. T. *Supererogat* is Loserth's correction of the codices' *supererogata* (555.27); with the codices: "these and the other supererogated goods, all of which are placed …". The subject of *supererogat* is taken as Christ. R. Side-note 555.18; B in the margin at 555.16: *Indulgencia quid sit*; at 555.20: *Thesaurus ecclesie*.
5. *Willielmum*: Loserth could not tell which William is meant: of Auxerre, of Montlauzun, Durand, or of Saint-Amour (555.29). *De reliquiis et veneracione sanctorum* is the title X 3.45 of the Decretals, but that title has only two chapters, so *capitulo V°* cannot be X 3.45.5 (the form is ours). C. *Que, si sit infundabilis …*: the relative is left without its own verb; the sentence turns to *patet gravedo peccati*. *Ficticie*: fiction (row *ficticia*).
6. *Fundabo vel colorabo*: ground, or at least give colour to (row *colorare*): the arguments that follow are for the opinion, not Wyclif's own. *Possibilitatem et probabilitatem*: that it can be so, and that it may be argued to be so. *Probabiliter sustinendum*: to be maintained as probable. R. Side-note 556.5; A in the margin at 556.5: *Arguitur pro possibilitate indulgenciarum*.

7. ***De communi cursu***: in the common course of God's ordering, set against his absolute power. ***Suadetur***: it is urged, argued persuasively. ***Caput ecclesie***: in this argument for the opinion, the pope, whom Wyclif elsewhere denies to be head (row *caput*). ***Pretendit***: claims, professes. ***Hoc sibi imponere***: to charge him with such an error. ***Dampnabilis***: untagged, beside row *dampnacio*. S. Luke 22:32, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (Douay–Rheims), given in the third person. T. B *absolutus* (556.10). Loserth's note at 556.17, *sic; sicut* (?), queries *sicut* for a *sic* in that line. R. Side-notes 556.11, 556.13; A in the margin at 556.9: *Racio*.
8. Matthew 16:19 (Douay–Rheims). C. ***Singulariter***: singly, each for himself. ***Proporcionaliter***: in proportion, as much as is loosed on earth. R. Side-note 556.22.
9. ***Quod non potest poni nisi Petri vicarius***: which can be taken to be no one but Peter's vicar. ***Factum suum … interpres sensus sui***: his deed interprets his mind; the pope's practice of granting indulgences shows what he holds. ***Cum conventu suo***: with his assembly, the cardinals of the curia. R. Side-note 556.30.
10. ***Assumptum … primi argumenti***: the assumption (row) of the first argument, that one can make satisfaction for another (556.11). ***Ecclesiam beatam***: the blessed church, the church triumphant. ***Contingit unum condempnare alterum***: one can bring another to condemnation, as Adam and Eve their offspring. ***Ex suis capitibus et consociis accusatis***: taken as condemned on account of their heads and associates, who were accused; *accusatis* may instead go with *multis aliis*, "many others accused on account of their heads". S. Galatians 6:2 (Douay–Rheims). T. B *contingir c.* (557.10); A *quam ad puniendum*, the *ad* struck out (557.13). R. Side-notes 557.3, 557.10.
11. ***Brachium … se exponit pro capite***: the arm exposes itself for the head, the common figure of natural self-defence. ***Ubi est ligatum forcius***: where the body is bound more strongly. ***Liberior … liberrimum***: freer, most free, that is, readier to release. ***Talentum***: a talent, the sum of a debt (cf. Matthew 18:24). ***Impetrat … impetrare sibi***: obtains by request (row); *sibi* taken as "for him", the other; it may be "for himself". ***Pia … consolativa … honorificativa***: pious, consoling, honouring. S. 2 Corinthians 11:29 (Douay–Rheims). R. Side-note 557.21; A in the margin at 557.32: *Responsio conclusio*.
12. ***Concedenda est ista conclusio***: Wyclif grants the assumption of the first argument and then distinguishes. ***Participative … iuvative … per se***: by sharing, by helping, of oneself. ***Pro suo contento***: for his own share (side-note 558.1, "his separate share"). ***In omnino altero***: in one wholly other. T. *Contento* is Loserth's reading; A has an abbreviation he queries as *cotitato* (cf. *partem cotam*, 510.6), B another (558.2). B *totalem satisfaccionem* (558.3). R. Side-note 558.1. A in the margin at 557.33: *Quomodo contingit unum satisfacere pro alio. Conclusio concedenda*; B at 558.4: *Satisfaccio pro alio tripliciter fit*.
13. ***In attomo***: in an individual, the logicians' *atomus*; B in the margin at 558.6: *Christus assumpsit naturam nostram in athomo. Complecione primiciarum tocius debiti*: the fulfilment of the first-fruits of the whole debt: Christ's nature, as first-fruits, pays the first share of the race's debt. T. B *consivium* (sic) for *confratrum* (558.10).
14. ***Fecit se naturam humanam***: made himself the human nature, by assuming it. ***Ad consolvendum ministracionem debitam***: to pay, together with the head, the service owed. ***Baptizatur flamine***: is baptized by the Spirit (row *baptismus flaminis*). R. B in the margin at 558.18 draws a consequence: if an infant dying without the baptism of the Spirit is condemned to eternal punishment for the first parents' guilt, without demerit of its own, then by the same token a blessed one could make satisfaction for a sinner who makes no satisfaction for his offence.
15. ***Ad primum***: to the first of the three arguments for the opinion (556.9). This paragraph and the next divide one sentence as the edition's paragraphs fall; it continues in the next part. R. Side-note 558.22.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 555: *pertinet* (5 is the line number)
  - 556: *a*
  - 556: *et* (b is a margin letter)
  - 557: *II*^{a}
  - 557: *ipse* (30 is the line number)
  - 557: *notandum*
  - 555: *habundancia* (italic; out is English side-note) [-MARK]
  - 557: *portate;* (italic) [-MARK]

Part 4: Answers to the three arguments: no one is saved or damned without his own concurrence, and the debt to God is unlike any debt to man

Loserth pp. 558.24–561.18

¶1 558.24–559.13
559.14 *As to the second argument one man's sin cannot cause another's damnation without fault of his own.*

[558] **ad salutem qui non vult iuvare Christum ad suam satisfaccionem, quia Psalmo LXI°, 13 dicitur: Tu reddes unicuique iuxta opera sua. Sic ergo tam militans quam triumphans satisfacit pro viatore indebitato quoad Deum, sed oportet ipsum indebitatum omnimode se ipsum iuvare, quia aliter ipse non solveret quod debebat, et per consequens non fuit** [559] **apud Deum illo debito exoneratus, sed unus alius a quo Deus debitum illud exigit, non ab illo. Ideo videat homo unto salvation who is not willing to help Christ toward his satisfaction; for in Psalm 61:13 it is said: "Thou wilt render to every man according to his works."**[1] **Thus, then, the church militant as well as the church triumphant makes satisfaction for a wayfarer who is in debt as regards God; but the one in debt must help himself in every way, because otherwise he would not pay what he owed, and consequently he was**

si potest esse beatus pure per procuratorem, et tunc concipiet si potest satisfacere pure per procuratorem; oportet enim percipientem premium persolvere meritum. Unde non foret onus meum, ad quod supportandum alius me iuvat nisi ego debeam satisfacere pro illo. Ideo dicit Apostolus: Unusquisque onus suum portabit Gal. VI°, 5. Sic ergo ex vi communionis sanctorum habemus reciproce adiutores, in tantum quod Dei adiutores sumus secundum Apostolum Iª, Corinth. III°, 9 seu oportet quod cum adiutorio isto simus cooperatores.

not [559] discharged of that debt before God; but some other was, from whom God exacts that debt, and not from him.[2] Therefore let a man see whether he can be blessed purely through a proctor, and then he will grasp whether he can make satisfaction purely through a proctor; for whoever receives the reward must pay the merit in full. Hence it would not be my burden, which another helps me to bear, unless I ought to make satisfaction for it. Therefore the Apostle says: "Every one shall bear his own burden," Galatians 6:5.[3] Thus, then, by virtue of the communion of saints we have one another as coadjutors, so much so that "we are God's coadjutors," according to the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 3:9; or, we must be co-workers with that help.[4]

¶2 559.14–560.5
560.6 *As to the third argument a debt to man is different in nature from our debts to God,*
560.17 *which increases the more we pay.*

[559] Ad secundum argumentum patet quod conclusio est concedenda, sed nunquam potest unus dampnare alium quoad Deum, nisi ipse superaddat proprium delictum, ut patet in materia de originali peccato, et ideo canit fidelis ecclesia quod nulla ei nocebit adversitas, si nulla dominetur iniquitas. Quomodo, queso, posset Deus dampnare non reum et per consequens non dampnabilem? Et patet bonitas Dei in hoc quod neminem salvat, nisi quem prevenit adiuvando, nec aliquem dampnat, nisi a quo preveniente occasionem accipit ex peccato. Et patet quod licet brachium se exponat pro capite, tamen oportet caput quodammodo se iuvare. Ideo quamvis quodlibet membrum iuvet aliud ad agendum, tamen nullum membrum supplet omnino alterius membri officium, sed iuvando satisfacit; et sic est de corpore Christi mistico, quia aliter posset Deus omnino eximere hominem a debito servitutis quoad Deum, quod notum est claudere repugnanciam formalem. Ideo sicut Deus in opere creacionis non potest habere naturam coadiuvantem [560] propter solitudinem sue supereminencie, sic creatura non potest opus quodcunque perficere nisi cum iuvamine alterius nature propter per se subieccionem servitutis et essencialem dependenciam a suo principio. Et per hec patet responsio.

To the second argument it is clear that the conclusion is to be granted; but one can never damn another as regards God unless the other adds his own offence besides, as is clear in the matter of original sin; and therefore the faithful church sings that "no adversity shall harm her, if no iniquity exercise lordship over her." How, I ask, could God damn one not guilty, and consequently not damnable?[5] And the goodness of God is clear in this: that he saves no one except one whom he goes before by helping, nor damns anyone except one from whom, going before him, he takes occasion by sin.[6] And it is clear that although the arm exposes itself for the head, yet the head must in some way help itself. Therefore, although each member helps another to act, yet no member wholly supplies the office of another member, but makes satisfaction by helping; and so it is with the mystical body of Christ, because otherwise God could wholly exempt a man from the debt of service as regards God, which is known to imply a formal repugnance.[7] Therefore, just as God in the work of creation cannot have a nature helping together with him, [560] because of the solitude of his supereminence, so a creature cannot perfect any work whatever except with the help of another nature, because of the subjection of service that belongs to it of itself and its essential dependence on its principle. And by these things the reply is clear.[8]

¶3 560.6–561.18
561.5 *The pardon of sin for money would imply that God sells righteousness,*
561.10 *1. e. himself.*
561.15 *God cannot remit sin without satisfaction.*

[560] Ad tercium dicitur negando minorem, nam oportet Deum in omni satisfaccione creature sue concurrere et est in racione debiti hominis ad hominem ac in racione debiti hominis ad Deum neganda differencia. Homo enim potest omnino solvi a corporali debito sui ad hominem, quia non est essencialiter debitor sui pro omni bono quod possidet, quia tunc alius foret Deus suus, sed nemo potest

To the third the answer is by denying the minor; for God must concur in every satisfaction of his creature, and in the notion of the debt of man to man and in the notion of the debt of man to God a difference is [not] to be denied.[9] For a man can be wholly released from his bodily debt to a man, because he is not essentially that man's debtor for every good that he possesses, for then the other would be his God; but no one can be

omnino eximi a debito Dei sui, quia tunc non teneretur Deo pro esse suo, sed foret Deus simpliciter par cum illo. Ideo ista est condicio obligacionis hominis ad Deum, quod de quanto copiosius et complecius solvit sibi debitum de tanto est obligacior quoad eum, quia de tanto plus boni ab eo recipit. Et hec racio quare homo potest recipere satisfaccionem debitoris sui in vita vel morte eius per procuratorem ipso non cooperante ad hoc. Deus autem non potest recipere a servo suo satisfaccionem pro debito nisi ipse in persona propria satisfaciat adiutus per Deum, et hoc testatur immensitatem libertatis Dei et excellenciam sui dominii, ut non oportet, si homo potest libere ac meritorie exuere se a dominio servi sui subiciendo se sue servituti, quod deitas sic potest quoad servum simpliciter; homo potest relinquere domini superioris vindictam offense non vindicando in persona propria, ergo Deus sic potest; homo potest dimittere culpam non expetendo sibi emendam satisfactoriam, ergo Deus sic potest, et sic de infinitis exemplis attestantibus infirmitatem humani dominii et invincibilitatem dominii divini. Et patet [561] quod ista sentencia est pia fidelibus sese consolantibus in domino et non blaspheme exigentibus honorem debitum soli Deo, unde qui putat peccatum commutari vel vendi pro nudo numismate implicat quod Deus vendit a se dominium parificans sibi creaturam a qua non exigit servitutem, et per consequens Deus venderet se ipsum, quia insuperabilem iusticiam, pro vili precio proprio, ut puta, pro minuta, cum pro qualibet parte precii venderet indivisibilem iusticiam que est Deus. Sed quid rogo blasfemius? Ideo si quis peccat in Deum, oportet quod ipse in persona propria expectat satisfaccionem vel satispassionem ab eadem persona, qui in eum peccaverit. Et patet quod primum assumptum est falsum, videlicet quod Deus potest peccata sine satisfaccione dimittere vel communicare vicario suo potenciam vel peccata taliter remittendi vel contra peccata taliter dispensandi. Hoc enim est de regalia propria deitati.

wholly exempted from the debt to his God, because then he would not be bound to God for his being, but God would be, without qualification, on a par with him. Therefore this is the condition of man's obligation to God: that by as much as he pays him the debt more copiously and more completely, by so much is he the more obliged as regards him, because by so much the more good does he receive from him.[10] And this is the reason why a man can receive the satisfaction of his debtor, in his life or at his death, through a proctor, the debtor himself not cooperating in it. But God cannot receive from his servant satisfaction for a debt unless the servant makes satisfaction in his own person, helped by God; and this attests the immensity of God's freedom and the excellence of his lordship; so that it need not be, if a man can freely and meritoriously strip himself of lordship over his servant by subjecting himself to that servant's service, that the Godhead can do so as regards one who is a servant without qualification. A man can leave to a superior lord the avenging of an offence, by not avenging it in his own person: therefore God can do so? A man can forgive a fault by not demanding of the offender amends by way of satisfaction: therefore God can do so? And so with infinite examples that attest the infirmity of human lordship and the invincibility of divine lordship.[11] And it is clear [561] that this teaching is pious to the faithful who console themselves in the Lord, and not to those who blasphemously demand the honour due to God alone; hence whoever thinks that sin is exchanged or sold for bare coin implies that God sells away from himself his lordship, making a creature equal to himself, from which he exacts no service; and consequently God would sell himself, because [he would sell] unsurpassable justice for a vile price of his own, as, say, for a mite, since for any part of the price he would sell the indivisible justice which is God.[12] But what, I ask, is more blasphemous? Therefore, if anyone sins against God, God himself in his own person must look for satisfaction or satispassion from the same person who has sinned against him. And it is clear that the first assumption is false, namely that God can remit sins without satisfaction, or communicate to his vicar the power either of remitting sins in this way or of dispensing against sins in this way. For this belongs to the regality proper to the Godhead.[13]

Notes

1. The sentence runs on from the previous part: "but let us not believe that Christ made satisfaction for the debt of that one unto salvation who is not willing to help Christ ...". *Ad suam satisfaccionem*: toward Christ's satisfaction, that is, by concurring in it; *suam* could refer to the debtor's own satisfaction. S. Psalm 61:13 (Douay–Rheims), without the Vulgate's *quia* ("for").

2. ***Tam militans quam triumphans***: ***ecclesia*** is understood. ***Viatore indebitato***: a wayfarer in debt (cf. row ***indebitare se***). ***Omnimode***: in every way. ***Sed unus alius***: the one discharged would be someone other than the debtor, and God would still exact the debt from the debtor himself.
3. ***Pure per procuratorem***: purely by a proxy (row ***procurator***). ***Oportet … percipientem premium persolvere meritum***: whoever receives the reward must himself pay the merit in full. ***Unde non foret onus meum …***: a burden is mine only if I must make satisfaction for it, even when another helps me bear it. S. Galatians 6:5 (Douay–Rheims), without the Vulgate's ***enim*** ("for"); it answers Galatians 6:2, quoted for the opinion at 557.6.
4. ***Habemus reciproce adiutores***: we have one another as helpers. ***Adiutores*** is rendered "coadjutors" both times, after the Douay–Rheims of 1 Corinthians 3:9, so the play on the word stays visible. ***Seu oportet …***: "or [rather]", restating the point: those helped must co-operate with the help. S. 1 Corinthians 3:9 (Douay–Rheims), given in part; the quotation is closed at "coadjutors".
5. ***Ad secundum argumentum***: the second ground of the assumption (557.10): one can bring condemnation on another. ***Superaddat proprium delictum***: the subject is taken as the one damned, who adds his own offence. ***In materia de originali peccato***: in the treatment of original sin, not located in this work; probably ***De civili dominio*** III c. 25 (Society ed. IV, 563 ff.), where original sin is a defect of the person's own justice (568). S. ***Canit fidelis ecclesia***: the collect ***Tuere, Domine, populum tuum … quia nulla ei nocebit adversitas, si nulla dominetur iniquitas*** (Gregorian and Leonine sacramentaries, PL 78, PL 55; cited by Bernard as ***collecta Ecclesiae***). The print gives it in indirect speech (***quod … nocebit***); the quotation is closed at ***iniquitas***. R. Side-note 559.14. B in the margin at 559.14: "This, it seems, tells against those who hold that an infant departing without the baptism of the Spirit is inevitably damned." A in the margin at 559.20: ***Soluciones utiles argumentorum supra positorum*** (Loserth: above, without a mark of reference).
6. ***Quem prevenit adiuvando***: whom God goes before by helping (cf. row ***gracia preveniens***). ***A quo preveniente occasionem accipit ex peccato***: from one who goes before God by his sin, God takes the occasion to damn. The sinner's act comes first, as God's help comes first in salvation.
7. ***Brachium … pro capite***: Wyclif turns the opinion's own figure (557.15). ***Iuvando satisfacit***: makes satisfaction [for another] by helping, not by replacing him. ***Claudere repugnanciam formalem***: to imply a formal repugnance, a contradiction in the terms (cf. row ***claudit contradictionem***).
8. ***Naturam coadiuvantem***: another nature helping him, which God cannot have in creating, since he alone is supereminent. ***Propter per se subieccionem servitutis***: because of the subjection of service that belongs to a creature of itself (***per se***). ***A suo principio***: on its source, God. T. At 560.3 Loserth reports B ***alterius nec***, presumably against ***alterius nature***; it does not give the sense.
9. ***Ad tercium***: the third ground of the assumption (557.21): God is freer to receive satisfaction than his servant, and a man often receives one man's debt from another's satisfaction. ***Negando minorem***: what follows grants that a man can receive satisfaction through a proctor and denies that the case carries over to God. T. The print reads ***est … neganda differencia***, "a difference is to be denied", which contradicts the argument that follows and the side-note at 560.6. We supply [not] (our supply): the print shows no loss at the line end and has no apparatus here; ***notanda***, "is to be noted", would give the same sense. R. Side-note 560.6; B in the margin at 560.8: ***Raciones debitorum hominis ad hominem et hominis ad Deum differunt***.
10. ***Corporali debito***: a bodily, that is a material, debt. ***Alius foret Deus suus***: the creditor would be his God. ***Simpliciter par***: equal without qualification (row). ***De quanto … de tanto***: by as much … by so much. R. Side-note 560.17.
11. ***Ipso non cooperante***: the debtor not cooperating. ***Ut non oportet …***: the inference from human lordship to God's does not hold. ***Subiciendo se sue servituti***: taken as subjecting himself to the servant's service. ***Quoad servum simpliciter***: one who is a servant without qualification, as every creature is to God. The two arguments ***homo potest …, ergo Deus sic potest*** are examples of the invalid inference; we punctuate them as questions, though they may be bare statements which Wyclif rejects. ***Relinquere domini superioris vindictam offense***: taken as leaving to a superior lord the avenging of the offence. ***Emendam satisfactoriam***: amends by way of satisfaction.
12. ***Sentencia***: CONTEXTUAL (teaching / sentence); here the position taught. ***Pia fidelibus sese consolantibus***: a pious teaching for, that is a comfort to, the faithful. ***Commutari … pro nudo numismate***: exchanged (row) for bare coin, money without satisfaction. ***Parificans sibi creaturam***: making the creature his equal. ***Quia insuperabilem iusticiam***: ***venderet*** is understood. ***Pro vili precio proprio***: ***proprio*** is awkward; taken with ***precio***, a price of his own setting. ***Minuta***: a mite, the smallest coin (Mark 12:42, ***minuta duo***). T. B ***de se consolantibus*** (561.1). R. Side-notes 561.5, 561.10. A in the margin at 561.5: ***Nota de usurpata auctoritate pape***.
13. ***Ipse in persona propria expectat***: the subject is taken as God, the one sinned against; ***expectat*** is indicative after ***oportet quod***. ***Primum assumptum***: the first argument's assumption (556.9–13), that God can remit sins without satisfaction and commit to his vicar the power of dispensing in this way. ***Communicare*** stands where the argument had ***committere*** (556.12). ***De regalia propria deitati***: belongs to the regality (row) proper to the Godhead. R. Side-note 561.15. B in the margin at 561.18 asks what Wyclif means: he has answered only about dispensing through another's satisfaction, so is it to be held that neither God nor any pope can dispense against any sin unless the offender makes satisfaction in his own person? "What, then, is that which belongs to the regality proper to the Godhead?"

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 558: ***illius*** (print: debito / illius ad salutem)
  - 558: ∅ (duplicate INS? at same pos 158 (ilhus = illius), given on the illius row)
  - 559: ***procuratorem*** (main token holds whole word (procu- / ratorem); 204c folio mark on next line)
  - 559: ***Iª***
  - 560: ***dependenciam*** [NW]
  - 560: ***tanto*** (English side-note "we" in slot of Latin tanto)
  - 560: ***est*** (print: tanto est obligacior)
  - 561: ***quod*** (204c is the glued folio mark)
  - 561: ***parificans*** [NW]
  - 561: ***sibi*** (English side-note "The" glued) [NW]

- **561:** ***blasfemius?*** **[NW]**

Part 5: The pope's claim answered: Christ's Godhead, scripture and Peter rule the church; the first objection, that past merits lie beyond the pope's power

Loserth pp. 561.19–564.31

¶1 561.19–563.6
561.19 *Certainly then the Pope cannot,*
561.27 *and he cannot be a Christian if he claims such a power.*
562.5 *To have Peter's power the popes must follow Peter in humility and service.*
562.23 *The head of the Church is Christ's divinity;*
563.3 *and Christ has left his testament to guide us.*
563.12 *In things doubtful the only authority is Scripture.*
563.26 *The Pope and Curia err, and their bulls are often falsified.*

[561]**Et per hec patet responsio ad primum argumentum quo suadetur dominum papam de facto sic facere; non enim pretendit vicarius Christi aut Petri vel sic se posse facere, nisi forte blasphemet et postea resipiscat. Unde signum infallibile foret homini quod sit extra regulam quam Christus suis instituit, nec sit de numero illorum pro quibus Christus tunc oravit, si potestatem talem sibi usurpaverit, nec sollicitor circa facta talia particularia dominum papam vel confratres suos temere accusando, sed scio quod si finaliter consummat in ista sentencia, nec fuit Christi vicarius nec eciam christianus, quia non intravit** [562]**humiliter per ostium Christum ad tale officium, sed ascendit aliunde violente per tractum regis superbie, et per consequens est, si factum suum sic se habuerit, fur et latro. Ad secundum argumentum captum ex dicto Christi Matthei XVI° patet ex sepe dictis quod quicunque sic extollitur, vel ad eum de potestate data Petro et eius vicariis, ideo necesse est papas addiscere scolam Petri specialiter in humilitate et ministerio spirituali, quia aliter non est ille qui sic pretenditur, ut patet quadragesima distinccione. Oportet ergo dominum papam circumspicere ut teneat se in limitibus sancti Petri, et specialiter quod notet verba scripture sacre, non usurpando quod ligat et solvit in purgatorio subter terram nec ascendit in celum imperciendo premia beatorum, cum sint insolubiliter limitata, sed oportet quod teneat se virtuose in medio super terram. Et patet quod minor argumenti est falsa, nam unus apostata potest pretendere se sic solvere vel ligare, sed non exhinc sequitur quod sic facit. Ideo (ut sepe dixi) oportet dominum papam cavere de modis sophisticis. Ad tercium argumentum dicitur quod minor est falsa, cum deitas Christi, scriptura sacra et beatus Petrus relicti sunt in ecclesia militante ad ipsam regulandum et eius dubia decidendum, que tria secundum singulum non sunt vicarii sancti Petri. Christus enim in ascensione sua dereliquit humanitus deitatem suam in terris, sed non divisit, cum copulatus** [563]**est sibi ypostatice, ubicunque fuerit humanitus, et ipsa deitas est caput ecclesie. Christus autem humanitus reliquit testamentum suum in terris per quod voluit suam ecclesiam regulari, nec voluit quod crederetur alicui Petri vicario, nisi de quanto vivit et docet conformiter illi legi.**

And by these things the reply to the first argument is clear, by which it is urged that the lord pope in fact does so; for the vicar of Christ, or of Peter, does not claim even that he can do so, unless perhaps he blasphemes and afterwards comes to his senses.[1] Hence it would be an infallible sign to a man that he is outside the rule which Christ instituted for his own, and not of the number of those for whom Christ then prayed, if he has usurped such power for himself. Nor am I anxious about such particular deeds, rashly accusing the lord pope or his brethren; but I know that if he finally ends in this teaching, he was neither Christ's vicar nor even a Christian, because he did not enter [562]**humbly by the door, Christ, into such an office, but climbed up another way, violently, drawn by the king of pride; and consequently, if his deed has been so, he is "a thief and a robber."[2] To the second argument, taken from the saying of Christ in Matthew 16, it is clear from what has often been said that whoever is so exalted, or to him concerning the power given to Peter and his vicars [...]; therefore it is necessary for popes to learn in the school of Peter, especially in humility and spiritual ministry, because otherwise he is not the one he is claimed to be, as is clear in the fortieth distinction.[3] The lord pope must therefore look about him, to keep himself within the limits of St Peter, and especially to note the words of holy scripture: not usurping [the claim] that he binds and looses in purgatory beneath the earth, nor ascending into heaven by imparting the rewards of the blessed, since these are assigned beyond loosing; but he must keep himself virtuously in the middle, upon the earth.[4] And it is clear that the minor of the argument is false; for an apostate can claim that he looses or binds in this way, but it does not follow from this that he does so. Therefore (as I have often said) the lord pope must beware of sophistical ways.[5] To the third argument the answer is that the minor is false, since the Godhead of Christ, holy scripture and blessed Peter have been left in the church militant to rule it and to decide its doubts, which three, taken singly, are not vicars of St Peter.[6] For Christ in his ascension, as man, left his Godhead on earth, but did not divide [it from himself], since it is** [563]**joined to him**

hypostatically wherever he is as man; and that Godhead is head of the church. And Christ as man left his testament on earth, by which he willed his church to be ruled; nor did he will that any vicar of Peter be believed, except so far as he lives and teaches in conformity with that law.[7]

¶2 563.7–564.6
564.11 *The merits of Christ and his Saints are things past,*
564.22 *and so beyond our power.*

[563] Unde quicunque sacerdos ecclesie post mortem Petri vivens et docens testamento illi conformiter potest racionabiliter dici Petri vicarius, sed specialiter ille qui vivit Petro conformius et ad istam doctrinam testamenti Christi similius; et ille supponitur esse Romanus episcopus, sed in synodis pro dubiis decidendis non est credendum cuicunque vianti, nisi de quanto dictum suum fundaverit in scriptura. Unde non est credendum quod fides catholica vel in veritate que creditur vel in habitu ecclesie catholice dependet ab ista persona, cum sit errabilis et de possibili non membrum ecclesie. Ego autem non sollicitor quid papa facit vel loquitur, cum scio quod nec sibi nec alicui istorum doctorum credendum est nisi de quanto se in scriptura fundaverit, cum in ipsa sit omnis veritas proporcionaliter, ut est necessarium ipsam nosci (ut patet secundo De Doctrina Christiana in fine). Unde sepe miratus sum quomodo aliquis istorum trium doctorum fundaret supradictam sentenciam in scriptura. Scimus autem quod papa cum cetu cardinalium eciam in materia fidei sepe errat, sed supponendum est quod scriptores bullarum papalium vel examinatores aut falsi suggestores sepe falsificant bullas suas, sicut noverunt auctores scripture de multis indulgenciis, de multis collacionibus [564] prefecturarum et de multis privilegiis et terroribus censurarum; ideo tales apud Deum incurrunt penam falsarii et sunt apud potentes, scientes et ordinate volentes notabiliter renotandi. Caput ergo ecclesie Christus cum scriptura sua et sanctis doctoribus debet esse regula ecclesie in dubiis decidendis.

Hence any priest of the church, living after Peter's death, who lives and teaches in conformity with that testament, can reasonably be called Peter's vicar; but especially he who lives more conformably to Peter and more like to this doctrine of Christ's testament; and he is supposed to be the Roman bishop. But in synods, for deciding doubts, no one on the road whatever is to be believed, except so far as he has grounded his saying in scripture.[8] Hence it is not to be believed that the catholic faith, either in the truth which is believed or in the habit of the catholic church, depends on this person, since he is liable to err and possibly not a member of the church. But I am not anxious about what the pope does or says, since I know that neither he nor any of these doctors is to be believed except so far as he has grounded himself in scripture, since in it is all truth, in proportion as it is necessary for it to be known (as is clear from the second book of *On Christian Doctrine*, at the end).[9] Hence I have often wondered how any of these three doctors would ground the above-said teaching in scripture. And we know that the pope with the company of cardinals often errs, even in matter of faith; but it is to be supposed that the writers of papal bulls, or the examiners, or false suggesters often falsify his bulls, as the authors of the writing have known, concerning many indulgences, many conferrals [564] of prefectures, and many privileges and terrors of censures; therefore such men incur before God the penalty of a falsifier, and among the powerful, the knowing and those of rightly ordered will they are to be notably marked out.[10] Christ, therefore, the head of the church, with his scripture and the holy doctors, ought to be the rule of the church in deciding doubts.[11]

¶3 564.7–564.22

[564] Secundo principaliter restat obicere contra fictas indulgencias, et primo contra sentenciam que imponitur sancto Thome, quia in ista materia concordant doctores alii, tam decretiste quam theologi. Primo (inquam) videtur quod supererogata merita Christi et membrorum suorum olim transierunt, et per consequens vel non sunt vel, si sunt pro suo tempore, sunt extra potestatem ordinariam iam superstitis Romani pontificis. Quid (queso) valet fingere quod iste Gregorius XI. ordinavit et instituit ut ymmolacio Ysaac et cetera merita patrum

Secondly, as the second principal part, it remains to object against feigned indulgences; and first against the teaching which is imputed to St Thomas, because in this matter the other doctors agree, decretists as well as theologians.[12] First (I say), it seems that the supererogated merits of Christ and of his members passed away long ago, and consequently either they are not, or, if they are for their own time, they are outside the ordinary power of the Roman pontiff who now survives. What, I ask, does it avail to feign that this Gregory XI ordained and instituted that

tantum precedencium in utroque testamento valeret ad ordinacionem suam cognato suo iam mortuo? Non enim valet fingere mendacia infundabilia propter extollenciam potestatis. Quomodo (rogo) est copia meritorum que non sunt, aut quomodo tam determinate lapsa in preteritum

the offering of Isaac, and the other merits of the fathers who only went before, in either testament, should avail, by his ordinance, for his kinsman now dead? For it avails nothing to feign groundless lies for the exalting of power. How, I ask, is there plenty of merits which are not, or how are things so determinately lapsed into the past[13]

¶4 564.23–564.31

[564]cum omnibus suis appendiciis sunt in potestate nostra, cum omnis actus quem nos ipsi fecimus preteriit potestatem nostram? Quomodo ergo distribuit ipse ista opera que non sunt in potestate sua? Nec valet fingere quod distribuit fructus istorum operum, quia illi non sunt nisi premia que sunt beatitudines quas non est in potestate sua a beatis auferre vel peccatoribus donare, quia tunc bonificaret eos, quod foret deliramentum asserere.

with all their appurtenances in our power, since every act which we ourselves have done has passed beyond our power? How, then, does he distribute these works, which are not in his power? Nor does it avail to feign that he distributes the fruits of these works, because these are nothing but rewards, which are blessednesses, which it is not in his power to take away from the blessed or to give to sinners; for then he would make them good, which it would be madness to assert.[14]

Notes

1. ***Ad primum argumentum***: the first of the three arguments that the pope does so in fact (556.13): the head of the church claims to do it. ***Suadetur***: it is urged. ***Sic ... facere***: to remit sins without satisfaction, or to dispense against them through a vicar (561.15–17). ***Pretendit ... vel sic se posse facere***: does not claim even (***vel***) that he can do so. ***Resipiscat***: comes to his senses. S. Loserth at 561.19 compares p. 556.9. R. Side-note 561.19.
2. ***Extra regulam quam Christus suis instituit***: outside the rule of life Christ set for his own. ***Pro quibus Christus tunc oravit***: taken as the prayer of Luke 22:32 that the argument alleged (556.13). ***Finaliter consummat***: persists to the end. ***Sentencia***: CONTEXTUAL (teaching / sentence); here the position taught. ***Per tractum regis superbie***: drawn by the king of pride, the devil (cf. Job 41:25, "king over all the children of pride"). S. John 10:1 and 10:7 (Douay–Rheims), "the door", "climbeth up another way", "a thief and a robber"; Loserth compares John 10:7 (562.1). R. Side-note 561.27. B in the margin at 562.1: "From these words it is known who, according to him, is to be called Christ's vicar."
3. ***Ad secundum argumentum***: the second argument (556.22), from Matthew 16:19; Loserth compares 556.22. ***Quicunque sic extollitur***: whoever is so exalted. ***Addiscere scolam Petri***: to learn in Peter's school. ***Non est ille qui sic pretenditur***: he is not the one (Peter's vicar) he is claimed to be. T. Loserth at 562.8: "some words seem to have fallen out here" (***Hoc loco aliquot verba excidisse videntur***); the clause ***vel ad eum ... vicariis*** has no verb, and we give its words as they stand and mark the gap [...]. B ***addicere*** for ***addiscere*** (562.8). S. ***Quadragesima distinccione***: Decretum D.40 c.6 ***Si papa*** and c.7 ***Ante omnia*** (Loserth 562.11; the form is ours). R. Side-note 562.5.
4. ***In limitibus sancti Petri***: within St Peter's limits (row ***limites***). The binding and loosing of Matthew 16:19 is ***super terram***, "upon earth": the pope must not claim it below the earth, in purgatory, or above it, in heaven. ***Cum sint insolubiliter limitata***: since the rewards are assigned (row ***limitare***) so that they cannot be loosed. ***In medio super terram***: in the middle, upon the earth.
5. ***Minor argumenti***: the minor of the second argument, that the pope so looses and binds on earth (556.26). ***Pretendere***: to claim. ***De modis sophisticis***: sophistical ways of arguing (cf. row ***sophisticari***). T. AA_1 lack ***Ideo ... sophisticis*** (562.21).
6. ***Ad tercium argumentum***: the third argument (556.30): God left one head in the church for deciding doubts, who can be none but Peter's vicar. Loserth compares 556.30. ***Minor***: the clause ***quod non potest poni nisi Petri vicarius***. ***Secundum singulum***: each singly; A and B ***singlm*** (562.27). R. Side-note 562.23. A in the margin at 562.23: ***Nota quis debet dubia ecclesie decidere?***
7. ***Humanitus***: as man, in his humanity. ***Dereliquit ... deitatem suam in terris, sed non divisit***: Christ left his Godhead on earth when he ascended, without being divided from it, since the union is hypostatic. ***Ipsa deitas est caput ecclesie***: it is the Godhead, not the pope, that is head (row ***caput***). ***Testamentum suum***: the New Testament, the law by which the church is to be ruled. R. Side-notes 562.23, 563.3. B in the margin at 562.28 copies the sentence ***Christus in sua ascensione ... non divisit***.
8. ***Ad istam doctrinam ... similius***: more like to this doctrine (row). ***Supponitur esse Romanus episcopus***: is presumed to be the Roman bishop; ***Romanus episcopus*** is kept apart from ***Romanus pontifex*** (row). ***Cuicunque vianti***: anyone still on the road (row ***viantes***), the pope included. R. Side-note 563.12. B in the margin at 563.13: ***Quale est premium accibile bonorum?*** (so the print, at line 13).
9. ***Vel in veritate que creditur vel in habitu***: the faith as the truth believed, and as the habit by which the church believes (cf. row ***habitus fidei***). ***Errabilis***: liable to err. ***De possibili non membrum ecclesie***: possibly not a member of the church, that is, possibly foreknown. ***Istorum doctorum***: the doctors of the opinion under examination. ***Proporcionaliter, ut est necessarium ipsam nosci***: in proportion as each truth must be known. S. Augustine, ***De doctrina christiana*** 2.42.63, where whatever is useful elsewhere is said to be found in scripture (Wyclif's wording is a loose paraphrase) (Loserth 563.24: ***Aug. Opp.*** III.1, 44; the modern form is ours). A in the margin at 563.24: ***Augustinus***.

10. ***Istorum trium doctorum***: B in the margin at 563.25 names them as St Thomas, the doctor Bonaventure, and William in *De reliquiis et veneracione sanctorum*. ***Cetu cardinalium***: the company (college) of cardinals. ***Falsi suggestores***: those who put false suggestions to the pope. ***Auctores scripture***: taken as the authors of the documents, the drafters themselves; it may be corrupt. ***Prefecturarum***: of prefectures, offices of authority. ***Ordinate volentes***: those whose will is rightly ordered. ***Notabiliter renotandi***: to be notably marked out, denounced. T. AA_1 lack *sepe* (563.24); B *cum cet.* (563.27); A *pravilegiis* (564.1). R. Side-note 563.26.
11. ***Caput ergo ecclesie Christus***: the conclusion of the answer to the third argument: Christ, not the pope, decides doubts, through scripture and the doctors. T. AA_1 read *sciencia doctoribus* (564.5), apparently for *sanctis doctoribus*.
12. ***Secundo principaliter***: the second part of the plan (556.5–8): the objections against the opinion. ***Fictas indulgencias***: feigned indulgences. ***Sentenciam que imponitur sancto Thome***: the teaching ascribed to St Thomas Aquinas, his commentary on the *Sentences*, IV d. 20 q. 1 a. 3 qc. 1 (= *Suppl.* q. 25 a. 1), quoted in 23-b. ***Decretiste ... theologi***: canonists and theologians, as in the previous part (555.16–556.4). R. A in the margin at 564.7: ***Secundum principale***; at 564.11: ***Hic arguitur contra fictas et falsas indulgencias***.
13. ***Supererogata merita***: supererogated merits (row *supererogare*). ***Olim transierunt***: passed away long ago; Loserth reports *transierant* from a manuscript (564.12; the siglum is illegible in the OCR). ***Pro suo tempore***: for their own time. ***Iam superstitis***: now surviving, the living pope. ***Iste Gregorius XI.***: Gregory XI (pope 1370–78); the grant for his dead kinsman is not identified. ***Ymmolacio Ysaac***: the offering of Isaac (Genesis 22). ***Patrum tantum precedencium***: taken as fathers who "only went before", whose acts are past; *tantum* may mean "so far". ***Ad ordinacionem suam***: at his ordinance (row *ordinacio*). ***Copia***: plenty (row). The question runs on into the next paragraph. T. B lacks *ad ordinacionem ... propter* (564.18). R. Side-note 564.11.
14. The question begun in the previous paragraph ends here: "how are things so determinately lapsed into the past, with all their appurtenances, in our power ...?" ***Appendiciis***: appurtenances, all that goes with the acts. ***Ipse***: the pope. ***Premia que sunt beatitudines***: the rewards are the blessednesses themselves. ***Bonificaret eos***: would make the sinners good. ***Deliramentum***: madness. R. Side-note 564.22.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 562: ***humiliter***
  - 562: ***Christum***
  - 562: ***fur et latro.*** (print line is "fur et latro." only; tr*k is noise) [GAP]
  - 562: ***et eius*** (print: Petro / et eius vicariis,)
  - 563: ***et ipsa deitas est caput ecclesie. Christus autem humanitus reliquit testamentum suum in terris per*** (two print lines; rehquit = reliquit, m = in on the ink) [GAP]
  - 563: ***non*** (205a is the glued folio mark)
  - 564: ***multis***
  - 564: ***cum omnibus*** (print: cum omnibus suis; cum has no main-scan token, appended here)
  - 564: ***bonificaret*** [NW]

Part 6: Against the treasury: the pope's power would reach heaven, purgatory and hell, and the saints' merits are already assigned by God

Loserth pp. 564.32–568.24

¶1 564.32–566.25
565.1 *God has rewarded the Saints according to their merits.*
565.9 *To distribute the merits would be to diminish the rewards.*
565.21 *Merits would not suffice to the Saint himself but for God's grace.*
565.26 *The power claimed makes the Pope judge of all souls, even in purgatory and heaven;*
566.10 *much more in hell.*
566.30 *All powers are of God, who has left no such power to the Pope.*

[564]**Item, omnibus beatis diffinitum est a Deo premium beatitudinis correspondenter ad omnia merita sua,** [565]**que adhuc manent in fructu, sed aliqua merita, requisita ad beatitudinem patriarcharum, non subiacent potestati huius Gregorii sic distribuere racione premii ex eis limitati; ergo nec alia. Assumptum patet, tum quia nihil est ociosum in meritis beatorum, tum quia beati habent gaudium et sic premium accidentale de quocunque bono quod fecerint. Minor autem sic ostenditur: In facta distribucione meriti stricte requisiti ad beatitudinem essencialem diminueretur de illa beatitudine correspondenter, quam iniuriam non potest papa facere, sicut nec Christus potest concives suos sic depauperare. Sed dicitur quod meritum beatorum, cum sit spirituale, non excommunicacione tali minuitur sed pocius perficitur. Sed (rogo) ad quid limitantur tunc merita supererogata ultra mensuram debitorum suorum vel superhabundanciam meritorum, cum merita stricte ad beatitudinem**

Again, for all the blessed a reward of blessedness has been defined by God, corresponding to all their merits, [565]**which still remain in their fruit; now some merits, required for the blessedness of the patriarchs, are not subject to the power of this Gregory to distribute in this way, by reason of the reward assigned from them; therefore neither are the others.**[1] **The assumption is clear, both because nothing is idle in the merits of the blessed, and because the blessed have joy, and so accidental reward, from whatever good they have done. Now the minor is shown thus: if a distribution were made of merit strictly required for essential blessedness, that blessedness would be diminished correspondingly; which injury the pope cannot do, just as Christ cannot so impoverish his fellow citizens.**[2] **But it is said that the merit of the blessed, since it is spiritual, is not diminished by such communication but rather perfected.**

requisita eque sufficerent ad distribucionem huius faciendam, aut quomodo est necessarium ponere nunc tantam copiam talium meritorum? Videtur multis fidelibus quod non est modo numerus talium meritorum, vel aliter omnia illa et longe plura si fierent non sufficerent ad aliquem gradum beatitudinis promerentis, nisi quod Deus ex infinitate gracie sue acceptat merita illa de congruo. Item, iuxta istam sentenciam sequitur quod potestas iudiciaria cuiuscunque pape se extendit ad omnes animas in purgatorio et omnes beatos in celo; consequens impossibile, et consequencia sic probatur: papa eciam prescitus habet potestatem ad imperciendum merita bonorum cuicunque et quandocunque voluerit, ut dicit posicio; sed longe minor potestas sufficit ad fundandum iudiciariam potestatem, ergo papa habet iudiciariam potestatem super beatos eciam super Christum. Potest enim facere quod beatus [566] mereatur cuicunque affecto suo quantumcunque voluerit, quia potest dare sibi meritum alterius, quod est idem. Ille enim qui habet potestatem super tam secretum thesaurum anime habet potestatem super personam quoad inferius corporale; in cuius signum Deus dedit dyabolo potestatem primo super substanciam beati Job, secundo super corpus. Verumptamen, inquit, animam eius serva, Job II°, 6. Et multo evidencius sequeretur quod papa preest cuicunque spiritui in purgatorio vel dampnato, et hoc videtur doctorem intendere, cum dicit quod bona communia multitudinis distribuuntur singulis de illa multitudine secundum arbitrium eius qui illi multitudini preest, et multo evidencius sequitur quod papa preest dampnatis, cum preest personis dignioribus, ut puta, purgandis spiritibus et beatis; qui enim habet potestatem cassandi opus dyaboli et tollendi ab eo predam quam tantum appetit, habet potestatem in eum, sed papa habet potestatem ad dandum quantamlibet indulgenciam captivo dyaboli, ne sufficiat amplius valere in eum, ut dicitur. Dicitur et Luce IX° quod Christus dedit discipulis potestatem super omnia demonia, sed nimis ampla foret pape iurisdiccio, qui instar Christi habet potestatem super multitudinem celestium, terrestrium et infernorum.

But (I ask) to what end, then, are supererogated merits assigned beyond the measure of their debts, or a superabundance of merits, since the merits strictly required for blessedness would equally suffice for making this distribution? Or how is it necessary to posit now so great a plenty of such merits?[3] It seems to many of the faithful that there is now no number of such merits; or else all those, and far more if they were done, would not suffice for any degree of blessedness for the one meriting, except that God, of the infinity of his grace, accepts those merits by congruity.[4] Again, according to this teaching it follows that the judicial power of any pope whatever extends to all the souls in purgatory and all the blessed in heaven; the consequent is impossible, and the inference is proved thus: a pope, even a foreknown one, has power to impart the merits of the good to whomever and whenever he wishes, as the position says; now a far lesser power suffices to ground judicial power; therefore the pope has judicial power over the blessed, even over Christ.[5] For he can bring it about that a blessed one [566] merits for anyone he favours as much as he wishes, because he can give him another's merit, which is the same thing. For he who has power over so secret a treasure of the soul has power over the person as regards the lower, bodily part; in token of which God gave the devil power first over the substance of blessed Job, secondly over his body: "But yet," he says, "save his life," Job 2:6.[6] And much more evidently it would follow that the pope is set over every spirit in purgatory or damned; and this the doctor seems to maintain, when he says that the common goods of a multitude are distributed to the single members of that multitude according to the judgment of him who is set over that multitude; and much more evidently it follows that the pope is set over the damned, since he is set over worthier persons, as, say, the spirits to be purged and the blessed.[7] For he who has power to quash the work of the devil and to take from him the prey which he so desires has power over him; now the pope has power to give an indulgence as great as he pleases to the devil's captive, so that the devil may no longer prevail against him, as it is said. And it is said in Luke 9 that Christ gave the disciples power over all devils; but the pope's jurisdiction would be far too ample, who, like Christ, has power over the multitude of those in heaven, on earth and under the earth.[8]

¶2 566.26–566.33

[566] Ex istis colligitur, cum tot inconveniencia sequuntur ex dicta palliacione potestatis papalis, quod radix istorum inconveniencium foret fidelibus venenosum. Quod autem ista sint inconveniencia, patet primo ex hoc quod secundum apostolum Roman. XIII°, 1 non

From these things it is gathered, since so many absurdities follow from the said cloaking of papal power, that the root of these absurdities would be a poison to the faithful. And that these are absurdities is clear, first, from this: that according to the apostle, Romans 13:1, "there is no power

est potestas nisi a Deo. Ipse autem non reliquit in lege sua papis huiusmodi potestatem, ergo non est fingenda, nam per idem foret infinitum amplianda.

but from God." Now he did not leave such power to popes in his law; therefore it is not to be feigned; for by the same token it would have to be amplified without end.[9]

¶3 566.34–567.13
567.2 *An undue power is claimed for the actual Pope over his predecessors.*
567.10 *The Pope might appropriate all merits to himself;*
567.26 *and would have demons at his service.*

[566]Secundo per hoc quod pape singuli citra Christum sunt paris potestatis; cum ergo par in parem non [567]habet imperium, videtur quod papa superstes non habet potestatem super omnes papas in purgatorio et in celo. Illi enim sunt excellenciores quia Deo propiores et cariores. Ideo oportet quod papa superstes serviat eis et non imperatorie concedat quod Petrus vel alius beatus mereatur amico suo quantumcunque sibi placuerit limitare. Et tercio per hoc quod papa superstes non habet tantam potestatem super corpus vel opus proprium, ergo multo magis non super opus Dei tam sibi alienum; homo enim quadam naturalitate dominatur super actibus et operibus propriis, nec autor nature dedit pape potestatem adversantem ordini naturali.

Secondly, by this: that the popes, each one, short of Christ, are of equal power; since, then, "an equal has no rule over an equal," [567]it seems that the surviving pope has no power over all the popes in purgatory and in heaven. For they are more excellent, because nearer and dearer to God. Therefore the surviving pope must serve them, and not grant imperiously that Peter or another blessed one should merit for his friend as much as it has pleased him to assign.[10] And thirdly, by this: that the surviving pope has not so great a power over his own body or work; therefore much more not over the work of God, so foreign to him; for a man by a certain naturalness exercises lordship over his own acts and works, nor did the author of nature give the pope a power adverse to the natural order.[11]

¶4 567.14–568.4
568.5 *We do not know that these merits have not been assigned;*
568.20 *as indeed they probably have been by God.*

[567]Assumptum patet ex hoc quod tunc posset facere opus suum esse quantumcunque meritorium sibi placuerit, quia limitare beatis quod sibi assisterent quantumcunque voluerit promerendo. Stultus enim foret qui propter fastum vel questum plus benefaceret alteri minus digno, quam eciam benefaceret sibi ipsi, et si dicatur quod potestas non datur ut sic benefaciat sibi ipsi, patet quod Deus dat potestatem solum ad bonum suo predestinato. Ideo daret suo vicario potestatem, ut sibi retribuat tantum bonum. Sed Hostiensis (ut recitavi superius) horrebat istam ficticiam, quia certum videtur quod, si haberet tantam potestatem super demonia et super cunctos subditos suos quoad corpus et animam, haberet eciam potestatem super eorum substanciam, et tunc multi pape (ut creditur) fecissent miracula, mandando spiritibus afferre sibi thesauros absconditos et acquisivissent sibi dominia adeo affectata. Sed (ut innuitur Act. III, 6), quia Petrus non habuit possessionem auri vel argenti, ideo habuit potestatem sanandi [568]infirmum, sed Simon, quia affectabat temporalia, caruit apostolica potestate (ut patet Act. VIII°). Apostoli enim denudati ab affeccione temporalium habuerunt super eis spiritualem potestatem atque dominium.

The assumption is clear from this: that then he could make his own work as meritorious as it pleased him, because [he could] assign to the blessed that they should assist him by meriting as much as he wished. For he would be a fool who, for pride or gain, did more good to another, less worthy, than he would do even to himself; and if it is said that the power is not given that he may so do good to himself, it is clear that God gives power only for the good of his predestinate. Therefore he would give his vicar power that he might repay himself so much good.[12] But Hostiensis (as I recounted above) shuddered at this fiction, because it seems certain that, if he had so great a power over devils and over all his subjects as regards body and soul, he would also have power over their substance; and then many popes (as is believed) would have done miracles, commanding the spirits to bring them hidden treasures, and would have acquired for themselves the lordships they so desired.[13] But (as is hinted in Acts 3:6), because Peter had no possession of gold or silver, therefore he had power to heal [568]the sick man; but Simon, because he desired temporal goods, lacked apostolic power (as is clear in Acts 8). For the apostles, stripped of affection for temporal goods, had spiritual power and lordship over them.[14]

¶5 568.5–568.24

[568]Item, secundum doctorem beati non fecerunt determinate huiusmodi superhabundancia opera satisfactoria pro isto vel isto qui remissione indiget, ideo restat ut Deus derelinquat vicario suo in

Again, according to the doctor, the blessed did not do such superabundant satisfactory works determinately for this one or that one who needs remission; therefore it remains that God leaves to his vicar

terris distributivam potestatem illius thesauri egenis ecclesie; sed illud videtur multipliciter palliatum, ergo posicioni deficit fundamentum. Minor probatur primo, per hoc quod eque probabiliter contingit sompniare quod tales beati determinate fecerunt ista opera supererogacionis pro illo qui eis participet, sicut quod reliquit papam, quod ipsa distribuat; ideo videtur peti ignotum per ignocius. Secundo quia dicti sancti fecerunt opera sua ex maiori gracia quam fuit illa in qua communiter vivunt pape, ideo verisimile est quod fecerunt ipsa principaliter pro ecclesia, relinquendo distribucionem divino arbitrio; hoc enim est habilitatis, sapiencie et necessitatis. Sed tunc fecissent determinate pro illis ad quos Deus limitat, ergo verisimile est quod meruerunt determinate pro illis, et hoc est certum quoad determinacionem divinam cui oportet stare.

on earth the power of distributing that treasury to the needy of the church; now that seems cloaked in many ways; therefore the position lacks a foundation.[15] The minor is proved, first, by this: that one may with equal probability dream that such blessed ones did these works of supererogation determinately for the one who shares in them, as that he left the pope to distribute them; therefore the unknown seems to be sought through the more unknown.[16] Secondly, because the said saints did their works out of a greater grace than that in which popes commonly live, therefore it is likely that they did them principally for the church, leaving the distribution to the divine judgment; for this belongs to qualification, wisdom and necessity. Now they would then have done them determinately for those to whom God assigns [them]; therefore it is likely that they merited determinately for those, and this is certain as regards the divine determination, by which one must abide.[17]

Notes

1. ***Item***: the second objection against the teaching ascribed to St Thomas. ***Diffinitum est***: has been defined, fixed (cf. row ***diffinicio***). ***Manent in fructu***: remain in their fruit, the reward. ***Huius Gregorii***: Gregory XI, named at 564.15. ***Racione premii ex eis limitati***: because a reward has been assigned (row ***limitare***) from those merits. ***Ergo nec alia***: if not the merits required for the patriarchs' blessedness, then not the others either, since by the major every merit has its reward. T. AA, ***districtum est a Deo*** for ***diffinitum est a Deo*** (564.32). B lacks ***requisita ... potestati*** (565.2). R. Side-note 565.1.
2. ***Assumptum***: the major, that God has defined a reward for every merit (row ***assumptum***). ***Premium accidentale***: accidental reward, beside row ***beatitudo accidentalis***. ***In facta distribucione***: if a distribution were made. ***Concives suos***: his fellow citizens, the blessed. R. Side-note 565.9.
3. The print reads ***excommunicacione***, "by such excommunication", which does not construe with the argument (the sharing out of merit). We translate ***communicacione***, "communication, sharing" (our emendation). C. ***Sed dicitur***: the defenders' reply. ***Ad quid limitantur***: to what end are assigned (row ***limitare***). ***Vel superhabundanciam meritorum***: a second subject of ***limitantur***. ***Copia***: plenty (row).
4. ***Non est modo numerus talium meritorum***: taken as "there are now no such merits to be counted"; it may mean only that their number is not fixed. ***Promerentis***: of the one meriting. ***De congruo***: by congruity (row): the merits fall short of condign merit, and God accepts them of grace. R. Side-note 565.21.
5. ***Potestas iudiciaria***: judicial power. ***Consequens ... consequencia***: the consequent (row) is denied, then the inference (row) is proved. ***Papa eciam prescitus***: even a pope who is one of the foreknown (row ***prescitus***). ***Ut dicit posicio***: as the position under attack says. R. Side-note 565.26.
6. ***Cuicunque affecto suo***: for anyone he favours. ***Quod est idem***: to give a blessed one's merit to another is the same as making the blessed one merit for him. ***Thesaurum anime***: the treasure of the soul, its merit. ***Quoad inferius corporale***: as regards the lower, bodily part. S. Job 1:12 (power over all he has) and Job 2:6 (Douay–Rheims, "but yet save his life"); Wyclif's argument takes ***animam*** as the soul. T. The codices read ***Job primo***; Loserth corrected it to ***II°*** (566.8).
7. ***Preest***: is set over. ***Doctorem***: St Thomas, whose teaching is under attack (564.8). His words are given in indirect speech, from ***In IV Sent.*** d. 20 q. 1 a. 3 qc. 1 co. (= ***Suppl.*** q. 25 a. 1), quoted in 23-b. ***Intendere***: to maintain (row). ***Purgandis spiritibus***: the spirits still to be purged. R. Side-note 566.10.
8. ***Cassandi opus dyaboli***: to quash the devil's work. ***Ne sufficiat amplius valere in eum***: the subject is taken as the devil, who can no longer prevail against his captive. ***Ut dicitur***: as the defenders say. ***Super multitudinem celestium, terrestrium et infernorum***: the words of Philippians 2:10, "of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth" (Douay–Rheims). S. Luke 9:1, "power ... over all devils" (Douay–Rheims). T. B ***Et Luce IX° dicitur***.
9. ***Inconveniencia***: CONTEXTUAL (absurdities / troubles); here absurdities in argument. ***Palliacione***: cloaking, disguise. ***Radix ... venenosum***: a neuter predicate with a feminine subject, "a poisonous thing". ***Ipse***: God. ***Infinitum amplianda***: to be extended without end. S. Romans 13:1 (Douay–Rheims). R. Side-note 566.30.
10. ***Pape singuli citra Christum***: every pope, short of Christ (row ***citra Christum***). ***Par in parem non habet imperium***: the legal maxim, as in Nicholas III's ***Exiit qui seminat*** (Sext 5.12.3, ***quum non habeat imperium par in parem***). ***Papa superstes***: the surviving, living pope. ***Imperatorie***: imperiously, as an emperor. ***Limitare***: to assign (row). R. Side-note 567.2.
11. ***Quadam naturalitate dominatur***: by a kind of natural right exercises lordship (row ***dominari***, here neutral) over his own acts. ***Autor nature***: God.
12. ***Assumptum***: that the surviving pope has no such power over his own work (567.9). It is proved by its consequence: if he had power over the merits of the blessed, he could make his own work as meritorious as he pleased. ***Quia limitare***: ***posset*** is understood. ***Propter fastum vel questum***: for pride or gain. ***Ut sibi retribuat***: that he might repay himself. R. Side-note 567.10. B

in the margin at 567.10: "Again, it seems hard to say that such merits of the good in the homeland, which the lord pope claims to impart at his will, still remain unrewarded, at least since the Lord rewards beyond what is condign and punishes short of it."
13. ***Hostiensis (ut recitavi superius)***: Wyclif reported Hostiensis earlier, chapter 22, pp. 519–522. C. ***Ficticia***: fiction (row). ***Substanciam***: their goods, as Job's "substance" above. ***Dominia adeo affectata***: lordships so much desired (row ***affectare***). R. Side-note 567.26.
14. ***Ut innuitur***: as is hinted: Acts 3:6 does not say that Peter's poverty was the cause of his power. ***Sanandi infirmum***: to heal the lame man of Acts 3. ***Super eis***: taken as over the temporal goods; it may refer to the devils (567.20). S. Acts 3:6 (alluded to, "Silver and gold I have none"); Acts 8:18–20 (Simon).
15. ***Item***: a further objection. ***Secundum doctorem***: according to St Thomas, ***In IV Sent.*** d. 20 q. 1 a. 3 qc. 1 co. (= ***Suppl.*** q. 25 a. 1). ***Determinate***: for a definite person. ***Distributivam potestatem illius thesauri***: the power to distribute the treasury of the church. ***Egenis ecclesie***: to the church's needy. ***Palliatum***: cloaked. ***Minor***: taken as ***illud videtur multipliciter palliatum***. T. The codices read ***huius***; ***huiusmodi*** is Loserth's reading (568.6). R. Side-note 568.5.
16. ***Pro illo qui eis participet***: for whoever shares in them. ***Sicut quod reliquit papam, quod ipsa distribuat***: the subject of ***reliquit*** is God, and ***ipsa*** the works. ***Peti ignotum per ignocius***: the fault of seeking the unknown through the more unknown.
17. ***Ex maiori gracia***: out of greater grace. ***Habilitatis***: of qualification (row ***habilitas***): fitness for the task. ***Ad quos Deus limitat***: to whom God assigns them. ***Cui oportet stare***: by which one must abide. R. Side-note 568.20.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 565: ***que*** (margin letter H and 205a folio mark glued)
  - 565: ***in***
  - 565: ***fructu,***
  - 565: ***merita,*** (English "God" follows in side-note)
  - 565: ***meritorum,***
  - 566: ***II°*** (comma dropped per superscript rule)
  - 566: ***1*** (print: Roman. XIII°, 1 (verse); leaf zoom: short old-style 1, lower than the capitals)
  - 567: ***habet*** (205b is the glued folio mark)
  - 567: ***Illi***
  - 567: ***cariores.***
  - 565: ∅ (second half of subia-cent; neighbour 13 already subiacent) [DELX]

Part 7: Against the treasury: the saints' suffrages are already assigned, and the clause in the bulls makes them superfluous

Loserth pp. 568.25–570.27

¶1 568.25–570.27
568.25 *God has preordained who is to profit by them, so the Pope's decree is superfluous.*
569.4 *The Pope cannot judge worthiness in God's sight; therefore either*
569.13 *a) his indulgences take effect without worthiness in the recipient;*
569.16 *b) the recipient profits simply according to his worthiness;*
569.21 *c) this condition is implied in the indulgence.*
569.24 *a) is blasphemous b) and c) make indulgences useless.*

[568] Tercio, quia beati vident continue in verbo quibus merita sua proficient, sicut eternaliter Deus necessario limitavit quibus proficient. Sed Deus nichil facit superfluum sive inconsonum, ergo non reliquit potestatem suis vicariis ad ista suffragia distribuendum. Superfluum dico, quia eo ipso quo Deus ordinat vel limitat quod isti vel isti proficiet sancti suffragium, eo ipso sic proficiet et aliter non, quomodocunque papa decreverit. Ideo foret omnino superfluum relinquere pape huiusmodi distributivam potestatem; non enim sapit quod super decreto pape [569] in talibus dependet ordinacio Dei eterna, intuicio benefica vel premiacio Dei iusta; superflua itaque foret potestas propter cuius officium nec maius nec minus contingeret. Item, Deus propter nullam magnificenciam papalis potencie preiudicat sue iusticie, sed hoc contingeret data ista potencia, ergo illa non est fingenda. Minor sic probatur: Papa sicut tota ecclesia militans errat in multis que concernunt divinum iudicium et statum ecclesie triumphantis, sed inter alia archana huiusmodi hoc est unum,

Third, because the blessed see continually in the Word those whom their merits will profit, just as God from eternity, of necessity, assigned whom they will profit.[1] Now God does nothing superfluous or discordant; therefore he did not leave to his vicars power for distributing these suffrages. I say "superfluous", because by the very fact that God ordains or assigns that a saint's suffrage will profit this one or that one, by that very fact it will so profit and not otherwise, however the pope may have decreed. Therefore it would be wholly superfluous to leave to the pope a distributive power of this kind; for it does not make sense that God's eternal ordinance, his beneficent regard or God's just rewarding should depend on the decree of the pope [569] in such things; so a power through whose office neither more nor less would come about would be superfluous.[2] Again, God for no magnificence of papal power prejudices his own justice; now this would come about if that power were granted;

569.29 *So the conditional clause in bulls makes them merely superfluous.*
570.9 *It follows that a man is not the better for soliciting indulgences.*

quis quante sit dignus ecclesiastico suffragio quoad Deum, ergo stat papam communiter errare in talibus. Ideo ergo oportet concedere quod eo ipso quo papa concedit alicui tantam indulgenciam eo ipso sic habebit, vel aliter non obstante concessione pape precise tantum participabit quantum dignus fuerit aput Deum, vel aliter quod papa generaliter intelligit istam condicionem in concessione sua qualibet, ut oportet. Prima pars est omnino impossibilis, implicans papam illum non posse peccare vel errare, et sic papa per se habilitaret et iustificaret subditum quoad Deum; quod foret blasphemum dicere. Ideo restant secunda via et tercia concedende; sed constat non oportere sumptuose acquirere tales bullas, quia illis subductis homo precise tantum participabit de merito quantum fuerit habilis apud Deum. Et quantum ad clausulam positam in bullis, quod datur tantum spirituale suffragium vere contritis et dignis apud Deum, vel de tanto absolvitur de quanto claves ecclesie non errantes permiserunt, videtur quod quilibet fidelis haberet hoc privilegium sine bulla, et quod quilibet sacerdos posset tante absolvere, et sic absolucio a [570] **pena et culpa introducta in opinione populi foret simplicium seductiva, et sequeretur utraque conclusio quam doctor reliquit ut inconveniens, scilicet quod absque omni tali indulgencia dignus apud Deum remissionem proporcionaliter sequeretur et indulgencie communiter fierent pro tota ecclesia. Profectum enim tocius ecclesie debet papa primo intendere et distribucionem premii iudicio divino relinquere, ut oportet. Ex quibus videtur quod non est altrinsecus valde meritorium instare penes papam pro indulgenciis huius acquirendis, quia vel oportet dicere quod racione huius occupacionis fit homo dignior apud Deum, quam foret omittendo talem instanciam, vel aliter quod ad habendum affectatam indulgenciam foret concessio vel bulla papalis indifferens. Primum non dabitur propter tria: Primo quia apostoli, quos spiritus sanctus docuit omnem veritatem, culpabiliter omisissent occupacionem tam meritoriam pro indulgenciis impetrandis; secundo quia tunc papa prorogaret concessiones huiusmodi, ut subditus diucius continuet in vita tam meritoria; et tercio facta tota diligencia tantum valeret petenti nec habere concessionem pape vel bullam sicut papam concedere vel bullare, et sequeretur tercium membrum quod multa officia clericorum papalium condempnarent. Tales multas evidencias cogitare possumus per quarum obiecciones et soluciones veritas catholica declaretur.**

therefore it is not to be feigned. The minor is proved thus: the pope, like the whole church militant, errs in many things that concern the divine judgment and the state of the church triumphant; now among other secrets of this kind this is one: who is worthy of how much ecclesiastical suffrage before God; therefore it may be that the pope commonly errs in such things.[3] Therefore, then, one must grant either that, by the very fact that the pope grants someone so great an indulgence, by that very fact he will have it so; or else that, notwithstanding the pope's grant, he will share precisely as much as he shall have been worthy with God; or else that the pope understands this condition generally in every grant of his, as he must.[4] The first part is wholly impossible, implying that that pope cannot sin or err, and so the pope by himself would qualify and justify a subject before God; which it would be blasphemous to say. Therefore the second way and the third remain to be granted; but it is evident that there is no need to acquire such bulls at great cost, because, with them taken away, a man will share in merit precisely as much as he shall have been qualified with God.[5] And as to the clause placed in the bulls, that so much spiritual suffrage is given to those truly contrite and worthy before God, or that one is absolved of as much as the keys of the church, not erring, have permitted, it seems that any faithful man would have this privilege without a bull, and that any priest could absolve to that extent; and so the absolution from [570] **punishment and guilt, introduced into the opinion of the people, would be a seducer of the simple; and each conclusion would follow which the doctor left as an absurdity, namely that without any such indulgence one worthy before God would obtain remission proportionally, and that indulgences would commonly be made for the whole church.[6] For the pope ought first to aim at the profit of the whole church, and to leave the distribution of reward to the divine judgment, as he must. From which it seems that it is not, on either side, very meritorious to press the pope for the acquiring of indulgences of this kind; because either one must say that by reason of this occupation a man becomes worthier before God than he would be by omitting such urging, or else that for having the desired indulgence the papal grant or bull would be indifferent.[7] The first will not be granted, for three reasons: first, because the apostles, whom the Holy Spirit taught all truth, would culpably have omitted so meritorious an occupation for obtaining indulgences; secondly, because then the pope would prolong grants of this kind, so that the subject might continue longer in so meritorious a life; and thirdly, when all diligence had been done, it would avail the**

petitioner as much not to have the pope's grant or bull as for the pope to grant or to bull [it]; and the third member would follow, which the many offices of the papal clerks would condemn. We can think out many such evidences, through whose objections and solutions catholic truth may be declared.[8]

Notes

1. *Tercio*: the third proof of the minor of 568.8, that the doctor's account is cloaked (the first and second at 568.12–24). *In verbo*: in the Word, the Son, in whom the blessed see what God has ordained. *Limitavit*: assigned (row *limitare*). *Necessario*: taken with *limitavit*. R. Side-note 568.25.
2. *Sed Deus nichil facit superfluum*: the minor premiss. *Quomodocunque papa decreverit*: whatever the pope has decreed. *Non ... sapit*: literally "it does not savour [of sense]". *Intuicio benefica*: God's beneficent regard. *Premiacio*: rewarding. *Propter cuius officium*: through whose exercise.
3. *Item*: a new argument: granting the power would make God prejudice his justice. *Minor*: that this would come about. *Stat papam ... errare*: "it can stand that the pope errs", it is possible. *Quis quante sit dignus*: who is worthy of how much, a double interrogative. *Quoad Deum*: in respect of God, "before God". T. The codices read *archana huius*; *huiusmodi* is Loserth's (569.10). R. Side-note 569.4. Hus reuses the passage (cf. Hus, *Opp.* I, 183b).
4. Three alternatives (side-notes 569.13, 569.16, 569.21): the grant takes effect of itself; the recipient shares only by his worthiness; the pope tacitly attaches that condition. *Ut oportet*: "as he must", taken with *intelligit*. T. Loserth's foot glosses *sic habebit* (569.14) as "that is, if he is worthy of ecclesiastical suffrage before God"; side-note 569.13 and the refutation that follows (the pope would then be unable to err) take the first alternative without that condition, and we translate so. The codices read *non non obstante*; Loserth prints one *non* (569.15). B *in concesso est sua* for *in concessione sua* (569.18).
5. *Habilitaret*: would make qualified (cf. row *habilis*). *Sumptuose*: at great cost. *Illis subductis*: with the bulls taken away. T. The codices read *concedenda*; *concedende* is Loserth's (569.23). R. Side-note 569.24.
6. *Clausulam*: the saving clause of the bulls. *Claves ecclesie non errantes*: the keys when they do not err. *Tante absolvere*: taken as "absolve to that extent", *tante* for *tantum*. *Sequeretur remissionem*: *sequi* with the accusative, "attain". *Doctor*: St Thomas, as in the preceding argument; the place where he leaves these two conclusions as absurd is *In IV Sent.* d. 20 q. 1 a. 3 qc. 1 co. (= *Suppl.* q. 25 a. 1), as quoted in 23-b (*alias absque omni indulgencia remissionem consequeretur ... vel communiter fierent pro tota ecclesia*; the modern text has *sed communiter*, Thomas's own view). *Inconveniens*: CONTEXTUAL (absurdity / troubles); here an absurdity in argument. T. B *caute absolvere*, "absolve cautiously" (569.32). R. Side-note 569.29.
7. *Altrinsecus*: "on either side", taken as looking forward to the two alternatives that follow; it may mean "on the other hand". *Instare penes papam*: to press the pope with requests. *Instanciam*: urging (row *instancia*, the "urgency" sense), not an objection. *Affectatam*: desired (row *affectare*). *Indifferens*: making no difference. T. B *hius* for *huius* (570.11); *huius* stands for *huiusmodi*. R. Side-note 570.9.
8. *Quos spiritus sanctus docuit omnem veritatem*: John 16:13, "he will teach you all truth" (Douay–Rheims), alluded to. C. *Prorogaret*: would prolong, make the grants last longer. *Nec habere ... sicut papam concedere*: *nec habere* for *non habere*. *Bullare*: to issue under bull. *Tercium membrum*: taken as the second branch of 570.13 (the bull is indifferent), which is also the third way of 569.20; *condempnarent* has *officia* as its subject: the papal clerks' offices live by the bulls. *Evidencias*: evidences (row), arguments of this kind. T. B *obiecciones soluciones* (570.27).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 569: *in* (205c is the glued folio mark)
  - 569: *archana* [NW]
  - 569: *generaliter*
  - 569: *haberet*
  - 570: *valde* (M is a margin letter)
  - 570: *vel*
  - 568: *quibus* (L is a margin letter)

Part 8: Common arguments: the pope's power would be infinite, and the calculators' cases would empty purgatory and hell

Loserth pp. 570.28–574.32

¶1 570.28–574.22

570.28 *The power ascribed to the Pope is infinite.*

[570] Ulterius fiunt argumenta communia contra omnem theologorum et decretistarum sentenciam in hac parte. Videtur enim, primo quod

Further, common arguments are made against every teaching of the theologians and decretists on this matter. For it seems, first, that the

571.8 *He should use it freely or he is guilty of the death of those whom he might save.*
572.7 *with full use of his power he might restore the golden age.*
572.21 *If the Pope can excuse a part of penance he can excuse all.*
573.18 *To say that the remission must always be partial derogates from the divine power.*
574.1 *The Pope cannot assign arbitrary value to certain alms.*
574.23 *If each indulgence can remit a part, a succession must remit the whole.*

potestas pape sit potencia infinita; nam papa habet potestatem ad concedendum indulgencias infinitis personis per infinitum tempus duraturas, ergo infinitum maioris potencie est quam episcopus, qui solum quadraginta dies solum finitis subditis potest concedere. [571] Consequencia patet ex hoc quod penes hoc est potestas maior, cum omnes ille sint univoce consimilis speciei; et antecedens videtur, tum quia super totum thesaurum ecclesie dominatur papa, qui thesaurus est quodammodo infinitus, tum quia non est dare quot personis potest papa thesaurum illum distribuere nec ad quantum. Item, videtur quod papa debet ex consciencia facere generaliter illud opus misericordie spiritualis, nam potens relevare fratrem suum et inexcusabiliter differens usque ad mortem corporalem fratris sui est reus homicidii, ergo multo magis differens liberare fratrem a morte spirituali, cuiusmodi est quicunque papa avarus de indulgencia generali; nec valet dicere quod potestas prelati in isto vilesceret, quia generaliter potentatus ex beneficii percepcione fit carior. Quam ergo excusacionem haberet qui a dampnacione perpetua posset proximum liberare quem debet diligere ut se ipsum, et tamen sine racione omittit? Numquid ille cui preceptum est eciam in sabbato extrahere bovem fratris de puteo non incurret prevaricacionem, si negligit liberare animam proximi ab inferno? Si ignorancia voluntatis divine excusat, quomodo alicui concedere talem indulgenciam papa temptat? Item, posito quod dictus papa Gregorius laxet ad tantum plenitudinem potestatis quantum Deus permiserit, et potestas sibi data suffecerit ad iuvandum spiritus in inferno, in purgatorio et hoc mundo, et sic concedat cuicunque presbitero plenitudinem vicarie potestatis ad absolvendum et indulgendum generaliter tam vivos quam mortuos, quantumcunque claves ecclesie permiserint, casus non videtur negandus, [572] quia tunc dictus Gregorius non foret precise tante potestatis quante foret papa alius post vel ante, ymmo non precise tante potestatis quante ipsemet foret, quia non foret dare in eo maximam potestatem nec aliquam parcialem potestatem (ut patet in materia De Maximo et Minimo). Admisso ergo casu videtur quod omnes spiritus liberarentur de inferno et purgatorio, et omnes viantes forent in gracia finalis perseverancie confirmati. Nam thesaurus ecclesie cuius accepit plenam dispensacionem est infinitum plus bonus quam habitus sibi oppositus est malus, et limitatur secundum sui ultimum ad agendum; ergo extingueret totum malum. Quis ergo argueret talem papam de imprudencia qui destrueret totam mundi maliciam, restituendo seculum aureum, ut in statu innocencie? Et cum quo Deus tam efficaciter concurreret approbando? Excitandus ergo foret papa ad tam instanter proficiendum ecclesie, si non diffidit, sed

power of the pope is an infinite power; for the pope has power to grant to infinitely many persons indulgences lasting for an infinite time; therefore he is of infinitely greater power than a bishop, who can grant only forty days, and only to finitely many subjects.[1] [571] The inference is clear from this: that by this measure power is greater, since all those [powers] are univocally of a like species; and the antecedent seems [true], both because the pope exercises lordship over the whole treasury of the church, which treasury is in a certain way infinite, and because there is no assigning to how many persons the pope can distribute that treasury, nor to how much.[2] Again, it seems that the pope ought in conscience to do that work of spiritual mercy generally; for one who is able to relieve his brother and inexcusably puts it off until his brother's bodily death is guilty of homicide; therefore much more one who puts off freeing his brother from spiritual death; of which kind is any pope whatever who is niggardly with a general indulgence. Nor is it valid to say that the prelate's power would grow cheap in this, because generally a power becomes dearer from the receiving of benefit.[3] What excuse, then, would he have who could free his neighbour, whom he ought to love as himself, from perpetual damnation, and yet without reason omits it? Shall not he who is commanded even on the sabbath to draw his brother's ox out of the pit incur transgression, if he neglects to free his neighbour's soul from hell? If ignorance of the divine will excuses [him], how does the pope attempt to grant such an indulgence to anyone?[4] Again, suppose that the said Pope Gregory looses his plenitude of power to as great an extent as God shall have permitted, and that the power given him shall have sufficed for helping spirits in hell, in purgatory and in this world, and that so he grants to any presbyter whatever the plenitude of vicarial power for absolving and indulging generally both living and dead, as far as the keys of the church shall have permitted: the case does not seem to be deniable, [572] because then the said Gregory would not be of precisely as much power as another pope after or before would be; indeed, not of precisely as much power as he himself would be, because there would be no assigning in him a greatest power, nor any partial power (as is clear in the matter *De maximo et minimo*).[5] The case being admitted, then, it seems that all spirits would be freed from hell and purgatory, and all those on the road would be confirmed in the grace of final perseverance. For the treasury of the church, of which he has received full dispensation, is infinitely more good than the habit opposed to it is evil, and it is assigned to act according to its utmost; therefore it would extinguish all

confidit in plenitudine potencie quam pretendit. Item, dominus papa potest remittere medietatem vel terciam partem tocius penitencie aut quamcunque partem eius aliquotam (ut dicit ista posicio et perdoniste preconizant) in patria, sed si hoc potest tunc potest totalem penitenciam omnino remittere, et sicut de una persona, sic de totali ecclesia; ergo potest preservare totalem ecclesiam ab omni pena purgatorii vel inferni. Hic dicunt decretiste communiter quod papa non remittit regulariter secundum partem quantam sed quotam, ut tetigi per Hostiensem superius et recitat glossa in decretis, XIII[a] q. II[a] super capitulo Tempus; et ista scola videtur [573] sompniata ut populus habeat continue aliquid redimendum. Contra istud queritur, primo utrum papa potest de plenitudine potestatis sue pro quocunque opere eque meritorio in persona habente tantum de culpa et eque capaci venie tantum peccatum remittere? Si potest, pono quod concedat cuicunque vere confesso et contrito facienti elemosinam ut quatuor, remissionem peccati ut quatuor, et indulgenciam ut quatuor, et pono insuper quod quilibet peccator iam militantis ecclesie multiplicet elemosinas, quousque totum peccatum suum sit dimissum et pena remissa, sicut faciliter hoc ordinato posset contingere. Illo ergo statuto pro lege perpetua faciliter excluderetur dyabolus a punicione hominum in inferno et tolleretur omnis punicio in purgatorio, et per idem liberarentur per tales indulgencias mortui puniti vel in purgatorio vel inferno. Si dicatur quod papa non potest statuere talem legem, sed oportet ipsum proporcionaliter semper remittere, videtur primo quod hoc derogat potestati divine, quod Deus personis eque dignis non potest tantam mercedem tribuere pro meritis paribus, ut Petro habenti peccatum ut octo in purgatorio vel inferno potest dare remissionem pene et culpe ut quatuor pro elemosina viatoris dantis pro eo denarium. Paulo autem ibi detento pro peccato ut quatuor non posset dare cum illis paribus remissionem pene et culpe ut quatuor pro tanta elemosina in via facta pro ipso, quia tunc posset Deus communicare potestatem talem eius vicario, ut omnino absolveret a pena et culpa tam vivos quam mortuos. Sed constat quod primum assumptum sequi ex opinione claudit contradiccionem; secundo videtur istam sentenciam derogare potestati papali, quia, si lex ligat papam [574] quod potest facere maius et non minus, quomodo concederetur legi sue, quod taxat ad votum pro quantumcunque parva elemosina remitti quamcunque partem aliquotam pene vel culpe? Numquid eo ipso quo ipse dicit terciam vel quartam aut quamcunque aliam partem penitencie indultam pro denario sequitur quod sit ita? Numquid oporteret quod previe subsit racio apud Deum? Ubi ergo est evidencia maioris racionis laxandi, est evidencia maioris

evil.[6] Who, then, would accuse of imprudence such a pope, who would destroy all the malice of the world, restoring the golden age, as in the state of innocence? And with whom God would so effectively concur, approving? The pope, then, would have to be roused to profiting the church so urgently, if he does not mistrust, but trusts in, the plenitude of power that he claims.[7] Again, the lord pope can remit half or a third part of the whole penance, or any aliquot part of it whatever (as this position says and the pardoners proclaim) in the homeland; now if he can do this, then he can remit the whole penance altogether; and as of one person, so of the whole church; therefore he can preserve the whole church from all punishment of purgatory or of hell.[8] To this the decretists commonly say that the pope does not, as a rule, remit according to a part of a quantity, but according to a proportional part, as I touched on through Hostiensis above, and as the gloss on the Decretum recounts, C. 13 q. 2, on the chapter *Tempus*; and this school seems [573] to have been dreamt up so that the people may always have something to redeem.[9] Against this it is asked, first, whether the pope can, of the plenitude of his power, for any equally meritorious work, in a person having as much guilt and equally capable of forgiveness, remit as much sin? If he can, I posit that he grants to anyone truly confessed and contrite who gives alms as four, remission of sin as four, and indulgence as four; and I posit further that every sinner of the church now militant multiplies his alms until his whole sin is forgiven and the punishment remitted, as could easily happen once this was ordained.[10] That being established, then, as a perpetual law, the devil would easily be shut out from punishing men in hell, and all punishment in purgatory would be taken away; and by the same token the dead who are punished, either in purgatory or in hell, would be freed by such indulgences. If it is said that the pope cannot establish such a law, but must always remit proportionally, it seems, first, that this derogates from the divine power, [namely] that God cannot bestow so great a reward on equally worthy persons for equal merits: as, to Peter, having sin as eight in purgatory or hell, he can give remission of punishment and guilt as four for the alms of a wayfarer who gives a penny for him; but to Paul, held there for sin as four, he could not, other things being equal, give remission of punishment and guilt as four for so great an alms made on the way for him; because then God could communicate such power to his vicar, so that he would absolve altogether from punishment and guilt both living and dead.[11] But it is evident that the first assumption, which follows from the opinion, implies a contradiction. Secondly, this teaching

potestatis ad hoc et econtra de irracionabilitate, ut repugnat prime racioni, per quam oportet omnes indulgencias fieri, quod hic sint infiniti puniti; quorum primus est aliqualiter capax venie secundum dignitatem habitam a Deo, secundus vero in duplo capacior et sic in infinitum, et tamen proporcionaliter ut fit maior elemosina pro magis capaci quoad Deum, habet ex taxacione pape minorem efficaciam ad peccatum vel penitenciam remittendum. Tales multe conclusiones impossibiles sequuntur ex potestate pape taxandi penas et peccata hominis suffragandi ad suum placitum et ex casibus calculatoriis quos ista scola habet admittere.

seems to derogate from the papal power; because, if a law binds the pope [574] so that he can do the greater and not the less, how would it be granted to his law that he assesses at will that any aliquot part of punishment or guilt be remitted for an alms however small? Does it follow, by the very fact that he says a third or a fourth or any other part of penance [is] indulged for a penny, that it is so? Would it not have to be that a reason underlies it beforehand with God?[12] Where, then, there is evidence of a greater reason for loosing, there is evidence of a greater power for it, and conversely of unreasonableness; as it is repugnant to the first reason, through which all indulgences must be made, that there be here infinitely many punished, of whom the first is in some degree capable of forgiveness according to the worthiness had from God, the second twice as capable, and so to infinity; and yet, in proportion as a greater alms is made for the one more capable before God, it has, by the pope's assessment, less efficacy for remitting sin or penance.[13] Many such impossible conclusions follow from the pope's power of assessing at his pleasure the punishments and sins of a man to be aided by intercession, and from the calculatory cases which this school has to admit.[14]

¶2 574.23–574.32

[574] Tercio videtur quod subiacet potestati pape omnino absolvere tam vivos quem mortuos a pena et a culpa, et pono quod sint infiniti homines et infiniti denarii sive simul sive successive creati et adnichilati de Dei potencia absoluta, et iniungat papa primo illorum quod det primum denarium pro delenda prima parte penitencie Petri; secundo autem iniungat quod secundus det secundum denarium pro delenda secunda parte sue penitencie, et sic in infinitum. Et patet quod in fine foret tota penitencia Petri deleta.

Thirdly, it seems that it lies within the pope's power to absolve altogether both living and dead from punishment and from guilt. And I posit that there are infinitely many men and infinitely many pennies, created and annihilated, either together or successively, by God's absolute power; and that the pope enjoins the first of them to give the first penny for blotting out the first part of Peter's penance, and enjoins the second that the second give the second penny for blotting out the second part of his penance, and so to infinity. And it is clear that in the end the whole of Peter's penance would be blotted out.[15]

Notes

1. ***Argumenta communia***: arguments that tell against theologians and decretists alike. ***Sentencia***: CONTEXTUAL (the glossary): the position taught, so 'teaching'. ***Infinitum maioris potencie***: of infinitely greater power. ***Quadraginta dies***: the bishop's indulgence of forty days, the limit set for bishops by the Fourth Lateran Council, c. 62 (*X* 5.38.14; form ours). ***Solum finitis subditis***: only to finitely many subjects. R. Side-note 570.28.
2. ***Penes hoc***: by this measure, the number of persons and the length of time. ***Univoce consimilis speciei***: of one species in the same sense (row ***univoce***), so that the powers can be compared by quantity. ***Non est dare quot ... nec ad quantum***: no number of persons and no amount can be assigned. ***Dominatur***: exercises lordship (row ***dominari***, here neutral).
3. ***Ex consciencia***: in conscience. ***Illud opus misericordie spiritualis***: the general indulgence. ***Differens***: putting off. ***Avarus de indulgencia generali***: niggardly with a general indulgence. ***Potentatus ... fit carior***: taken as "a power becomes dearer [to its subjects]" through the benefit they receive; ***potentatus*** may be the person, "a potentate". T. B lacks ***fratrem*** (571.13). R. Side-note 571.8. Hus reuses the passage (cf. Hus, ***Opp.*** I, 184a). B's margin at 571.8 asks what the lawyers' saying means, "that the lord pope does not remit as a rule according to a part of a quantity but a proportional part", with Loserth's cross-reference to p. 752, l. 30; Wyclif reaches that saying at 572.28.

4. ***Quem debet diligere ut se ipsum***: Matthew 22:39, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Douay–Rheims). ***Eciam in sabbato extrahere bovem fratris de puteo***: Luke 14:5, the ox fallen "into a pit" and drawn out "on the sabbath day", with Deuteronomy 22:4, "thy brother's ... ox"; Wyclif joins the two. C. ***Prevaricacionem***: transgression (cf. row *prevaricator*). ***Si ignorancia ... excusat***: if the pope pleads ignorance of whom God wills to free, the same ignorance forbids him to grant any indulgence.
5. ***Dictus papa Gregorius***: Gregory XI, named earlier in the chapter (564.15). ***Laxet ad tantum plenitudinem potestatis***: looses (lets out) his plenitude of power as far as God allows; *laxare* is rendered "loose" throughout. ***Vicarie potestatis***: the power of a vicar. ***Casus non videtur negandus ... quia tunc***: taken as "on that teaching", that the pope's power is infinite: such a power has no greatest degree, so nothing fixes how much power Gregory has, and nothing bars the case. ***De Maximo et Minimo***: Wyclif's own treatment of the limits of capacities, "on maximum and minimum", which he cites as his in *De dominio divino* I c. 4 (27) and *De veritate* c. 19; cf. *Logice continuacio* c. 7.
6. ***Admisso ... casu***: the disputant's admission of a posited case. ***Viantes***: those on the road (row). ***Habitus sibi oppositus***: the contrary habit, sin. ***Limitatur secundum sui ultimum ad agendum***: taken as "is assigned (row *limitare*) to act to its utmost", the full dispensation having been granted. T. AA_1 *forent magna* (572.8); its sense is unclear and the print is translated. R. Side-note 572.7.
7. ***Seculum aureum ... status innocencie***: the golden age set beside the state of man before the fall. ***Plenitudine potencie quam pretendit***: the plenitude of power (here *potencia*, not *potestas*) that he claims. T. *Quis* is Loserth's emendation; the codices read *quia* (572.13). *Approbando* is Loserth's doubtful reading (he marks it "?"); A and B have the abbreviation *app'ndo* (572.17).
8. ***Dominus papa***: the lord pope. ***Partem ... aliquotam***: an aliquot part, one that measures the whole exactly (row *partes aliquote*). ***Perdoniste preconizant***: the pardoners proclaim. ***In patria***: taken with *preconizant*, "in the homeland", that is, in this country (row *patria*, the earthly sense); if it goes with *remittere*, it would be the remission of what is owed in the next life. R. Side-note 572.21.
9. ***Hic dicunt decretiste***: the decretists' answer (A and B mark it *Responsio decretistarum* in the margin, 572.28). ***Secundum partem quantam sed quotam***: not by a fixed quantity, but by a proportional part, a fraction of what remains, so that the remission never reaches the whole; Hostiensis's formula *secundum partem cotam non quantam* (519.1). ***Glossa in decretis***: the ordinary gloss on Decretum C. 13 q. 2 c. 23 *Tempus* (form ours). ***Ut populus habeat continue aliquid redimendum***: the remainder is never paid off. T. A *habeant* (573.1).
10. ***Contra istud queritur***: A in the margin *Questio* (573.2). ***Eque capaci venie***: equally capable of forgiveness (*venia*, kept apart from *condonacio* "pardon"). ***Ut quatuor***: "as four", the calculators' measure of degree: alms of four degrees, remission of four. ***Peccator iam militantis ecclesie***: a sinner of the church now militant (row *ecclesia militans*). ***Hoc ordinato***: once this was ordained.
11. ***Si dicatur***: A in the margin *Responsio quedam* (573.18). ***Proporcionaliter semper remittere***: always to remit only a proportional part. ***Quod Deus ... non potest***: the derogation, in apposition to *hoc*. Peter, owing eight, can have four remitted (a half) for a penny; Paul, owing four, could not have four remitted (the whole) for the same alms, since a whole remission would open the way to total absolution. ***Cum illis paribus***: other things being equal. ***In via***: on the way, by a wayfarer. R. Side-note 573.18.
12. ***Primum assumptum sequi ex opinione***: taken as "the first assumption, which follows from the opinion" (that God cannot give the same reward for equal merits); the infinitive may instead make the whole the subject: "that the first assumption follows from the opinion implies a contradiction". ***Claudit contradiccionem***: implies a contradiction (row). ***Si lex ligat papam quod potest facere maius et non minus***: if the law of proportional remission lets him remit a part and forbids him the whole. ***Taxat ad votum***: assesses at will (cf. row *taxacio*). ***Numquid ... Numquid***: the first expects "no", the second "yes". T. AA_1 *crederetur* for *concederetur* (574.2). B *prime subsit* for *previe subsit* (574.7–8). R. Side-note 574.1.
13. ***Et econtra de irracionabilitate***: and conversely: where the reason is less, the power is less. ***Ut repugnat prime racioni ... quod hic sint infiniti puniti***: taken as introducing a case that offends the first reason, God's: an infinite series of the punished, each twice as capable of forgiveness as the one before, for whom larger alms are given, and who yet get less by the pope's fixed assessment. ***Habet***: its subject taken as the alms. ***Dignitatem habitam a Deo***: the worthiness had from God.
14. ***Hominis suffragandi***: of the man to be aided (row *suffragari*). ***Taxandi***: of assessing (cf. row *taxacio*). ***Casibus calculatoriis***: the calculatory cases, the logicians' cases on infinite series and degrees. ***Habet admittere***: has to admit.
15. ***Tercio***: the third argument against the decretists' answer (the first at 573.2, the second at *secundo videtur*, 573.33). ***Quem mortuos***: the print's *quem* is taken as *quam*. ***Prima pars ... secunda pars***: taken as proportional parts (a half, a quarter and so on), as at 575.5–6, so that the infinite series completes the whole. R. Side-note 574.23.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 572: *tunc*
  - 572: *forent*
  - 573: *sompniata* (margin letter N and 206a folio mark precede)
  - 573: *populus*

Part 9: The cases are imaginary, but so is the power; any priest could make indulgences

Loserth pp. 574.33–576.2

¶1 574.33–575.13

575.1 *Our cases are said to be fanciful, but all this*

[574]**Et si dicatur quod tales casus sunt ymaginarii solum possibiles de Dei potencia absoluta, revera sic potestas ficta de concessione**

And if it is said that such cases are imaginary, possible only by God's absolute power: truly, in the same way the feigned power concerning

papal power is a mere fancy.
575.14 *Every priest should have power of indulgence.*
575.25 *Formerly the Pope did not claim this excessive power.*

indulgenciarum est [575]imaginaria non colorabilis, nisi Deus specialiter assistat iuvando iuxta suam potenciam absolutam, et sibi foret facile dare potenciam vel subito vel successive laxandi peccata vel penam capacibus pro merito maiori vel minori; nec est viator cercior de uno quam reliquo, ut si Deus statuat quod per primam partem proporcionalem dati meriti remittatur prima pars proporcionalis pene date vel peccati, et per secundam secunda, et sic infinitum, tunc papa faciens isti conformiter ex sciencia et potestate sibi data posset absolvere quemcunque peccatorem a pena et culpa, et eque probabiliter posset unum fingi ut reliquum, cum toti isti materie deficit fundamentum.

the grant of indulgences is [575]imaginary, not colourable, unless God specially assists, helping according to his absolute power; and it would be easy for him to give a power, either suddenly or successively, of loosing sins or punishment for those capable, for greater or lesser merit.[1] Nor is a wayfarer more certain of the one than of the other: as, if God should establish that by the first proportional part of a given merit the first proportional part of a given punishment or sin is remitted, and by the second the second, and so [to] infinity, then the pope, acting in conformity with this from the knowledge and power given him, could absolve any sinner whatever from punishment and guilt; and the one could be feigned with as much probability as the other, since the whole of this matter lacks a foundation.[2]

¶2 575.14–575.32

[575]Item, videtur quod quilibet sacerdos potest facere indulgencias, nam quilibet sacerdos habet parem potestatem ordinis cum quolibet et ipso existente in gracia habet potestatem super thesaurum ecclesie. Ergo cum aliter populo digno preest, videtur quod ipse et ex parte sui et ex dignitate potest eis aliquam indulgenciam impertiri. Nam quadraginta dies quos dat episcopus non limitant minimum gradum indulgencie, quare ergo non posset inferior curatus dare unus viginti dies et alius decem vel varie secundum quod Deus decreverit? Confirmatur primo ex hoc quod ante publicacionem huius materie habuerunt ecclesiastici potestatem ut modo, sed tunc non fuit racio, quare papa potest pro infinitum magno tempore indulgere; quicunque autem episcopus pro anno vel quadraginta diebus et non aliter; ergo nec modo subest racio quoad Deum, nec potest fundari racio huius variacionis nec est vicarius Petri istius potestatis ut generaliter sit dignus dicere:

Again, it seems that any priest can make indulgences; for any priest has power of order equal with any other, and, being in grace, has power over the treasury of the church. Therefore, since he is otherwise set over a worthy people, it seems that he, both on his own part and from [their] worthiness, can impart some indulgence to them.[3] For the forty days that a bishop gives do not limit the least degree of indulgence; why, then, could not a lower curate give, one twenty days and another ten, or variously, according as God shall have decreed?[4] This is confirmed, first, from this: that before the publication of this matter the clergy had power as now; now there was then no reason why the pope can indulge for an infinitely great time, but any bishop for a year or forty days and not otherwise; therefore neither now is there a reason underlying it before God, nor can a reason for this variation be grounded; nor is the vicar of Peter of such power that he is in general worthy to say:[5]

¶3 575.33–575.33

[575]Sic volo, sic iubeo; sit pro racione voluntas.

"Thus I will, thus I command; let my will stand for reason."[6]

¶4 576.1–576.1
576.1 *The power of absolution implies the power of indulgence.*

[576]Non ergo sequitur: Ecclesia non decrevit tali curato licenciam

It does not follow, then: the church has not decreed to such a curate a licence[7]

¶5 576.2–576.2

[576]indulgendi, ergo non habet licenciam, quia tunc

to indulge, therefore he does not have a licence; because then

Notes

1. ***Si dicatur***: the reply that the calculatory cases of 574.23 posit what only God's absolute power could do. ***Revera sic***: "truly, in the same way". ***Potestas ficta***: the feigned power (cf. row ***ficcio***). ***Non colorabilis***: without colour, that is, without a plausible ground (cf. rows ***color***, ***colorare***). ***Vel subito vel successive***: at once or by successive parts. ***Laxandi***: of loosing (as at 574.8). T. B ***casus sunt ymaginum*** (574.33). R. Side-note 575.1.
2. ***De uno quam reliquo***: of the one (that God gives such a power) than of the other (the power the pope claims): neither has a ground. ***Partem proporcionalem***: a proportional part, a fixed fraction of what remains (a half, then a quarter ...), so that the infinite series sums to the whole. ***Faciens isti conformiter***: acting in conformity with this ordinance. ***Eque probabiliter posset unum fingi ut reliquum***: either could be feigned with equal probability. T. The print reads ***sic infinitum***; "[to]" supplies the usual ***in*** (our supply). B ***possent*** (575.10).
3. ***Potestatem ordinis***: the power of order, given in ordination, the same in every priest. ***Ipso existente in gracia***: he being in grace. ***Cum aliter populo digno preest***: taken as "since he is otherwise (that is, already) set over a worthy people"; ***aliter*** is awkward here. ***Ex parte sui et ex dignitate***: on his part (his power) and from the worthiness of the people; ***dignitate*** may be his own dignity. R. Side-note 575.14.
4. ***Non limitant minimum gradum***: do not limit, that is, do not fix as the lowest, the degree of indulgence: forty days are not the least indulgence possible (row ***limitare***, the restricting sense). ***Inferior curatus***: a curate below the bishop (row ***curatus***). ***Unus ... et alius***: one curate ... another. ***Decreverit***: its subject is God.
5. ***Ante publicacionem huius materie***: before this doctrine of indulgences was published. ***Ecclesiastici***: the clergy (row, CONTEXTUAL; here the usual sense). ***Pro anno vel quadraginta diebus***: the year allowed a bishop at the dedication of a church and the forty days otherwise. ***Quicunque autem episcopus***: ***potest indulgere*** is understood. ***Vicarius Petri***: the pope as Peter's vicar; not the row ***vicarius Christi***. ***Istius potestatis***: of such power. R. Side-note 575.25.
6. Juvenal, ***Satires*** 6.223, ***Hoc volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas***. Loserth notes that the right text begins ***Hoc volo***. T. B in the margin: ***Versus*** (575.33).
7. The sentence runs on through 576.2 into the next part (576.3): ***quia tunc nunquam incepisset ecclesia habere talem licenciam***, "because then the church would never have begun to have such licence". The inference denied runs from the church's not having decreed a licence to the curate's not having one. R. Side-note 576.1.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 574: ***ymaginarii*** (P is a margin letter)
  - 575: ***foret***
  - 575: ***merito***
  - 575: ***ut*** (English side-note "claim" glued in other scans)
  - 576: ***licenciam*** (English "power" dropped; print: curato / licenciam indulgendi,)

Part 10: The laity could indulge their prelates; the form of indulgences implies falsehood; the pious fraud rejected

Loserth pp. 576.3–580.9

¶1 576.3–580.9

576.19 *The laity may give indulgence to the clergy.*
577.5 *God may pardon rather at the instance of a layman than of a wicked prelate.*
577.31 *If remission depends on worthiness, bulls are superfluous.*
578.13 *Even Peter could bind and loose only in accordance with Goa's will,*
578.28 *which he knew by divine inspiration.*
579.1 *St. Thomas enumerates four opinions as to the value of indulgences.*
579.5 *The first makes them a pious fraud,*
579.12 *and is to be rejected.*

[576] **nunquam incepisset ecclesia habere talem licenciam; similiter quilibet habens licenciam absolvendi habet licenciam commutandi penam temporalem pro pena perpetua quam confitens aliter supportaret, sed cum hoc sit indulgere, videtur quod quilibet sacerdos habet infinitam potenciam indulgendi. Non enim videtur racio quin in foro penitencie abscondito fiunt indulgencie, sicut fiunt extra in foro arbitrii per bullas publice proclamate. Nec est racio quin tantum valeant, cum fiunt utrimque devocius, humilius et legi Christi conformius; absolvens ergo preest ecclesie, et ad utilitatem ecclesie intendit efficaciter quod certa persona habeat remissionem grandis debiti pro parva satisfaccione. Sic enim potest diaconus, vel legatus secundum potestatem iurisdiccionis que est inferior potestate ordinis subditis indulgere. Et ex istis tercio videtur quod quilibet de populo potest indulgere suo prelato, quia debita largissima sibi dimittere, et hoc est secundum modum loquendi scripture indulgere. Nam sicut apostolus dicit Rom. I, 14, quod Grecis vel Latinis est debitor, ita videtur quod dominus papa sit debitor ad serviendum et spiritualiter**

[because then] the church would never have begun to have such a licence.[1] Likewise, anyone who has licence to absolve has licence to exchange a temporal punishment for the perpetual punishment that the one confessing would otherwise bear; now since this is to indulge, it seems that any priest has an infinite power of indulging. For there seems no reason why indulgences should not be made in the hidden court of penance, as they are made outside, in the court of discretion, publicly proclaimed through bulls.[2] Nor is there a reason why they should not be worth as much, since on both sides they are made more devoutly, more humbly and more conformably to the law of Christ; the one absolving, therefore, is set over the church, and for the profit of the church he effectually intends that a certain person have remission of a great debt for a small satisfaction. For in this way a deacon, or a legate, can indulge his subjects by the power of jurisdiction, which is lower than the power of order.[3] And from these, thirdly, it seems that anyone of the people can indulge his prelate, because [he can] remit to him the most ample debts;

proficiendum cuilibet christiano, et illud debitum videtur eo maius quod Deus ad hoc obligat sub pena gravissima, et illud quod debetur foret preciosius debito corporali. Si igitur ille potest in debito isto deficere, et Christus docet Matthei VI, 12: Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris, videtur quod subditi possunt eciam pape copiosius indulgere. Ymmo videtur quod prelati maxime indigent indulgenciis laycorum, nec est indulgencia tantum sacramentum, quin laicis possit competere, [577] quomodocunque fundabiliter terminus sit descriptus, quod laici possunt eis relaxare debitum spiritualiter ad utilitatem ecclesie, racione cuius relaxacionis Deus graciose coassistet, dimittendo peccatum et pene debitum, quod contingit Deum facere ad instanciam layci efficacius quam ad instanciam istius prelati qui blaspheme aut sacrilege vendicat aut vendit vel saltem pretendit se facere quod Deo non potest competere. Nam danti pecunias vel eis equivalens datur indulgencia quantumcunque laxa sive pro vivis sive pro mortuis quantumcunque incapacibus, sed egeno vel pauperi evangelice non dant indulgencias pro opere virtuoso, cum tamen quelibet virtus vel meritum sit infinitum prestancius quam totus thesaurus huius mundi et plus dignificat hominem ad habendum indulgencias quoad Deum, quia illa per se et alia solum per accidens. Item, videtur quod vel forma indulgenciarum est falsa vel indulgenti ambigua; nam indulgencie indifferenter conceduntur vivis et mortuis, sed sepe contingit quod non valeant illis vel non tantum valeant, eo quod sunt inhabiles quoad Deum. Ergo forma indulgenciarum sepe implicat falsum; et idem patet de impetrante indulgencias eciam plus quam centum millia annorum, quam largicionem vel oportet esse falsam vel diem iudicii adeo prorogari vel indulgencias valere in inferno post diem iudicii. Sed due posteriores partes sunt inopinabiles, ideo relinquitur prima pars, videlicet quod forma indulgenciarum sepe sit inutilis et falsa. Nec valet dicere quod subintelligende sunt condiciones capacitatis personarum quoad Deum pro quibus indultum est, quia talem promissionem posset quilibet de vulgo secure facere cuicunque, ut certum est quod omnis dampnatus habebit plenam remissionem [578] si dignus fuerit et habilis ad tantam veniam quoad Deum, et aliter indubie propter concessionem Petri vicarii non habebit indulgencie plus vel minus. Ymmo videtur quod talis arroganter presumens dare tales indulgencias non sit procurator idoneus, ut ad sui peticionem Deus sit debitori magis propicius, quia in re concedit servus Dei, sepe sibi odibilis ex peccato quod Deus indulgebit suo affecto remittendo culpam et relaxando penam. Sed quomodo faceret Deus misericordiam ad tam luciferinam et tam infundabilem concessionem

and this, according to scripture's manner of speaking, is to indulge.[4] For as the Apostle says, Romans 1:14, that he is a debtor to Greeks or Latins, so it seems that the lord pope is a debtor to serve and to profit spiritually every Christian; and that debt seems the greater in that God binds [him] to it under the gravest penalty, and what is owed would be more precious than a bodily debt.[5] If, therefore, he can fail in that debt, and Christ teaches, Matthew 6:12, "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors", it seems that subjects can even indulge the pope more copiously. Indeed it seems that prelates most of all need the indulgences of lay people; nor is indulgence so great a sacrament that it could not belong to lay people, [577] however groundedly the term be defined, in that lay people can spiritually relax a debt to them for the profit of the church;[6] by reason of which relaxation God will graciously assist alongside, remitting the sin and the debt of punishment. And it may happen that God does this at the urging of a layman more effectually than at the urging of that prelate who blasphemously or sacrilegiously claims or sells, or at least pretends that he does, what cannot befit God.[7] For to one who gives money, or its equivalent, an indulgence however lax is given, whether for the living or for the dead, however incapable they are; but to the needy man, or to one poor after the gospel's pattern, they give no indulgences for a virtuous work; although any virtue or merit is infinitely more excellent than the whole treasure of this world, and dignifies a man more for having indulgences as regards God; for the one does so of itself, and the other only by accident.[8] Again, it seems that the form of indulgences is either false or ambiguous for the one who indulges; for indulgences are granted indifferently to the living and the dead; now it often happens that they are of no worth to them, or not of so much worth, because they are unqualified as regards God. Therefore the form of indulgences often implies a falsehood; and the same is clear of one who obtains indulgences even of more than a hundred thousand years: that bestowal must either be false, or the day of judgement be put off so far, or indulgences avail in hell after the day of judgement. Now the two latter parts are unthinkable; so the first part remains, namely that the form of indulgences is often useless and false.[9] Nor does it avail to say that conditions of capacity, as regards God, in the persons for whom the indulgence is granted are to be understood as implied; for anyone of the common people could safely make such a promise to anyone: as it is certain that every damned man will have full remission [578] if he be worthy and qualified for so great a forgiveness as regards God; and otherwise, beyond doubt, he will have

unius servi tam indigni? Revera melius foret quod vel doceret in hoc vicariam potestatem vel teneret se in limitibus sancti Petri. De Petro autem non plus sequitur: Quodcunque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum et in celo, ergo Petrus habuit potestatem ad taliter relaxandum penas tam in vivis quam mortuis in purgatorio vel dampnatis, quam sequitur: Christus dedit Petro illam potestatem ligandi et solvendi, ergo si Petrus voluisset insurgere contra Christum et membra sua, excommunicando eos et plene indulgendo membris dyaboli, ergo oportuit fuisse in celo apud Deum taliter diffinitum. Unde omnes fideles concedunt quod omnis potestas concessa Petro vel eius vicario limitata est quod humiliter et conformiter pareat Deo; ex cuius conformitate capit de tanto virtutem et ex eius deformitate capit tam prepositus quam subiectus seduccionem. Et hec racio quare Petrus et alii divinitus inspirati non magnificarunt potestatem suam ultra limites quos Deus instituit, sed precise ad tantum solverunt et ligarunt ad quantum docti sunt Deum solvere vel ligare. In ambiguis vero vel tacuerunt vel condicionem secundum quam oportet Deum principaliter [579] solvere expresserunt. Unde sanctus Thomas conclusione secunda articuli tercii, d. XX, quarti libri movet dubium, utrum indulgencie tantum valent quantum pronunciantur, et arguendo ad partes recitat opinionem quadruplicem. Quarum prima dicit quod indulgencie non tantum valent quantum pronunciantur, sed ecclesia ad hoc ita pronunciat, ut quadam pia fraude homines ad beneficienciam et honorificenciam alliciat, sicut mater promittens false filio pomum vel aliud delectabile ad ambulandum provocat. Sed (ut dicit) periculosum est sic dicere, primo quia scola ista est patris mendacii, sed Job XIII°, 7 dicitur: Numquid Deus indiget mendacio vestro, ut pro eo loquamini? Item, sic dicens peccaret in se mortaliter et daret occasionem diffidendi de quocunque dicto vel facto prelati ecclesie. Nam Iª Corinth. XV°, 14 dicit Apostolus: Si inanis est predicacio nostra, inanis est et fides nostra. Talis autem falsum predicans dampnabiliter evacuat a se fidem. Et pro secunda parte beatus Augustinus epistola decima nona probat beato Jeronymo quod, si in scriptura sacra deprehenderetur aliquid falsitatis, robur auctoritatis scripture periret. Item, cum promittens donum spirituale magis obligatur ex promissione quam promissione corporalis pecunie, sequitur quod episcopus literatorie sic false promittens indulgencias obligat se ad solvendum thesaurum Deo. Caveat ergo episcopus de indiscreta et presumptuosa obligacione ad dandum thesaurum domini, quia hoc videtur magis dampnabile quam talentum Dei abscondere, [580] quia sic false promittens superbe mentitur de Christo, cum Corinthiis dicit Apostolus: Si quid donavi

no more and no less of indulgence on account of the grant of Peter's vicar.[10] Indeed it seems that such a one, arrogantly presuming to give such indulgences, is not a fit proctor, such that at his petition God should be more favourable to the debtor; for in fact a servant of God, often hateful to him from sin, grants that God will indulge his favourite by remitting the guilt and relaxing the punishment.[11] But how would God show mercy at so luciferian and so groundless a grant by one servant so unworthy? Truly it would be better that he either showed his vicarial power in this, or kept himself within the limits of St Peter. And of Peter it no more follows, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven", therefore Peter had power so to relax punishments, both in the living and in the dead, in purgatory or the damned, than it follows: Christ gave Peter that power of binding and loosing; therefore if Peter had wished to rise up against Christ and his members, excommunicating them and fully indulging the members of the devil, then it must have been so defined in heaven before God.[12] Hence all the faithful grant that every power granted to Peter or to his vicar is limited [to this]: that it humbly and conformably obey God; from conformity with whom it takes power in that measure, and from its deformity both superior and subject take seduction. And this is the reason why Peter and others divinely inspired did not magnify their power beyond the limits that God instituted, but loosed and bound precisely so far as they were taught that God looses or binds. In doubtful cases, however, they either kept silent or expressed the condition according to which God must principally [579] loose.[13] Hence St Thomas, in the second conclusion of the third article of distinction 20 of the fourth book, raises the doubt whether indulgences are worth as much as they are proclaimed [to be], and, arguing on both parts, recites a fourfold opinion.[14] The first of these says that indulgences are not worth as much as they are proclaimed, but that the church proclaims them so to this end, that by a kind of pious fraud it may entice men to beneficence and to doing honour, as a mother, falsely promising her son an apple or some other delightful thing, provokes him to walk. But (as he says) it is dangerous to say this: first, because that school is of the father of lies; now in Job 13:7 it is said, "Hath God any need of your lie, that you should speak for him?"[15] Again, one who said so would sin mortally in himself and would give occasion for distrusting any word or deed of a prelate of the church. For in 1 Corinthians 15:14 the Apostle says, "If our preaching is vain, our faith is also vain." Now such a one, preaching what is false, damnably empties faith out of himself. And for the second

in persona Christi. Quilibet ergo episcopus dicit in literis suarum indulgenciarum implicite quod Christus de thesauro domini tantum donat. Et patet ex dictis de mendacio quod non maior posset esse prelatorum defamacio vel ecclesie scandalizacio quam dicere quod in causa Dei ad seduccionem fidei populi prelati tam alti tam patule menciuntur.

part, blessed Augustine, in the nineteenth letter, proves to blessed Jerome that if anything of falsity were detected in holy scripture, the strength of scripture's authority would perish.[16] Again, since one who promises a spiritual gift is more bound by the promise than by a promise of bodily money, it follows that a bishop who thus falsely promises indulgences by letter binds himself to pay the treasure to God.[17] Let the bishop beware, therefore, of an indiscreet and presumptuous obligation to give the Lord's treasure; for this seems more damnable than to hide God's talent, [580] since one who promises falsely in this way lies proudly about Christ, as the Apostle says to the Corinthians: "If I have pardoned any thing, in the person of Christ."[18] Every bishop, therefore, says implicitly in the letters of his indulgences that Christ gives so much from the Lord's treasure. And it is clear from what has been said about lying that there could be no greater defaming of prelates or scandalising of the church than to say that in God's cause, to the seducing of the people's faith, prelates so high lie so openly.[19]

Notes

1. The sentence begins in the previous part (576.1–2): "It does not follow, then: the church has not decreed to such a curate a licence to indulge, therefore he does not have a licence; because then the church would never have begun to have such a licence." The bracketed words repeat the end of that part (our supply). *Confitens*: the penitent. *Commutandi penam temporalem pro pena perpetua*: to exchange the temporal punishment of purgatory or penance for the eternal punishment the sin deserves, which absolution does. T. B *ecclesiam* (576.3), which does not construe.
2. *In foro arbitrii*: in the outward court, where a prelate grants at his own discretion (*arbitrium*), set against the hidden court of penance (row *forum penitencie*). *Proclamate* agrees with *indulgencie*, not with *bullas*: the indulgences are proclaimed through bulls.
3. *Utrimque*: on both sides, that is, by confessor and penitent alike; "in both courts" is possible. *Absolvens ergo preest ecclesie*: the confessor meets the conditions required for an indulgence, authority over the church and the church's profit. *Potestas iurisdiccionis*: the power of jurisdiction, held by appointment, set against the power of order given in ordination; a deacon or a legate may have the first without the priestly order. T. B *iurediccionis* (576.17), a spelling.
4. *Quia debita largissima sibi dimittere* has no finite verb; "[he can]" is our supply, for a probable lost *potest*. C. *Indulgere* in scripture's manner of speaking is to forgive a debt. R. Side-note 576.19.
5. Romans 1:14. The Vulgate reads *Graecis ac barbaris*, "To the Greeks and to the barbarians" (DR); Wyclif's *Grecis vel Latinis* is his own, and Loserth gives the Vulgate. C. *Eo maius quod*: the greater in that.
6. *Nec est indulgencia tantum sacramentum, quin laicis possit competere*: indulgence is not so great a sacrament that it cannot belong to the laity. The *quod* clause (*quod laici possunt*) is taken as stating the ground ("in that"); it may instead give what belongs to the laity ("that lay people can ..."). *Descriptus*: "defined", from *describere* (cf. row *descripcio*). T. The apparatus to 576.34 gives *totum sacramentum* (siglum lost in the OCR), "a whole sacrament", against the print's *tantum*.
7. *Ad instanciam*: at the urging of (row *instancia*, the sense of urgency, not "objection"). C. *Quod Deo non potest competere*: what cannot befit God, that is, an act (selling remission) which God himself could not rightly do. R. Side-note 577.5 ("at the instance of a layman").
8. *Laxa*: "lax", the adjective of *laxare* (row "loose"): an indulgence of any breadth. *Pauperi evangelice*: one poor after the gospel's pattern. *Illa per se et alia solum per accidens*: virtue fits a man for indulgence of itself, money only by accident. T. The apparatus to 577.1 seems to give *plus significat* (siglum lost in the OCR) for *plus dignificat*.
9. *Indulgenti ambigua*: ambiguous for the one who indulges, who cannot know whether it holds; "ambiguous in the indulging" is possible. *Plus quam centum millia annorum*: a remission longer than the time left before judgement, so that either the grant is false, or judgement is postponed, or indulgences avail in hell. *Inopinabiles*: unthinkable. T. A reads *forma falsa vel* at 577.18–19 (the OCR'd apparatus is garbled).
10. *Subintelligende*: to be understood as implied (row). The tacit condition empties the promise: any commoner could promise a damned man full remission "if he be worthy". *Petri vicarii*: the pope as Peter's vicar (row, kept apart from *vicarius Christi*). R. Side-note 577.31.
11. *Procurator idoneus*: a fit proctor (row) to plead for the debtor. *Sibi odibilis*: hateful to God. *Suo affecto*: his favourite. *Suo* refers to the subject, the granting servant, so the one he favours is meant; *affectus* is taken as a noun, "one held in affection".

12. Matthew 16:19 (DR; the Vulgate reads *in caelis*). C. Two parallel inferences: the first (from the text to a power over the dead) is no better than the second (from the gift of the keys to a ratification in heaven of Peter's rebellion). In the second, the repeated *ergo* opens the consequent of the conditional ("then"). *Diffinitum*: defined, determined (cf. row *diffinicio*). R. Loserth compares Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales*, *Opp.* I, fol. 186b. Side-note 578.13.
13. *Limitata est quod*: limited to this condition (row *limitare*, the restricting sense). *Ex cuius conformitate*: *cuius* is God. *Capit de tanto virtutem*: takes power in that measure. *Prepositus*: the superior (cf. row *prepositi*). T. B *et eius* for *ex eius* (578.26). The manuscripts read *solverant*; Loserth prints *solverunt* (578.30). R. Side-note 578.28.
14. Thomas Aquinas, *In IV Sent.* d. 20, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 2, the source of *Summa theologiae* Suppl. q. 25, a. 2, *Utrum indulgentiae tantum valeant quantum praedicantur*. Loserth cites the Supplement as "questio XXVII" (Opp. VI, p. 76), which does not match the modern numbering. Wyclif's *conclusione* stands for Thomas's subquestion. *Arguendo ad partes*: arguing on both sides of the question. R. Side-note 579.1.
15. The pious fraud and the mother's promised apple are Thomas's first opinion in that article, *In IV Sent.* d. 20 q. 1 a. 3 qc. 2 co. (= *Suppl.* q. 25 a. 2); Job 13:7 and 1 Cor. 15:14 are his two *sed contra*. *Patris mendacii*: the devil, John 8:44. Job 13:7: the Vulgate ends *loquamini dolos* (DR "speak deceitfully for him"); Wyclif omits *dolos*. C. *Sed Job ... dicitur*: the step bringing the premiss ("now"). R. Side-notes 579.5, 579.12.
16. 1 Corinthians 15:14. The Vulgate reads *Si autem Christus non resurrexit, inanis est ergo praedicatio nostra, inanis est et fides vestra* ("then is our preaching vain: and your faith is also vain", DR); Wyclif shortens it and reads *fides nostra*. Augustine, Ep. 82 (formerly 19) to Jerome, §§21–22 on the officious lie (Loserth's reference); the closest wording, that one admitted lie would leave no part of scripture's authority standing, is Ep. 28.3 (PL 33). T. A and B read *Cor. XV* without the number of the epistle (579.17). The manuscripts give *epistola nona*; *decima nona* is Loserth's correction (579.21). C. *Pro secunda parte*: for the second reason, the occasion of distrust.
17. *Literatorie*: by letter, in letters of indulgence. *Ad solvendum thesaurum Deo*: to pay to God the treasure he has promised. T. A and A_1 read *thesaurum domini* (579.28), as in the next sentence.
18. *Talentum Dei abscondere*: the servant who hid his talent, Matthew 25:25. 2 Corinthians 2:10: the Vulgate reads *si quid donavi, propter vos in persona Christi* ("if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ", DR); Wyclif omits *propter vos*, as Loserth notes.
19. At *Quilibet* (580.1) A reads *quilt.* and A_1 *qualiter*. C. *Tam alti tam patule*: so high, so openly; the chapter's charge is that the form of indulgences makes the prelates liars.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 576: *populo* (Q is a margin letter)
  - 576: *possit competere,* (main token covers two printed words; com- / petere, (top of p. 577, leaf zoom))
  - 577: *instanciam* (English side-note "at" glued)
  - 578: *Quodcunque*
  - 578: *solverunt* (30 is the line number)
  - 579: *Iª*
  - 579: *literatorie* [NW]

Part 11: Thomas's measure of indulgences tested; the first six conclusions

Loserth pp. 580.10–584.22

¶1 580.10–584.22
580.10 *The other three agree that their value depends on their being rightly given.*
580.18 *St. Thomas says that it depends on the amount of merit applied to them.*
580.28 *This does not account for different values arbitrarily assigned to indulgences.*
581.18 *The Pope's general indulgences cannot be given with regard to the capacity of the recipient.*

[580] Ideo tres alie opiniones vere dicunt quod omnes indulgencie tantum valent quantum sunt rite promulgate. Sed una dicit quod valor earum attenditur penes fidem et devocionem indulti. Alia vero dicit quod valor indulgenciarum attenditur penes iustam estimacionem valoris rei date. Tercia autem dicit quod bonitas indulgencie cum predictis respicit causam pro qua datur indulgencia. Sed doctor dicit quod attenditur penes quantitatem meritorum ecclesie, que applicantur ad indulgenciam faciendum. Et sic oportet quod ex parte dantis sit auctoritas, ex parte recipientis caritas, et ex parte cause pietas, penes que omnia simul attenditur indulgencie quantitas, quia omnia ista respiciunt honorem Dei et utilitatem ecclesie. Et penes utrumque istorum attenditur valor indulgencie, et sic (ut dicit) nec per tales indulgencias peccatum remittitur nec pena remittitur, sed unius pena alteri commutatur. Sed contra ista dicta

Therefore the three other opinions say truly that all indulgences are worth as much as they are duly promulgated. But one says that their worth is reckoned by the faith and devotion of the one indulged. Another says that the worth of indulgences is reckoned by a just estimate of the worth of the thing given. And the third says that the goodness of an indulgence, together with the aforesaid, regards the cause for which the indulgence is given.[1] But the doctor says that it is reckoned by the quantity of the merits of the church that are applied to making the indulgence. And so there must be authority on the part of the giver, charity on the part of the recipient, and piety on the part of the cause, by all of which together the quantity of the indulgence is reckoned, because all these regard the honour of God and the profit of the church.[2] And the worth of an indulgence is reckoned by each of these; and so (as he

582.1 *If penalties are only commuted, they must still be to pay.*
582.16 *If the Pope destroys punishment, he must destroy sin.*
582.23 *Absurdities in the laws about indulgences.*
583.14 *Wyclif's final conclusions:*
583.17
1. *God alone grants indulgences and only to those whom be has made worthy.*

583.22
2. *Each receives according to his worthiness,*

583.27
3. *No bishop's indulgence profits save as the recipient is worthy.*

584.1
4. *And so far as the bishop's instruction has fitted him.*

584.6
5. *Priests have no power to give indulgence for a specified time unless by revelation.*

584.17
6. *Christ's vicar may not give indulgences of days or years.*

videtur primo quod non generaliter excusantur litere indulgenciarum a mendacio, quia sepe in causa et devocione omnino consimili, quantumcunque dispariter conceduntur indulgencie, ergo vel oportet concedere quod absolute valent indulgencie proporcionaliter ad intencionem concedentis, et sic mentiri [581] non posset in istis ut Deus, vel aliter valor indulgenciarum non simul attenditur penes omnia ista tria, ymmo sepe, ubi causa est minus pia caritasque magis remissa, maior indulgencia est concessa; ut unus papa concedere posset indulgencias exercitantibus se in torneamentis, ubi alius papa prius excommunicavit omnes artem huiusmodi exercitantes. Nec oportet quod immineat sic varie necessitas ecclesiam Christi defendendi per gladium; patet factum in Extravagante Johannis XXII[i] Quia in futurorum eventibus. Item, videtur istam posicionem restringere potestatem pape in donando indulgencias, cum dacio dependet ex pietate cause et caritate persone cui sunt indulgencie conferende. Sed papa non regulariter rectificat istas causas sicut nec potest, ergo nec iustificat omnes suas indulgencias, et per consequens, ex timore excessus prodigi non foret tam laxus indulgencias concedendo. Non enim videtur racio quare Romanus pontifex posset concedere in generalibus indulgenciis centum millibus cuilibet septem annos, quin per idem uni persone tantum temporis simul, quia si noticia dignitatis requiritur, nunquam procederet talis indulgencia generalis. Ymmo videtur, cum merita triumphantis ecclesie sint connexa, quod omnia simul applicarentur ad penam tollendam, et specialiter meritum Christi in cuius virtute oportet alia operari; quod cum sit agens naturale, agit secundum ultimum sue potencie infinite; videtur quod tolleret generaliter omnem penam. Si dicitur quod Deus regulat, tunc stat quod papa indulgens non applicat, sed quod Deus ad rogatum unius laici egeni copiose penam dimittat. Item, si non dimittitur pena, sed commutatur (ut dicit sanctus doctor), tunc omnis pena que ante indulgencias [582] foret debita est futura, quia data pena que non videtur, quod illa pena virtute indulgencie est dimissa. Ad istum enim sensum Deus dimittit penam, et per consequens, per indulgencias nec relaxatur pena nec alleviatur ille cui fit indulgencia. Nam si aliqua pena caret quam aliter haberet, tunc sibi dimitteretur illa pena, et cum pena individuatur a tempore et consistit in successione, videtur quod non est commutacio pene pro pena, tum quia quod non est non commutatur; pena autem pro qua fit indulgencia nec fuit nec est nec erit, et pena beati non est modo, nec potest subiectari in eo cui fit indulgencia. Videtur insuper, cum pena et peccatum sese inseparabiliter consequuntur, qui dimittit vel relaxat unum relaxat et reliquum, ut qui extinguit

says) through such indulgences neither is sin remitted nor is punishment remitted, but the punishment of one is exchanged for another.[3] But against these sayings it seems, first, that letters of indulgences are not in general excused from lying; for often, in a cause and devotion wholly alike, indulgences are granted however unequally; therefore either one must grant that indulgences are worth absolutely in proportion to the intention of the grantor, and so [581] he could not lie in these, as God cannot; or else the worth of indulgences is not reckoned by all these three together. Indeed, often, where the cause is less pious and charity more slack, a greater indulgence is granted: as one pope could grant indulgences to those who exercise themselves in tournaments, where another pope had earlier excommunicated all who exercised that art. Nor need the necessity of defending Christ's church by the sword press so changeably; the fact is clear in the Extravagant of John XXII, *Quia in futurorum eventibus*.[4] Again, this position seems to restrict the pope's power in giving indulgences, since the giving depends on the piety of the cause and the charity of the person on whom the indulgences are to be conferred. Now the pope does not as a rule set these causes right, as neither can he; therefore neither does he justify all his indulgences; and consequently, for fear of prodigal excess, he would not be so lax in granting indulgences.[5] For there seems no reason why the Roman pontiff could grant, in general indulgences, seven years to each of a hundred thousand, and not by the same token as much time at once to one person; for if knowledge of worthiness is required, such a general indulgence would never go forth. Indeed it seems, since the merits of the church triumphant are connected, that all would be applied together to taking away punishment, and especially the merit of Christ, in whose power the others must work; and since it is a natural agent, it acts according to the utmost of its infinite power; it seems that it would take away all punishment universally.[6] If it is said that God regulates [it], then it may stand that the pope who indulges does not apply [the merits], but that God, at the request of one needy layman, copiously remits the punishment. Again, if punishment is not remitted but exchanged (as the holy doctor says), then all the punishment that before the indulgences [582] would have been owed is still to come; for, granted the punishment, it does not seem that that punishment was remitted by virtue of the indulgence.[7] For it is in this sense that God remits punishment; and consequently through indulgences neither is punishment relaxed nor is he lightened to whom the indulgence is made. For if he lacks some punishment that he would otherwise have, then

risibilitatem extinguit humanitatem; cum ergo papa extinguit penam extinguit et peccatum, quia aliter remaneret peccatum ineque punitum vel penitus inpunitum, vel aliter dans indulgenciam supplet satisfaccionem, quod non faceret nisi secundum racionem meriti, et sic oporteret omnem indulgentem esse in gracia, sicut oportet omnem cui facta est indulgencia quod leges impugnant. Alie autem sunt consideraciones de irracionabilitate legum multiplicatarum in ista materia, ut centum episcopi in dyocesi Petri non sufficiunt concedere Paulo de dyoecesi Petri nisi eosdem quadraginta dies quos Petrus diocesanus concedit, quia aliter (ut inquiunt) forent iurisdicciones permixte, et quilibet episcopus haberet potestatem super totalem ecclesiam sicut papa; sed Paulo vagante per illos centum episcopatus et deteriorato continue apud Deum accrescerent sibi de quadraginta diebus cum suis ratificacionibus quatuor millia dierum. [583]Sed que racio (rogo) huius? vel que diversitas quod episcopus Nullatensis non sufficit concedere alicui indulgenciam quantumcunque digno apud Deum, episcopus autem dotatus sufficit concedere parem indulgenciam quantumcunque dispariter indispositis de sua dyocesi? Numquid talia dicta sonant quod indulgencia est pure ex arbitrio prepositi post dotacionem ecclesie adinventa et irracionabiliter ac fallaciter ad illusionem ecclesie sepe ficta? Et revera qui videntur defendere libertates, privilegia, honores ecclesie, ut amici, sunt ex adulacionis oleo inficiente mendacio et defensione fallaci in peccato diu abscondito eiusdem ecclesie nequissimi domestici inimici. Ideo premissa humili protestacione de ecclesie veneracione, de humili subieccione et de suarum libertatum constanti defensione dico primo quod nemo est capax indulgencie, nisi fuerit et de quanto fuerit dignus vel dispositus per graciam apud Deum. Patet ex hoc quod nemo si non Deus dat tales indulgencias qui non dat nisi caris suis quos sic prius habilitat. Dico secundo quod omnis recipiens tales indulgencias de tanto copiosius eas recipit, de quanto fuerit habilior quoad Deum. Patet ex hoc quod precise de tanto Deus dat sibi copiosius tales indulgencias, sed ipse facit quicquid facit ad regulam. Dico tercio quod nullius episcopi indulgencia prodest homini, nisi de quanto prius se disposuit apud Deum. Patet ex hoc quod Deus non dat sibi talem indulgenciam nisi ad tantum ex proposicione proxima, sed precise de tanto cuiuscunque episcopi indulgencia prodest. [584] Dico quarto quod episcopi indulgencia de tanto recipienti proderit, de quanto episcopus eum in fide Christi instruxerit, in devocionem et amorem Dei accenderit vel quomodocunque habilem ad indulgenciam Dei fecerit. Patet totum ex dictis. Dico quinto quod sacerdotes Christi non habent potestatem donandi indulgencias secundum quantitatem

that punishment would be remitted to him; and since a punishment is individuated by time and consists in succession, it seems that there is no exchange of punishment for punishment: both because what is not is not exchanged, now the punishment for which the indulgence is made neither was nor is nor will be; and [because] the punishment of the blessed one is not now, nor can it have its subject in him to whom the indulgence is made.[8] It seems, moreover, since punishment and sin follow each other inseparably, that whoever remits or relaxes the one relaxes the other too, as whoever extinguishes risibility extinguishes humanity. Since, therefore, the pope extinguishes punishment, he extinguishes sin too; for otherwise sin would remain unequally punished or wholly unpunished; or else the one giving the indulgence supplies the satisfaction, which he would not do except by way of merit; and so everyone who indulges would have to be in grace, as must everyone to whom an indulgence has been made: which the laws attack.[9] And there are other considerations about the irrationality of the laws multiplied in this matter: as that a hundred bishops in Peter's diocese do not suffice to grant to Paul, of Peter's diocese, more than the same forty days that Peter the diocesan grants; because otherwise (as they say) jurisdictions would be mixed together, and any bishop would have power over the whole church as the pope does; but if Paul wandered through those hundred bishoprics, growing continually worse before God, four thousand days would accrue to him from the forty days with their ratifications.[10] [583]But what reason (I ask) is there for this? Or what difference, that a bishop "of Nowhere" does not suffice to grant an indulgence to anyone, however worthy before God, but an endowed bishop suffices to grant an equal indulgence to those of his diocese, however unequally unfit they are? Do not such sayings sound as if indulgence were purely from the will of a superior, devised after the endowment of the church, and often feigned irrationally and fallaciously to the mockery of the church?[11] And truly those who seem, as friends, to defend the liberties, privileges and honours of the church are, by the oil of flattery, by infecting falsehood and by fallacious defence in a sin long hidden, that same church's most wicked enemies of its own household.[12] Therefore, having first made a humble declaration of veneration for the church, of humble subjection and of constant defence of its liberties, I say first that no one is capable of indulgence unless, and in so far as, he is worthy or disposed by grace before God. This is clear from this: that no one but God gives such indulgences, and he gives only to his dear ones, whom he thus first qualifies.[13] I say second that everyone who receives

temporis, nisi eis specialiter fuerit revelatum. Patet ex illo morali Judith VIII°, 13: Posuistis vos tempus miseracionis domini, et in arbitrium vestrum diem constituistis ei. Ille ergo cui non fit ad hoc revelacio, qui spondet indigno apud Deum ex sibi dubio quod infra tantum tempus Deus miserebitur eius, donando sibi plenam remissionem, stulte pangit, cum non habet evidenciam quod Deus illud concesserit. Dico sexto quod ex fide scripture in qua est omnis veritas non fundabitur quod licet vicario Christi cui non fit ad hoc specialis revelacio, ut donet diurnas indulgencias vel annales. Patet ex hoc quod ex scriptura que non obviat sibi ipsi foret talis indulgencia temptacio Dei et seduccio populi.

such indulgences receives them the more copiously the more qualified he is as regards God. This is clear from this: that precisely in that measure God gives him such indulgences more copiously; now he does whatever he does by rule. I say third that no bishop's indulgence profits a man except in so far as he has first disposed himself before God. This is clear from this: that God gives him such an indulgence only so far, by the last proposition; now precisely so far does any bishop's indulgence profit.[14] [584] I say fourth that a bishop's indulgence will profit the recipient in so far as the bishop has instructed him in the faith of Christ, kindled him to devotion and the love of God, or in any way made him qualified for God's indulgence. The whole is clear from what has been said. I say fifth that the priests of Christ do not have power to give indulgences according to a quantity of time, unless it has been specially revealed to them. This is clear from that moral [lesson] of Judith 8:13: "You have set a time for the mercy of the Lord, and you have appointed him a day, according to your pleasure." He, then, to whom no revelation is made for this, who pledges to one unworthy before God, on a ground doubtful to himself, that within such a time God will have mercy on him, giving him full remission, makes a foolish compact, since he has no evidence that God has granted it.[15] I say sixth that it will not be grounded from the faith of scripture, in which is all truth, that it is lawful for a vicar of Christ to whom no special revelation is made for this to give indulgences of days or of years. This is clear from this: that, from scripture, which does not contradict itself, such an indulgence would be a tempting of God and a seducing of the people.[16]

Notes

1. Thomas's three other opinions, which he takes before his own (*In IV Sent.* d. 20, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 2; *Summa theol.* Suppl. q. 25, a. 2): worth measured by the recipient's faith, by the value of what is given, by the cause. C. *Vere dicunt*: they say truly, against the first opinion's pious fraud. *Attenditur penes*: is reckoned by. T. For *penes* B has *pu'* (580.21). R. Side-note 580.10.
2. *Doctor*: Thomas. *Ad indulgenciam faciendum*: the gerund stands where the gerundive *faciendam* is expected. *Auctoritas ... caritas ... pietas*: Thomas's three conditions, in the giver, the receiver and the cause. R. Side-note 580.18.
3. *Utrumque istorum*: each of the two ends just named, God's honour and the church's profit. *Unius pena alteri commutatur*: literally "the punishment of one is exchanged to another"; it may mean that one person's satisfaction is transferred to another's account. Wyclif reads it below (582.3) as an exchange of punishment for punishment, and the English follows him.
4. *Ut Deus*: as God, whose intention alone makes a grant true, cannot lie. *Sic varie*: so changeably, from one pope to the next. S. *Extrav. Jo. XXII* 9 un., *Quia in futurorum eventibus* (*De torneamentis*), which lifted the earlier ban on tournaments; the form of the reference is ours. The earlier pope is Clement V, whose ban with excommunication John XXII here revokes. T. The manuscripts read *Equidem in futurorum eventibus*; *Quia* is Loserth's correction (581.10). R. Side-note 580.28.
5. *Non regulariter rectificat istas causas*: does not as a rule examine and set right the causes and the recipients' charity, nor could he. *Ergo nec iustificat*: so he cannot show all his indulgences to be just. *Ex timore excessus prodigi*: the position, if true, should make the pope sparing.
6. *Centum millibus cuilibet septem annos*: seven years to each of a hundred thousand, that is, 700,000 years in all, which could as well be given to one. *Noticia dignitatis*: knowledge of the recipients' worthiness. *Connexa*: bound together, so that all merits act as one. *Agens naturale*: an agent acting by nature, to the utmost of its power, not by choice. The second *videtur* resumes the sentence after the *quod cum* clause. T. B *ecclesie connexa* (581.24). R. Side-note 581.18.
7. *Stat quod*: it is consistent that. *Sanctus doctor*: Thomas. T. B *Si dicatur* (581.29). At 582.1 the print reads *quia data pena que non videtur, quod*, which does not construe; Loserth's note marks *que* as superfluous and gives the right reading as *quia data pena non videtur quod*, translated here. R. Side-note 582.1.

8. ***Individuatur a tempore*: a punishment is this punishment by its time. *Tum quia ... et*: the second reason follows *et* without a second *tum*. *Pena beati*: the punishment endured by a saint whose merits are applied; being past, it neither exists now nor can inhere in the one indulged. *Subiectari*: to have its subject in. T. A and A_1 read *quamalter*, with A in the margin *aliter* (582.6).**
9. **Risibility, the capacity to laugh, is the property proper to man: remove the property and the nature goes. *Ineque*: unequally. *Supplet satisfaccionem*: makes up the satisfaction from his own merit. *Quod leges impugnant*: the canons deny that the granter of an indulgence must himself be in grace. T. Loserth's note to 582.10 reads *risibilitatem; racionabilitatem (?) ita codd.*, the print's *risibilitatem* is Loserth's text, the manuscripts reading (with his query) *racionabilitatem*. The English follows the print. R. Side-note 582.16.**
10. **Peter and Paul are stock names for any bishop and any man of his diocese. The canons limit a bishop's indulgence to forty days and to his own subjects, so that a hundred bishops in one diocese give no more than its own bishop; yet a man who tours the hundred dioceses collects 100 × 40 days. *Paulo vagante ... et deteriorato*: an ablative absolute, "while Paul wanders ... and grows worse". S. The canons meant are X 5.38.14 *Cum ex eo* (Lateran IV: forty days) and X 5.38.4 *Quod autem*, which makes grants profit only those whose own judges grant them. T. B *iurediccione* (582.28). R. Side-note 582.23.**
11. ***Episcopus Nullatensis*: a bishop "of Nowhere", in Loserth's note a bishop who has no episcopal see (a titular bishop). *Dotatus*: endowed with a see and its revenues. *Numquid ... ?* expects assent here. T. B *rogo hoc* (583.1).**
12. ***Domestici inimici*: "And a man's enemies shall be they of his own household" (Matthew 10:36). T. B *amici sint* (583.11).**
13. ***Protestacio*: Wyclif's declaration of submission (row), made before the conclusions; not a defiance. C. *Nisi fuerit et de quanto fuerit*: unless, and to the degree that, he is. *Habilitat*: makes qualified (cf. row *habilis*). R. Loserth compares Hus, *Adversus indulgencias papales*, *Opp.* I, fol. 185b ff.. Side-notes 583.14, 583.17.**
14. ***Sed ipse facit ... ad regulam* and *sed precise de tanto*: each *sed* brings the premiss that closes the proof ("now"). *Ex proposicione proxima*: by the second conclusion. T. A and A_1 lack *se* (583.28). R. Side-notes 583.22, 583.27, 584.1.**
15. **Judith 8:13 (DR). The manuscripts read *in arbitrio vestro*; Loserth corrected it to *in arbitrium vestrum* from the Vulgate (584.10). C. *Ex illo morali*: from that moral lesson. *Ex sibi dubio*: on a ground doubtful to himself. *Stulte pangit*: makes a foolish compact. R. Side-note 584.6.**
16. ***Diurnas indulgencias vel annales*: indulgences reckoned in days or in years. *Que non obviat sibi ipsi*: which does not contradict itself. *Temptacio Dei*: the tempting of God that scripture forbids (Deuteronomy 6:16). R. Side-note 584.17.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **580: ∅ (ihree is the English side-note (The other three); Ideo already at pos 66)**
  - **580: *omnes* (T is a margin letter)**
  - **580: ∅ (to is the English side-note (merit applied to); oportet already at pos 136)**
  - **581: *XXII*^{i}**
  - **581: *racio* [NW]**
  - **582: *dyocesi* [NW]**
  - **582: *diocesanus* [NW]**
  - **583: *dyocesi?* [NW]**
  - **584: *proderit,***
  - **584: *fide* (207c is the glued folio mark)**
  - **584: *veritas***
  - **584: *vicario***
  - **584: ∅ (English side note (Christ's vicar)) [DELX]**

Part 12: The last conclusions; sin and punishment in purgatory; merit after death; the end of the treatise

Loserth pp. 584.23–587.15

¶1 584.23–586.17

584.23
7. The bishops should be careful to teach this to their flocks.
585.1
8. Priests (unless by special revelation) ought not to give unconditional absolution.

[584] **Dico septimo quod prelati ecclesie debent in ista veritate catholica subiectos instruere, ne laici infideliter occupati circa minus utilia attendant superbiam et avariciam sacerdotum? Patet in simili de lege questorum, quibus limitatum est quod non dicant populo nisi quod in literis episcoporum eis fuerit limitatum, ut patet libro septimo de Penitenciis et Remissionibus, capitulo Abusionibus. Multo magis ergo Christi vicarii debent docere populum secundum limites literarum spiritus sancti quas eis tradidit ad docendum.** [585]

I say seventh that the prelates of the church ought to instruct their subjects in this catholic truth, lest the laity, faithlessly busied about less useful things, attend upon the pride and avarice of priests.[1] This is clear by a like case from the law about questors, for whom it is assigned that they say nothing to the people except what has been assigned to them in the bishops' letters, as is clear in the seventh book, *Of Penances and Remissions*, chapter *Abusionibus*. Much more, therefore, ought the vicars

585.18 *The sacrament of penance is needful though useless without contrition.*
586.1 *Sin lasts as long as punishment.*
586.18 *For all sin there is an appointed punishment, with which God cannot dispense.*
586.31 *How the blessed gain reward for themselves and others,*

Dico octavo quod sacerdotes Christi, licet habeant potestatem ad absolvendum subditos a pena et culpa, non tamen debent absolvere sub hac forma nec subiecti illud expetere, nisi hoc eis specialiter fuerit revelatum. Prima pars patet ex hoc quod sacerdos potest sacramentaliter ostendere sibi confitentem taliter absolutum, qui ad tantum conteritur quod statim decedens sine pena purgatorii advolaret, et hoc est sacerdotem absolvere. Nec est potestas alicuius sacerdotis in casu ultime necessitatis sic ligata quin, quantum Deus revelans permiserit, possit absolvere; foret autem nimia presumpcio aliquem Christi vicarium absolucionem talem pretendere, nisi Deus hoc sibi revelaverit faciendum, ne forte incurrat blasphemum mendacium. Quid ergo valet subiectos inoportune absolucionem talem expetere, cum certe debent credere quod correspondenter ad sua merita vel demerita taxabuntur? Licet autem sufficiat apud Christum ubique presentem contricio, tamen sacramentum penitencie est valde necessarium, licet non proderit sine illa. Ideo foret stulticia sacerdotem cui non fit ad hoc revelacio diffinire quod penitencia vel aliud sacramentum suo suscipienti proderit ad salutem. Sic enim vetaret ut pro absoluto suo a pena et culpa in mortis articulo fieret suffragium ecclesie, sicut non facimus pro quocunque mortuo quem constat nobis iam esse beatum. Istam sentenciam de suffragiis et indulgenciis dixerim ad instruccionem inferiorum ecclesie, et exposicionem correccioni, supplecioni et approbacioni superiorum secundum regulas scripturarum et leges humanas ac decreta potentatuum precise ad tantum apprecior. Sed ad materiam de peccati purgacione quam tetigi in proximo argumento videtur mihi probabile quod quilibet purgandus tam diu habet peccatum [586] **in purgatorio, quam diu inibi subit penam. Nam sequitur: Hec est pena peccati, ergo est aliquid peccati, cum omnis pena sit res iusta per quam peccatum bonificatur, et per consequens illud peccatum est. Similiter, si quilibet in purgatorio purgatus est omnino sine peccato, tunc est ita mundus sicut beatus in celo, cum solum peccatum causat talem inmundiciam, et per consequens foret tam amabilis in purgatorio ab ecclesia triumphante, sicut ipso beato, quia tam pulcher. Similiter, quilibet existens in purgatorio propter peccatum suum preteritum deficit a plena dileccione Dei et ecclesie, ymmo a pleno profectu sibi et aliis quem debuit tunc habere. Ille ergo defectus purgandus est peccatum, ideo videtur penam purgare illum defectum et satisfacere pro defectu preterito, et quando lux amoris primo inducitur, tunc primo obscuritas peccati educitur.**

of Christ to teach the people according to the limits of the letters of the Holy Spirit, which he has delivered to them to teach.[2] [585] **I say eighth that the priests of Christ, although they have power to absolve their subjects from punishment and guilt, yet ought not to absolve under this form, nor ought the subjects to seek it, unless this has been specially revealed to them. The first part is clear from this: that a priest can sacramentally show the one who confesses to him to be so absolved, being contrite to such a degree that, dying at once, he would fly off without the punishment of purgatory; and this is for the priest to absolve. Nor is the power of any priest, in a case of last necessity, so bound that he cannot absolve, as far as God, revealing it, permits; but it would be excessive presumption for any vicar of Christ to put forward such an absolution unless God had revealed to him that it was to be done, lest perhaps he fall into a blasphemous lie.**[3] **What does it avail, then, for subjects to seek such an absolution unseasonably, since they surely ought to believe that they will be assessed correspondingly to their merits or demerits? And although contrition suffices with Christ, who is everywhere present, yet the sacrament of penance is very necessary, though it will not profit without that [contrition].**[4] **So it would be folly for a priest to whom no revelation is made for this to define that penance, or any other sacrament, will profit its receiver to salvation. For so he would forbid that the suffrage of the church be made for the one he has absolved from punishment and guilt at the point of death, as we do not make it for any dead man whom we know to be already blessed.**[5] **This teaching on suffrages and indulgences I would have spoken for the instruction of the lower [members] of the church; and the exposition [I submit] to the correction, supplementing and approval of my superiors according to the rules of the scriptures; and human laws and the decrees of the powerful I value precisely so far [as they agree with these].**[6] **But as to the matter of the purging of sin, which I touched on in the last argument, it seems probable to me that anyone who is to be purged has sin** [586] **in purgatory for as long as he undergoes punishment there.**[7] **For it follows: this is the punishment of sin, therefore it is something of sin; since every punishment is a just thing through which sin is made good, and consequently that sin exists.**[8] **Likewise, if anyone in purgatory, being purged, is wholly without sin, then he is as clean as one blessed in heaven, since sin alone causes such uncleanness; and consequently he would be as lovable to the church triumphant, while in purgatory, as the blessed one himself, since he is as beautiful.**[9] **Likewise, anyone who is in purgatory falls short, on account**

of his past sin, of the full love of God and of the church, indeed of the full profit to himself and to others that he ought then to have. That defect, then, which is to be purged, is sin; so it seems that punishment purges that defect and makes satisfaction for the past defect; and when the light of love is first brought in, then first is the darkness of sin brought out.[10]

¶2 586.18–586.30

[586]Videtur ulterius quod pro quolibet peccato in quo decedit predestinatus Deus statuit certam penam, cum quo non poterit illo peccato supposito dispensare. Nam per idem posset dispensare cum quolibet peccato in purgatorio vel in inferno, et dimittere homini peccatum sine hoc quod voluerit converti ad dominum, sine amore faciendo ipsum beatum, cum nulla pena essencialiter consequeretur peccatum sed foret tantum per accidens arbitraria quoad Deum. Sicut ergo pena essencialis est per se iusta, sic est tanta iusticia in pena accidentali, sed meritum ecclesie facit esse aliud peccatum totale in purgatorio quam foret merito illo dimisso.

It seems, further, that for every sin in which a predestinate [person] dies God has established a certain punishment, with which, that sin being supposed, he will not be able to dispense. For by the same token he could dispense with any sin in purgatory or in hell, and remit sin to a man without his having willed to be converted to the Lord, making him blessed without love; since no punishment would follow sin essentially, but it would be only by accident, arbitrary as regards God.[11] As, therefore, essential punishment is just of itself, so there is as much justice in accidental punishment; but the merit of the church makes the total sin in purgatory other than it would be were that merit set aside.[12]

¶3 586.31–587.15
587.1 *and the souls in purgatory for themselves.*

[586]Videtur tercio quod sicut beati in celo merentur sibi continue usque ad diem iudicii premium accidentale, aliis autem utrumque, sed existentes in [587]purgatorio merentur sibi premium utrumque continue, sic dampnati usque in finem continue demerentur. Prima pars videtur: Eo quod beati, sicut continue merentur aliis in via, sic merentur ut post habeant consorcium eorum in patria; purgati vero merentur sibi nedum remissionem peccaminum, sed beatitudinem tam essencialem quam accidentalem futuram, voluntarie gracia huius ex Dei gracia paciendo; licet autem peccent continue, quia tunc sunt in gracia sine mortali, non video quomodo proprie demerentur, sicut nec libere contradictorie tunc merentur. Dampnati vero cum sint peccato mortali in malivolencia sua continue peiorati, continue demerentur, licet prosint per accidens. De isto alibi. Explicit tractatus de sancta matre ecclesia.

It seems, thirdly, that as the blessed in heaven merit for themselves continually, until the day of judgement, accidental reward, but both [rewards] for others, but those who are in [587]purgatory merit both rewards for themselves continually, so the damned continually demerit until the end.[13] The first part is evident thus: because the blessed, as they continually merit for others on the way, so they merit that afterwards they may have their fellowship in the homeland; and those being purged merit for themselves not only remission of sins but future blessedness, both essential and accidental, suffering willingly for its sake out of God's grace; and although they sin continually, since they are then in grace without mortal [sin], I do not see how they properly demerit, as neither do they then merit with the freedom of contradiction.[14] But the damned, since in mortal sin they are continually made worse in their malevolence, continually demerit, although they profit [others] by accident. Of this elsewhere. Here ends the treatise on holy mother church.[15]

Notes

1. ***Attendant***: taken as "attend upon", that is, serve and feed the priests' pride and avarice by buying indulgences; "give heed to" (and so be scandalised by) is possible. T. The print ends the sentence with a question mark, though it is a statement. R. Side-note 584.23.
2. ***Clem.*** 5.9.2 ***Abusionibus***: Loserth's reference ("Clementinarum lib. V, tit. IX, cap. II"); the form is ours. Wyclif calls the Clementines, as medieval canonists did, the "seventh book" (***liber septimus***) of the decretals. C. ***Questores***: the alms-collectors who published indulgences, whom the canon restricts to what their bishops' letters contain. ***Limitatum***: "assigned", in both places (row ***limitare***). ***Christi vicarii***: priests at large, as vicars of Christ. ***Litere spiritus sancti***: scripture.

3. ***Sub hac forma***: in the form "from punishment and guilt" (***a pena et culpa***). ***Prima pars***: that priests have the power. ***Ostendere ... absolutum***: declare sacramentally that the penitent is absolved. ***Advolaret***: would fly off, straight to heaven. ***Pretendere***: put forward, claim. R. Side-note 585.1.
4. ***Inoportune***: out of season, without a revelation. ***Illa***: contrition. T. B ***afnciat*** for ***sufficiat*** (585.18), a slip. R. Side-note 585.18.
5. ***Diffinire***: to determine (cf. row ***diffinicio***). ***Sic enim vetaret***: by defining that the dying man was absolved from punishment and guilt, the priest would in effect forbid the church's suffrage for him, since the church makes none for those known to be blessed. ***In mortis articulo***: at the point of death.
6. The sentence is Wyclif's submission. ***Et exposicionem correccioni, supplecioni et approbacioni superiorum*** has no verb; "[I submit]" is our supply, for a word such as ***submitto*** that may have been lost. ***Secundum regulas scripturarum*** is taken with the correction of superiors. ***Precise ad tantum apprecior***: "I value precisely so far", with the measure, agreement with the rules of scripture, left unexpressed and here supplied in brackets (our supply). ***Inferiorum***: the lower members of the church.
7. ***In proximo argumento***: the argument that punishment and sin go inseparably together (582.10–20). T. B ***inpurgacione*** (585.33). A notes ***Conclusio*** in the margin (586.1). R. Side-note 586.1.
8. ***Aliquid peccati***: something belonging to sin. ***Bonificatur***: is made good, that is, set in just order by its punishment. ***Illud peccatum est***: the sin still exists.
9. ***Ab ecclesia triumphante, sicut ipso beato***: taken as "as lovable to the church triumphant as [is] the blessed one himself"; the ablative may instead mean "loved by the blessed one himself". The argument is a reductio: the soul in purgatory is not yet as clean as the blessed.
10. ***Ille defectus purgandus***: the shortfall of love and profit, which remains to be purged, is itself sin. ***Lux amoris ... obscuritas peccati***: light brought in and darkness brought out (***inducitur ... educitur***), the scholastic language of form induced and privation removed.
11. A notes ***Conclusio*** in the margin (586.18). C. ***Cum quo***: with which punishment (***quo*** for ***qua***). ***Illo peccato supposito***: given that sin. ***Arbitraria quoad Deum***: depending on God's mere choice. R. B in the margin at 586.21: ***Apparet quod tenet predestinatum posse decedere in peccato***, "It appears that he holds that a predestinate [person] can die in sin." Side-note 586.18.
12. ***Pena essencialis ... accidentali***: the punishment that follows sin of itself, and the punishment that comes by accident, which the merit of the church can change. ***Merito illo dimisso***: that merit being set aside. R. B in the margin at 586.23: ***Quam vocat penam essencialem et quam accidentalem?***, "Which does he call essential punishment and which accidental?"
13. ***Utrumque***: both rewards, the essential and the accidental. The blessed merit only accidental reward for themselves, since their essential reward is already had; for others still on the way they merit both. ***Demerentur***: they deserve ill, the opposite of ***merentur***. R. A notes ***Conclusio*** in the margin (586.31). Side-notes 586.31, 587.1.
14. ***Gracia huius***: for its sake. ***Licet autem peccent continue***: Wyclif has just argued (585.33–586.17) that the souls in purgatory keep sin while they are punished. ***Sine mortali***: without mortal sin. ***Libere contradictorie***: with the freedom of contradiction, the power to act or not to act, which they no longer have; so they neither properly merit nor demerit in that way. T. A and A_1 read ***quia tum*** (587.9).
15. ***Prosint per accidens***: the damned profit others by accident, not by their will (for instance, in showing God's justice). ***De isto alibi***: he treats it elsewhere; the place is not named. T. B ***licet profuit*** (587.14). B has ***Explicit*** alone; A_1 adds ***Continet viginti tria capitula et sic est finis***, "It contains twenty-three chapters, and so is the end" (587.15).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 586: ***purgatorio,***
  - 586: ***bonificatur,*** [NW]
  - 586: ***Ille***
  - 586: ***aliis*** [NW]
  - 586: ***in***
  - 587: ***finem*** [NW]
  - 587: ***peiorati,*** [NW]

Glossary

The renderings held steady across the translation. Each row: the Latin term, its English, and a note where the choice needs defending.

The church

***ecclesia*: church.** Lower-case in English except in a proper title.
***ecclesia militans / triumphans / dormiens*: the church militant / triumphant / sleeping.** *Dormiens* = the souls in purgatory. Not "dormant".
***pars peregrinans; peregrinari*: the pilgrim part; to be a pilgrim.** Augustine's *peregrinatio* (Ench. 56).
***predestinatus, -i*: the predestinate (sg. "a predestinate [person]").** Never "the elect", which is *electi* and gets "the elect".
***prescitus, -i*: the foreknown.** Wyclif's technical term for those God foreknows will be damned. It is not "the reprobate" (*reprobi* → "the reprobate"). Explain it in a note at its first occurrence in each work. The English word misleads on its own and Penn explains it only once (T. p. 361 n. 12).
***presciencia*: foreknowledge.**
***viator*: wayfarer.** One still on the road, not yet in the homeland. Loserth: "a traveller on earth".
***viare; vians*: to be a wayfarer; [one] on the way.** The verb of *viator*; tag g:viator. (8 sites).
***via / patria*: the way / the homeland.** *Beatitudo patrie* → "the blessedness of the homeland". The earthly sense (one's native country) is also "homeland"; a note where it matters (*Dial.* 54.2).
***sponsa / sponsus*: bride / bridegroom.**
***corpus Christi misticum*: the mystical body of Christ.**
***mater nostra*: our mother.** Church as mother is the governing figure of *De ecclesia* I.
***symbolum*: creed.** *Utrumque simbolum* = both creeds, Apostles' and Nicene (T. p. 368).
***fides formata / informis*: formed faith / unformed faith.** Faith formed by charity.
***fides explicita / implicita*: explicit faith / implicit faith.** The scholastic pair (*Dial.* 28.16–17)..
***articulus fidei*: article of faith.** (4 sites).
***infidelis*: unbeliever; with a dative, faithless (to).** Two senses by construction. Pairs with *infidelitas*, unbelief. (10 sites).
***apocrifa; apocrifus*: apocrypha; apocryphal.** Wyclif applies it to the saints' chronicles as well as to books outside the canon. (6 sites).
***sacerdotes vulgares*: common priests.** The adjective; kept apart from *vulgares*, "the common people". (2 sites).
***neophitus*: novice.** 1 Tim. 3:6..
***Christicole*: worshippers of Christ.** .
***caritas*: charity.** Never "love". *Amor* and *dilectio* → "love". The argument often turns on charity as the Holy Spirit (Lombard, *Sent.* I d.17).
***suffragia*: suffrages.** The prayers and good works shared out by the church or an order. (11 sites).
***suffragari*: to aid by intercession.** The verb of *suffragia*. (2 sites). Where privileges or law, not prayers, do the aiding: "to aid" (*Eccl.* 241.1; cf. *suffragium* "aid").
***litere fraternitatum*: letters of fraternity.** Friars' letters admitting a benefactor to the order's suffrages. (4 sites).
***canonizare*: canonize.** The same English whether pope or scripture canonizes (*Dial.* 20.31, 21.1). (6 sites).
***viantes*: those on the road.** The participle beside *viator* (wayfarer); kept distinct so the reader sees which word Wyclif used. (≈22 sites in *De ecclesia*; first *Eccl.* 10.12).
***capitaneus*: captain.** Kept apart from *caput* "head": Wyclif grants the pope captaincy and denies him headship. (*Eccl.* 17.13, 19.21–24, 22.8).
***matrix ecclesia*: mother church.** The local mother church (cathedral or metropolitan); a C note at the first occurrence in each chunk, to keep it apart from the church as *mater nostra*. (*Eccl.* 23.12).
***universitas fidelium*: the whole body of the faithful.** (*Eccl.* 37.13).
***obedienciarius*: one who obeys.** Non-classical agent noun: the subject bound to obey (not the monastic officer). (*Eccl.* 39.3).
***elemosinarius*: almsman.** The one who receives alms (cf. *elemosinatus*). (46.21).
***caput*: head.** The card's key ruling, now a row: Christ alone is head of the church; kept apart from *capitaneus* "captain"..
***speculator*: watchman.** The bishop as watchman (Ezek. 3:17). (*Eccl.* 55.16).
***ecclesiastici*: CONTEXTUAL: clergy / those who belong to the church.** Usually the clergy; where Wyclif means every member of the church (*Eccl.* 81.4) render "those who belong to the church" and write a C note..
***placitare*: plead at law.** (85.8).
***iuvencula*: young girl.** The church militant as Christ's young bride; kept apart from the Song's *adolescentula* "young maiden" (DR). (*Eccl.* pp. 23, 37, 94.27).

***adolescentula*: young maiden.** Song 1:2, 6:7 (DR "young maidens")..
***prepositura*: office of superior.** The abstract beside *prepositi*. (95.3).
***filii imitacionis*: sons of imitation.** Children of Abraham by imitating him, not by flesh. (89.27, 90.7).
***regalia*: regality.** The king's royal right. (*Eccl.* 148.3, 151.12, 152.12).
***forisfacere*: commit forfeiture.** (152.13).
***ecclesia laycalis / secularis*: the lay church / the secular church.** (154.15, 156.3).
***orator*: CONTEXTUAL: bedesman / advocate / suppliant.** Plural *oratores* "bedesmen" (Dialogus ruling); of one who pleads the church's cause (*orator ecclesie*, *Eccl.* 165.25, 166.4) "advocate", with a C note.. Of one who prays to God himself (*devotus Dei orator*, *Pot. pape* 68.17) "suppliant", with a C note.
***privilegium / privilegiare / privilegiacio*: privilege / to privilege / privileging.** The key term of *Eccl.* 8–9..
***exempcio*: exemption.** (*Eccl.* 9).
***furce et puteus*: gallows and pit.** The franchise of capital justice. (*Eccl.* 9).
***expropriacio*: renunciation of property.** Never "expropriation" (seizure). (*Eccl.* 9).
***uxoratus*: married.** .
***membrum*: member.** The card's key ruling, now a row (with *caput*)..
***vicarius Christi*: vicar of Christ.** The card's ruling, now a row..
***elemosinans*: almsgiver.** The participle of *elemosinare*: the donor. (*Eccl.* 13).

Lordship, law, office

***dominium*: lordship.** Not "dominion". Titles: *De civili dominio* → *On Civil Lordship*; *De dominio divino* → *On Divine Lordship*.
***dominus; dominari*: lord; to exercise lordship / to lord it.** Pick by context (neutral vs. pejorative) and note the pejorative.
***dominium civile / naturale / evangelicum*: civil / natural / evangelical lordship.**
***regnum*: kingdom.** Every sense: the political state as well as the kingdom of God and scripture's kingdoms. Not "realm". Wilson, (27 sites).
***dominacio*: exercise of lordship.** Kept apart from *dominium*. (6 sites).
***ordinacio; ordinancia*: ordinance; of the sacrament, ordination.** Two senses by referent (not CONTEXTUAL): the sacrament (*clericorum ordinacio*, *Dial.* 50.21) is "ordination"; everywhere else "ordinance". (22 sites).
***consuetudo*: custom.** (28 sites).
***autorizare*: authorize.** (6 sites).
***familia*: household.** A great man's retinue..
***magnates*: magnates.** .
***capitalis dominus; tenere de*: chief lord; to hold of.** Feudal tenure language, kept literal: the lords "hold of Christ as chief lord".
***titulus*: title.** As in title to property.
***servicium*: service.** Pair with *dominium* (T. p. 363 n. 19 on the definitions). Liturgical *servicia ecclesie*, "services of the church", is untagged..
***ius*: right / law.** Two senses (subjective right vs. body of law). The chunk's note picks one wherever it matters.
***lex dei / lex Christi / lex evangelica*: God's law / the law of Christ / the gospel law.**
***vicarius deitatis / vicarius humanitatis Christi*: vicar of the Godhead / vicar of Christ's humanity.** King and priest respectively (*Dial.* 2.14–16; *Off. reg.* 13, 137).
***deitas / divinitas*: the Godhead / divinity.** Kept distinct; B reads *divinitatis* at *Dial.* 2.13.
***potencia regulata racione*: power regulated by reason.**
***elemosina*: alms.**
***elemosinare; elemosinatus*: to give alms to; almsman.** The almsman is the beneficiary of an endowment. (2 sites).
***manus mortua*: the dead hand.** Mortmain; kept literal because Truth's pun turns on it (*Dial.* 60.18, 61.14–17). (3 sites).
***ditare*: to enrich.** Kept apart from *dotare*, endow. (21 sites).
***appropriare; appropriacio*: to appropriate; appropriation.** Canon law: a parish church annexed to a college or house. (4 sites).
***affeccio proprietaria*: proprietary affection.** .
***decime; pars decima*: tithes; the tenth part.**
***dotacio*: endowment.**
***temporalia*: temporal goods.**
***prelatus*: prelate.**
***curatus*: curate.** In the old sense: a priest with the cure of souls. Note at first occurrence per work.

***sacerdos / presbiter*: priest / presbyter.** Kept distinct: Wyclif's argument on orders needs the difference visible.
***clerus; clericus*: the clergy; cleric.**
***clerus cesareus*: the caesarean clergy.** Wyclif's term for clergy in secular office.
***temporales domini*: temporal lords.** Kept apart from *mundani domini*, worldly lords. (22 sites).
***brachium seculare*: the secular arm.** (7 sites).
***milicia; milites*: knighthood; knights.** The second estate; Pollard's word.. *Milites Christi / antichristi* (the Pauline figure, 2 Tim. 2:3 DR "good soldier of Christ Jesus") → "soldiers"; the estate stays "knights"..
***coactivus; cohercere, cohersitivus*: coactive; coerce, coercive.** Kept apart: *potencia coactiva* "coactive power" (the ruler's), *cohercere* "coerce"..
***laboratores*: labourers.** The third estate..
***tercia pars ecclesie*: the third part of the church.** The commons (*Dial.* 85.15, 85.22)..
***prepositi*: superiors.** Heads of houses; kept apart from *prelatus*..
***ius patronatus*: right of patronage.** .
***prescripcio*: prescription.** The legal title by long use..
***sacramentalia*: sacramentals.** .
***secularitas*: worldliness.** Kept apart from *secularis*, a secular..
***simonia*: simony.** (3 sites).
***beneficium ecclesiasticum*: ecclesiastical benefice.** .
***patronus*: patron.** Of a benefice. (13 sites).
***procurator; procuratrix*: proctor.** Pollard's word..
***gleba*: glebe.** (12 sites).
***mortificacio*: amortization.** Land put into mortmain; with *manus mortua*. (2 sites). Of a privilege that dies by abuse (*mortificacio privilegii*, *Eccl.* 200.17): "mortification", with a G note.
***legalitas*: legal standing.** .
***castra caynitica*: Caim's castles.** The friars' houses; the Wycliffite English name (CAIM = the four mendicant orders' initials)..
***commutacio; commutare*: exchange; to exchange.** The argument on true and false trade turns on it (*Dial.* cap. 33). (8 sites).
***secularis (noun)*: a secular.** English keeps Latin's range (secular cleric or layman); a C note where the referent matters. (80 sites, *secular-*).
***censura*: censure.** (4 sites).
***citare; citacio*: to cite; citation.** Summons to a church court. (12 sites).
***suspendere; suspencio*: to suspend; suspension.** Note the pun on hanging where live (*Dial.* 57.10–16)..
***graduacio; graduati*: CONTEXTUAL: graduation / gradation; graduates.** Academic "graduation" (Dialogus, 4 sites); of rank or lordship (*graduacio dominii*, *Pot. pape* 293.33, 297) "gradation".; CONTEXTUAL.
***prelatus / sacerdos cesarius*: caesarean prelate / priest.** Extends *clerus cesareus*. (22 sites, *cesar-*).
***papa*: pope.** (34 sites).
***indulgencie*: indulgences.** (7 sites).
***oratores*: bedesmen.** Those bound or paid to pray for a benefactor; Pollard's side-note word. Not "those who pray". (5 sites).
***pencio annua*: yearly pension.** (3 sites).
***commercium; commercari*: trade; to trade.** (21 sites).
***conducentes*: those who hire them.** .
***episcopus; dominus episcopus*: bishop; the lord bishop.** *Dominis episcopis* → "the lord bishops". The courtesy is his, possibly barbed; don't sharpen it.
***religio privata; secta*: private religion; sect.** His name for the religious orders. Keep "sect".
***religiosi*: the religious.** Members of the orders. (8 sites).
***claustrales*: cloisterers.** (20 sites).
***doctrina*: doctrine.** Kept apart from *sentencia*, teaching. (12 sites).
***thema*: theme.** The scripture text of a sermon. (2 sites).
***frater*: friar (of the mendicants) / brother.** By context.
***possessionati*: the possessioners.** Endowed religious.
***satrapa*: satrap.** Derogatory: church-court officials wielding delegated power (T. p. 378 n. 58). Keep the word; note it at first occurrence per work.
***vulgares*: the common people.** The third estate. Not "the vulgar".
***iconomus (= oeconomus)*: householder.** *Dial.* 2.21., with a note.

***protestacio; protestari*: declaration; to declare solemnly.** The submission formula ("if anyone can teach me this is contrary to scripture or reason, I will humbly retract"). Penn and Lahey both inverted it (T. pp. 369, 378). Render it as a retraction offer, never as defiance.
***lex gracie*: the law of grace.** The new law, opposed to *lex vetus*. (*Dial.* 10.3; 7 sites).
***curia romana*: the Roman curia.** (*Dial.* 7.8; 5 sites).
***heretica pravitas*: heretical depravity.** The heresy courts' formula; keep it recognisable. (*Dial.* 7.5, 7.8).
***plenitudo potestatis*: plenitude of power.** The canonists' term for papal power. (6 sites in *De ecclesia*; first 13.6).
***bigamia*: bigamy.** Canon-law sense: a second marriage (successive, or to a widow), a bar to orders; a C note at the first occurrence in each chunk says so. (3 sites; first *Eccl.* 11.6).
***habitudo*: condition.** A person's present state, set against predestination (Richard of St Victor). *Habitudo ad*: "condition toward", a relation (180). (*Eccl.* 72.24).
***humidum radicale / fluens*: radical / flowing moisture.** The physicians' terms. (75.19).
***de virtute sermonis*: in the proper sense of the words.** Wyclif's recurring formula for the literal force of an expression. (*Eccl.* 115.6, 115.8).
***distrahens*: diminishing qualifier.** The logicians' *determinacio distrahens*, which takes away from what it qualifies ("a dead man"). (*Eccl.* 128.3).
***locus a maiori*: the topic from the greater.** The dialectical topic; for *a simili* see "the topic from likeness". (*Eccl.* 144.27).
***ficticia*: fiction.** A feigned ground in an objection (*Nec valet ficticia*). (145.19).
***gracia preveniens / comitans / concomitans / consumans*: prevenient / accompanying / concomitant / consummating grace.** (06-g).
***allegare / allegacio*: allege / allegation.** To cite as an authority; implies nothing about truth (the period sense). (*Eccl.* 162–165; as earlier chunks).
***insolubilia*: insolubles.** The logicians' paradoxes of self-reference. (*Eccl.* 175.11).
***perquisitum*: acquisition.** Property acquired, not inherited (the legal term). (*Eccl.* 215.4).
***contribules*: countrymen.** Lev. 25:17 (DR). (208.2, 214.20, 214.27).
***franchisia*: franchise.** (*Eccl.* 239.22).
***facinus*: misdeed.** Wyclif equates it with "felony" (239.13, 239.21)..
***privilegiandus*: the one to be privileged.** (*Eccl.* 12).
***elemosina temporalis / perpetua*: temporary alms / perpetual alms.** "Temporary" keeps it apart from *temporalia*; *perpetua* answers to frankalmoign. Where the sense is alms *paid in* temporal goods (as 335.11), "alms in temporal goods", with a C note. (*Eccl.* 13, 15).
***manucapcio*: mainprise.** (270.13).
***autenticus / autenticacio*: authentic / authentication.** The key term of *Eccl.* 13..

Logic, disputation, metaphysics

***quiditas*: quiddity.** Kept. Explain at first use per work ("what a thing is").
***inconveniencia; inconveniens*: CONTEXTUAL: an absurdity (in argument) · troubles, ill consequences (in affairs).** One word for what does not fit: the absurd consequence of a premiss, and the disorder that follows from an act. Dikaiosune rule: English by context, C note at first occurrence in each chunk and wherever it leans the other way (*Dial.* 22.16 troubles; 23.2, 23.16 absurdities). (3 sites).
***opinio*: opinion.** Opposed to *fides* throughout (*Dial.* 20.24–31). (11 sites).
***credulitas*: credence.** With *credere*, believe (*Dial.* 23.17–24.4)..
***argumentum topicum*: topical argument.** Merely probable, not demonstrative. (4 sites).
***medium inductivum*: a middle term that leads on.** (*Dial.* 25.5).
***ars obligacionis*: the art of obligation.** The disputation genre *de obligationibus*. (2 sites).
***assumptum*: the assumption.** The premiss taken for the argument. (3 sites).
***sentenciare*: to pronounce.** The verb of *sentencia*. (2 sites).
***predicamentum*: category.** The Aristotelian category; never "predicament" (*Dial.* 92.1: the standard member of a category)..
***sequela*: CONTEXTUAL: what follows / following.** The logical consequence "what follows"; of following Christ (*sequela Christi*) "following" (*Pot. pape* 63.13).; second sense.
***practizare*: to put into practice.** (4 sites). With *contra* + person, "practise against" (plot), *Dial.* ch. 17..
***sophisticare (transitive)*: to counterfeit.** Kept apart from *sophisticari*, to play the sophist..
***respectus; respectivus*: relation; relational.** .
***racio (against* substancia*)*: aspect.** This technical sense only; *racio* elsewhere by context..
***locus a simili*: the topic from likeness.** Wyclif's jibe *a simiali similitudine*: "from apish likeness". (6 sites).
***sinderisis*: synderesis.** .
***fallacia*: fallacy.** .
***sophisticari*: to play the sophist.** (6 sites).

***insinuativus*: implied.** Paired with *expressus*, express..
***occasionaliter*: by occasion.** Occasion, not cause..
***quid nominis*: what the name means.** Not "the name" (T. p. 365).
***differencia*: difference (logical *differentia*).**
***subiectum / passio*: subject / attribute.** *Passio* in the *Posterior Analytics* sense (a proper attribute), never "passion".
***dicitur multipliciter*: is said in many ways.** Aristotle's *pollachōs legetai*.
***sumitur pro*: is taken for.** Supposition language.
***famosior*: best-known [sense].**
***simpliciter / secundum quid*: without qualification / in a certain respect.** Always opposable. Never "simply", "wholly", "directly", "naturally" etc. (T. p. 364).
***necessitas suppositionis / ex suppositione*: necessity of supposition / necessity on supposition.** Conditional necessity.; *ex suppositione* (34.12, 38.22).
***de congruo / de condigno*: by congruity / by condignity.**
***contingens ad utrumlibet*: contingent either way.** T. p. 364.
***consequencia*: inference.** Not "consequence" (T. p. 361 n. 13).
***consequens / antecedens*: consequent / antecedent.**
***sequitur*: it follows.** Introduces a stated inference, often quoted in the next words. Not tagged where it is not an inference ("the third law follows", *Dial.* ch. 5)..
***propositio copulativa / disiunctiva*: conjunction / disjunction.** Not "copulative proposition" (T. p. 365).
***claudit contradictionem / contradictorium*: it implies a contradiction.** Stronger than "is against reason". Keep the escalation visible.
***instancia; objectum*: objection.** Not "instance" (T. p. 373). Also "urgency" (*ad instanciam*, at someone's urging, *Eccl.* 154.16), with a C note.
***tollere (instanciam, argumentum)*: to dispose of, demolish.** T. p. 373.
***redarguere*: to refute.** T. p. 365.
***proponere*: to propose.** Against *postponere* (put after), "put forward" may keep the pair visible, with a note (*Dial.* 74.25–26).
***concludere*: to infer.** "Conclude" only when a conclusion is literally drawn (T. p. 365).
***instatur; obicitur*: it is objected.** The disputation's objection formulae (*Eccl.*). (Wilson, with the *De ecclesia* card).
***dicitur (opening an answer)*: the answer is.** Elsewhere "it is said" (*Hic dicitur quod ...*, *Eccl.* 26.8: "To this the answer is that ..."). (Wilson).
***respondetur*: the reply is.** (Wilson).
***descripcio*: definition.** Not "description" (T. p. 363).
***glosare*: to gloss.** Interpret so as to remove the difficulty (T. p. 366).
***argucie; argucia*: stratagems, quibbles; a quibble.** T. p. 367.
***sophisma*: sophism.** A proposition that can apparently be proved and disproved (T. p. 360 n. 10).
***successivum / permanens*: successive entity / permanent entity.** T. p. 368 n. 31.
***ens / esse / essencia*: a being / being (existence) / essence.** *Esse* is ambiguous; note when it matters.
***universale; ydea*: universal; idea.**
***ampliacio*: ampliation.** Logical term (T. p. 364 n. 23).
***metaphisica*: metaphysics.** *Inter omnes metaphisicas* → "among all the metaphysics": he counts the doctrine of the church as one (T. p. 368).
***philosophia sermocinalis / realis*: the philosophy of language / the philosophy of reality.** T. pp. 364–5.
***liberum arbitrium*: free choice.** The scholastic term, not "free will" (*voluntas*). (*Dial.* 4.15).
***ex fide*: as faith teaches; with a genitive, from the faith of [scripture].** "It is of faith", on scripture's authority. *Ex fide scripture / duplicis testamenti* → "from the faith of scripture / of the twofold testament". after a census (30 sites in the *Dialogus*). An adjective works like the genitive: *ex fide catholica* → "from the catholic faith". Not the formula when a verb or participle governs *ex* (*racio capta ex fide* → "reason drawn from faith", epil-a)..
***citra fidem*: short of faith.** The contrast with *ex fide*: held on evidence, not as faith teaches. (4 sites).
***sentencia*: CONTEXTUAL: teaching / sentence.** The position taught, incl. Falsehood's (*tua sentencia*, "your teaching"). Not "sentence" for a position taught. (51 sites in the *Dialogus*). A judicial sentence (of excommunication) is "sentence", with a C note (*Eccl.* 221.33).
***evidencia*: evidence.** "Proof" only where it names a demonstration, with a note. (41 sites).
***repplicacio; repplicare*: rejoinder; to rejoin · of a grant, renewal.** Two senses by referent: the disputation move / the re-grant of a charter or privilege (*Dial.* 70.24).
***concessio*: grant.** Of property or privilege. (5 sites).
***exproprietarii / exproprietarie*: the propertyless / without property.** The friars who profess to own nothing. (6 sites); the adverb (*Eccl.* 169.6); the adjective (*status exproprietarius*) "propertyless" (*Pot. pape* 146.25).
***reditus*: revenue(s).** (23 sites). Exception: *Dial.* 18 (ch. 9 n5), *reditus* = the clergy's "return" (to wealth), on *revertatur* 15.9 / *redire* 15.21; the note gives "revenue" as the alternative..
***formido (*sine / cum formidine*)*: misgiving.** The scholastic "fear of the opposite" that qualifies assent; "fear" only where it is plainly the emotion. (19 sites in *De ecclesia*; first 5.24).

***capitas*: headship.** Non-classical abstract of *caput* (*officium capitatis*). (*Eccl.* 18.19; B *capitis*).
***obicitur per*: it is objected, by appeal to.** Parallel to *arguitur per*. (*Eccl.* 21.27).
***aggregative*: aggregatively.** The church taken as an aggregate of its members. (26.21).
***de inesse*: as a matter of fact.** The assertoric (non-modal) proposition. (31.22).
***sillogismus expositorius / expositorie*: expository syllogism / expositorily.** A syllogism with a singular middle term. (28.13, 31.11).
***influxus / influere*: inflow / flow in.** The head's inflow of grace into the members; not "influence" (which renders *influencia*). (33–34).
***confuse / confusus (*fides, noticia*)*: indistinct(ly).** The scholastic *cognitio confusa*: known in the whole, not in its parts; never "confused". (42.19, 46.2, 46.6).
***viacio*: wayfaring.** The state of the *viator*. (42.30).
***citra Christum*: short of Christ.** As *citra fidem*. (45.8).
***color (*non est color*)*: colour (a plausible ground).** The period sense, as in "colour of title"; never "pretext". A C note at the first occurrence in each chunk. (Wilson; *Eccl.* 21.18, 23.5, 23.7).
***fucus*: disguise; pretence.** CONTEXTUAL. "Disguise" of hypocrisy, its recurring use (*Eccl.* 51.23, 53.24). "Pretence" of a specious argument (*ex isto fuco concluditur*, *Pot. pape* 12-f).; merged with the *Pot. pape* row.
***glosa*: gloss.** The noun beside *glosare*. (52.10).
***vocatus (*vocata bona, vocata ecclesia*)*: so-called.** (55.6, 62.7).
***libertas arbitrii*: freedom of choice.** Beside *liberum arbitrium*. (60.18).
***digestio*: digestion.** The recurring figure of the four digestions (Rom. 8:30). (60.29 ff.).
***concorporacio*: concorporation.** Incorporation into one body (Loserth's own English). (73.11).
***capitaliter*: as head (as chief lord).** (64.33, 76.9). Of a crown worn on the head (Apoc. 12:1, *Pot. pape* 143.20): "at her head", with a C note.
***penaliter*: in hardship.** The adverb of *penalitas*. (76.29, 76.34).
***participium*: participation.** Not the grammatical participle, except where Wyclif is doing grammar (*Pot. pape* 21.24 *participium neutrum*, G note). (85.6).
***suffragium sensus*: aid of sense.** As *suffragium* "aid"; not the church's *suffragia*. (97.22).
***dyameter / costa*: diameter / side.** The geometers' terms (the square's incommensurable diagonal). (97.21 ff.).
***dulia / latria*: dulia / latria.** Kept as the theologians' terms, glossed once per chunk. (95.17).
***conclusio*: conclusion.** The disputation formula (card)..
***terminus communis*: common term.** Aristotle's common boundary of a continuum (*Cat.* 6). (*Eccl.* 104.23 ff., 107.23).
***capitari / capitatus*: to be headed / headed.** The verb beside *capitas*. (116.21, 117.2–3).
***tyriaca*: theriac.** The medieval antidote to poison; a recurring medical figure, with *apostema*. (130.21, 131.1).
***inobedienciarius*: disobedient man.** The negative of *obedienciarius*. (146.11).
***suffragium (*legis, privilegii*)*: aid.** As *suffragium* "aid" (01-a) and *suffragium sensus*. (149.29, 152.8).
***ingratitudo*: ingratitude.** Toward a person. (156.8).
***indoles*: promise.** The natural promise of a thing (the midwives' argument, *Eccl.* 163.18, 164.1–12; Comestor reads *de dolo*)..
***colorare*: give colour to.** The verb beside *color*. (163.2).
***minoritas*: lesser standing.** Beside *maioritas* "greatness". (172.22).
***philargiria*: love of money.** 1 Tim. 6:10 *radix omnium malorum cupiditas*..
***mundialitas / secularitas*: mundanity / worldliness.** Kept apart. (*Eccl.* 9).
***laureola*: aureole.** The theologians' special crown (of virgins, martyrs, doctors)..
***sagena*: dragnet.** Matt. 13:47..
***impetrare*: obtain (by request).** .
***indispensabilis*: not to be dispensed.** .
***falsigraphus*: false writer.** The one who sets out false figures or texts. (*Eccl.* 9).
***iugum*: yoke (a pair).** (*Eccl.* 202.9 ff.).
***ociatores*: men of leisure.** (201.27).
***irreatus (*pene*)*: non-liability (to penalty).** Non-classical abstract. (*Eccl.* 239.30).
***subintelligere*: understand as implied.** Recurs through *Eccl.* 12..
***distribucio accomoda*: accommodated distribution.** The logicians' term. (268.19).
***compossibilis*: compossible.** (271.13).
***satispassio*: satispassion.** Set against *satisfaccio*. (270.11).

False friends and ordinary words that mislead

***sensibilis*: perceptible.** "sensible" (T. p. 362)
***insensibilis*: imperceptible; of a thing that cannot feel, without sensation.** Two senses by referent: what cannot be perceived / what cannot perceive (*lapis insensibilis*, *Dial.* 56.3). Kept visibly paired with *sensibilis*. (3 sites).
***zizania*: cockle.** Douay–Rheims (Matt. 13:25)..
***cautela*: wile.** Not "caution"; *cautela diaboli*, the devil's wile. (8 sites).
***apostema*: abscess.** A recurring medical figure. (3 sites).
***illabi*: to flow into.** .
***sub divo*: in the open air.** The refrain of cap. 21. (10 sites).
***vecors; vecorditer; vecordia*: faint-hearted; faint-heartedly; faint-heartedness.** The medieval sense, not classical "senseless". (5 sites).
***affectare*: to desire.** Kept apart from *affeccio*, affection. (3 sites).
***ingratus*: displeasing (to God).** *Ingratus deo*: unpleasing to God. "Ungrateful" only where a person is ungrateful to someone. (5 sites).
***perplexus*: perplexed.** The moral-theology sense: bound to sin whichever way one turns..
***cataracta*: trapdoor.** "Floodgate" in a C note where the Genesis image is live..
***globus*: band.** Derogatory collective (*globus reprobus*, *globos claustralium*). (2 sites). Of things (*globus temporalium*): "mass", untagged with a note.
***solvere (oaths, charters)*: to dissolve.** Not "pay" in this use..
***cohabitacio*: joint dwelling.** .
***idiota*: unlearned man.** Not "idiot"..
***deacceptus*: disowned.** .
***monita*: admonitions.** .
***indebitare se*: to make oneself a debtor.** Sense doubtful; C note (*Dial.* 85.15)..
***discoli*: froward.** Douay–Rheims (1 Pet. 2:18)..
***magisterium*: rule; of teaching, the teaching office.** Provisional; by context, C note (*Dial.* 83.15)..
***subtiliare*: to lighten; to refine (argue subtly).** CONTEXTUAL. "Lighten" provisional in *Dial.* 67.19, 68.11 (C note); "refine, argue subtly" of argument (*Pot. pape* 260.8).
***infidelitas*: heathenism, unbelief.** "infidelity" (T. p. 362)
***sciolus*: knowing, wise.** "smatterer" (the classical sense). Neutral in Wyclif.
***philocaptus*: besotted.** "philo-captive" (T. p. 363)
***hictericus*: jaundiced.** "hysterical" (T. p. 366)
***impresenciarum*: nowadays, at present.** (T. p. 366)
***ut plurimum*: for the most part.** "to the highest degree" (T. p. 366)
***inhabilis*: unqualified (to hold office).** "unwieldy" (T. p. 366)
***detegere*: to expose.** "wipe away" (T. p. 366)
***ignorare*: to be ignorant of.** "ignore" (T. p. 366)
***disciplinabilis*: teachable.** "impressionable" (T. p. 366)
***laude digni*: worthy of praise.** (T. p. 366)
***arguitur per*: it is argued by appeal to.** "X raises objections" (T. p. 366)
***autonomatice / antonomastice*: by antonomasia (pre-eminently).**
***in necessitatis articulo*: at the point of need.**
***processus (of a book)*: the course, the argument.**
***recencius*: more freshly.**
***mulier aliena*: strange woman.** Proverbs' figure.
***mulier fortis*: valiant woman.** DR Prov. 31:10.
***indispositus; (se) indisponere*: unfit; to make (oneself) unfit.** "indisposed" (now "unwell"). (8 sites).
***limitare; limites*: to assign (an office); limits.** "to limit" for the verb (i.e. never "to assign" where it means to restrict, as beside *restringere*, *Eccl.* 217.10). The noun *limites* stays "limits" (*in limitibus apostoli*). after a census (13 verb, 5 noun).
***prevaricator; prevaricancia; prevaricacio*: transgressor; transgression; transgression.** (*prevaricacio*, *Pot. pape* 155.10). *Basali prevaricancia* (*Dial.* 9.24) is doubtful: see its C note.
***carecter, caracter (sensibilis)*: (perceptible) character.** "reputation". The mark of orders. (*Dial.* 5.7).
***conversacio*: manner of life.** "conversation". (6 sites).

***mendicacio; mendicare; mendicitas*: begging; to beg; beggary.** Kept apart; *mendicitas* is DR's "beggary" (Prov. 30:8)..
***penalitas*: hardship.** "penalty"..
***gratitudo*: kindness (received).** "gratitude"..
***habere conscienciam super*: to be troubled in conscience over.** (5 sites).
***prioritas; majoritas*: priority; greatness.** Paired with *prior / major* in the argument (*Dial.* 12.4–8)..
***prevaricari*: to transgress.** The verb of *prevaricator*..
***servitivus*: serviceable.** .
***precipui sacerdotes*: leading priests.** Kept apart from *principes sacerdotum*, "chief priests"..
***intendere (a thesis)*: maintain.** Scholastic "hold, argue for": *intendimus quod* → "we maintain that" (epil-a 86.4, 90.19). "Intend" only for purpose..
***pietas / pie*: piety / piously.** Kept apart from *misericordia* "mercy". (*Eccl.* 12).
***irreligiositas*: irreligion.** .
***ecclesia cesarea*: the caesarean church.** The church as endowed by Caesar; pairs with *clerus cesareus* (§B). (*Eccl.* 13).
***elemosina cartalis*: charter alms.** Alms granted by charter. (*Eccl.* 13).
***ditarius*: almsman.** The one enriched by the alms (cf. *ditare*, §B). (*Eccl.* 13).
***pseudomonachus*: false monk.** Kept apart from *pseudofrater* if it appears. (*Eccl.* 13).
***elemosinator*: almsgiver.** Agent noun beside *elemosinans* (same English); *elemosinatus* "almsman" (the 09-28 row governs; conformed, *Eccl.* 16). (*Eccl.* 13).
***elemosinacio*: almsgiving.** *Temporalis elemosinacio* "almsgiving from time to time" against perpetual alms. (*Eccl.* 13).
***ius poli / ius fori*: the law of heaven / the law of the court.** Augustine's pair. (*Eccl.* 14).
***mundialis (noun)*: worldly man.** Beside *mundialitas*. (*Eccl.* 14).
***nolicio*: nolition.** Scholastic act of not-willing, against *volicio*. (*Eccl.* 14).
***dispensator*: dispenser.** As DR 1 Cor. 4:1–2; kept apart from *procurator* "proctor". (*Eccl.* 14). Inside a DR quotation of Titus 1:7, DR's "steward".
***clericatus*: clerical state.** (*Eccl.* 14).
***in capite (tenure)*: in chief.** Feudal tenure from the king directly. (*Eccl.* 14).
***ritus*: rite.** Any usage or observance, not only liturgical. (*Eccl.* 14).
***civilitas*: civil standing.** Kept apart from *dominium civile* "civil lordship". (*Eccl.* 14).
***ydiota*: unlettered man.** Never "idiot". (*Eccl.* 14).
***catholicare / hereticare*: to declare catholic / to pronounce heretical.** (*Eccl.* 14).
***dominatus*: lordly rule.** Bernard's word (*apostolis interdicitur dominatus*); kept apart from *dominium* "lordship". (*Eccl.* 14).
***ablacio*: taking-away.** Set against *restituere/restitucio*. (*Eccl.* 15).
***forisfactura*: forfeiture.** Noun beside *forisfacere* "forfeit". (*Eccl.* 15).
***subdominans*: holding lordship under.** Beside *dominari*. (*Eccl.* 15, 339.6).
***redempcio temporalium*: redemption of the temporal goods.** Chapters buying back seized goods. (*Eccl.* 15, 340.15).
***nominetenus clerici*: clerics in name only.** Recurs (*solum nomine sacerdotes*, 347). (*Eccl.* 15, 340.19). Of a pope (*Pot. pape* 147.31): "pope in name only".
***cognoscere super*: take cognizance of.** Legal sense. (*Eccl.* 15, 340.31).
***subautenticus*: sub-authentic.** Beside *autenticus*. (*Eccl.* 15, 345.15).
***ablatarius*: the one from whom it is taken.** Beside *ablacio* "taking-away". (*Eccl.* 15, 343.7).
***salvacio*: salvation.** Covers bodily and eternal; Wyclif pairs the senses. (*Eccl.* 15, 345.24–26).
***virtus*: power (faculty) / virtue (moral habit).** Split by sense. (*Eccl.* 15, 345).
***legii*: lieges.** (*Eccl.* 15, 343–344).
***redempcio (of a sentence)*: redemption.** Buying off a penalty; kept apart from *redempcio temporalium*. C note at first use. (*Eccl.* 15, 352.1).
***signa (of an argument)*: stages.** (*Eccl.* 15, 351.19).
***oculata fide*: with our own eyes.** (*Eccl.* 15, 352.27).
***susurrones*: whisperers.** As DR Rom. 1:29. (*Eccl.* 15, 356.13).
***pseudoprepositi*: false superiors.** (*Eccl.* 15, 358.24).
***dii subterranei*: gods beneath the earth.** (*Eccl.* 15, 357.30).
***brocardicum / brogardicum*: brocard.** The schoolmen's stock maxim. (*Eccl.* 16, 360.9).
***calumpnia (ponere / capere)*: challenge (to lay a challenge against / to be open to challenge).** The disputant's formal objection to a premiss. (*Eccl.* 16, 363.18, 363.24, 367.11).
***usufructus*: usufruct.** Beside *dominacio evangelica*. (*Eccl.* 16, 365.23).
***Romanus pontifex*: Roman pontiff.** Kept apart from *papa* "pope". (*Eccl.* 16, 366.29).
***clerimonia*: learning.** The clergy's lettered state (ME "clergy"). (*Eccl.* 16, 373–374).

***cantaria*: chantry.** (*Eccl.* 16, 16-d/16-e).
***collegiatus*: collegiate.** (*Eccl.* 16, 16-d/16-e).
***dominabilia*: the things held in lordship.** (*Eccl.* 16, 378.6).
***potencia absoluta*: absolute power.** (*Eccl.* 16, 375).
***presbiteri conducticii*: hired presbyters.** (*Eccl.* 16, 374).
***milicia / milites (the clergy as paid spiritual army)*: soldiery / soldiers.** Under the Pauline-figure clause of the 09-28 *milicia; milites* row, which governs; G note at use. The captive knight (381.1–2) stays "knight". (*Eccl.* 16, 384–385).
***collacio*: conferral.** Of a gift or endowment; paired with *ablacio* "taking-away". (*Eccl.* 16, 385–386).
***ficcio*: fiction.** As *ficticia*; Wyclif numbers six *ficciones*. (*Eccl.* 16, 385.7).
***amerciare; multacio*: amerce; fine.** Legal terms. (*Eccl.* 16, 387.19–21).
***monstracio*: muster.** (*Eccl.* 16, 384.11).
***legalia*: the legal precepts.** Of the old law, beside *cerimonialia* "ceremonial precepts". (*Eccl.* 17, 389.2–3).
***raciuncula*: little argument.** The opponent's ten arguments. (*Eccl.* 17, 398.15).
***signabile*: signifiable; assignable.** CONTEXTUAL. The logical noun (*omne signabile*, what can be signified) is "signifiable" (*Eccl.* 17, 398.29). As an adjective on a degree, instant or step (*in quocumque gradu/profectu signabili*) it is "assignable", any one could name (*Pot. pape* 11-j, 11-k).; extended (close-out R3).
***adequata ecclesia*: the adequate church.** C note at use. (*Eccl.* 17, 393).
***denominacio; denominare*: naming; to name.** The argument turns on it. (*Eccl.* 17, 391.17, 398.2).
***dotes (docium) beatorum*: the dowries of the blessed.** (*Eccl.* 17, 396.6).
***christianus in figura / in effectu / in fructu*: Christian in figure / in effect / in fruit.** (*Eccl.* 17, 397–398).
***Jesuani*: Jesuans.** (*Eccl.* 17, 400.11).
***diffinicio*: definition.** Beside *descripcio* (also "definition", frozen row governs): where the two stand together a C note gives the Latin. (*Eccl.* 17, 403.25).
***humidum naturale*: natural moisture.** Synonym of *humidum radicale* (row above); G note at use. (*Eccl.* 17, 410.2).
***color rethoricus*: rhetorical colour.** The figure of speech, distinct from *color* "plausible ground". (*Eccl.* 17, 405.3).
***argumentum ad hominem*: argument to the man.** (*Eccl.* 17, 405.13).
***habitus fidei*: habit of faith.** (*Eccl.* 17, 407–408).
***pars quantitativa*: quantitative part.** (*Eccl.* 17, 406–407).
***ecclesia nuncupativa*: the church in name only.** (*Eccl.* 17, 408.27).
***secundum presentem iusticiam*: according to present justice.** As against predestination; "present justice" is the established rendering (11 chunks; 18-a conformed). (*Eccl.* 18, 415–416).
***falsarius*: falsifier.** The opponent's epithet. (*Eccl.* 17, 414.6).
***adnascencia*: growing-on.** Adhesion without being a part. (*Eccl.* 18, 416.15).
***species specialissima*: most special species.** (*Eccl.* 18, 418).
***unum per accidens*: one by accident.** (*Eccl.* 18, 418).
***legiste*: legists.** Civil lawyers. (*Eccl.* 18, 420.20).
***persona successiva*: successive person.** (*Eccl.* 17, 414.1).
***capitales (noun)*: chiefs.** (*Eccl.* 18, 424.30).
***proprietarius*: proprietary.** (*Eccl.* 18, 425.5, 427.15).
***transsumptive*: transumptively.** (*Eccl.* 18, 431.30).
***circumscriptive*: circumscriptively.** (*Eccl.* 18, 423.24).
***acephala; incapitata*: acephalous; unheaded.** *Incapitata* pairs with *capitatus*. (*Eccl.* 18, 435.20–23).
***possessionatus (adj.)*: possessioned.** The adjective beside the noun *possessionati* "the possessioners". (*Eccl.* 18, 434–435).
***pseudocardinales*: pseudo-cardinals.** (*Eccl.* 18, 426.32).
***quadriga diaboli*: the devil's four-horse chariot.** (*Eccl.* 18, 427.12).
***vetula*: old woman.** (*Eccl.* 18, 431–433).
***summi pontifices*: highest pontiffs (of popes); high priests (of the Jewish priesthood).** Split by referent. (*Eccl.* 18, 424.19, 425.20).
***equivoce*: equivocally.** (*Eccl.* 19, 444; as in 05-a, 06-b, 06-f).
***limitacio (ad officium)*: assignment.** Follows *limitare* "to assign" (row above); where it means restriction, "limitation". (*Eccl.* 19, 445).
***gracia gratificans*: grace that makes pleasing.** (*Eccl.* 18, 441.8).
***deputacio*: deputation.** (*Eccl.* 19, 443.34).
***responsalis*: the respondent.** (*Eccl.* 19, 445.24).

***termini magistrales*: masters' terms.** (*Eccl.* 19, 445.23).
***continuacio*: continuity.** (*Eccl.* 18, 436.19).
***precaria*: precarial grant.** Wyclif defines it (*Eccl.* 453.21). (*Eccl.* 19).
***vir ecclesiasticus*: churchman.** (*Eccl.* 19, 450.18, 451.10).
***ecclesiasticus (sg. noun)*: ecclesiastic.** (*Eccl.* 19, 453.10).
***lex cesarea*: caesarean law.** Of the *clerus cesareus* family (pejorative), not neutral "imperial/civil law". (*Eccl.* 19, 451.17).
***indisposicio*: unfitness.** Noun of *indispositus*. (*Eccl.* 19).
***evidencia topica*: topical evidence.** Pairs with *argumentum topicum*. (*Eccl.* 19).
***locus evidencie*: topic of evidence.** *locus* = dialectical topic (cf. *locus a maiori*); not "place". (*Eccl.* 19).
***porisma*: porism.** A consequence drawn from a principle; kept apart from *corollarium* "corollary". (*Eccl.* 19, 462.22).
***confundere (supposition)*: make (a term) stand confusedly.** The logic of supposition; distinct from the *confuse/confusus* "indistinct" row. (*Eccl.* 19, 463.15).
***translative*: by transference.** Kept apart from *transsumptive* "transumptively". (*Eccl.* 19, 467.10).
***rectiloqui*: those who speak correctly.** (*Eccl.* 19, 468.15).
***habilis / habilitas; habilitare*: qualified / qualification; to qualify.** The positive of *inhabilis* "unqualified". (*Eccl.* 19, 469.4).
***perplexitas*: perplexity.** The noun beside *perplexus* "perplexed". (*Eccl.* 19, 470.3).
***raciones exemplares / seminales*: exemplary reasons / seminal reasons.** Augustine's terms; "seminal reasons" already used at 06-d. (*Eccl.* 20, 473.18).
***affidacio*: affiance.** Betrothal by plighted trust; keeps the play on *confidit*. (*Eccl.* 20, 475.22).
***institor*: merchant.** After Douay "merchant's ship" (Prov. 31:14); *mercantes* = "traders". (*Eccl.* 20, 478.20).
***predicacio secundum causam*: predication by cause.** One of Wyclif's modes of predication. (*Eccl.* 20, 481.14).
***preconium*: commendation.** (*Eccl.* 20, 488.20).
***excrescencia*: increase.** (*Eccl.* 20, 485.28).
***beatitudo essencialis / accidentalis*: essential / accidental blessedness.** The scholastic pair; follows *beatitudo* "blessedness". (*Eccl.* 20, 490.15).
***signacio / significacio*: signification.** B treats them as one word (492.9–10, 493.1). (*Eccl.* 21, 491).
***dampnacio*: CONTEXTUAL: damnation / condemnation.** Thomas's broad/strict senses turn on it; Douay "condemnation" kept in Luke 23:40. (*Eccl.* 21, 495.24). Of a judgement passed on a teaching (*dampnacio istius sentencie tamquam heretice*, *Pot. pape* 84.10) "condemnation".
***taxacio (pene)*: assessment.** (*Eccl.* 21, 498.8).
***sophista*: sophist.** Kept apart from *sophisma*. (*Eccl.* 21, 495.15).
***commentum (mendacii)*: fabrication.** Wyclif numbers the opponent's fabrications. (*Eccl.* 21, 498.31).
***signaculum*: seal.** (*Eccl.* 21, 500.21).
***laicatus*: the lay state.** (*Eccl.* 21, 502.7).
***partes potestative / subiective / aliquote*: potestative / subjective / aliquot parts.** The scholastic division of wholes. (*Eccl.* 21, 509.3–5).
***pars integralis*: integral part.** (*Eccl.* 21, 514.15).
***res sacramenti*: reality of the sacrament.** (*Eccl.* 21, 511.8).
***gracie gratis date*: graces freely given.** Kept apart from *gracia gratificans*. (*Eccl.* 21, 512.13).
***baptismus flaminis*: baptism of the Spirit.** (*Eccl.* 21, 514.24).
***caracter in actu*: character in act.** (*Eccl.* 21, 513.18).
***pseudoclerici*: false clerics.** Cf. *pseudomonachus*. (*Eccl.* 21, 511.17).
***ordo per accidens*: order by accident.** (*Eccl.* 21, 514.29).
***univoce*: univocally.** (*Eccl.* 21, 514.4).
***incompossibilis*: incompossible.** Beside *compossibilis*. (*Eccl.* 22, 522.1).
***beatificacio*: beatification.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***sacerdotes annales*: annual priests.** Priests hired to say masses for a year. (*Eccl.* 22).
***perfeccio secunda (mundi)*: second perfection.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***oracio absoluta / condicionata*: absolute / conditional prayer.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***bona de genere*: good in kind.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***bonum honestum / utile / delectabile*: honourable / useful / pleasurable good.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***exequie*: exequies.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***obsequium (for the dead)*: duty.** Kept apart from *servicium* "service", *officium* "office". (*Eccl.* 22).
***gilda*: gild.** (*Eccl.* 22).

***liga*: league.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***memoriale*: memorial.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***affeccio naturalis / deliberativa*: natural / deliberative affection.** (*Eccl.* 22).
***beatitudo circularis*: circular blessedness.** Hostiensis's term. (*Eccl.* 22).
***indulgere*: to indulge.** The etymology (*inde* + *algere*) turns on the verb. (*Eccl.* 23, 549).
***forum penitencie / penitenciale; forum ecclesie / Dei*: court of penance; court of the church / of God.** (*Eccl.* 23, 550.15).
***condonare; condonacio*: to pardon; pardon.** Kept apart from *remittere / remissio* "remit / remission". (*Eccl.* 23, 549.27).
***cambium*: barter.** Kept apart from *commutacio* "exchange". (*Eccl.* 23, 551.24).
***thesaurus ecclesie*: treasury of the church.** (*Eccl.* 23, 551.11).
***supererogare; supererogacio*: pay out beyond [what is owed]; supererogation.** *supererogata merita* "supererogated merits". (*Eccl.* 23, 551).
***reatus pene*: liability to punishment.** (*Eccl.* 23, 552.4).
***copia / habundancia*: plenty / abundance.** (*Eccl.* 23, 553.15, 555.20).
***relaxare; relaxacio*: to relax; relaxation.** (*Eccl.* 23, 554.9).
***satisfaccio; satisfacere*: satisfaction; to make satisfaction.** Cf. *satispassio*. (*Eccl.* 23, 556).
***participative / iuvative*: participatively / helpingly.** (*Eccl.* 23, 558.2).
***in athomo*: in an individual.** The logicians' *atomus*. (*Eccl.* 23, 558.4).
***Romanus episcopus*: the Roman bishop.** Kept apart from *Romanus pontifex*. (*Eccl.* 23, 563.10).
***palliacio; palliare*: cloaking; to cloak.** (*Eccl.* 23, 566.27).
***potestas iudiciaria*: judicial power.** (*Eccl.* 23, 565.26).
***papa superstes*: the surviving pope.** (*Eccl.* 23, 567).
***premium accidentale*: accidental reward.** (*Eccl.* 23, 565.6).
***laxare*: loose.** Kept apart from *relaxare* "relax". (*Eccl.* 23, 571.29).
***perdoniste*: pardoners.** (*Eccl.* 23, 572.24).
***venia*: forgiveness.** Kept apart from *condonacio* "pardon". (*Eccl.* 23, 573.4).
***taxare*: assess.** Beside *taxacio* "assessment". (*Eccl.* 23, 574.1).
***casus calculatorii*: calculatory cases.** (*Eccl.* 23, 574.32).
***pars quanta / quota*: a part of a quantity / a proportional part.** As at 519.1. (*Eccl.* 23, 572.29).
***colorabilis*: colourable.** Beside *color*, *colorare*. (*Eccl.* 23, 575.1).
***potestas ordinis*: power of order.** (*Eccl.* 23, 575.15).
***vicarius Petri*: vicar of Peter.** Kept apart from *vicarius Christi*. (*Eccl.* 23, 575.31).
***remissio; remittere*: remission; to remit.** Headword row (cf. *condonacio* "pardon", *venia* "forgiveness"). (*Eccl.* 23).
***potestas iurisdiccionis*: power of jurisdiction.** Paired with *potestas ordinis*. (*Eccl.* 23).
***potestas*: power.** Always "power" (*De pot. pape*, Wilson). Its kin by row: *potestas ordinis*, *iurisdiccionis*, *iudiciaria*.
***potencia*: CONTEXTUAL: potency / power.** "Potency" inside Aristotle's analysis of *dynamis* (active / passive potency, rational potency, the potency terminated); "power" elsewhere (God's power, free choice, might). Wyclif uses *potestas* and *potencia* interchangeably (*potestas vel potencia*, *Pot. pape* 4.7): a pair is "power or potency" with a C note. Keeps *potencia absoluta* "absolute power". Ruled by Wilson (*Pot. pape* 01-a review).
***potentatus*: CONTEXTUAL: sovereignty / potentate.** The abstract "sovereignty" (*Pot. pape* 4.27); of the person who holds power "potentate" (*Pot. pape* 14.20, 15.13, 16.17, 20.28, 22.20, 23.13, 27.13), no note needed where the person is plain..
***iurisdiccio*: jurisdiction.** Cf. *potestas iurisdiccionis*. (*Pot. pape* 23.17).
***gentilitas*: paganism.** Kept apart from *infidelitas* "heathenism, unbelief". (*Pot. pape* 29.26).
***pseudochristus*: false christ.** Matt. 24:24 (DR "false Christs"). (*Pot. pape* 28.32).
***Ardmacanus; dominus Ardmacanus*: Armachanus; the lord of Armagh.** Richard FitzRalph. The bare name stays "Armachanus" (as in *De ecclesia*); with *dominus* "the lord of Armagh" (card)..
***conficere*: to consecrate (the eucharist).** Of the priest at the altar; otherwise "to make up, compose". (*Pot. pape* 11.20).
***licencia*: licence.** Permission granted; never "power". Wyclif usually sets it against *potestas*, but can also identify the two where power is defined as a grant (*illa licencia est potestas*, *Pot. pape* 21.29): render "licence" either way and let the argument show which. (*Pot. pape* 41.21); qualified (close-out R1).
***primatus*: primacy.** Peter's and the pope's; *preeminencia* stays "preeminence". (*Pot. pape* ch. 3).
***primitas*: firstness.** Being first in order, as against *primatus*. (*Pot. pape* ch. 3).
***auctoritas*: authority.** (*Pot. pape* 63.16).

***procuratoria potestas*: proctorial power.** From *procurator* "proctor". (*Pot. pape* 63.9).
***archivicarius*: archvicar.** (*Pot. pape* 62.20).
***geromantici*: geomancers.** (*Pot. pape* 71.23).
***superintendencia*: oversight.** The bishop's office as *episcopus* "overseer". (*Pot. pape* 73.20).
***repugnare; repugnancia*: to be incompatible; incompatibility.** The logical sense; not "to fight". (*Pot. pape* 73–75).
***episcopus suffraganeus*: suffragan bishop.** .
***auctoritativus, autoritativus*: authoritative.** Beside *auctoritas* "authority". (*Pot. pape* 76–78).
***decretiste*: decretists.** The commentators on Gratian. (*Pot. pape* 81.27).
***officiarii*: officers.** (*Pot. pape* 86.19).
***religiositas*: religiousness.** (*Pot. pape* 86.21).
***coraula*: choir-leader.** (*Pot. pape* 92.17).
***negociatores*: dealers.** Kept apart from *mercantes* "traders" (*Eccl.*); the servants of the talents parable (Matt. 25). (*Pot. pape* 101.7).
***trahere in consequenciam*: draw into a precedent.** The legal idiom; *consequencia* stays "inference". (*Pot. pape* 94.13).
***primogenitura*: primogeniture.** (*Pot. pape* 103.2).
***potestas regiminis*: power of rule.** Paired with *potestas ordinis* "power of order". (*Pot. pape* 115.2).
***preco (Dei)*: herald (of God).** (*Pot. pape* 06-b, 06-d).
***criminosus*: criminous man.** (*Pot. pape* 06-c).
***deliramenta*: ravings.** (*Pot. pape* 06-c).
***Lincolniensis*: Lincoln.** Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln (S note at first occurrence), as in *De ecclesia*. (*Pot. pape* 59.8).
***seculares domini*: secular lords.** Kept apart from *temporales domini* "temporal lords". (*Pot. pape* 52.16).
***potestas dominativa*: lordly power.** .
***relacio racionis*: relation of reason.** Scholastic term (a relation in the mind only)..
***debitum (coniugale), ex debito*: the (marriage) debt.** Of spouses (1 Cor 7:3–4): "the marriage debt", not "what is owed". (*Pot. pape* 5.8).
***maneries*: kind.** .
***status (disposicionis, virtutis, ...)*: state (of disposition, of virtue, ...).** Ch. 6 turns on it (a man's state changed by sin)..
***preeminencia*: preeminence.** Kept apart from *primatus* "primacy"..
***primas (noun)*: primate.** .
***dominari (with a negative, 1 Pet. 5:3)*: lord it (over).** DR "lording it over"..
***correpcio fraterna*: fraternal correction.** .
***dileccio*: love.** Kept apart from *caritas* "charity"..
***gracia concomitancie*: by reason of concomitance.** Not *gracia concomitans* "concomitant grace": *gracia* + genitive = "for the sake of". (*Pot. pape* 06-h).
***Pseudo (as a noun)*: the Pseudo.** Wyclif's name for the false pope of the eleven conditions (ch. 6)..
***illapsus*: inflowing.** .
***generalis attornatus*: general attorney.** Legal term (a proctor with general powers)..
***claves potestatis / auctoritatis (sciencie)*: keys of power / of authority (of knowledge).** The pair kept fixed..
***suppeditacio (temporalium)*: treading (temporal goods) underfoot.** .
***fantasia*: imagination.** The faculty (scholastic *phantasia*)..
***propriacio*: owning.** The opposite of *expropriacio*; kept apart from *appropriacio* "appropriation"..
***paterfamilias*: householder.** DR's word (Matt. 20:1 etc.)..
***regulariter*: as a rule.** .
***capitalis (civitas, episcopus)*: capital (city, bishop).** Rome as capital (ch. 8); *capitalis dominus* stays "chief lord"..
***sessiva*: seisin.** So the manuscripts (Loserth 170.8, *ita cod.*); feudal possession that perfects a title..
***influencia (celestis)*: (celestial) influence.** Astrological sense..
***quaternarius / denarius / quadragenarius*: the four / the ten / the forty.** Number exegesis (the 153 fishes, ch. 7)..
***heresis realis*: real heresy (heresy in deed).** .
***pseudopapa*: pseudo-pope.** Cf. *pseudocardinales*..
***impertinens; impertinencia*: irrelevant; irrelevance.** .
***eleccio equivoca*: equivocal election.** Ch. 8's two elections (God's and men's)..
***apostolicus (noun, not the papal title)*: an apostolic man.** Where it is the pope's title, "the apostolic [lord]" with a G note..
***connexio*: conditional (proposition).** Logic: the "if ... then" proposition..

***tenacia*: tight-fistedness.** Avarice's vice of holding on..
***irregularitas*: irregularity.** Canonical impediment to orders or office..
***negociacio*: dealing.** Pairs with *negociatores* "dealers"..
***allocari (in an account)*: be allowed.** Accounting sense..
***Cestrensis*: the Chester [chronicler].** Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* (S note at first occurrence in a chunk)..
***infundabilis; infundabiliter*: without foundation.** .
***seniores; maiores natu*: elders; the ancients.** Inside a DR quotation, DR's word ("ancients", Acts 20:17)..
***pompare; pompacio; pompa*: boast; boasting; boasting.** .
***fantasticus*: imaginary.** Cf. *fantasia* "imagination"..
***extollencia*: exaltation.** Self-exaltation of the proud..
***servitus (laboris)*: servitude.** Kept apart from *servicium* "service"..
***capitalitas*: capital standing.** Rome's standing as capital; cf. *capitalis*..
***memorativa potencia*: memorative power.** A faculty of the soul (the "power" sense of *potencia*)..
***discrasia*: distemper.** Physicians' term..
***media (of an argument)*: middle terms.** .
***policia*: polity.** .
***carismata; carisma*: CONTEXTUAL: charisms / chrism.** "Charisms" (gifts; *Pot. pape* 176.1). Singular *misticum carisma* in Augustine's sense of the anointing that names Christians (*chrisma*, *Pot. pape* 312.16) "chrism", with a T note.; CONTEXTUAL.
***primicia (virtutum)*: being first (in the virtues).** Kept apart from *primatus* "primacy" and *primitas* "firstness"..
***bipapalis*: two-pope.** Of the church under two popes (1378)..
***defidare*: distrust.** .
***replicatur; replicatum*: it is rejoined; rejoinder.** A further objection against an answer; kept apart from *respondetur* "the reply is" (so 04-b)..
***potestas vicaria*: vicarial power.** .
***locus a simili*: the topic from likeness.** Dialectical topic..
***ordo cesareus / divinus*: the caesarean / divine order.** .
***malum culpe / pene*: the evil of fault / of penalty.** .
***neutra*: neutral things.** Things neither commanded nor forbidden (obedience *in neutris*)..
***reputative; assertive*: by estimation; assertively.** Opposed to *ex revelacione*..
***eleccio passiva / activa*: passive / active election.** .
***equivocacio*: equivocation.** .
***papa cesareus*: caesarean pope.** The pope as endowed temporal lord (chs. 10–12)..
***imperium (vicarium, autoritativum)*: command (vicarial, authoritative).** The power to command (*par in parem non habet imperium*); "empire" only of the Empire..
***corripere; correpcio*: reprove; reproof.** Kept apart from *corrigere; correccio* "correct; correction"; *correpcio fraterna* stays "fraternal correction"..
***credulitas explicita / implicita*: explicit / implicit credence.** Beside *fides explicita / implicita*..
***summus sacerdos*: high priest.** DR; kept apart from *summus pontifex* "highest pontiff"..
***preponderancia; dispensacio*: preponderance; dispensation.** .
***sensus compositus / divisus*: composite / divided sense.** The logicians' pair..
***precellencia*: pre-excellence.** Kept apart from *preeminencia* "preeminence"..
***summum sacerdocium*: high priesthood.** Cf. *summus sacerdos* "high priest"..
***preternecessarius*: beyond necessity.** .
***cultus Dei*: worship of God.** .
***pontifex (Old Testament, unqualified)*: pontiff.** Kept apart from *sacerdos* "priest"; *summus pontifex* of the Jewish priesthood is "high priest" (see *summi pontifices*)..
***superhumerale; racionale*: superhumeral; rational.** The ephod and the breastplate (DR)..
***penalis*: hard, of hardship.** Beside *penalitas*..
***pastor cesareus*: caesarean shepherd.** The *papa cesareus* family..
***vians*: wayfarer.** As *viator*..
***laxus*: lax.** (*Eccl.* 23).
***episcopus Nullatensis*: a bishop "of Nowhere".** (*Eccl.* 23).
***demereri*: to demerit.** (*Eccl.* 23).

questores: questors. Kept apart from *perdoniste* "pardoners". (*Eccl.* 23, 584).
bonificare: make good. (*Eccl.* 23).
precellenter: pre-excellently. Adverb beside *precellencia* "pre-excellence"..
difformitas; difformis: difformity; difform. Paired against *uniformitas*..
archiprepositus: arch-superior. Formed on *prepositi* "superiors"..
correptibilis: open to reproof. Beside *corripere* "reprove"..
potencia ordinata: ordained power. Pair of *potencia absoluta* "absolute power"..
necessarioritas: greater necessity. Non-classical comparative abstract..
inhabilitas: lack of qualification. Beside *inhabilis* "unqualified"..
vita suffraganea: the suffragan life. .
calumpniator: challenger. Under *calumpnia* "challenge"..
pallium privilegii: cloak of privilege. Kept apart from *palliacio* "cloaking"..
sacramentum cesareum: caesarean sacrament. Ironic..
interludium: interlude. .
refuga: deserter. .
remisse (of assent): with slackened [assent]. Opposed to full assent in the degrees of belief..
gradus (of belief): degree. The four degrees of belief (*Pot. pape* 327.18 ff.)..
potissimus; pocior (Antichristus): foremost; greater. Superlative and comparative kept visible as a pair..
raciones topice: topical arguments. With *evidencia topica*..
meander (dyaboli): meander. Figure for the devil's tortuous wiles, with a C note..
episcopi cesarei: caesarean bishops. Extends *prelatus / sacerdos cesarius*..
pseudopontifices: false pontiffs. Cf. *pseudoclerici*..
sophisticacio: sophistry. Noun beside *sophisticare*..
procuratorium: proctor's mandate. .
patronus (a saint): patron. A second sense beside the benefice row; untagged..
spissius (vivere): more closely. Of living to a rule..
evangelizans: preacher of the gospel. .
prepositus (participle of preponere***)***: the one preferred. CONTEXTUAL beside *prepositi* "superiors" (the noun); untagged..
capitalis eleccio: the chapter's election. .
gracia (papal provision): grace. The papal grant of a benefice; untagged..
persona populi: the person of the people. .
dominativa forma: lordly form. After *potestas dominativa*..
pagina (of a law): page. .
latitudo (of a quality): latitude. The intension/remission term..
illibertare: rob of liberty. .
provisio (papal): provision. .
proventus: proceeds. Kept apart from *redditus* "revenues"..
civilitas cesarea: caesarean civil standing. After *civilitas* "civil standing" and *papa cesareus*..
decimacio: tithing. .
decimantes: tithe-payers. .
involucrum: wrapping. .
sophisticare quod (with a clause): argue sophistically that. Takes *sophisticari*'s sense, not "counterfeit" (which needs an object)..
gravandi: those to be charged. .
inhabilitare: disqualify. Beside *inhabilis* "unqualified", *inhabilitas*..
indiffinite: without fixed bounds. .
principatus (pl., given to churches): principalities. I.e. prelacies..
contracta / contrata: district. Loserth glosses "country"..
papatus; racio papatus: papacy; the nature of the papacy. .
forum consciencie: court of conscience. Extends the *forum penitencie* row..
dicere (logical use): signify. Of a term or name..

***coloracior*: more colourable.** Comparative, with the *color* / *colorabilis* rows..
***obviare; obvia (logical)*: meet; meeting.** Of a case or argument..
***diccio procuratoria*: proctorial pronouncement.** C note gives *dicio* "authority" as the alternative..
***refrigescentia arma*: arms that grow cold.** .
***specularis prudencia*: the prudence of a watchman.** .
***ars cesarea*: the caesarean art.** After *papa cesareus*..
***servitus ydolorum*: servitude of idols.** Beside *servitus laboris*..
***ingeniacio*: wit.** .
***principaliter (*secundo/tercio principaliter*)*: as a main head.** Marks the compendium's main divisions against the counts within them..
***precellere*: excel.** Verb beside *precellencia* "pre-excellence"; not "pre-excel"..
***suadere*: make the case.** To persuade, not to prove..
***ditacio*: enrichment.** .
***cesaree (adv.)*: in caesarean fashion.** After *papa cesareus*..
***est dare*: one may posit.** .
***insolubiliter*: inextricably.** Kept apart from *insolubilia* "insolubles"..
***probabiliter*: with probability; by probable argument.** Scholastic: argued from probable premisses, as against demonstration; not the modern hedge "probably". (close-out R1; *Pot. pape* 52.3).
***nimis*: exceedingly.** Medieval intensive (= *valde*); "too much" only where excess is the point. (close-out R2; *Pot. pape* 169.2).