De potestate pape

On the Power of the Pope

John Wyclif

**Latin text of Loserth's edition for the Wyclif Society (1907),
with a new English translation and notes**

Translated by Wilson Pruitt

Wroot Press · wyclif.wrootpress.com

De potestate pape: On the Power of the Pope. Latin and English.

John Wyclif's treatise on papal power, written in 1379, the ninth book of his Summa theologie. Wyclif first settles what power is and in how many senses the word is said, then turns to Peter's primacy, the pope as vicar of Christ, papal election, the "caesarean" pope made by the endowment, and Antichrist, answering Richard FitzRalph as he goes. The Latin of Johann Loserth's edition (1907), with a new English translation and notes: 12 chapters in 107 parts, and the medieval summary that came down with the work,

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 7
Part 1: What power is, and the senses of the word 7
Part 2: Spiritual and secular power, after Hugh of St Victor 11
Part 3: Spiritual power redefined: of order and in common 14
Part 4: The divisions of power, and five objections to multiplying them 17
Part 5: Power given from above: the answers, and Christ before Pilate 21
Chapter 2 26
Part 1: Idle priests, the shrinking of power, and miracles 26
Part 2: No man gives the Spirit, takes away sin, or punishes beyond God 30
Part 3: How the apostles were made priests, and the order of powers 35
Part 4: The nine gifts: prophets, doctors, the second and third hierarchies, the body 39
Part 5: Body and church compared; power lost by mortal sin 43
Chapter 3 46
Part 1: Peter's primacy: the sifting, the faith that fails not, the order of the names 46
Part 2: Peter's primacy: the rock, the keys, and the gospel's figures 50
Part 3: Peter's primacy: the mystical sense, Peter's acts after the Ascension, and the witness of the saints 53
Part 4: Peter's faith, the first of his three virtues 57
Part 5: Peter's humility and charity 60
Chapter 4 64
Part 1: The vicar of Peter and what election is worth 64
Part 2: Election by lot, the apostles and Matthias 67
Part 3: Chrysostom on the lot; the hereditary priesthood 71
Part 4: Many bishops over one people 73
Part 5: The apostles had no recourse to Peter 77
Chapter 5 81
Part 1: The chief vicar must live without property 81
Part 2: Charity would leave civil lordship to the laity 83
Part 3: Objections from the papal dignity and from the saints who approved endowment 86
Part 4: Lawful use, the more perfect state, and the likeness of Peter's vicar 89
Part 5: The saints' venial fault, and the powers of order and of jurisdiction 93
Part 6: The keys given for the church, Paul's licence from God, and three conclusions 96
Chapter 6 102
Part 1: The seventh teaching: no apostle had Christ's human power, nor every pope an apostle's 102
Part 2: The apostles' powers and the authority of scripture 105
Part 3: The decretals are not scripture; the apostles' equal authority 109
Part 4: The power of order and the gentile name of authority 113
Part 5: The eighth teaching: antichrist, and the first six conditions of the pseudo-pope 115

Part 6: The seventh to eleventh conditions of the pseudo-pope 120
Part 7: The pseudo-pope's sophistries: what a state is 123
Part 8: States: whether a man's state is changed by sin 127
Part 9: The duty of reproving superiors 130
Chapter 7 133
Part 1: Peter's preeminence lies in service, not lordship 133
Part 2: The keys are power and knowledge, given to every priest 136
Part 3: Peter on the waters: the dragon, the ship and the propertyless way 139
Part 4: A fourth sense: riches make the mind giddy 144
Part 5: The fifth argument: the watchful vicar and the two who say they are popes 145
Part 6: The sixth argument: Peter's second fishing and the 153 fishes 149
Part 7: The seventh argument: Peter at the council and how a vicar should correct 153
Part 8: The eighth confirmation: the propertyless state of the clergy 156
Chapter 8 162
Part 1: The name "pope", and the reason from Rome as capital 162
Part 2: The lie of Christ's lordship, and the holiness of the place 166
Part 3: No man can elect the highest pontiff 170
Part 4: Two elections: how the name of pope arose 172
Part 5: Rival popes from the chronicle of Ralph de Diceto 177
Part 6: The rival popes and the signs of antichrist 181
Part 7: Antichrist seeks glory from men; popes struck down 184
Part 8: Redeeming the time 188
Chapter 9 191
Part 1: Human election does not make a pope 191
Part 2: The poison of endowment; presbyter and bishop once the same 194
Part 3: No middle order; election and the boast of the keys 197
Part 4: The blind quibble of the keys; pride of order and the narrow way 201
Part 5: Holiness of life: Jude's six marks of the proud 204
Part 6: The wandering stars, and the primacy not to be sought 207
Part 7: Human election, the Roman church, and the conditional law 211
Part 8: The dignity of sees, worship in spirit, and the abomination of desolation 215
Chapter 10 219
Part 1: The objection that the pope must be the mightiest lord 219
Part 2: The plea of papal poverty and Otto's demand 220
Part 3: Primacy from the Lord, the submission of kingdoms, the doctors 224
Part 4: The donation of Constantine and the caesarean jurisdiction 228
Part 5: The argument from what the community believes, and a third rejoinder for the endowment 231
Part 6: The answer: the saints who approved the endowment sinned 233
Part 7: Cutting the root of cupidity; the caesarean order not needed for salvation 237

Part 8: The schism and the oaths of obedience 242
Part 9: Jerome's Roman church is the race of the predestinate 245
Part 10: The king charged with heresy, and Lincoln on the cardinals 248
Part 11: New articles of faith: no one must believe the pope is pope 253
Part 12: May the pope be reproved? three arguments answered 256
Chapter 11 261
Part 1: Order in the priesthood, and Bernard against papal lordship 261
Part 2: The caesarean priest and the disciple of Christ; Christ the one prince of priests 265
Part 3: The Virgin, a woman, a layman as pope; the old priesthood no ground for primacy 267
Part 4: Sacramental power equal in all priests; episcopal rites and vestments 271
Part 5: The vestments of the priesthood: girdle, breeches, inner tunic, superhumeral 275
Part 6: The pontiff's vestments: rational, mitre, golden plate, bells, and what they figure 278
Part 7: The priest's six vestments, and signs become false 282
Part 8: The prelates' ornaments perverted; the third argument, from order 286
Part 9: Custom, human tradition and the law of God; no secular gradation in the clergy 289
Part 10: Clerical dignity in poverty; Gregory refuses the name "universal"; an argument for the caesarean order 293
Part 11: Sin profits the church by accident; simple priests supply when prelates fail 297
Part 12: Lay baptism, the woman pope, and confession beyond necessity 301
Part 13: All the holy are priests; the two orders of the apostles 305
Chapter 12 310
Part 1: The church can do without a caesarean pope 310
Part 2: The abomination of desolation in the holy place 313
Part 3: Augustine on Antichrist; four degrees of belief 317
Part 4: Not every pope antichrist; canonization a matter of opinion 321
Part 5: The wicked prelate worse than the devil; two heads, two clergies 323
Part 6: The caesarean clergy, Judas's field, and Jesus as patron 325
Part 7: The law of christ suffices for the church without men's laws 330
Part 8: The saints against the laws of men; the sext's rule on rival provisions 334
Part 9: Causes, benefices and the dangers of papal provision 337
Part 10: Provisions, elections and the stipends of failing superiors 341
Part 11: Excommunication for withheld tithes, the schism, and alms against rents 344
Part 12: The minister's stipend and the people's withholding of tithes 348
Part 13: The pope must be the holiest of wayfarers 352
Part 14: The papacy is service, and the name of pope is equivocal 356
Part 15: The Franciscan pope, insignia, and the propertyless state 360
Part 16: The king's justice: the twenty-two conditions of a king 364
Part 17: The king must rule his clergy first; the clergy's ornaments 368
Part 18: Dispensations: the pope only promulgates what God allows 371
Part 19: The pope and heresy; the first six of the twelve abuses 375

Part 20: The seventh to twelfth abuses: prayer, burdens, appointments, indulgences, captains, earthly cares **379**
Part 21: The endowed bound to contradictories; why Constantine is not canonized; the protestation **384**
Compendium **388**
Part 1: The compendium, chapters one to seven **388**
Part 2: The compendium, chapters eight to eleven (breaks off) **392**
Glossary **397**
The church **397**
Lordship, law, office **398**
Logic, disputation, metaphysics **400**
False friends and ordinary words that mislead **403**

Chapter 1

Part 1: What power is, and the senses of the word

Loserth pp. 1.1–5.21

Occasion. ***The*** **Tractatus de potestate pape** ***is a treatise in twelve chapters, written in 1379 on Loserth's dating (intro. §4: not before 1379, at the latest early 1380), after*** **De ecclesia** ***and *De veritate sacre scripture*, which precede it in Wyclif's*** **Summa theologie***; its first sentence cites chapter 14 of "the book next before",* **De veritate.** ***It opens with*** **Iam ultimo restat***, "it remains, last of all", and so presents itself as the closing stage of a larger inquiry into the church: having treated the church, Wyclif now asks how Christ ordered its hierarchy. It is the ninth of the twelve books of his* **Summa theologie.** ***Wyclif speaks in the first person, states conclusions, raises objections and answers them.***

The text. ***Johann Loserth's edition for the Wyclif Society (1907) rests on Prague, Metropolitan Chapter C 73 (A), his base, with Prague, University Library III F 11 (B, early fifteenth century), which he judges a copy of A (B omits words that A has); Prague, University Library XI E 3 (C) supplies variants only near the end (pp. 395–397). Loserth prints the marginal notes of A and B; A's copyist was no friend to Wyclif and annotates against him (*****cave foveam, hic contradicit sibi*****). Our copy-text is Loserth's printed text, read against the plates. In the scripture references the chapter numbers are Wyclif's, the verse numbers Loserth's. The side-notes are Loserth's own English, printed verbatim. Pages 398–406 of the edition print a medieval summary of the chapters (*Sentencia libri ... in compendio*) that came down with the work as the index in A and B, incomplete in both and breaking off at the same words; it is translated here like the text.***

The move. ***Before the pope, power. Proceeding, as he says, from what is prior after the manner of nature, Wyclif first settles what power (*****potestas*****) is and in how many ways the word is said: the active and passive potencies of*** **Metaphysics** ***V, rational potency and Anselm's free choice, the acquired habit, and from it the twofold power in man, supernatural and civil; then, from scripture, the angelic order of "powers", sovereign authority, and the pretended power of darkness. Only then does he turn to Peter's primacy, the pope as vicar of Christ, papal election, the "caesarean" pope and the endowment, and Antichrist. Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh (*****dominus Ardmacanus*****), and his*** **Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum** ***are quoted and answered at length.*** **Potestas** ***is always "power".*** **Potencia** ***is "potency" where Wyclif works Aristotle's analysis of power, and "power" elsewhere. Wyclif himself treats the two words as interchangeable (*****potestas vel potencia*****).***

Where it is answered. ***Loserth's foot-notes mark the passages that Hus took over into his own *De ecclesia* ("but an echo" of Wyclif's two treatises, intro. p. i). A direct answer to the treatise has not yet been traced.***

¶1 1.1–1.14
1.1 *Our subject is: What kind of hierarchy Christ ordained for his Church.*
1.9 *We must first make clear what power is and what are its accidents.*
1.15 *Power is that by which we effect movement or change in another.*

[1] **Iam ultimo restat videre quomodo Christus, dominus noster, caput universalis ecclesie, ordinavit sponsam suam secundum gradus ecclesiastice hierarchie. Pro cuius declaracione necesse est primo supponere stabilimentum autoritatis scripture, de quo patet capitulo XIV libri proximi. Secundo suppono vulgatas significaciones terminorum questionis, quas alibi expono diffusius. Quibus suppositis superest tractare de partibus, de quantitate, de qualitate et habitudine moderne ecclesie ad priorem. Et cum innata sit nobis via instar nature a priori procedere, necessarium videtur scholasticum stabiliri in materia de quidditate et accidentibus potestatis.**

It remains, last of all, to see how Christ our Lord, head of the universal church, ordered his bride according to the grades of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. To make this clear it is necessary, first, to presuppose the establishment of the authority of scripture, as is clear from chapter 14 of the nearest book.[1] Second, I presuppose the common significations of the terms of the question, which I expound more fully elsewhere. These being presupposed, it remains to treat of the parts, of the quantity, of the quality and of the condition toward the earlier [church] of the modern church. And since the way innate to us is, after the manner of nature, to proceed from what is prior, it seems necessary that the student be grounded in the matter of the quiddity and accidents of power.[2]

¶2 1.15–2.22
2.8 *Various meanings assigned to 'power' by Aristotle.*

[1] **Potestas enim est universale instrumentum operandi et communicandi in ista materia. Describitur autem potestas ab Aristotele V Metaphysice quod est principium motus vel mutacionis**

For power is the universal instrument of working and of communicating in this matter. And power is defined by Aristotle, *Metaphysics* V, as that which "is the principle of motion or change either in another or in so far

2.23 *It may be created or uncreated.*

aut in altero aut in quantum alterum. Et [2]sic est communis ad omnem activam potestatem; quo modo videtur scripturam loqui Apocalypsis IX, 3 dicente: Quod data est potestas locustis, sicut habent potestatem scorpiones terre; racione cuius potestatis tenet dominus Ardmacanus II de questionibus Armenorum, capitulo IV, quod potestas est extensior quam nature racionalis potencia. Sed quia iuxta Aristotelem (ubi supra) potestas equivocatur ad quatuor, scilicet generaliter ad activam potenciam iam descriptam, que est vis transmutandi aliquid motu proprie dicto vel mutacione quantumlibet extensiva; et sic est vis generandi atque corrumpendi. Nec solum dicitur respectu essencie extra potens sed eadem essencia, in quantum activa, dicitur habere potenciam agendi intra se ipsam, in quantum est passiva, vel racione indisposicionis contrarie aut racione terminandi quomodolibet faccionem propriam ut passiva. Sic enim est potestas rectificandi se in virga, potestas frigefaciendi se in aqua, et potestas intelligendi se in anima; et sic de similibus.

as [it is] other".[3] And [2]so it is common to every active power; and in this way scripture seems to speak in Apocalypse 9:3, saying "that power was given to the locusts, as the scorpions of the earth have power";[4] by reason of which power the lord of Armagh holds, in book II of the *Questions of the Armenians*, chapter 4, that "power is wider than the power of rational nature".[5] But since, according to Aristotle (in the place cited), power is said equivocally in four ways: namely, generally, of the active potency already defined, which is the force of transforming something by motion properly so called, or by change however extended; and so it is the force of generating and corrupting.[6] Nor is it said only with respect to an essence outside the one that has the power; but the same essence, in so far as it is active, is said to have a potency of acting within itself, in so far as it is passive, either by reason of a contrary unfitness or by reason of terminating in any way its own making, as passive.[7] For in this way there is a power of straightening itself in a rod, a power of cooling itself in water, and a power of understanding itself in the soul; and so of like cases.

¶3 2.23–3.2
3.8 *Created power may be corporal or spiritual.*
3.20
2. Power may be passive, responding to active power.
3.24
3. Power is what enables us to do things well; i. e. according to our wishes.

[2]Quamvis autem transmutatum in istis non sit aliud quam ipsum transmutans, tamen vel est alterum, vel ut terminans potenciam est alterius racionis. Et sic intelligendo potenciam patens est eius divisio, cum aliqua sit increata, et aliqua potencia est creata. Increata potencia potest intelligi dupliciter, vel personaliter ut pro patre in divinis, cuius actum terminat Verbum suum, qui non est aliud sed alter, et alius quam dicta potencia, quia genitus et causatus; vel essencialiter [3]ut tota trinitas est una potencia intelligendi ac volendi se ipsam.

And although what is transformed in these cases is not another thing than the transformer itself, yet either it is other,[8] or, as terminating the potency, it is of another aspect. And understanding potency in this way, its division is plain, since some is uncreated, and some potency is created.[9] Uncreated potency can be understood in two ways: either personally, as [it is taken] for the Father in divine matters, whose act is terminated by his Word, who is not another thing but another, and other than the said potency, because begotten and caused; or essentially, [3]as the whole Trinity is one potency of understanding and of willing itself.[10]

¶4 3.3–3.10

[3]Et sic potest vocari potestas illa solum ad actus intrinsecos vel ad extra, ut est effectus extrinseci productiva. Que potestas licet non sit dispar essencia, tamen dicit disparem relacionem racionis hic et ibi. Et omnis talis potestas est increata, immensa et eterna, sicut natura divina, que est illa potencia; et sic loquitur scriptura Danielis VI, 26: Potestas eius usque in eternum.

And so that [potency] can be called power, either with respect to intrinsic acts alone or with respect to what is outside, as it is productive of an extrinsic effect.[11] And though this power is not a different essence, yet it implies a different relation of reason here and there. And every such power is uncreated, immense and eternal, as is the divine nature, which is that potency; and so scripture speaks in Daniel 6:26: "His power shall be for ever."

¶5 3.11–3.23

[3]Potestas autem creata vel est corporalis vel spiritualis, et sic subdividendo secundum differencias activorum, in quibus sunt multe differencie, quia spiritualis potestas racionalis creature est perpetua

And created power is either corporeal or spiritual, and so [one goes on] subdividing according to the differences of active things, among which there are many differences; for the spiritual power of a rational creature

indelebilis sed restringibilis in effectu, corporalis autem potestas est delebilis et acquiribilis, cum sit qualitas de secunda specie qualitatis non inseparabiliter connaturalis substancie cui inest. Secundo vero modo sumitur potestas in textu Aristotelis, pro passiva potencia creature, secundum quam dicitur recipere congrue activi extrinseci accionem.

is perpetual, indelible, but restrictable in effect, while corporeal power is delible and acquirable, since it is a quality of the second species of quality, not inseparably connatural to the substance in which it is.[12] And in the second way power is taken in Aristotle's text for the passive potency of a creature, according to which it is said to receive fittingly the action of an extrinsic agent.

¶6 3.24–5.21

4.1 *The inalienable power of doing right is called by Anselm Free will.*

4.11 *4. Power may be an acquired accident, e. g. medicinal skill.*

4.18 *It may be supernatural, as in the ministration of the sacraments, or civil, inflicting penalties on rebels to the Church,*

5.11 *Besides all these meanings 'power' denotes an order of angels,*

[3]Sed tercio pertinencius accipitur potestas pro principio faciendi aliquid, non quocunque modo, sed bene, quod Aristoteles dicit fieri secundum voluntatem. Et ista videtur mihi potencia rationalis; de qua nono Methaphisice 30 et 10. Et illa subdividitur secundum homines et angelos bonos vel malos; et illa potestas dicitur vel intrinsece vel extrinsece, proporcionaliter ut dictum est de potencia divina; unde potencia racionalis inseparabilis [4]a creatura racionali servandi rectitudinem vocatur a venerabili Anshelmo, liberum arbitrium, ut patet in libello suo De Libero Arbitrio. Liberum, inquit, arbitrium est potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem; tales autem potenciae impediri potuerunt sed non extingui. Verumtamen potestas vel potencia sumitur quandoque pro sufficiencia meritorie operandi, vel incitantibus resistendi, et talis per peccatum potest diminui atque tolli. Quarto vero modo accipit Aristoteles potestatem sive potenciam pro habitu accidenter aquisito, secundum quod eius subiectum potens est alterius mutatum, ut ars medicinalis vel alii habitus operandi. Nec distat multum sufficiencia iam dicta ab ista potencia. Secundum hoc itaque inest homini duplex maneries potestatis, scilicet supernaturalis et civilis. Supernaturalis est potestas, quam Deus dat homini ad spiritualiter proficiendum ecclesie, cuiusmodi est potestas sacerdotalis in conficiendo vel ministrando sacramenta aut alia spiritualia bona ecclesie. Potestas autem civilis est potestas dominativa ad cohercendum rebelles ecclesie secundum penam sensibilem et dicit libertatem in potentatu et subdicione in extrinseco terminante. Et isto modo videtur Salvator dicere Math. XX, 25: Principes gencium dominantur eorum; et qui maiores sunt potestatem exercent in eos. Et Jeremie XXXIV, 9 refert Propheta quomodo Judei dimiserant servos suos et ancillas, ut essent liberi sue potestatis; quando [5]enim homo habet libertatem sine coactivo preposito ad faciendum cum suis quod foret sibi expedicius, tunc dicitur sub nullius redigi potestate, ut loquitur Apostolus I. Corinth. VI, 12; et sic videtur Apostolum loqui I. Corinth. VII, 4 quando dicit quod coniuges non habent sui corporis potestatem, eo quod oportet eos ex debito servire sibi reciproce in actibus carnalibus, quando esset utilius contemplari. Et sic servitus et obligacio ad

But in the third way, and more pertinently, power is taken for the principle of doing something, not in any manner whatever, but well, which Aristotle says "comes about according to will".[13] And this seems to me to be rational potency, of which [he treats in] *Metaphysics* IX, 3 and 1.[14] And it is subdivided according to men and angels, good or evil; and that power is spoken of either intrinsically or extrinsically, proportionally as was said of the divine potency; hence the rational potency of keeping rectitude, inseparable [4]from a rational creature, is called by the venerable Anselm free choice, as is clear in his little book *On Free Choice*. "Free choice," he says, "is the power of keeping rectitude of will for the sake of rectitude itself";[15] and such powers could be hindered but not extinguished. Nevertheless, power or potency[16] is sometimes taken for the sufficiency to work meritoriously, or to resist those who incite [to sin], and such [power] can be diminished and taken away through sin. And in the fourth way Aristotle takes power or potency for a habit accidentally acquired, according to which its subject, [itself] changed, is capable of [changing] another, as the art of medicine or other habits of working.[17] And the sufficiency just mentioned differs little from this potency. Accordingly, then, there is in man a twofold kind of power, namely supernatural and civil. Supernatural power is the power which God gives a man for profiting the church spiritually, of which kind is priestly power in confecting or ministering the sacraments or other spiritual goods of the church. And civil power is lordly power for coercing rebels against the church by perceptible penalty, and it implies freedom in the one who holds sovereignty and subjection in the extrinsic party in which it terminates.[18] And in this way the Saviour seems to speak in Matthew 20:25: "The princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that are the greater, exercise power upon them." And in Jeremiah 34:9 the prophet relates how the Jews had let their menservants and maidservants go, "that they might be free, in their own power"; for [5]when a man has freedom, without a coactive superior, to do with his own what would be more expedient to him, then he is said to be "brought

carnalem copulam in coniugio sunt status imperfecti quodammodo. Preter istas significaciones sumitur potestas in scriptura nunc pro sexto ordine angelorum, ut Colos. I, 16 et aliquando pro ipso potentatu, ut Rom. XIII, Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Et quandoque sumitur equivoce pro potestate pretensa vel false palliata, ut Luce XXII, 53 dicit Christus suis captoribus: Hec est hora vestra et potestas tenebrarum. Et istas equivocaciones potestatum oportet diligenter notare secundum pertinencia materie ventilate.

under the power of none", as the Apostle speaks in 1 Corinthians 6:12; and so the Apostle seems to speak in 1 Corinthians 7:4 when he says that "spouses have not power of their own body", because they must, out of the marriage debt, serve one another in carnal acts when it would be more profitable to contemplate. And so servitude and obligation to carnal union in marriage are in a certain way imperfect states.[19] Besides these significations, power is taken in scripture at one time for the sixth order of angels, as in Colossians 1:16, and at another for sovereignty itself, as in Romans 13[:1], "Let every soul be subject to higher powers."[20] And sometimes it is taken equivocally for a power pretended or falsely cloaked, as in Luke 22:53 Christ says to his captors: "This is your hour and the power of darkness." And these equivocations of powers must be carefully noted, according to what pertains to the matter under discussion.

Notes

1. *capitulo XIV libri proximi*, "chapter 14 of the nearest book". Loserth takes *libri proximi* for a scribal error: the nearest book is *De officio regis*, which treats only royal power, while the establishing of scripture's authority runs through *De veritate sacre scripture* (ed. Buddensieg). *De officio regis* has only twelve chapters, and chapter 14 of *De veritate* (on keeping silent about the truth) does not treat the point; the chapter meant is untraced.
2. *Quiditas*, "quiddity", is what a thing is; its accidents are what belong to it beyond that. *A priori procedere* is "to proceed from what is prior", not the modern epistemic sense. The phrase *innata ... nobis via* recalls Aristotle, *Physics* I.1 (*innata autem est nobis via ex notioribus nobis*), 184a16.
3. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* Δ 12 (Wyclif's book V). Loserth: "rectius Metaph. IV, 12, ed. acad. Borussica" (*principium motus aut transmutacionis in altero aut prout alterum est*); the modern form Δ 12, 1019a15–20 is ours.
4. Wyclif has *data est potestas locustis*; the Vulgate *data est illis potestas* (DR "power was given to them").
5. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* II.4, as Wyclif cites it; Loserth could not check it ("mihi ad manum non est"); in the Paris 1512 print, book II is on Old Testament proofs that the Messiah is God (II.4 is on Ps. 109), so Wyclif's numbering does not match the print, and the words were not found in XI.1–7 either. The Latin is *potestas est extensior quam nature racionalis potencia*. The comparison is of extent (power in general, which the locusts have, against the power of rational nature), not of two concepts, so *potencia* is "power" here. Wyclif treats *potestas* and *potencia* as interchangeable in this chapter (see n. 16).
6. *Sed quia ... potestas equivocatur ad quatuor* has no main clause: the period breaks off after the first sense, and the count resumes at 3.20 (*Secundo*), 3.24 (*tercio*) and 4.11 (*Quarto*). The English keeps the break.
7. *extra potens*, "outside the one that has the power": the patient distinct from the agent, as against the self-acting case that follows. Loserth refers this line (2.16) to Aristotle, *Metaph.* VIII, 1, 2 (= Θ 1, 1046a, our modern form).
8. *aliud ... alterum*: "another thing" (a different nature) as against "other" (the same thing taken otherwise), the distinction applied to the Trinity at 2.29–3.1.
9. B lacks *et aliqua potencia est creata* (2.27–28); the print is translated.
10. *qui non est aliud sed alter*: the Son is "not another thing but another", i.e. not a different nature but a different person. *Causatus*, "caused", is Wyclif's word for the Son and is kept.
11. *Et sic potest vocari potestas illa*: we take *illa* (the uncreated *potencia* of 2.26–3.2) as the subject and *potestas* as the predicate, so that Wyclif says the potency just divided may be called power. The alternative takes *potestas illa* together as the subject ("that power can be called [so]"). In God the "potency" of this analysis is active power, terminated by the Word, not unrealised potentiality; it stays "potency" (here and at 3.9, 3.31) because Wyclif is carrying Aristotle's division into the Trinity.
12. The second species of quality is natural capacity or incapacity (Aristotle, *Categories* 8, 9a14). *Indelebilis* is Loserth's form (codd. *indelibilis*); for *delebilis* (3.16) B reads *debilis*, "weak".
13. Aristotle, *Metaph.* Δ 12, 1019a23–26 (*kata proairesin*); Loserth refers 3.26 to *Metaph.* VIII, 1. B lacks *tercio* (3.24).
14. The print has *nono Methaphisice 30 et 10* (checked on the plate); we take *30* and *10* for the ordinals 3° and 1°, the ° printed as a zero, chapters. Loserth: "Rectius Metaph. VIII, 2" (= Θ 2, 1046b, on rational potencies; our modern form).
15. Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii* 3 (PL 158, 494B: *libertas arbitrii est potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem*); Loserth gives Anselm, *Opera* (Paris, 1721), p. 118.

16. ***potestas vel potencia***, "power or potency" (so ***potestatem sive potenciam***, 4.11): Wyclif doubles the two words as synonyms, as he calls the uncreated ***potencia potestas*** (3.3) and says every such ***potestas*** "is the divine nature, which is that ***potencia***" (3.9). ***Potestas*** is always "power"; ***potencia*** is "potency" inside Aristotle's analysis and "power" elsewhere (Anselm's ***tales potencie*** just above, "such powers").
17. ***potens est alterius mutatum*** does not construe cleanly: "its subject, changed, is capable of another". The bracketed words give the likelier sense (Aristotle's potency in another); ***mutativum***, "capable of changing", may have been intended. Loserth records no variant.
18. Loserth prints ***et subdicione***; the manuscripts read ***subdicionem*** (4.27). The English follows the manuscripts: the print's ablative does not construe (it would put "subjection" under ***in*** beside "freedom", "freedom in sovereignty and in subjection"), while the accusative makes subjection a second thing that civil power implies, lodged in the party subjected. ***Potentatus*** is therefore concrete here, "the one who holds sovereignty", in parallel with ***in extrinseco terminante***. Loserth also reports ***Codd.: vel ut*** at 4.21, where his print has ***vel*** (***conficiendo vel ministrando***).
19. Jeremiah 34:9 tells of the release; the phrase ***ut essent liberi et suae potestatis*** is from 34:16 (DR "let go free, and set at liberty"), here without ***et***. 1 Corinthians 6:12 Vg ***sed ego sub nullis redigar potestate*** (DR "I will not be brought under the power of any"); 7:4 is paraphrased.
20. Loserth notes that Hus's ***De ecclesia*** (fol. 217b) gives 5.11–19 word for word. ***Potentatus*** is rendered "sovereignty" (5.13) and, of its holder, "the one who holds sovereignty" (4.27).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 1: ∅ (print has nothing between Iam and ultimo; scans' text is English preface) [GAP]
  - 1: ***V***
  - 1: ***aut***
  - 2: ***sicut***
  - 3: ***illa***
  - 3: ***est perpetua indelebilis*** (one token covers three printed words)
  - 3: ***sed restringibilis*** (one token covers two printed words)
  - 3: ***illa***
  - 3: ***illa***
  - 4: ***pote-*** (hyphenated pote-/statem; main token holds first half)
  - 4: ***statem*** (second half of pote-statem)
  - 5: ***coactivo*** (print has v) [NW]
  - 5: ∅ (15 is the line number)
  - 3: ***principio*** (25 is the line number)
- 3.28 ***30 et 10***: as printed (plate n0064 read this session); see n. 12.
- Omitted per: line numbers and the MS folio marker 162ª (3.21).

Part 2: Spiritual and secular power, after Hugh of St Victor

Loserth pp. 5.22–9.10

¶1 5.22–8.2
5.22 *All these meanings must be allowed since they are in common use.*
6.29 *Even restricting the word to a free rational power exercised by man;*
7.1 *it is of many kinds.*
7.18 *There are powers spiritual and secular of which the heads are respectively pope and king.*
8.18 *The spiritual power is said to be superior 10 the secular in antiquity, dignity and usefulness.*
8.29 *Usefulness: The Jews were governed only by this till the time of Saul.*

[5]Quamvis autem nesciam fundare efficaciter ex scriptura, quod aliqua sit potestas nisi racionalis potencia, tamen quia videtur Aristotelem et doctores nostros loqui extensius, et nomen est vox sensitiva ad placitum, satis possunt admitti omnes significaciones termini supradicte, nam beatus Johannes intelligit in primo libro prophetico homines bestialiter conversantes. In cuius signum Apocal. IX describit bestias descripcionibus, quales non possunt corporaliter competere animali. Ut patet de locustis, quas dicit habere caudas similes scorpionum, et aculei erant in caudis earum. [6]Et sic intelligitur de potestate equorum, qui post tubacionem sexti angeli exierunt, et conformiter intelligitur capitulo XIII, 4 de potestate, quam draco dedit bestie. Unde propter defectum auctoris non audeo dicere quod Deus habet potestatem producendi quicquam ad intra

But although I cannot ground effectively from scripture that there is any power other than a rational potency,[1] yet because Aristotle and our doctors seem to speak more broadly, and a name is a perceptible sound by convention,[2] all the significations of the term set out above can well be admitted; for blessed John, in the first prophetic book, understands men who live like beasts.[3] In sign of this, Apocalypse 9 describes beasts in terms such as cannot bodily fit an animal, as is clear of the locusts, which he says have "tails like to scorpions: and there were stings in their tails". [6]And so it is understood of the power of the horses which went out after the sixth angel sounded his trumpet, and in like manner it is understood, in chapter 13:4, of the "power which the dragon gave to the beast".[4] Hence, for want of an authority, I do not dare to say that God

sed solum ad extra, licet habeat potenciam ad omnia producibilia sui intrinseca producendum, nec personam aut actum in Deo sue dicimus subici potestati. Omnes tamen actus nostri liberi arbitrii, sicut opera extrinseca per hos facta, dicuntur nostre subici potestati, ut patet I. Retractacionum XXXII, III De libero arbitrio et in De spiritu et anima XXVI. Unde non sequitur: si unum convertibilium non sit in potestate nostra, tunc nec reliquum vel e contra; antecedens non est in potestate nostra, igitur nec consequens vel e contra. Et sic argumentando affirmative ex opposito: in potestate, inquit Augustinus, nostra non est, nisi quod nostram sequitur voluntatem. Sequitur enim: Deus predestinavit me igitur habeo virtutem finalis perseverancie et e contra. Sequitur eciam: placet mihi de hoc quod digero alimentum, igitur sic digero; antecedens est in potestate mea et consequens non, quia ex II. Ethicorum propter illa que non sunt in potestate nostra non sumus laudandi moraliter nec culpandi. Supposito igitur, quod fiat restriccio potestatis a racionalem potenciam liberam accidentalem homini, patet quod tales potestates habent subdivisionem [7] multiplicem et terminos magistrales, ut alia est potestas ordinis, alia regiminis vel iurisdiccionis, alia potestas autentica, et alia vicaria vel commissa. Et breviter secundum distinccionem operum est distinccio potestatum. Famosior autem distinccio potestatis pertinens huic proposito est illa quam tangit Hugo II De Sacramentis, parte II capitulo IV, dicens quod sicut duplex est vita hominis; vita terrena corporalis vel naturalis, alia celestis spiritualis vel supernaturalis, sic duplex est potestas. Prima vita corpus vivit ex anima, secunda vero vita anima vivit ex Deo illapso per graciam, et utraque vita suum bonum habet quo vegetatur et nutritur, ut possit subsistere; ut autem in utraque vita iusticia servetur, est dare secundum duos populos, scilicet clerum et laicos, duplicem potestatem, scilicet spiritualem et secularem; et in utraque diversi sunt gradus et ordines potestatum, sub uno tamen capite ecclesie utrimque distributi, et quasi ab uno principio deducti et ad unum relati. Terrena potestas caput habet regem in terris, sicut spiritualis potestas summum pontificem, Sed difficultas scolastica est quomodo iste potestates due describi debeant; et videtur Hugonem innuere quod spiritualis potestas sit potestas clerici ad dirigendum ecclesiam, ut bene vivat vita spirituali. Potestas autem secularis vel terrena sit potestas laici ad dirigendum ecclesiam, ut bene vivat vita naturali. Et habent iste potestates suas leges ac bona sua, de quibus principaliter intromittunt, ut laicus [8] bona nature et fortune, sed clericus bona gracie et virtutis.

has power of producing anything within [himself], but only outside; although he has power to produce all the producibles intrinsic to himself, nor do we say that a person or an act in God is subject to his power.[5] Yet all the acts of our free choice, like the extrinsic works done through them, are said to be subject to our power, as is clear in *Retractations* I.32, *On Free Choice* III, and *On the Spirit and the Soul* 26.[6] Hence it does not follow: if one of two convertibles is not in our power, then neither is the other, or conversely; the antecedent is not in our power, therefore neither is the consequent, or conversely. And so, arguing affirmatively from the opposite: "there is nothing in our power", says Augustine, "but what follows our will". For it follows: God has predestined me, therefore I have the virtue of final perseverance, and conversely. It also follows: it pleases me that I digest food, therefore I so digest; the antecedent is in my power and the consequent not, because, from *Ethics* II, "on account of those things which are not in our power we are not to be praised morally nor blamed".[7] Supposing therefore that the restriction of power be made to a free rational potency accidental to man,[8] it is clear that such powers have a manifold subdivision [7] and masters' terms, as one is the power of order, another of rule or jurisdiction, one authentic power and another vicarious or committed. And, briefly, according to the distinction of works is the distinction of powers.[9] And the best-known distinction of power pertaining to this purpose is the one Hugh touches on, *On the Sacraments* II, part 2, chapter 4, saying that "as the life of man is twofold, the earthly, bodily or natural life, the other heavenly, spiritual or supernatural, so power is twofold. By the first life the body lives from the soul, but by the second life the soul lives from God, who flows into it by grace; and each life has its own good by which it is quickened and nourished, so that it may subsist; and so that justice may be kept in each life, there is, according to the two peoples, namely the clergy and the laity, a twofold power, namely spiritual and secular; and in each there are different grades and orders of powers, yet distributed on both sides under one head of the church, and as it were drawn from one principle and referred to one. The earthly power has as its head the king on earth, as the spiritual power has the highest pontiff."[10] But the scholastic difficulty is how these two powers ought to be defined; and Hugh seems to hint that spiritual power is the power of a cleric to direct the church so that it lives well by the spiritual life, and secular or earthly power the power of a layman to direct the church so that it lives well by the natural life. And these powers have their own laws and their own goods, with which they

chiefly concern themselves, as the layman [8] with the goods of nature and fortune, but the cleric with the goods of grace and virtue.

¶2 8.3–8.17

[8] Iste autem descripciones videntur perplexe, cum clerici nostri videntur habere potestatem secularem concessam eis a regibus. Sicut ad reges pertinet subditos suos in virtute instruere, specialiter cum per se finis vite naturalis sit ut ornetur virtutibus, nec aliter est regnum vel populus, nec aliter vivit legaliter. Cum igitur quicquid potestas potest inferior, potest superior, non e contra, potestas autem spiritualis excedit aliam ut anima corpus, patet secundum doctorem quod potestas spiritualis habet aliam instruere, et quando deviat iudicare; spiritualis, inquit, potestas a solo Deo debet iudicari iuxta illud I. Corinth. II, 15: Spiritualis iudicat omnia, et ipse a nemine iudicatur.

But these definitions seem perplexed, since our clerics seem to have secular power granted to them by kings. So too it belongs to kings to instruct their subjects in virtue,[11] especially since the end of natural life, of itself, is that it be adorned with virtues, and not otherwise is there a kingdom or a people, nor does it otherwise live lawfully. Since, therefore, whatever a lower power can do a higher can, and not conversely, and since now "the spiritual power exceeds the other as the soul the body", it is clear according to the doctor that the spiritual power is to instruct the other, and to judge it when it goes astray; "the spiritual power", he says, "ought to be judged by God alone, according to that of 1 Corinthians 2:15: 'the spiritual man judgeth all things: and he himself is judged of no man.'"[12]

¶3 8.18–8.28

[8] Unde spiritualis potestas excedit aliam in antiquitate in dignitate et in utilitate. In antiquitate, quia prius iubente Deo sacerdocium institutum est, ut patet Exod. XXVIII, postea per sacerdocium iubente Deo instituta est regalis potestas, ut patet Deuter. XVIII et I. Regum XII. Ex quo videtur quod ista potestas excedit aliam in dignitate, quia, cum secundum Apostolum Heb. VII: Maior est qui benedicit, et minor qui benedicitur, videtur quod potestas consecrandi et instituendi regem excedit regiam potestatem.

Hence spiritual power exceeds the other in antiquity, in dignity and in usefulness. In antiquity, because "first, at God's command, the priesthood was instituted", as is clear in Exodus 28; afterwards, "through the priesthood, at God's command, royal power was instituted", as is clear in Deuteronomy 18 and 1 Kings 12.[13] From which it appears that this power exceeds the other in dignity, because, since according to the Apostle, Hebrews 7, "greater is he who blesses, and less he who is blessed",[14] it appears that the power of consecrating and instituting the king exceeds the royal power.

¶4 8.29–9.5
9.6 Dignity: This is self evident.

[8] Utilitas maioritatis eius ex hoc evidet, quod Potestas spiritualis per se sufficit ad regimen populi, ut patet de Israhele usque ad tempora Saul sine potestate regia salubriter regulato. [9] Potestas igitur spiritualis cum sit de bonis optimis et per se sufficientibus, excedit potestatem terrenam, cum illa nichil valet sine potestate spirituali principaliter regulante. Sed e contra ista per se sufficit sine illa.

The usefulness of its greatness is evident from this[15], that spiritual power by itself suffices for the rule of the people, as is clear of Israel, governed to its health without royal power until the times of Saul.[16] [9] Spiritual power, therefore, since it concerns the best goods and those sufficient of themselves, exceeds earthly power, since that is worth nothing without spiritual power principally governing it. But, conversely, this suffices by itself without that.

¶5 9.6–9.10

[9] In ista utique materia tenendum est pro constanti quod potestas spiritualis quoad dignitatem excedit aliam, ut testatur doctor et quotlibet leges hominum fundate racionibus et scripturis, ut patet capitulo V huius.

In this matter, at any rate, it must be held as constant that spiritual power, as regards dignity, exceeds the other, as the doctor testifies, and any number of human laws grounded in reasons and scriptures, as is clear in chapter 5 of this [treatise].[17]

Notes

1. ***racionalis potencia***: the first ***potencia*** in this part, here "potency", the rational potency of the analysis of ***dynamis***. Wyclif uses ***potestas*** and ***potencia*** interchangeably (***potestas vel potencia***, 4.7); outside that analysis both are "power" (6.5–6).
2. ***vox sensitiva ad placitum***: so the print. The logicians' definition of a name is ***vox significativa ad placitum***, "a sound significant by convention" (Aristotle, ***De interpretatione*** 2; 16a19; Boethius, ***vox significativa ad placitum***); ***sensitiva*** may stand for ***significativa***. Translated as printed.
3. ***in primo libro prophetico***: Loserth's foot to 5.28 notes ***primo*** and offers a better reading (***rectius: in illo ...***) that the scan of the foot does not let us recover. The book meant is the Apocalypse.
4. Apocalypse 9:10 (Loserth 5.32), the locusts; 9:17 (Loserth 6.2), the horses, loosed at the sixth angel's trumpet; 13:4, "the dragon which gave power to the beast". The italic words of 13:4 are quoted within Wyclif's own syntax. ***Descripcionibus*** (5.31) has its ordinary sense here, not the logical "definition" of 7.15 and 8.3.
5. ***potestatem ... potenciam***: both "power". The scruple is over the word: Wyclif knows no authority (***auctor***) for saying that God has ***potestas*** to produce ***ad intra***, within the Godhead, though he grants him ***potencia*** for "all the producibles intrinsic to himself". The ***licet*** clause runs on into ***nec ... dicimus***; the stops are the print's.
6. Augustine, ***Retractationes*** I.32 (so the text; Book I has 27 chapters, and the words Loserth's foot quotes, ***sponte homo, id est libero arbitrio, cadere potuit***, are I.9.6, PL 32, 598); ***De libero arbitrio*** III.3.7 (***nihil tam in nostra potestate, quam ipsa voluntas est***); ***De spiritu et anima*** 26 (so the text; the matter is ch. 48, PL 40, 814, ch. 26 being on apparitions), a pseudo-Augustinian work printed among Augustine's spuria and received in Wyclif's day as his.
7. Augustine, ***Retractationes*** I.22.4 (PL 32, 620), word for word: ***in potestate nostra non est, nisi quod nostram sequitur voluntatem***; Loserth's II.2–3 is wrong. Aristotle: Loserth gives ***Nic. Eth.*** II.9 with a query; the place is ***Eth.*** II.5, 1105b28–1106a10 (we are neither praised nor blamed for what we have by nature), and the doctrine that praise and blame attach to the voluntary opens book III. The two non-sequiturs state one rule: of two convertibles, or of antecedent and consequent, one may be in our power and the other not, as the two examples show.
8. ***a racionalem potenciam***: so the print; the sense wants ***ad***, translated "to". AB in the margin (6.29): ***Potestas multiplex libera***. Hus repeats 6.31–7.4 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213b), as he does Wyclif's account of power at 5.11–19 (Hus, ***De ecclesia*** fol. 217b, "verbotenus").
9. ***secundum distinccionem operum est distinccio potestatum***: powers are told apart by the works they are for; the definition Wyclif gives at 10.25 builds on this.
10. Hugh of St Victor, ***De sacramentis*** II.2.4 (PL 176, 418), "loosely quoted" (Loserth). Loserth's italics carry the quotation to ***summum pontificem***. "Who flows into it" renders ***illapso***. AB in the margin: ***Vita hominis duplex, naturalis et spiritualis*** (7.9), ***Potestas duplex*** (7.11).
11. ***perplexe***: here of the definitions, "tangled", not the moral-theology sense of ***perplexus***. ***Sicut ad reges pertinet***: the ***sicut*** clause has no main clause to answer it; taken as a second ground of the objection, "so too". It may instead hang on the ***cum*** clause before it ("as it belongs to kings ...").
12. Hugh again: Loserth (8.12) marks what follows as excerpted from him. 1 Corinthians 2:15 (Vulgate ***spiritualis autem***). Loserth's italics give the two Hugh clauses, quoted here.
13. ***iubente Deo*** (8.22): the manuscripts lack ***Deo***; Loserth supplied it from Hugh's text (translated). Exodus 28, the institution of Aaron's priesthood; ***Deuter. XVIII*** and ***I. Regum XII*** (1 Samuel 12) as printed. The two clauses in quotation marks follow Loserth's italics (Hugh).
14. Hebrews 7:7, Vulgate ***quod minus est, a meliore benedicitur***, DR "that which is less is blessed by the better". The text's wording (Hugh's) is a paraphrase; translated as it stands.
15. ***evidet*** (p. 8): so the print, read on the plate; taken as ***evidet[ur]*** ("is evident"), our emendation. The sense is not in doubt.
16. ***Utilitas maioritatis eius***: "the usefulness of its greatness", the third head (usefulness) of the comparison; the sense is "its superiority in usefulness".
17. "The doctor" is Hugh. ***capitulo V huius***: chapter 5 of this treatise. AB in the margin (9.6): ***Potestas spiritualis est dignior potestate regia***. Hus repeats 9.1–5 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213b).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 6: ***illa***
  - 6: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 7: ***multiplicem***
  - 7: ***terminos***
  - 7: ***magistrales***
  - 7: ***illa***
  - 7: ***deducti***
  - 7: ***relati***
  - 8: ***antiquitate*** (hyphenated antiqui-tate; main token covers whole word)
  - 8: ***in***
  - 8: ***dignitate***
  - 8: ***prius***
  - 9: ***illa***
  - 9: ***illa***
  - 7: ***possit*** (LEFT-nw: italic; print = possit)
  - 8: ***Maior*** (LEFT-nw: italic, capital M)

Part 3: Spiritual power redefined: of order and in common

¶1 9.11–10.24
9.11 *Antiquity: It is believed that Adam and Cain had a sort of priesthood.*
9.26 *In God however the kingly power has priority.*
10.1 *Objections to accepting Hugo's description. 1. Both powers were united in one person e. g. Melchizedek. 2. A similar union of powers in clerics, 3. and in kings, since it belongs to them to increase virtue.*
10.25 *Spiritual power is a power of the Spirit to direct a rational creature according to the gifts of grace.*

[9]**Quantum ad antiquitatem, patet quod sacerdocium gentile vel naturale precessit sacerdocium leviticum. Et correspondenter de potestate dicitur, ut tangitur XXI capitulo V libri. Unde illo modo creditur Adam et Cayn eius progenitum ante peccatum fuisse quodammodo naturaliter sacerdotes. et sic potestas spiritualis benedicendi et consecrandi, videtur dignitate, tempore et utilitate precedere potestatem civiliter coactivam, ymmo potestas sacerdotalis levitica videtur potestatem regiam Israheliticam antiquitate precedere; non autem potestatem regiam gentilem, cum tempore Abrahe legitur novem reges fuisse in valle congregatos. Dignitate autem et utilitate videtur sacerdotalis potestas levitica esse prior. In Deo autem videtur racio potestatis regie increate precedere potestatem sacerdotalem; sicut secunda persona origine precedit terciam, et opus sustentacionis; opus confirmacionis, que correspondent istis officiis, et per consequens sacerdos eternus primos parentes matrimonio copulavit, licet spirituale matrimonium Christi et ecclesie ipsum precesserit.** [10]**Redeundo igitur ad descripciones potestatum predictas, videtur quod capiunt multas calumpnias; primo quia eidem persone insunt ambe potestates simul; que persona fuit layca in veteri testamento, ut patet de rege Salem Melchisedech Genes. XIV, de Moyse et aliis iudicibus qui non erant sacerdotes levitici, in tantum quod videtur multis ipsos fuisse populares vel laicos. Secundo quia in novo testamento videtur multis quod clerici habeant simul utramque potestatem, cum habent secularem dominacionem; ut fingitur. Et tercio quia reges temporales habent spiritualem ad destruendum vicia et plantandum ac augendum virtutes in se et in aliis, quotquot autem receperunt Christum per fidem, dedit eis potestatem racione filiacionis spiritualis, ad impendendum opera spiritualia misericordie que indubie est potestas spiritualis; quia potestas data divinitus immediate ad vitam spiritualem gignendam et alendam. Nec potest christianus sine hac potestate sanctificare sabbatum; quam potestatem auferre a quolibet Christiano foret contradicere legi Dei; ut patet Exod. XX. Omnis enim potestas qua homo sanctificiat se vel tempus est potestas spiritualis.**

As to antiquity, it is clear that the gentile or natural priesthood preceded the Levitical priesthood. And correspondingly it is said of power, as is touched on in chapter 21 of the fifth book.[1] Hence in that way Adam and Cain his offspring are believed to have been in some way naturally priests before sin.[2] And so the spiritual power of blessing and consecrating seems to precede in dignity, time and usefulness the civilly coactive power; indeed the Levitical priestly power seems to precede the Israelite royal power in antiquity; but not the gentile royal power, since in the time of Abraham nine kings are read to have been gathered in the valley (Genesis 14). But in dignity and usefulness the Levitical priestly power seems to be prior. But in God the notion of the uncreated royal power seems to precede the priestly power, as the second person precedes the third in origin, and the work of sustaining the work of confirming, which correspond to these offices;[3] and consequently the eternal priest joined the first parents in matrimony, although the spiritual matrimony of Christ and the church preceded it. [10]**Returning, therefore, to the definitions of the powers given above, they seem to be open to many challenges: first, because both powers are in the same person at once, a person who was lay in the old testament, as is clear of the king of Salem, Melchizedek, Genesis 14, and of Moses and the other judges, who were not Levitical priests, so much so that it seems to many that they were of the people, or lay. Secondly, because in the new testament it seems to many that clerics have both powers at once, since they have secular exercise of lordship, as is feigned. And thirdly, because temporal kings have spiritual [power] to destroy vices and to plant and increase virtues in themselves and in others; and "as many as received" Christ by faith, "he gave them power",[4] by reason of spiritual sonship, to perform the spiritual works of mercy, which is undoubtedly spiritual power, since it is a power given by God immediately for begetting and nourishing the spiritual life. Nor can a Christian sanctify the sabbath without this power; to take this power away from any Christian would be to contradict God's law, as is clear in Exodus 20. For every power by which a man sanctifies[5] himself or a time is spiritual power.**

¶2 10.25–11.16
11.10 *Corporal power is the ordering of the creature according to gifts of nature or fortune.*

[10]**Et patet impugnacio descripcionis supradicte. Ideo ut descripcio dictarum potestatum sit nocior et ecclesie consentaneor, potest dici quod potestas spiritualis est potestas spiritus per se immediate**

And the impugning of the definition given above is clear. Therefore, so that the definition of the said powers may be better known and more consonant[6] with the church, it can be said that spiritual power is a power

11.17 *Different kinds of spiritual power; the power given in orders and that which is common to all christians.*

ordinata, ut creatura racionalis secundum bona gracie dirigatur, et sic individuatur tam a subiecto quam obiecto. Est autem omnis homo spiritus, cum sit duarum naturarum utraque, ut loquitur scriptura Luce IX; 55: Nescitis cuius [11]spiritus estis, et I. Joh. IV, 3: Omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jhesum, ex Deo nou est, spiritus ibi est subtilis hereticus. Et sic sive analogizetur potestas ad Deum et creaturas racionales, sive restringatur ad potestates hominum et angelorum verum est, quod omnis potestas spiritualis est potestas spiritus. Et quamvis homo non det graciam, ministrat tamen sacramenta, ut subditus secundum bona gracie dirigatur. Potestas autem corporalis, quamvis sit gracia bonorum gracie; tamen immediate est; ut creatura Dei ordinetur secundum bona naturalia vel fortune. Et ita videtur omnis homo habere duplicem potestatem, cum omnis homo debet habere potestatem super actus membrorum, et preterea habet potestatem viandi in gracia.

of a spirit, ordered of itself immediately to this, that a rational creature be directed according to the goods of grace; and so it is individuated both by its subject and by its object.[7] Now every man is a spirit, since he is of two natures, both of them,[8] as scripture speaks in Luke 9:55: "You know not of what [11]spirit you are"; and 1 John 4:3: "Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God": spirit there is a subtle heretic.[9] And so, whether power is analogized to God and to rational creatures, or restricted to the powers of men and angels, it is true that every spiritual power is a power of a spirit. And although man does not give grace, yet he ministers the sacraments, so that the subject may be directed according to the goods of grace. But bodily power, although it exists for the sake of the goods of grace, yet is immediately [ordered] so that God's creature may be ordered according to natural goods or those of fortune.[10] And so every man seems to have a twofold power, since every man must have power over the acts of his members, and moreover he has the power of making his way in grace.[11]

¶3 11.17–11.32

[11]Ideo potestas spiritualis capit subdivisionem multiplicem, cum aliqua sit ordinis, et aliqua sit communis. Potestas ordinis vocatur potestas spiritualis quam habet clericus ad ministrandum ecclesie sacramenta, ut spiritualiter prosit sibi et laicis, ut est potestas conficiendi, absolvendi et sacramenta ministrandi. Nam potestas conficiendi ordinatur per se et immediate, ut sacerdos conficiat, sicut habitus virtutis moralis ordinantur propter actus habitibus meliores; et cum sacerdos, ut digne conficiat, dirigitur secundum bona gracie; ideo patet in isto et sibi similibus descripcio supradicta. Potestas autem spiritualis communis, quam habet quilibet christianus, in exercendo opera spiritualia misericordie in se et in aliis; de quibus meminit iste versus:

Therefore spiritual power takes a manifold subdivision, since some is of order and some is common. Power of order is the name for the spiritual power which the cleric has for ministering the sacraments of the church, so that he may profit himself and the laity spiritually, as is the power of consecrating, of absolving and of ministering the sacraments.[12] For the power of consecrating is ordered of itself and immediately to this, that the priest consecrate, as the habits of moral virtue are ordered for the sake of acts better than the habits; and since the priest, in order to consecrate worthily, is directed according to the goods of grace, therefore the definition given above is clear in this and in things like it. And the common spiritual power, which every Christian has, in exercising the spiritual works of mercy in himself and in others; of which this verse makes mention:[13]

Notes

1. Loserth refers the place to *De civili dominio* III, p. 425 of the Society's edition, where chapter 21 begins; the "fifth book" is that work counted within Wyclif's *Summa theologie*, as Wyclif numbers it himself on that page (*capitulo XI huius V*).
2. *ante peccatum*: "before sin", most naturally the first sin; but Cain was born after the fall, so Wyclif may mean before Cain's own sin. *progenitum*: "offspring".
3. The print stops after *terciam* and after *confirmacionis* (*terciam. et opus sustentacionis; opus confirmacionis. que ...*). Construed across the stops, with *precedit* understood: the work of sustaining (answering to the king) precedes the work of confirming (answering to the priest), as the Son precedes the Spirit. The comparison may have lost a word.
4. John 1:12 (Loserth 10.14), DR "as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God"; Wyclif writes *Christum per fidem* and turns the power to the works of mercy. The quoted words follow Loserth's italics. *habent spiritualem*: the noun is understood, supplied as [power]. Exodus 20:8, "keep holy the sabbath day".
5. *sanctificiat* (p. 10): so the print, read on the plate; a misprint for *sanctificat*, our emendation.
6. *consentaneor* (p. 10): so the print, read on the plate; a misprint for the comparative *consentanior*, our emendation.

7. ***individuatur tam a subiecto quam obiecto***: the power is marked off by its bearer (a spirit) and its object (the goods of grace). A in the margin (10.27): *Potestas spiritualis quid est?*; B: *Potestas spiritualis*. Hus repeats 10.27 ff. and all of p. 11 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213a, 213ab).
8. ***cum sit duarum naturarum utraque***: literally "since he is of two natures, both"; taken as man made of body and spirit together, so that he is rightly called a spirit. A word may be lost.
9. Luke 9:55; 1 John 4:3. Loserth's italics stop at *Nescitis cuius*, where the page turns; the quotation is completed to the verse's end. Wyclif glosses the "spirit" of 1 John as the heretic.
10. ***gracia bonorum gracie***: *gracia* with the genitive taken as "for the sake of". *immediate est* lacks its participle, supplied as [ordered] after *ordinata* in the definition (10.27); a word may have dropped. AB in the margin (11.10): *Potestas corporalis*.
11. ***viandi***: from *viare*, "to be on the way", the verb of the *viator*, the wayfarer.
12. ***sacramenta*** (11.21): the manuscripts read *sacramentalia*; Loserth prints *sacramenta*, translated. At 11.18 A reads *alia* for *aliqua*. *conficere*: to consecrate the eucharist. A in the margin (11.19): *Potestas ordinis*.
13. The sentence has no main verb and runs on into the verse that opens p. 12 (the next part). B in the margin (11.29): *Potestas communis christianis*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 9: *Et*
  - 10: *insunt*
  - 11: *nou* (print has open-topped u (misprint), zoomed)
  - 11: *angelorum*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Corporai ^ower of the creanlrf (11.10).

Part 4: The divisions of power, and five objections to multiplying them

Loserth pp. 12.1–16.21

¶1 12.1–14.10

12.6 *So secular power may be civil, of the ruler, or common, by which the individual directs his private affairs.*
12.16 *Every man must have common power both spiritual and secular.*
12.22 *Wrongful claims of the clergy as to juridiction.*
12.33 *Objections to the multiplication of human powers.*
13.20 *Power the same in kind may be enlarged or restricted.*
14.11 *All spiritual power is the direct gift of God,*
14.30 *The pope cannot confer authority on others,*

[12]**Doc., consul, castiga, solare, remitte, fer, ora, quia (ut dictum est) quotquot receperunt Christum fide formata, dedit eis potestatem sic filios Dei fieri, ut liceat eis dirigere se et fratres suos in via patris sui Christi, eciam corripiendo, sicut patet Matth. XVIII. Unde correspondenter ad potestatem spiritualem potestas secularis est duplex, scilicet civilis et communis. Civilis autoritativa solum domino civili competit, sed civilis vicaria convenit ballivis vel aliis gerentibus vicem secularium dominorum. Potestas autem communis secularis est qua quilibet potest secundum bona nature et fortune dirigere se et suos. Et ita sicut homo non potest esse sine anima et corpore, nec filius Dei adoptivus sine bonis nature et gracie, sic non stat viatorem esse nisi habeat tam secularem quam spiritualem potestatem communem, quamvis in infantibus et morionibus sit ligata. Spiritualis autem potestas est utrobique perfeccior, sed et sacerdotalis potestas spiritualis superaddit spiritualem communem. Quod autem limitatur potestas clericis super bonis suis temporalibus, seclusa potestate secularium, videtur esse presumpcio et avaricia sacerdotum. Et sic sunt quotlibet divisiones magistrales potestatum, quas curiositas ecclesie adinvenit, ut archidiaconus et electus dicuntur habere potestatem iurisdiccionis, eciam ad absolvendum et excommunicandum, licet non habeant ad hec potestatem ordinis, et talem potestatem in foro contencioso dicitur laycos habere ex commissionibus prelatorum. Contra dicta de multiplicitate potestatis**

"Teach, counsel, chastise, comfort, forgive, bear, pray";[1] for (as has been said) "as many as received" Christ by formed faith, "he gave them power" so "to be made the sons of God" that it is lawful for them to direct themselves and their brothers in the way of their father Christ, even by correcting them, as is clear in Matthew 18.[2] Hence, corresponding to spiritual power, secular power is twofold, namely civil and common. Civil authoritative [power] belongs only to the civil lord, but civil vicarious [power] befits bailiffs or others acting in place of the secular lords. And common secular power is that by which anyone can direct himself and his own according to the goods of nature and fortune. And so, just as a man cannot be without soul and body, nor an adopted son of God without the goods of nature and of grace, so it does not hold that one is a wayfarer unless he has both secular and spiritual common power, although in infants and fools it is bound. And spiritual power is the more perfect in both cases, and priestly spiritual power indeed adds over and above the common spiritual [power]. But that power over their temporal goods is assigned to clerics, the power of seculars being shut out, seems to be the presumption and avarice of priests.[3] And so there are any number of masters' divisions of powers, which the curiosity of the church has devised, as an archdeacon and a bishop-elect are said to have power of jurisdiction, even for absolving and excommunicating, although they do

humane arguitur. Videtur enim quod Deus non potest [13]ordinare medium multiplicius pro fine qui eque perfecte fieret per medium brevius, cum omnis talis ordinacio foret frustra; sed omnis finis pro quo ordinaretur potestas tam multiplex eque perfecte si non perfeccius fieret per unicam simplicem potestatem, que est liberum arbitrium, sicud per quotlibet potestates superadditas, igitur superfluit ponere tam multas. Minor probatur ex hoc, quod omnis potestas creata est propter opus perfeccionis universi secundum ecclesiam vel aliam eius partem, sed in omne tale opus sufficit liberum arbitrium sine potestate accidentali, nam in statu innocencie foret solum talis potestas, sicut post statum innocencie illi qui vixerunt religiosius caruerunt huiusmodi potestate, quid (queso) sufficit homo ordinare vel facere, quod non sufficit ex puro libero arbitrio? Videtur enim quod palliata potestas superaddita pocius perturbat ecclesiam. Item, eadem potestas in numero potest nunc laxari et nun restringi, ut patet de potestate ordinis pari in quolibet sacerdote, licet in prelatis suscipiat in laxacione et restriccione gradus multiplices; igitur per idem naturalis potestas potest nunc laxari et nunc restringi quantum oportet pro regimine ecclesie, igitur cum in tali laxacione non acquiritur nova potestas, nec in restriccione deperditur, sequitur quod non oportet superaddere novam huiusmodi potestatem. Minor patet, tum quia potestas non componitur ex suis partibus intensivis, tum eciam quia aliter non foret eadem potestas restricta vel laxata sed omnino vel antiqua perdita vel nova genita. Et illud evidencius movet quod non oportet in sacerdote ponere distinccionem specificam inter [14]potestatem ordinis et iurisdiccionis, sed dans potestatem ordinis dat ut sic potestatem iurisdiccionis, quia aliter foret nuda potestas ordinis nimis superflua, quia insufficiens ut sit in materiam quantumcunque exercita. Christus autem quando dedit discipulis potestatem predicandi dixit Math, ultimo generaliter: Euntes igitur docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos; quando igitur conceditur principale, conceditur accessorium sine quo ipsum non posset proficere.

not have the power of order for these; and laymen are said to have such power in the contentious court by commissions of prelates. Against what has been said of the multiplicity of human power it is argued.[4] For it seems that God cannot [13]ordain a more manifold means for an end that would be done equally perfectly by a shorter means, since every such ordinance would be in vain; now every end for which so manifold a power would be ordained would be done equally perfectly, if not more perfectly, by a single simple power, which is free choice, as by any number of superadded powers; therefore it is superfluous to posit so many. The minor is proved from this, that every created power is for the work of the perfection of the universe according to the church or another part of it; now for every such work free choice suffices without accidental power, for in the state of innocence there would be only such power, just as after the state of innocence those who lived more religiously lacked power of this kind. What (I ask) is man sufficient to ordain or do that he is not sufficient for out of pure free choice? For it seems that a cloaked superadded power rather disturbs the church. Again, the same power in number can at one time be loosed and at another restricted[5], as is clear of the power of order, equal in every priest, although in prelates it takes on manifold degrees in loosing and restriction; therefore, by the same token, natural power can at one time be loosed and at another restricted as much as is needed for the rule of the church; therefore, since in such loosing no new power is acquired, nor is one lost in restriction, it follows that it is not necessary to superadd a new power of this kind. The minor is clear, both because power is not composed of its intensive parts, and also because otherwise it would not be the same power restricted or loosed, but either the old one wholly lost or a new one begotten. And this moves more evidently [to the view] that it is not necessary to posit in a priest a specific distinction between [14]power of order and of jurisdiction, but he who gives the power of order gives as such the power of jurisdiction, since otherwise the bare power of order would be exceedingly superfluous, being insufficient to pass into its matter however much it were exercised.[6] Now Christ, when he gave the disciples the power of preaching, said generally, Matthew, the last chapter: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them";[7] when, therefore, the principal is granted, the accessory is granted, without which it could not profit.

¶2 14.11–14.22

[14]Item, nulla pura creatura cooperatur cum Deo in producendo quantitatem mentis indivisibilem omnis huiusmodi potestas est

Again, no pure creature cooperates with God in producing an indivisible quantity of the mind; every such power is an indivisible quality of the

qualitas mentis indivisibilis, ergo nulla pura creatura cooperatur cum Deo in producendo huiusmodi potestatem, et per consequens preter potestatem quam Deus creat in anima non est dare aliam datam ab homine. Assumptum patet ex hoc quod nullum materiale agit in immateriale, ut dicit Augustinus XII Sup. Gen. ad litteram: Omnis potentatus est substancia materialis, igitur non imprimit in animam spiritualem huiusmodi potestatem.

mind; therefore no pure creature cooperates with God in producing such power, and consequently, besides the power which God creates in the soul, there is no other given by man.[8] The assumption is clear from this, that nothing material acts on the immaterial, as Augustine says, ***On Genesis according to the Letter*** XII: "every potentate is a material substance";[9] therefore he does not imprint such power on the spiritual soul.

¶3 14.23–14.29

[14]Similiter, nulla pure creatura cooperatur cum Deo nisi ut eius organum, sed Deus non requirit creaturam ut organum in produccione subdita huius indivisibilis qualitatis pocius quam in produccione gracie, cum hoc superflueret, igitur creatura non comproducit cum Deo huiusmodi qualitatem.

Likewise, no pure creature cooperates with God except as his instrument; now God does not require a creature as instrument in the sudden production of this indivisible quality any more than in the production of grace, since this would be superfluous; therefore a creature does not co-produce such a quality with God.[10]

¶4 14.30–16.21

15.15 *or revoke or increase power given by God.*
15.30 *Yet be may have the right of authentic promulgation of what God has ordained.*

[14]Similiter, posito quod dominus papa committat potestatem per bullas in Angliam Petro archiepiscopo ad absolvendum Paulum criminosum in [15]casibus curie reservatis, et pono quod dominus papa ante adventum bullarum in Angliam moriatur, tunc dominus papa nec pro instanti propositi sui conferendi Petro potestatem huiusmodi imprimit in Petro subito huiusmodi potestatem nec pro aliquo posteriori signando. Et idem iudicium de qualibet creatura, que daret alteri potestatem, igitur non est aliqua potestas huiusmodi nisi ficta; non enim potest Christi vicarius ad votum imprimere tam distanter qualitatem in animam, quia tunc foret superfluum auctorizare potestatem huiusmodi per bullas, et continue post foret accio pape impertinens, sicut foret ipso mortuo pro instanti noticie bullarum. Et per idem sequitur, quod non subiacet potestati sue revocare potestatem a Deo datam nec laxare potestatem prius ligatam, sicut non subest potestati sue quod quandocumque pretendit se dare potestatem huiusmodi quod Deus concurrat prebens principaliter potestatem. Et aliter certum est quod non datur potestas talis ab homine; sicut igitur non datur potestas inhabili vel invito, sic nec potentatus dat potestatem alteri si pretendit, aliter enim possent homines in se potestatum commercia experiri, et generalis volicio qua omnis papa vult quod omnes sacerdotes Christi habiles et solum tales habeant potestatem causaret longe aliter quam reputat ecclesia potestatem. In ista materia videtur mihi quod potestas dicit nunc absolute potenciam ad regulandum, et nunc dicit aggregative potenciam talem cum notificacione aut promulgacione autentica, et cum [16]sensus sint eque noti, patet quod non repugnat non esse potestatem nisi a Deo; et tamen aliud a Deo dare potestatem, hoc est promulgacionem autenticam in facie ecclesie, quod persona

Likewise, supposing that the lord pope commits power by bulls into England to Peter the archbishop, to absolve Paul, a criminal, in [15] cases reserved to the curia, and I suppose that the lord pope dies before the bulls arrive in England,[11] then the lord pope neither at the instant of his purpose to confer such power on Peter suddenly imprints such power in Peter, nor at any later [instant] that can be designated. And the same judgment [holds] of any creature that would give power to another; therefore there is no such power except a feigned one. For the vicar of Christ cannot at will imprint a quality in the soul at so great a distance, since then it would be superfluous to authorize such power by bulls, and continuously afterwards the pope's action would be irrelevant, as it would be, he being dead, at the instant the bulls became known. And by the same token it follows that it is not subject to his power to revoke power given by God, nor to loose power previously bound, just as it is not subject to his power that, whenever he claims to give such power, God concurs, principally providing the power. And otherwise it is certain that such power is not given by man; as, therefore, power is not given to the unqualified or the unwilling, so neither does a potentate give power to another if he claims to; for otherwise men could try out a trade in powers among themselves, and the general volition by which every pope wills that all the qualified priests of Christ, and only such, have power would cause power far otherwise than the church reckons. In this matter it seems to me that power at one time means absolutely a potency for ruling, and at another means, aggregatively, such a potency together with authentic notification or promulgation;[12] and since [16] the senses are

creata habeat a Deo huiusmodi potestatem; tale quidem aggregatum secundum partem datur ab homine, sed nonnisi Deus principaliter auctorizet, ut patet inferius. Ad primum conceditur consequencia cum assumpto, sed negatur minor, cum post lapsum necesse est habere potestatem secundum timorem servilem promulgatam ab homine ad cohercendum rebelles sicut non oportuit in statu innocencie nec in regimine pie obediencium, quia lex talis propter transgressores posita est, quam non timebit humilis Christianus. Et conceditur quod potentatus male accipiunt occasionem ad perturbandum ecclesiam ex ficticia potestatis; oportet tamen Deum dare potestates spirituales ad ministrandum sacramenta, ad cohercendum seculariter rebelles ecclesie, preter liberum arbitrium, ut patet ex scriptura multiplici.

equally known, it is clear that it is not repugnant that there is no power except from God, and yet that something other than God gives power, that is, authentic promulgation in the face of the church that a created person has such power from God; such an aggregate is indeed given in part by man, but only if God principally authorizes it, as is clear below. To the first, the inference is granted with the assumption, but the minor is denied, since after the fall it is necessary to have power promulgated by man according to servile fear for coercing rebels, as it was not needed in the state of innocence nor in the rule of the piously obedient, since such a law is set because of transgressors, which the humble Christian will not fear.[13] And it is granted that potentates wrongly take occasion to disturb the church from the fiction of power; yet God must give spiritual powers for ministering the sacraments, for coercing the rebels of the church in secular fashion, besides free choice, as is clear from manifold scripture.

Notes

1. The verse names the seven spiritual works of mercy, the mnemonic line *Consule, castiga, solare, remitte, fer, ora* with *doce*. It completes the sentence left open at 11.32.
2. John 1:12 (Loserth 12.1), DR "as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God"; the quoted words follow Loserth's italics, and Wyclif adds *Christum fide formata*, "by formed faith" (faith formed by charity). *corripiendo*: Matthew 18:15, "rebuke him between thee and him alone". Hus repeats 12.1–20 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213b).
3. *limitatur*: "is assigned" (glossary: *limitare*); *seclusa potestate secularium*: the seculars' power being shut out. Wyclif condemns the clergy's claim to sole power over their temporal goods; Loserth's side-note (12.22) reads it of jurisdiction. *sed et*: "and indeed", an addition, not a contrast.
4. B marks the objections in its margin: *Obieccio* at 12.33, then 2 (13.20), 3 (14.11), 4 (14.23), 5 (14.30); the answers begin at 16.8 (AB *ad 1*) and run into the next part. "It is argued" renders *arguitur*.
5. *nun* (p. 13): so the print, read on the plate; a misprint for *nunc* (*nunc ... nunc*), our emendation.
6. *quia insufficiens ut sit in materiam quantumcunque exercita*: construed "being insufficient to pass into its matter (to take effect on anything), however much exercised", with *exercita* agreeing with *potestas*. The phrase is compressed and may have lost a word.
7. Matthew 28:19 (*Math. ultimo*, "the last chapter"), quoted to the end of Loserth's italics.
8. 14.12–15: the words from *quantitatem* to *producendo* are wanting in A and B; in A another hand adds them in the margin (Loserth). Within them *quantitatem*, "quantity", stands where the minor premiss and 14.24 have *qualitas*, "quality", which the argument needs; translated as printed. The minor premiss has no connective. B in the margin (14.11): 3.
9. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* XII XII.16.33 (PL 34, 467: *nec sane putandum est facere aliquid corpus in spiritu ... praestantior est qui facit, ea re de qua aliquid facit*; Loserth's page is lost in the scan). Loserth italicises *Omnis potentatus est substancia materialis*, but the sentence may be Wyclif's minor premiss rather than Augustine's words. *potentatus* here, and at 15.13, 16.17 and 20.28, is the holder of power, "potentate", not the abstract "sovereignty".
10. *in produccione subdita* (14.25): so the print; A reads *subita*, "sudden", which gives the sense (cf. *subito*, 15.4) and is translated. B in the margin (14.23): 4.
11. 15.2–3: the words from *ante* to *papa* are wanting in A and B; in A another hand adds them in the margin (Loserth). Translated as printed. B in the margin (14.30): 5.
12. *potenciam ad regulandum*: "potency", the bare capacity Wyclif sets against the aggregate (capacity together with authentic promulgation); *potestas* and *potencia* name one power here. AB in the margin (15.30): *Potestas*; B: *Responsio ad obiectum*. Hus repeats 15.30–16.7 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213b).
13. *lex talis propter transgressores posita est*: an echo of Galatians 3:19, "it was set because of transgressions" (Vulgate *propter transgressiones posita est*); Wyclif has *transgressores*. AB in the margin (16.8): *ad 1*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 12: *Quod*
  - 12: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 14: *producendo*
  - 15: *concurrat* (20 is the line number)

Part 5: Power given from above: the answers, and Christ before Pilate

Loserth pp. 16.22–21.31

¶1 16.22–17.17

16.22 *Power given by God cannot be enlarged or diminished, but the acts orising from it may be controlled.*
17.2 *In what sense Free will may be augmented or diminished.*
17.18 *In the sacraments man's cooperation is but secondary; God gives the grace.*

[16]**Ad secundum dicitur quod talis potestas non laxatur vel restringitur, augmentatur vel diminuitur quoad suam essenciam, sed quoad execucionem operis quod ab ipsa procederet, quod licet facere, sed non nisi affuerit causa rationalis, quoad Deum. Et illum sensum exponit XXIV canon, quest, prima, Miramur: Aliud, inquit, est potestas officii, aliud execucio, et ut plurimum in monachis et aliis retinetur potestas officii, velud in suspensis, quibus ministracio interdicitur, potencia non aufertur. Et ad conformem sensum conceditur quod naturalis potestas que est** [17]**liberum arbitrium potest nunc laxari per graciam et nunc restringi, et sic per equivocacionem solvuntur apparentes discordie doctorum, quorum aliqui (ut Anshelmus) dicunt quod non potest perdi, augmentari vel minui liberum arbitrium. Alii autem (ut Augustinus Encheridion) dicunt quod perdi potest liberum arbitrium per peccatum et augeri per graciam. Intelligunt autem sufficienciam propinquam ad operam, quam oportet post primum peccatum dari ex gracia, sicut et ordinis potestatem, preter liberum arbitrium naturale, et sic potestas naturalis augetur vel restringitur per adventum potestatis adventicie et illa consistens in successione, potest instar etatis nunc esse amplior et nunc minor, licet sit indivisibilis quo ad molem. De potestate vero ordinis et iurisdictionis dicetur inferius.**

To the second the answer is that such power is not loosed or restricted, increased or diminished as to its essence, but as to the execution of the work that would proceed from it, which it is lawful to do, but not unless a reasonable cause is present, as regards God.[1] And the canon *Miramur*, [Causa] 24, question 1, expounds this sense: "The power of the office", it says, "is one thing, its execution another; and for the most part the power of the office is retained in monks and others, as in the suspended, to whom the ministry is forbidden: the power is not taken away."[2] And in a conformable sense it is granted that natural power, which is [17] **free choice, can at one time be loosed by grace and at another restricted; and so by equivocation the apparent disagreements of the doctors are resolved, some of whom (as Anselm) say that "free choice cannot be lost, increased or diminished". But others (as Augustine, *Enchiridion*) say that "free choice can be lost by sin and increased by grace".[3] And they mean the proximate sufficiency for the work, which after the first sin must be given by grace, as must also the power of order, besides natural free choice; and so natural power is increased or restricted by the coming of an adventitious power, and that [power], consisting in succession, can like age be at one time greater and at another less, although it is indivisible as to bulk.[4] And of the power of order and of jurisdiction it will be said below.**

¶2 17.18–18.9

18.10 *Concerning nothing is there such a flood of lies as about the grant, withdrawal and restriction of spiritual powers.*
18.23 *Righteousness in the chief sign of power.*

[17]**Ad tercium dicitur quod assumptum et consequencia illata videntur michi vera; quamvis enim creatura cooperatur cum Deo, faciendo signa sacramentalia et sic quodammodo faciendo, quia facit occasionaliter quod Deus dat graciam, imprimit karacterem, vel producit huiusmodi qualitatem supernaturalem, non tamen producit cum Deo huiusmodi qualitatem, ut dicetur proximo capitulo; sed Deus nunc antecedenter nunc consequenter et nunc concomitanter ad signum sensibile per se facit opus supernaturale, et potestas ordinis est quodammodo causa; quare Deus sic agit, cum statuit se concurrere cum quolibet sacerdote rite ministrante huiusmodi sacramenta. Sicut natura dat animam post disposicionem** [18]**materie per qualitates elementares et virtutes corporales, quibus non est pars produccionis anime tribuenda sed disposicionis previe, ideo dicuntur coefficere animam quoad animacionem non nude quoad essenciam spiritus, quia**

To the third the answer is that the assumption and the inference drawn seem to me true; for although a creature cooperates with God by making the sacramental signs, and so in a way by making, since it brings it about by occasion that God gives grace, imprints a character, or produces a supernatural quality of this kind, yet it does not produce such a quality with God, as will be said in the next chapter; but God, sometimes antecedently, sometimes consequently and sometimes concomitantly to the perceptible sign, of himself does the supernatural work, and the power of order is in a way the cause why God so acts, since he has determined to concur with every priest duly ministering such sacraments.[5] As nature gives the soul after the disposition [18] **of matter through elementary qualities and bodily powers, to which no part of the production of the soul is to be attributed, but [a part] of the**

tunc crearent; et sic homo non alterat spiritum imprimendo in ipso aliquod absolutum, sed subautentice facit nosci in signo sensibili, quod Deus dat huiusmodi potestatem.

prior disposition, and therefore they are said to co-effect the soul as to animation, not barely as to the essence of the spirit, since then they would create; and so man does not alter the spirit by imprinting in it something absolute, but sub-authentically makes known in a perceptible sign that God gives power of this kind.[6]

¶3 18.10–18.29

[18]Unde inter omnes locuciones blasfemas quibus christianismus illuditur, maximus cathaclismus mendacii est de collacione, subtraccione vel restriccione huiusmodi potestatum. Quando enim Deus et racio cogunt ad utilitatem ecclesie, ut sic fiat per hominem, tunc et aliter non Deus dat huiusmodi potestatem. Ideo in primitiva ecclesia non usi sunt apostoli tali locucione civili, quia tunc foret potestas symoniaca vendibilis et emibilis sicut officium, ideo propter bullas papales non attribuitur potestas subdito plus vel minus, cum Deus dat potestatem habilibus ad edificacionem ecclesie independenter a tali sacramento sensibili introducto, et rectitudo operis est evidencius signum talis potestatis quam littera vel sacramenta prelati; nec ex hoc infertur quod liceret civiliter assumere sibi potestatem ad taliter operandum; quia nemo assumeret potestatem sibi ipsi, sed acciperet ab alio quando Deus necessitat.

Hence, among all the blasphemous ways of speaking by which Christianity is mocked, the greatest cataclysm of lying is about the conferral, withdrawal or restriction of such powers.[7] For when God and reason compel, for the usefulness of the church, that it be so done by a man, then and not otherwise God gives such power. Therefore in the primitive church the apostles did not use such civil speech, because then power would be simoniacal, saleable and purchasable like an office; therefore, because of papal bulls, power is not attributed to a subject more or less, since God gives power to the qualified for the edification of the church independently of such a perceptible sacrament as has been introduced, and rightness of work is a more evident sign of such power than the letter or the sacraments of a prelate; nor is it inferred from this that it would be lawful to assume power to oneself in civil fashion to work in such a way, since no one would assume power to himself, but would receive it from another when God necessitates.

¶4 18.30–20.19
19.10 *God alone gives civil power,*
19.23 *as Christ declared to Pilate.*
20.14 *Four lessons from Christ's words.*

[18]Unde Symon Magus non presumpsit sibi assumere potestatem apostolicam, quia timeret tunc sibi, ne effectualis efficacia operis sequeretur. [19]ideo voluit emisse potestatem pecunia, ut patet Actuum VIII. Sed nostri prepositi quietati in cortice signorum, solum querentes honorem et lucrum seculi, sunt odibilius Deo symoniaci; et sic conceditur, ut tangitur in confirmacione tercia, quod nimis multe sophisticaciones volant in ista materia, quia omnes que non sunt fundabiles in scriptura, cum ipsa contineat singulas veritates. Potestatem autem secularem regendi civiliter, videtur Apostolum fundare Rom. XIII 1 quando vocat temporales dominos potestates; et dicit, quod non sine causa portant gladium, id est potestatem civiliter coactivam, dicens quod ibidem foret resistere Deo et illis quoad execucionem huiusmodi potestatis, quia (ut inquit) non est potestas nisi a Deo; quod oportet omnino intelligere quod solus Deus dat huiusmodi potestatem, vel quod non datur a racionali creatura, nisi Deus prius ipsam dederit, ita quod hoc signum nisi sumatur pro si non, ad modum loquendi scripture. Et istum sensum dixit Christus Joh. XIX, 10 11 ubi legitur Christo tacente Pilatus dixisse: Nescis quia

Hence Simon Magus did not presume to assume apostolic power to himself, because he would then fear for himself that the effectual efficacy of the work would not follow;[8] [19]therefore he wished to buy the power with money, as is clear in Acts 8. But our superiors, quieted in the rind of signs, seeking only honour and the gain of the world, are simoniacs more hateful to God;[9] and so it is granted, as is touched on in the third confirmation, that exceedingly many sophistries fly about in this matter, since all [opinions] that cannot be grounded in scripture [are sophistries], since scripture contains every single truth.[10] And the Apostle seems to ground the secular power of ruling civilly in Romans 13:1, when he calls the temporal lords powers; and he says that they "bear not the sword in vain", that is, civilly coactive power, saying that here it "would be to resist God" and them as to the execution of such power, since (as he says) "there is no power but from God".[11] This must be understood altogether [to mean] that God alone gives such power, or that it is not given by a rational creature unless God has given it first, so that this sign ***nisi*** is taken for ***si non***, in scripture's manner of speaking.[12] And Christ spoke this sense

potestatem habeo crucifigere te et potestatem habeo dimittere te? Cui Jesus: Non haberes potestatem adversum me ullam, nisi tibi datum esset desuper. Super quo Augustinus Omelia CXVI notat, primo quomodo Dominus sepe tacuit et sepe respondit. Tacuit coram Pilato, coram sacerdotibus et Herode propter tria, primo ut impleretur scriptum Isaie LIII, 7: Sicut agnus coram tondente sine voce, sic non aperuit os suum; secundo [20] ut ostendatur eius miticia Math. XII, 19 recitata: Neque aliquis in plateis audiet vocem eius, et tercio ut doceat quomodo verbalis contencio est sepe inutilis; et ideo quando expedit est silendum. Ideo ad tollendum instancias de huiusmodi negativis dicit Augustinus quod generaliter non sicut reus vel dolosus obmutuit, sed sicut agnus, hoc est simplex et innocens, non aperuit os suum. Nunquam enim loquebatur excusando se de suo crimine, sicut nunquam tacuit pro suo reatu; et sic utrobique tam eius silencium quam eius responsio propter latens misterium est notandum; ubi inquit, non respondit sicut ovis silebat, et ubi respondit sicut pastor docebat. Discamus ergo quatuor veritates; quas pastor in responsione sua docuerit, primo docet dicendo, quod non haberet potestatem nisi datum esset sibi desuper, quod per Apostolum suum docuit; quod non est potestas nisi a Deo.

in John 19:10–11, where it is read that, Christ being silent, Pilate said: "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee?" To whom Jesus: "Thou shouldst not have any power against me, unless it were given thee from above." On which Augustine, Homily 116, notes first how the Lord often kept silent and often answered.[13] He was silent before Pilate, before the priests and Herod, for three [reasons]: first, that the scripture of Isaiah 53:7 might be fulfilled: "like a lamb without voice before his shearer, so openeth he not his mouth";[14] secondly, [20] that his gentleness might be shown, recited in Matthew 12:19: "neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets"; and thirdly, to teach how verbal contention is often useless, and therefore, when it is expedient, one must keep silence. Therefore, to dispose of objections from negatives of this kind, Augustine says that in general he did "not" keep dumb "as one guilty or deceitful, but as a lamb, that is, simple and innocent, he opened not his mouth". For he never spoke excusing himself of his crime, just as he never kept silent for his guilt; and so on both sides both his silence and his answer are to be noted for the hidden mystery: "where", he says, "he did not answer, as a sheep he kept silence, and where he answered, as a shepherd he taught. Let us learn, then", four truths which the shepherd taught in his answer. First he teaches, by saying "that he would not have power unless it were given him from above", what he taught through his Apostle: that "there is no power but from God".[15]

¶5 20.20–20.24

[20] Secundo docet quod plus peccat qui potestati innocentem occidendum livore tradit quam potestas ipsa, cum eum timore alterius maioris potestatis occidit; propterea, inquit; qui tradidit me tibi maius peccatum habet.

Secondly he teaches that "he sins more who out of envy hands over an innocent man to the power to be killed than the power itself, when it kills him out of fear of another, greater power"; for this reason, he says, "he that hath delivered me to thee hath the greater sin".[16]

¶6 20.25–20.27

[20] Et patet tercio, quomodo vanum est excusare Pilatum a crimine sed magis est vanum excusare maioritatem peccati in sacerdote.

And it is clear, thirdly, how vain it is to excuse Pilate from the crime, but it is more vain to explain away the greatness of the sin in the priest.[17]

¶7 20.28–21.13

21.12 *Power is not a self existent thing, but a grant to a creature to act in God's name.*

[20] Quarto vero innuitur quomodo quis est sub alterius potestate; et quod potentatus superior non est eo ipso culpandus quo inferior excedit [21] limites potestatis talis: Talem, inquit, Deus Pilato dederat potestatem, ut esset eciam sub cesaris potestate. Unde quidam intelligunt Christum non solum intelligere dacionem potestatis Pilati desuper non solum a Deo sed cesare, quia cesarem plus timuit ut autorem potestatis sue quam occidere regem gentis aliene. Sed timor ille fuit servilis, cum postposita regula potestatis divine, non timuit

And fourthly it is intimated how one is under another's power, and that a superior potentate is not to be blamed by the very fact that an inferior exceeds [21] the limits of such power: "Such power", he says, "God had given Pilate, that he should be also under Caesar's power." Hence some understand Christ to mean not only the giving of Pilate's power from above not only by God but [by] Caesar,[18] because he feared Caesar more, as the author of his power, than [he feared] to kill the king of a foreign nation. But that fear was servile, since, the rule of divine power being set

occidere innocentem; excusacionem autem non habuit, cum excessit potestatem quam habebat a cesare, qui potuit pretendere se dare potestatem adversum Dominum, sed non Deus.

aside, he did not fear to kill an innocent man; and he had no excuse, since he exceeded the power which he had from Caesar, who could claim to give power against the Lord, but God could not.[19]

¶8 21.14–21.31

[21]Et videtur mihi quinto quod magister docet misterium metaphysice per hoc, quod dicit nisi datum esset tibi desuper, non solum quod cesar non dat nisi Deus prius dederit, verum eciam quod potestas non est quid absolutum, quod posset per se existere, sed potestas dicitur dari ab autore, quando datum est a Deo creature, ut ministro Dei, quod sic aut sic sufficiat facere ad populum in Dei nomine regulandum, et credere quod hoc sit res que posset per se esse foret nimis magna stulticia; et sic per hoc participium neutrum datum convenienter exprimitur res verbi exprimenda per complexum, ut concessum est creature, quod legittime possit in nomine Domini regulare, et illa licencia est potestas, quam Deus nunc dat immediate per se, et nunc per sacramentale ministerium ad notificandum populo Dei licenciam.

And it seems to me, fifthly, that the master teaches a mystery of metaphysics[20] by saying "unless it were given thee from above": not only that Caesar does not give unless God has given first, but also that power is not something absolute that could exist of itself, but power is said to be given by its author when it is given by God to a creature, as to a minister of God, that it be sufficient to do this or that for ruling the people in God's name; and to believe that this is a thing that could be of itself would be exceedingly great folly. And so by this neuter participle *datum*, "given", there is fittingly expressed the thing of the verb, which is to be expressed by a complex: namely that it has been granted to the creature that it may lawfully rule in the name of the Lord; and that licence is power, which God gives sometimes immediately by himself, and sometimes through sacramental ministry, to notify the licence to the people of God.[21]

Notes

1. *quod licet facere ... quoad Deum*: the loosing or restricting of the execution is lawful, but before God only for a reasonable cause; *quoad Deum* may instead go with *causa rationalis* ("a cause reasonable in God's sight"). B in the margin (16.22): *ad 2m*.
2. Decretum, C. 24 q. 1 c. 37, *Miramur* (Loserth 16.28; the modern form is ours) ; the words are Gratian's dictum after the canon, d.p.c. 37 §1, Friedberg I, 981, which Wyclif cites by the canon's incipit. The dictum takes up *potestas officii* with *potencia*: the two words name one power here, and both are "power". Hus repeats 16.22–33 (Loserth: "Hussii Opp." 213b–214a).
3. Anselm, *De libertate arbitrii* (Loserth 17.4: "De Libero Arbitrio 121", the page of the 1721 *Opera*; the doctrine is in chs. 3 and 11–12, PL 158, 493–494, 502–504). Augustine, *Enchiridion*: Loserth quotes *Libero arbitrio male utens homo et se perdidit et ipsum* (*Enchiridion* 30, PL 40, 246). The "equivocation": the doctors use *liberum arbitrium* of the natural power (Anselm) and of the proximate sufficiency given by grace (Augustine).
4. *illa consistens in successione*: the adventitious power, a successive thing, which grows and shrinks like age though it has no parts of bulk. At 17.12 Loserth notes that the codex has *stringitur*; he prints *restringitur*, translated.
5. *quodammodo faciendo*: the creature "in a way" makes, only by occasion. *nunc ... nunc ... nunc*: "sometimes", not "now". "The next chapter" is ch. 2. AB in the margin (17.18): *ad 3m*; Loserth's side-note at 17.18 gives the sense. *causa; quare Deus sic agit*: taken as *causa quare*, "the cause why God so acts", against Loserth's semicolon. With the print's stop: "and the power of order is in a way a cause; wherefore God so acts, since he has determined ...".
6. The comparison: the elementary qualities dispose matter but do not produce the soul, as the minister's sign disposes but does not produce the power. *absolutum*: an absolute entity, as against a relation (cf. 21.16).
7. *cathaclismus*: B writes the Greek word otherwise (Loserth 18.10); AB in the margin: *Potestatum subtraccio*, with the three nouns bracketed; B (18.18): *Nota*. Hus repeats 18.10–14 (Loserth: cf. "Hussii Opp." 214a).
8. *timeret ... ne effectualis efficacia operis sequeretur*: *ne ... sequeretur* as printed (plate checked); the sense requires *ne non* / a negative, our emendation. Literally "lest the effectual efficacy of the work should follow", which would reverse the argument; we translate "would not follow", Simon fearing that the work would not take effect. Acts 8:18–21 (Loserth 19.2).
9. *quietati in cortice signorum*: resting in the husk of the signs (bulls, seals), not in the work. B reads *odibiles* (19.4) for *odibilius*; the print is translated.
10. *in confirmacione tercia*: apparently the confirmation of the third objection (14.11–22). *quia omnes que non sunt fundabiles in scriptura*: every opinion that cannot be grounded in scripture is a sophistry, since scripture contains every truth. B lacks *secularem* (19.10); B in the margin (19.11): *Fundamentum potestatis civilis*.
11. Romans 13:1 (Loserth 20.19); 13:4, "he beareth not the sword in vain" (singular in the Vulgate: Wyclif makes it plural of the lords); 13:2, "he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God", here paraphrased as "to resist God". Quotation marks follow Loserth's italics.
12. *hoc signum nisi ... pro si non*: the logical sign "except" (*nisi*) is read as "if not" (*si non*): no power is given if God has not first given it.

13. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem*: the text says "Homily 116"; Loserth (19.27) gives "in Ev. Joannis cap. XIX, tract. CXVII" ; the text is right: the passage is *Tract.* 116.4–5 (PL 35), and Loserth's 117 is wrong. John 19:10–11: Wyclif omits Pilate's "Speakest thou not to me?". AB in the margin (19.29): *Christus sepe tacuit*; A numbers the three reasons 1 (19.30), 2 (19.32), 3 (20.2).
14. Wyclif cites Isaiah 53:7, but his words are those of Acts 8:32, which quotes it (Vulgate *sicut agnus coram tondente se sine voce sic non aperuit os suum*); the DR of Acts 8:32 is used. Isaiah 53:7 Vulgate: *quasi agnus coram tondente se obmutescet*. Matthew 12:19.
15. Augustine, the same tractate (Loserth 20.13: *ibid.*), quoted within Loserth's italics; "Let us learn, then" opens Augustine's own list. Romans 13:1 (Loserth 20.19). B in the margin (20.14): *Quatuor veritates*, numbered 1 (20.16), 2 (20.19).
16. 20.21: the manuscripts read *cum enim* and lack *potestatis*; Loserth supplies *potestatis* from Augustine's text and prints *cum* (translated). John 19:11 (Loserth 20.24). B in the margin (20.24): 3.
17. *maioritatem peccati in sacerdote*: the "greater sin" of John 19:11, laid on the priest who handed Christ over; *excusare* here is "to explain away".
18. *non solum … non solum* (21.3–4): the second *non solum* looks doubled; translated as printed. The words in quotation marks are Augustine's (Loserth 20.30: "Augustinus ut supra") (*Tract.* 116.5). AB in the margin (20.30): *Pilatus habuit potestatem et peccavit*.
19. *qui potuit pretendere se dare potestatem adversum Dominum, sed non Deus*: Caesar could claim to give power against the Lord, but God could not give it; alternatively "but [Caesar could] not [as] God".
20. "The master" is Christ. The fifth truth is Wyclif's own, added to Augustine's four.
21. *participium neutrum datum*: here the grammatical participle, not the the glossary's *participium*, "participation". *res verbi exprimenda per complexum*: what the verb signifies is not a thing but what only a proposition can state ("that it has been granted …"). AB in the margin (21.7): *Potestas quomodo dicitur dari*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 16: *illum*
  - 17: *illa*
  - 17: *concomitanter* [NW]
  - 19: *1* (old-style arabic 1, x-height like the 2)
  - 19: *11* (print: Joh. XIX, 10—11, ubi; main has 10 only, the 11 is the inserted token)
  - 19: *aperuit os* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 20: *ubi*
  - 21: *Talem*
  - 21: *Deus*
  - 21: *ut*
  - 21: *illa*
  - 21: *nisi* (LEFT-nw: italic; print = nisi)

Chapter 2

Part 1: Idle priests, the shrinking of power, and miracles

Loserth pp. 22.2–26.8

¶1 22.2–22.7
22.2 *No one has power to do anything but what God wills,*
22.8 *This is made an excuse by idle priests.*
22.22 *But we must note the difference between what God wills we should do and his will that we do it,*

[22]**Sed adhuc videtur, cum omnis potestas sit a Deo, quod nemo habet potestatem ad faciendum aliquid, nisi quod Deus intendit ut faciat. Ex quo videtur quod sacerdotes ociantes excusantur, cum non habent potestatem ad faciendam aliquid quod omittunt.**

But it still seems, since all power is from God, that no one has power to do anything except what God intends that he do. From this it seems that idle priests are excused, since they do not have power to do anything that they omit.[1]

¶2 22.8–22.11

[22]**Hic videtur mihi quod questio prima illata concedi debeat, nam Deus omnisciens non dat homini aliquid nisi propter finem, quem plenissime et distinccione intendit, quia aliter frustra daret.**

Here it seems to me that the first question brought forward ought to be granted, for God, being omniscient, gives a man nothing except for an end, which he intends most fully and distinctly, since otherwise he would give in vain.[2]

¶3 22.12–22.16

[22]**Item, nemo habet potestatem ad aliquid faciendum, nisi liceat sibi illud facere, cum a Deo non sit potestas nisi legitima, et per consequens Deus obligat eum sub pena peccati vel amissionis premii ut illud faciat, sicut Deus intendit.**

Again, no one has power to do something unless it is lawful for him to do it, since there is no power from God but lawful [power]; and consequently God binds him, under pain of sin or of the loss of reward, to do it, as God intends.[3]

¶4 22.17–22.21

[22]**Item; recipiens talem potestatem a Deo est ut sic obligacior, sed oportet Deum cognoscere excessum obligacionis, et per consequens, quid adequate potentatus debet facere ex illa potestate, et sic Deus intendit ut illud faciat.**

Again: one who receives such power from God is, as such, the more bound; now God must know the excess of the obligation, and consequently what the potentate ought adequately to do from that power; and so God intends that he do it.[4]

¶5 22.22–23.3
23.4 *Idleness of priests condemned by St. Paul.*
23.12 *The fault is double; I. negligence of those who have power.*
23.18
2. Hindrances of jurisdiction.

[22]**Sed notandum est, quod sicut aliud est Deum velle quod Petrus sit salvus et aliud Deum velle quod ipse est salvus, sic aliud est Deum intendere, quod Petrus faciat hoc et aliud Deum intendere quod ipse facit hoc; quia eo ipso quo Deus obligat Petrum sub obtentu premii vel incursu pene quod Petrus faciat hoc; Deus intendit quod faciat hoc; et sic utrobique solum intendit et vult veritatem, cum veritas est quod** [23]**Petrus debet facere hoc; licet non sit verum, quod hoc facit, et per consequens non intentum vel volitum a Deo.**

But it must be noted that, just as it is one thing for God to will that Peter be saved and another for God to will that he is saved, so it is one thing for God to intend that Peter do this and another for God to intend that he does this; for by the very fact that God binds Peter, under the gaining of reward or the incurring of pain, that Peter do this, God intends that he do this; and so in both cases he intends and wills only truth, since the truth is that [23]**Peter ought to do this, although it is not true that he does it, and consequently [that] is not intended or willed by God.**[5]

¶6 23.4–23.11

[23]**Et patet quod non excusatur sed accusatur ocium sacerdotum dicente Apostolo: Hortamur vos ne in vacuum graciam Dei recipiatis. Quicunque enim aliquam potestatem a Deo receperit, per quam liceat sibi opus Dei facere et ex negligencia pretermittit, in vanum graciam Dei recipit. Et in hoc imitamur eos, qui ex omissione instanter operando bonum peccaverunt continue.**

And it is clear that the idleness of priests is not excused but accused, as the Apostle says: "We exhort you that you receive not the grace of God in vain."[6] For whoever has received any power from God by which it is lawful for him to do God's work, and through negligence passes it over, receives the grace of God in vain. And in this we imitate those who sinned continually by omission of urgently working good.[7]

¶7 23.12–23.23

[23]**In hoc tamen est duplex culpa, prima est negligencia potentatus, et secunda maior, crebrior et periculosior est vetacio sathane, qua adversans impedit ne potentatus exerceat potestatem; et hoc contingit per mille meandros tradicionis humane, et specialiter per ficta de iurisdiccione. Quando autem non stat per illum qui immediate habet potestatem sed per alium irracionabiliter restringentem, tunc non sibi sed alii est debitum imputandum; sed hoc raro contingit, cum causa martirii foret hominem se exponere pro distribucione prudenti thesauri Domini.**

In this, however, there is a twofold fault. The first is the negligence of the potentate; and the second, greater, more frequent and more dangerous, is Satan's forbidding, by which the adversary prevents the potentate from exercising his power; and this happens through a thousand windings of human tradition, and especially through fictions about jurisdiction. But when it does not rest with the one who immediately has the power but with another who unreasonably restrains him, then the debt is to be imputed not to him but to the other; but this rarely happens, since it would be a cause for martyrdom for a man to expose himself for the prudent distribution of the Lord's treasure.[8]

¶8 23.24–23.33

[23]**Unde videtur multis, quod Deus non intendit ut potens faciat tale opus; nec habet potestatem ad hoc; sed habet potestatem ut mereatur ex hoc quod nititur ad sic agendum. Alii autem dicunt quod habet potestatem remotam ad sic faciendum, hoc est, potestatem mediate; qua potest sic facere, et tamen Deus non intendit simpliciter quod ita faciet, et sic habet potestatem sic faciendi, sed non ad finem ut sic faciat.**

Hence it seems to many that God does not intend that the one who has power do such a work, nor does he have power for it; but he has power to merit from the fact that he strives to act so. But others say that he has remote power to do so, that is, power mediately, by which he can do so, and yet God does not intend without qualification that he will do so; and so he has power of doing so, but not to the end that he do so.

¶9 24.1–24.29
24.8 Prelates have less power now than in the primitive Church.
24.26 Miracles are works done by God alone and all his works are miracles,

[24]**Sed dimissa ista dissensione logica, videtur quod omnis potestas secularis diminuetur usque ad non gradum, quia solum durat pro tempore vie, ut docet Apostolus prima Corinth. XV, 24: Deinde, inquit, finis, cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri cum evacuaverit omnem principatum et potestatem et virtutem. Ymo videtur, cum Christus limitat omni sacerdoti suo formam et numerum obiectorum, quod hodie sunt prepositi potestatis minoris quam erant in primitiva ecclesia, et sic usque ad non gradum. Et id considerarent qui stulte et nescie suam magnificant potestatem. Videtur enim quod proporcionabiliter ut plus meritorie nituntur ad edificandum ecclesiam, sic habent amplius potestatis, cum secundum illam mensuram Deus dat potestatem hominibus; quilibet autem clericus vel laicus habet potestatem sufficientem edificandi ecclesiam, si voluerit esse Dei adiutor, faciens quod Deus destinavit eum ad taliter**

But, setting aside this logical dissension, it seems that all secular power will be diminished down to no degree, since it lasts only for the time of the way, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Corinthians 15:24: "Afterwards," he says, "the end: when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father: when he shall have brought to nought all principality and power and virtue." Indeed it seems, since Christ assigns to every priest of his the form and number of objects, that today superiors are of less power than they were in the primitive church, and so down to no degree.[9] And those who foolishly and unknowingly magnify their own power should consider this. For it seems that in proportion as they strive more meritoriously to build up the church, so they have more power, since God gives power to men according to that measure; and any cleric or layman

faciendum. Noverunt, inquam, logici quod est in libera potestate hominis facere quod Deus destinavit eum vel ordinavit eum ad fines huiusmodi. Sed aliter loquuntur qui ponunt globum potestatis quam Deus ubilibet potest per se ponere. Secundo principaliter arguitur de potestate faciendi miracula, de potestate dandi Spiritum Sanctum vel graciam, de potestate ampla absolvendi vel dispensandi alia sacramenta.

whatever has power sufficient to build up the church, if he will be God's helper, doing what God destined him to do in such a way. Logicians know, I say, that it is in the free power of a man to do what God has destined him, or ordained him, to [do for] ends of this kind.[10] But they speak otherwise who posit a mass of power which God can by himself place anywhere.[11] In the second principal place, it is argued about the power of working miracles, about the power of giving the Holy Spirit or grace, and about the ample power of absolving or of dispensing the other sacraments.

¶10 24.30–26.8
25.12 *Danger of too much attention to wonders.*

[24] Quantum ad primum videtur mihi quod miraculum potest dici factum vel faccio quam Deus appropriate facit, et sic solus Deus agit miracula et longe crebrius quam putamus, quia quicunque creat licet solita, quia non miramur ea non [25] vocamus miracula, ut declarat Augustinus super Joh. Omel., et sic quelibet creatura, sicut quilibet actus creandi potest dici miraculum, sic et quelibet faccio que Deo est propria. Unde idem esset creaturam vendicare potestatem miraculose agere, et vendicare quod sit alter Deus; quod Deus non potest creature concedere. Creare autem non potest Deus communicare creature, nec annichilare potest alicui competere, ut dictum est in materia de universalibus. Et patet quomodo debemus iudicare intellectu et fide miracula. Periculosum autem est instante tempore Antichristi magnificare signa sensibilia, cum Antichristi discipuli extollunt se super omne quod dicitur Deus, de principatu, de potestate, et virtute, quas Apostolus dicit evacuandos per Christum, Deus autem ad meritum hominis tam vivi quam mortui sepe facit miracula. Ad quem sensum dicitur corpora mortuorum facere miracula, ymo truncos lapides et multa putrida finguntur facere miracula propter lucrum. Sic autem equivocando in faccione miraculi, videtur quod omne membrum sancte matris ecclesie, de quanto sic meretur ut Deus operetur miraculose, facit miraculum, et pauci mortui qui sunt in statu merendi beati in patria. Illi autem qui dicunt quod lapis, herba et alia natura corporea habet virtutem faciendi miracula, videntur michi nimis confuse loqui, quia sic omnia forent miracula, cum nemo posset facere nisi miraculum quoad Deum. Alii autem dicunt quod oportet [26] esse opus mirabile, et sic sunt illis quibus sunt mira insolita opera nature miracula, aliis autem non forent miracula, et sic de multis ficticiis infundabiliter adinventis. Vel ergo dicamus quod solus Deus habet potestatem faciendi miracula vel equivoce concedamus quod omnis homo promerens aput Deum, ut faciat ad preces suas miracula, facit quodammodo ipsa miracula.

As to the first, it seems to me that a miracle can be called a deed or making which God does as proper to himself; and so God alone works miracles, and far more often than we think; for whatever he creates, although customary, we do not [25] call miracles, because we do not wonder at them, as Augustine declares on John, in a homily;[12] and so every creature, as every act of creating, can be called a miracle, and so too every making that is proper to God. Hence it would be the same for a creature to claim power to act miraculously and to claim that it is another God, which God cannot grant to a creature. And God cannot communicate creating to a creature, nor can annihilating belong to anyone [but him], as has been said in the matter of universals.[13] And it is clear how we ought to judge miracles, by understanding and by faith.[14] But it is dangerous, with the time of Antichrist at hand, to magnify perceptible signs, since the disciples of Antichrist "lift themselves up above all that is called God" on the score of principality, of power and of virtue, which the Apostle says are "to be brought to nought by Christ".[15] But God often works miracles for the merit of a man, living as well as dead. In this sense the bodies of the dead are said to work miracles; indeed stocks, stones and many rotten things are feigned to work miracles for the sake of gain. And speaking equivocally in this way about the making of a miracle, it seems that every member of holy mother church, insofar as he so merits that God works miraculously, works a miracle, and few of the dead who are in the state of meriting, the blessed in the homeland.[16] But those who say that a stone, a herb and other bodily nature have the power of working miracles seem to me to speak exceedingly indistinctly, since in that way all things would be miracles, since no one could make anything but a miracle with respect to God. And others say that it must [26] be a wonderful work; and so the unusual works of nature are miracles to those to whom they are wonders, but to others they would not be miracles; and so with many fictions groundlessly invented. Either, therefore, let us say that God alone

has power of working miracles, or let us grant equivocally that every man who merits with God that he should work miracles at his prayers does in some manner work the miracles himself.[17]

Notes

1. The print's *ad faciendam aliquid* (22.6) is a slip of gender for *faciendum*, translated as such. A reads *faciendum aliud nisi* at 22.2–3 for *faciendum aliquid, nisi*. A and B note in the margin *Potestatem habere (ad aliquid faciendum)*.
2. *Questio prima illata* is taken as the first objection just brought in (¶1, no power except to what God intends), which Wyclif grants. *Distinccione* (22.10) is an ablative used as an adverb, "with distinction", rendered "distinctly".
3. "As God intends" renders Loserth's *sicut Deus intendit* (22.16); the codices read *et sic Deus* ("and so God intends"), which he emends. The manuscript reading also construes and gives the same sense as the close of ¶4.
4. *Potentatus* (22.20, 23.13–14) is here the person who holds power, "the potentate", not the abstract "sovereignty" of the the glossary row (4.27). *Obligacior*, a comparative of the participle, "the more bound".
5. The distinction turns on mood: *quod Petrus sit salvus / faciat* (subjunctive, what God wills or binds to be done) against *quod ipse est salvus / facit* (indicative, the fact). God intends the first, which is true (Peter ought to do it), and need not intend the second, which may be false.
6. 2 Cor. 6:1 (editor's reference). The Vulgate has *Adiuvantes autem exhortamur ne in vacuum gratiam Dei recipiatis* (DR "And we helping do exhort you that you receive not the grace of God in vain"); Wyclif's *Hortamur vos* drops "helping".
7. Loserth prints *operando* (23.11) and notes *Rectius: operandi*; *ex omissione ... operando* does not construe, so his correction is translated ("by omission of urgently working good"). B lacks *et* at 23.10.
8. *Non stat per illum* is the legal idiom "it is not owing to him". The last clause gives the reason the case is rare: the hindrance would be a cause worth martyrdom, so the one who holds the power ought to expose himself rather than yield, and the debt usually remains his. *Iurisdiccio* has no the glossary row; rendered "jurisdiction".
9. *Limitat* (24.8) stands with a capital in the established text; the reading is the plate's (scans *hmitat*). The sense "assigns" follows the the glossary row for *limitare*.
10. "Free power" renders Loserth's *libera potestate* (24.21); the codices read *libertate*, which he corrects, since *in libertate potestate* does not construe.
11. *Globus potestatis*: of a thing, "mass" (glossary: *globus*, untagged in this sense): power imagined as a stock God could set down anywhere, against Wyclif's view that power answers to the merit of the one who uses it.
12. "Augustine on John, in a homily": Loserth compares Augustine, *Sermo* 80 (on John 6) and *Sermo* 126, which has the thought (126.3: *quotidiana miracula Dei non facilitate, sed assiduitate viluerant*). The theme, that God's daily works are not wondered at because they are customary, is also in *In Ioannis evangelium tractatus* 24.1 and 9.1 (*quotidiana miracula ... assiduitate viluerunt*), which answer Wyclif's "on John" best. C. *Quicunque creat* (24.32) is taken as *quecunque* ("whatever [things] he creates"); as printed the masculine has no construal.
13. "In the matter of universals": Wyclif's *Tractatus de universalibus* (place untraced): creating belongs to God alone, and annihilating, as Wyclif says here, to no one.
14. "By understanding" renders Loserth's *intellectu* (25.11); the codices read *intellectum*, which he corrects.
15. 2 Thess. 2:4 (editor's reference), turned to the plural: Vulgate *extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus*. "To be brought to nought" echoes 1 Cor. 15:24, quoted at 24.4 (*evacuaverit omnem principatum et potestatem et virtutem*); Loserth refers to 2 Cor. 3:7. *Evacuandos* is masculine against the feminine *quas*, as printed. C. *De principatu, de potestate, et virtute* is taken with *extollunt se*: they exalt themselves on the score of these.
16. As printed the clause has no verb of its own and its sense is doubtful: the blessed in the homeland are not in the state of meriting. The likelier sense is that few of the dead work miracles in this way, since merit belongs to the wayfarer; a word (perhaps *non*, "not in the state of meriting") may be lost at 25.24–25. Translated as printed.
17. B reads *Si autem* for *Sic autem* at 25.21–22, *promerent* for *promerens* at 26.7; A reads *sunt miracula* at 26.1–2. *Aput* is the print's spelling of *apud*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **22: *CAPITULUM SECUNDUM.***
  - **22: *illa***
  - **22: ∅ (in-/tendere is one word, already whole at pos 174 (intendere))**
  - **22: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar before obligat)**
  - **23: *volitum* (print has v) [NW]**
  - **23: *Hortamur***
  - **23: *periculosior* [NW]**
  - **23: *illum***
  - **24: ∅ (English side-note word)**
  - **24: *ea***
  - **24: *Limitat* (Hmitat -> Limitat (scans: hmitat | hmitat | limitat | hmitat))**

- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 5. II. Cor. VI, 1. (23.33); reference Danger of too (25.12).**

Part 2: No man gives the Spirit, takes away sin, or punishes beyond God

Loserth pp. 26.9–32.8

¶1 26.9–32.8
26.9 *Man cannot give the Holy Spirit.*
26.24 *A bishop has a spiritual power but he cannot grant the Spirit at his will.*
27.1 *Nor can the pope; indeed many popes have themselves lacked it.*
27.27 *The power of absolution: Only God takes away sin.*
28.21 *God himself cannot give absolution save to one whom he has fitted to receive it.*
29.6 *The priests in the old law did not cure the leper but declared his state; so it is as to absolution in the new law.*
29.26 *How bad priests usurp the office of God,*
30.17 *They should attribute to themselves the office of a servant and ascribe all power to God.*
30.31 *Example set by the apostles.*
31.10 *A simple priest can declare absolution to the contrite as well as the Pope.*
31.25 *So as to excommunication, no man has the power of punishing thus unless God has already punished.*

[26]**Quantum ad potestatem dandi Spiritum Sanctum vel graciam, videtur dicendum conformiter quod foret nimis magna presumpcio dicere quod homo peccator dat Spiritum Sanctum, quia Christo super quem specialiter descendit columba appropriatur baptizacio ista, ut patet Joh. primo, Ymo nullus talis habet potestatem servandi sibi Spiritum Sanctum, quomodo igitur ad dandum alteri, cum ignorat utrum pertineat ad columbam? Ymo apostoli, ad quorum ministerium dabatur Spiritus Sanctus, non presumpserunt asserere quod dederunt, sed, ut patet Act. VIII, 15, oraverunt pro illis ut acciperent Spiritum Sanctum. Ideo vel solus Deus habet potestatem dandi Spiritum Sanctum, vel quilibet laycus baptizando vel promerendo habet potestatem dandi Spiritum Sanctum; differenter tamen episcopus, secundum quod autoritative det donum tale, nimis multum excederet vicariam potestatem. Quis igitur concederet, quod habet potestatem super Deum vel eius graciam, et quomodocunque locuti fuerimus, maximum foret quod unus meretur alteri primam graciam, quia, cum in omni motu movens et motum sunt simul, nimis scandalosum foret quod Romanus episcopus tam distanter, tam generaliter et tam improporcionaliter ad** [27]**Deum, alteraret homines, dando graciam, cum multorum talium spiritus, in quibus subiectaretur talis potestas, sunt miserabiliter damnandi non sufficientes iuvare se ipsos. Et si dicatur quod solum limitatur potestas eorum habilibus, cum solum talibus Deus potest dare graciam, revera habiles haberent a Deo graciam non eo plus vel minus, licet tales non sic menciantur se dare graciam Sicut igitur non habent potestatem faciendi filios Dei, dando graciam predestinacionis, sic nec aliquam graciam, qua Christianus foret gratus Deo. Nec est color si habent potestatem super antecedens, quod habent potestatem super omne consequens vel convertibile, eo quod sic essent potentatus pares Deo, et cum Psalmo LXXXIX, 10 dicitur: Si in potentatibus octoginta anni, et amplius eorum, labor et dolor. Et revera minus videtur errorem sapere quod sanitas corporalis subsit hominis potestati, quam quod gracia vel Spiritus Sanctus subsit, nam cum nichil est in potestate hominis dare, nisi quod subiacet sue potestati, nimis magnum foret christianum habere potestatem dandi Spiritum Sanctum; hoc enim est singulare donum sui principii, cum**

As to the power of giving the Holy Spirit or grace, it seems that one must say, in conformity [with the foregoing], that it would be exceedingly great presumption to say that a sinful man gives the Holy Spirit, since this baptism is appropriated to Christ, upon whom the dove specially descended, as is clear from John 1.[1] Indeed no such man has power to keep the Holy Spirit for himself; how then [has he power] to give it to another, since he is ignorant whether he belongs to the dove? Indeed the apostles, by whose ministry the Holy Spirit was given, did not presume to assert that they gave it, but, as is clear from Acts 8:15, they "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost". Therefore either God alone has power of giving the Holy Spirit, or any layman whatever, by baptizing or by meriting, has power of giving the Holy Spirit; yet it is otherwise with a bishop: insofar as he were to give such a gift by his own authority, he would far too much exceed vicarial power.[2] Who, therefore, would grant that he has power over God or over his grace? And however we may have spoken, the most there could be is that one merits the first grace for another; for since "in every motion the mover and the moved are together", it would be exceedingly scandalous that the Roman bishop, so distant, so general and so out of proportion to [27]**God, should alter men by giving grace, since the spirits of many such men, in whom such power would have its subject, are wretchedly to be damned, not sufficient to help themselves.[3] And if it is said that their power is limited only to the qualified, since to such alone can God give grace, in truth the qualified would have grace from God neither more nor less on that account, even if such men did not lie in this way that they give grace. Just as, therefore, they do not have power of making sons of God by giving the grace of predestination, so neither [have they power to give] any grace by which a Christian would be pleasing to God. Nor is there colour [for saying],[4] if they have power over the antecedent, that they have power over every consequent or convertible, since in that way they would be potentates equal to God; and as it is said in Psalm 89:10: "If in the strong they be fourscore years: and what is more of them is labour and sorrow."[5] And in truth it seems to savour less of error that bodily health should be**

christianus non potest ipsum vendere. Et conformis est consideracio de absolucione; quondam enim reputabatur Deo proprium tollere peccata tam aput fideles quam aput infideles; unde singulariter dixit Baptista de Christo, ut legitur Joh. I, 29: Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi. Super quo dicit August. Omel. IV: Nemo sibi arroget et dicat, quod ipse aufert peccata [28] mundi. Iam attendite contra quos superbos intendebat digitum Ioannes. Nondum erant nati heretici et iam ostendebantur, contra illos clamabat a fluvio. Unde sepe imposuerunt Judei Christo blasfemiam ex hoc quod peccata dimisit simpliciter, quia non dimittitur peccatum simpliciter nisi ex hoc, quod offensa in Deum laxatur, sed quis dimittit iniuriam, nisi vel factam sibi vel suo subdito? Deus enim dando homini potestatem huiusmodi, prius dimitteret suam iniuriam antequam vicarius suus dimitteret. Et ista videtur sentencia multorum doctorum, ut XXIII, q. V ex decreto beati Ambrosii sic habetur: Remittuntur, inquit, peccata per Dei filium, cuius levita interpres et quidam excusator est, quia, ut dicitur XV, q. I: Nec is: Levita minister remissionis est. Unde super illo decreto Archidiaconus ita scribit: Prelati quando ligant vel solvunt indignos, mirum est si tunc ligantur vel solvuntur in celis, sed intelligitur de illis, quorum merita ligari vel solvi postulant. Et illud notat XXIV, q. I Ubi sana et Quicunque. Nec dubium de ista sentencia, ne blasfemetur quod prelati nostri prevalent contra Deum; Deus enim non potest quemquam absolvere, nisi prius ipsum habilitet; cum igitur christianus nullum habilitat, nisi forsan orando vel merendo, patet quod oportet Deum habilitare hominem secundum meritum eius. Et de isto debet christianus confidere non autem in pseudochristi blasfemia, [29] qua sompniat et facit ignaros credere de sua insensibili et infundabili potestate; unde non sinit quod scrutinium sue blasphemie in luce clareat, et licet sit tantum errabilis, blasfemat profundius quod Deus est necessitatus complere omnia sua iudicia. Sicut igitur sacerdotes legis veteris non fecerunt hominem sanum vel leprosum sed notificabant, ut patet IV Sentenciarum dist. XVIII et recitatur inferius, sic presbyteri legis nove. In cuius signum Christus suscitavit Lazarum et fecit Apostolos ipsum solvere, ut patet X, XI: et decem leprosi, dum ipsi irent, mundati sunt, ut dicitur Luce XVII, 12, 14 et Psalmus XXXI, 5: Dixi confitebor adversum me, et tu remisisti. Verum tamen amplius habent sacerdotes Christi quam sacerdotes legis veteris, quia plus est iudicare de macula spiritus quam de macula corporali, plus eciam est dignum et humile habere graciam et meritum ex subieccione ecclesie quam corporaliter infirmum esse notificatum in populo esse sanum; et sic licet in multis excellenciis sacerdocium legis veteris superat sacerdocium legis nove,

subject to a man's power than that grace or the Holy Spirit should be; for since nothing is in a man's power to give except what lies under his power, it would be too much for a Christian to have power of giving the Holy Spirit; for this is the singular gift of its own principle, since a Christian cannot sell it.[6] And the consideration of absolution is alike; for once it was reckoned proper to God to take away sins, among the faithful as well as among unbelievers; hence the Baptist said singularly of Christ, as is read in John 1:29: "Behold the Lamb of God. Behold him who taketh away the sins of the world." On which Augustine says, in Homily 4: "Let no one arrogate it to himself and say that he takes away the sins [28] of the world. Mark now against what proud men John was pointing his finger. The heretics were not yet born, and already they were being pointed out; against them he was crying from the river."[7] Hence the Jews often charged Christ with blasphemy because he forgave sins without qualification; for a sin is not forgiven without qualification except by the offence against God being released; now who forgives an injury, except one done either to himself or to his subject? For God, in giving a man power of this kind, would forgive his own injury before his vicar forgave it.[8] And this seems to be the teaching of many doctors, as is had thus in [C.] 23 q. 5 from the decree of blessed Ambrose: "Sins," he says, "are remitted through the Son of God, whose interpreter and a kind of excuser the Levite is"; for, as is said in [C.] 15 q. 1, *Nec is*: "The Levite is the minister of remission."[9] Hence on that decree the Archdeacon writes thus: "When prelates bind or loose the unworthy, it is a wonder if they are then bound or loosed in heaven; but it is understood of those whose merits demand that they be bound or loosed." And he notes this at [C.] 24 q. 1, *Ubi sana* and *Quicunque*.[10] Nor is there doubt about this teaching, lest it be blasphemously said that our prelates prevail against God; for God cannot absolve anyone unless he first qualifies him; since, then, a Christian qualifies no one, except perhaps by praying or meriting, it is clear that God must qualify a man according to his merit. And in this a Christian ought to trust, but not in the blasphemy of the false christ, [29] by which he dreams, and makes the ignorant believe, of his imperceptible and groundless power; hence he does not allow the scrutiny of his blasphemy to shine out in the light, and although he is so liable to error, he blasphemes more deeply that God is necessitated to fulfil all his judgments.[11] Just as, therefore, the priests of the old law did not make a man clean or leprous but made it known, as is clear from *Sentences* IV dist. 18, and is recounted below, so [too] the presbyters of the new law.[12]

ad sacerdocium tamen Christi non potest attingere, sed generaliter fallit, quando non sequitur arbitrium interni iudicis, ut patet XI, q. III Ad hoc vera est. Ista autem blasfema gentilitas, qua sacerdotes debiliores usurpant sibi opus, quod est Deo proprium, maculat matrem ecclesiam, ideo necesse foret eos cognoscere, quomodo quidam tantum a veritate degeneraverant quod negarunt accionem aliquam competere creature (ut patet IX Metaphysice Comment. [30] VII). Alii autem magis blasfeme concesserant quod Deus omnem accionem illis ad extra communicat tamquam eius vicariis, et hii tamquam alter Nabuchodonosor, de quo Dan. IV. et alter Senacherib, de quo II. Paralip. XXXII vendicant se esse socios Trinitatis. Considerarent autem dictum Augustini II De Mirabilibus Scripture Sacre cap. IV quomodo sol et luna steterunt contra Gabaon, non humani imperii auctoritate sed Domini imperantis. Nil, inquit, propter iubentis hominis verbum creature faciunt, sed quod Dominus servi sui oracioni obediens precipit, et cap. XXIV dicit quod lepra Naaman sanata est in sermone imperantis Dei, et non in re aliqua sacramentum virtutis continebatur, et hinc Elizeus accipere munera recusavit. Et sic attribuerent sibi quod servo est proprium, promulgando, operando et promerendo, quod Deus dignatur per illos facere continue, sumendo ut servi humiliter de se ipsis. Ubi autem dubitant de suo opere, debent vere, religiose et secure totam accionem Deo ascribere, cum oportet eum facere omnem accionem creature. Sive utatur igitur in tali accione creatura sua ut organo sive non, sibi laus est operis tribuenda, laudem autem creature de quanto meretur oportet esse aput Deum absconditam, unde magnificantes suam potenciam notarent formam utendi et ascribendi potestatem in sanctis apostolis, et nimis magnum foret, quod nostri illos excederent. Ipsi autem sepe confitentur, quod non habent potestatem nisi ad edificacionem ecclesie, ut patet [31] II. Corinth. X. et iterum confitentur quod ve illis nisi edificatorie usi fuerint potestate, ut patet I. Corinth. IX, 16: Ve mihi, si non evangelizavero, et tercio confitentur se non audere de se ipsis loqui vel aliis nisi quod Christus in eis loquitur. Nam Rom. XV, 18 ait Apostolus: Non, inquit, audeo aliquid loqui eorum, que per me non effecit Christus. Stulticia igitur foret, episcopum cecum infundabilia et inopinabilia de se ipso presumere. Quantumcunque itaque fuerit magnus Christi episcopus, non potest quemquam absolvere nisi de quanto contritus prius et absolutus fuerit apud Deum; et tunc videtur multis quod de tanto quilibet simplex sacerdos posset absolvere, ymo quasi contritus secure absolvitur, etsi humana absolucio non sequatur, dimittere autem suam iniuriam sicut peccatum in ipsum potest quilibet christianus eque plene ut papa, sicut ponit Matth.

In token of which Christ raised Lazarus and had the apostles loose him, as is clear from [John] 10, 11; and the ten lepers, "as they went, were made clean", as is said in Luke 17:12, 14; and Psalm 31:5: "I said I will confess against myself ... and thou hast forgiven."[13] Nevertheless the priests of Christ have more than the priests of the old law, since it is more to judge of a stain of the spirit than of a bodily stain; it is also more worthy and humble to have grace and merit from subjection to the church than for one bodily sick to be made known among the people to be clean; and so, although in many excellences the priesthood of the old law surpasses the priesthood of the new law, yet it cannot reach to the priesthood of Christ; but it generally fails when it does not follow the judgment of the inward judge, as is clear from [C.] 11 q. 3, *Ad hoc vera est*.[14] And this blasphemous paganism, by which feebler priests usurp to themselves the work that is proper to God, stains mother church; therefore it would be needful for them to know how certain men had degenerated so far from the truth that they denied that any action belongs to a creature (as is clear from *Metaphysics* IX, comment [30] 7). But others, more blasphemously, had granted that God communicates every outward action to them as his vicars; and these, like another Nebuchadnezzar, of whom Daniel 4, and another Sennacherib, of whom 2 Chronicles 32, claim to be partners of the Trinity.[15] And let them consider the saying of Augustine, *On the Wonders of Holy Scripture* II, chapter 4, how the sun and moon stood still against Gibeon "not by the authority of a human command but of the Lord commanding. Creatures," he says, "do nothing on account of the word of the man who bids, but what the Lord, obeying the prayer of his servant, commands"; and in chapter 24 he says that Naaman's leprosy was healed "at the word of God commanding, and the sacrament of power was not contained in any thing; and hence Elisha refused to accept gifts".[16] And so they should attribute to themselves what is proper to a servant, proclaiming, working and meriting what God deigns to do continually through them, taking [the part] of servants humbly with regard to themselves. And where they are in doubt about their own work, they ought truly, religiously and safely to ascribe the whole action to God, since he must do every action of a creature. Whether, then, he uses his creature as an instrument in such an action or not, the praise of the work is to be given to him; and the praise of the creature, insofar as it merits, must be hidden with God; hence those who magnify their own power should note the form of using and ascribing power in the holy apostles, and it would be too much that ours should exceed them.[17] And they [the

VI et XVIII. Quomodo igitur auderet aliquis dicere quod ipse habet singulariter potestatem absolvendi quemcumque peccatorem a pena et a culpa? Revera foret nimis damnabilis, qui ad detrimentum ecclesie tantum incarcerat huiusmodi potestatem. Et conformiter dicitur de potestate excommunicandi vel puniendi subiectos. Nemo enim habet ut membrum Christi potestatem puniendi aliquem, nisi de quanto Deus prius punierit, quod si excedit, punit ut tortor dyaboli. Et hinc dicit Augustinus in De Mirabilibus Scripture cap. XVII quod Isaac benedixit non Esau quem voluit, sed [32]Jacob quem noluit benedicere, ut in benediccione non hominis ostenderet beneficium sed Dei benedicentis. Denique dictum est in Numeris ad Moysen et Aaron sacerdotes: Vos ponite nomen meum super filios Israhel, ego Dominus benedicam vos. Nec voluntas sacerdotis obesse aut prodesse possit ultra meritum benediccionem poscentis. Nec dubium fideli de ista sentencia.

apostles] often confess that they have no power except for the building up of the church, as is clear from [31]2 Corinthians 10; and again they confess that woe to them unless they have used power to build up, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 9:16: "Woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel"; and thirdly they confess that they do not dare to speak of themselves or of others except what Christ speaks in them. For in Romans 15:18 the Apostle says: "For I dare not," he says, "to speak of any of those things which Christ worketh not by me."[18] It would therefore be folly for a blind bishop to presume groundless and incredible things of himself. However great, then, a bishop of Christ may be, he cannot absolve anyone except insofar as [the man] has first been contrite and absolved before God; and then it seems to many that to that extent any simple priest could absolve; indeed, as one contrite, he is safely absolved, even if human absolution does not follow; and any Christian can forgive his own injury, as a sin against himself, as fully as the pope, as Matthew 6 and 18 lay down.[19] How then would anyone dare to say that he singularly has power of absolving any sinner whatever from penalty and from guilt? In truth he would be exceedingly damnable who, to the detriment of the church, so imprisons power of this kind.[20] And it is said in conformity concerning the power of excommunicating or punishing subjects. For no one has, as a member of Christ, power of punishing anyone except insofar as God has first punished; and if he exceeds this, he punishes as the devil's torturer. And hence Augustine says in *On the Wonders of Scripture*, chapter 17, that "Isaac blessed not Esau, whom he wished [to bless], but [32]Jacob, whom he did not wish to bless, so that in the blessing he might show the benefit not of man but of God who blesses. Finally it was said in Numbers to Moses and Aaron the priests: 'Put ye my name upon the children of Israel; I the Lord will bless you.' Nor can the will of the priest hinder or help beyond the merit of him who asks for the blessing."[21] Nor is there doubt for one of the faithful about this teaching.

Notes

1. John 1:32–33: the Spirit descending as a dove on Jesus, "he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost". "Belongs to the dove" (26.14) is whether one has the Spirit at all. A in marg.: *Dare Spiritum Sanctum*.
2. *Differenter tamen episcopus* is elliptical: a layman may be said to give the Spirit by baptizing or meriting, but a bishop claiming to give it *autoritative*, by his own authority, would exceed a vicar's power. T. Loserth reports *Sed quod* from the codices at 26.26, apparently where he prints *secundum quod*; translated as printed.
3. "In every motion the mover and the moved are together": Aristotle, *Physics* VII.2 (243a), the axiom of contact between mover and moved. Hence a distant Roman bishop cannot "alter" men by giving grace. C. *In quibus subiectaretur talis potestas*: in whom such power would inhere as in its subject; the pronoun is taken with the spirits of the bishops.
4. *Nec est color*: "colour" in the period sense, a plausible ground (glossary: *color*), not a pretext.

5. Ps. 89:10 (Vulgate numbering); Wyclif omits *autem*. C. The verse turns on *potentatibus*, which DR renders "the strong" and the Latin shares with *potentatus*, "potentates", just before: those who claim God's power have only labour and sorrow beyond their span. *Potentatus* is the person who holds power, as in 02-a.
6. *Singulare donum sui principii*: a gift that belongs to its own source alone (the Spirit is given only by God); that a Christian cannot sell it recalls Simon Magus (Acts 8:18–20).
7. John 1:29: the Vulgate has *peccatum mundi* (DR "the sin of the world"); Wyclif's *peccata* is followed. Augustine, *In Ioannis evangelium tractatus* 4 (Loserth: "cap. I, tract. IV, Opp. III, p. 316"; 4.10; Augustine reads *auferat peccatum mundi* and *clamabat tunc a fluvio*). *Fluvio* is the Jordan.
8. Mark 2:7, Luke 5:21: "Who can forgive sins, but God only?" A in marg. at 27.27: *Peccata tollit solus Christus*.
9. Decretum C.23 q.5 c.49, from Ambrose (editor; form ours); the passage is Ambrose, *De Cain et Abel* 2.4.15, which reads *per Dei verbum* and *executor* (PL 14, 348A; Friedberg also reads *executor*). Loserth notes *Rectius: per Dei verbum*. T. *Excusator* ("excuser") is translated as printed; the source's *executor* ("executor") may be the true reading. The second citation is Decretum C.15 q.1 c.11 (editor; codices *XVI*, corrected by Loserth); *Nec is* is taken as the canon's incipit.
10. "The Archdeacon" is Guido de Baysio, *Rosarium* on the Decretum (Loserth: "Archid. l. c."; identification ours, the gloss itself untraced). Decretum C.24 q.1 cc.27 and 29 (editor; form ours); the codices read *XXIV, q. I versus sua et quodcunque*. B in marg.: *Absolutio*. A reads *nec blasphemetur* (28.22).
11. "The false christ" (*pseudochristi*, Matt. 24:24) is singular in the print, and the pronouns that follow refer to him; he is the claimant to such power. "Necessitated to fulfil all his judgments": that God must ratify whatever he binds or looses.
12. Peter Lombard, *Sentences* IV d.18 d.18 c.6, PL 192, 887–888 (Loserth: "ed. Lugd. p. 41[.]"), on the priests of the old law who declared, not made, a leper clean (Lev. 13–14). "Clean" renders *sanum* (whole, sound).
13. *X, XI* (29.10) names no book; the raising of Lazarus and the command to loose him are John 11:44 ("Loose him, and let him go"); the Gospel does not name whom Christ bids, but Lombard, *Sent.* IV d.18 c.6 (PL 192, 887), which Wyclif follows here, has Christ hand Lazarus, already raised, to the disciples to be loosed (*Lazarum jam vivificatum obtulit discipulis solvendum*). Probably *Joh. XI* with the book lost. S. Luke 17:14 (Wyclif adds *ipsi*); Ps. 31:5, abridged (DR "I said I will confess against my self my injustice to the Lord: and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin").
14. "It cannot reach" has as subject the priesthood of the old law, which in outward excellences surpasses the new but falls short of Christ's; "it generally fails" is taken of any priesthood that does not follow the inward judge. B reads *quantum non sequitur* (29.24–25). S. Loserth: no chapter *Ad hoc vera est* exists; the place is C.11 q.3 c.62, *Tunc vera est* (Gregory, *Hom. in Ev.* 26), whose rubric Wyclif echoes: *non est vera presidentis absolutio, nisi sequatur arbitrium interni iudicis*.
15. Averroes, *In Metaphysicam* IX, comm. 7, on those who denied any action to creatures (the *loquentes*). Dan. 4 (Nebuchadnezzar's boast); 2 Chron. 32 (Sennacherib's against the God of Israel).
16. Augustinus Hibernicus, *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* II.4 (Josh. 10:12–13) and II.24 (4 Kings 5) (editor: Augustine *Opp.* III, 2, 1000; the work is pseudonymous). Loserth corrects the codices' *III … cap. 3* and *Cap. 22*. T. "In any thing" renders Loserth's emendation *in re aliqua*; the codices read *non in aqua* ("the sacrament of power was not contained in the water"), which also construes and fits Naaman's washing.
17. *Potencia* here is ordinary might, "power" (glossary: *potencia*, CONTEXTUAL), beside *potestas*; Wyclif uses the two interchangeably. *Sumendo ut servi humiliter de se ipsis* (30.19) is compressed: taking the part of servants, humbly, as regards themselves. The codices read *continue sumando ut supera* (Loserth).
18. 2 Cor. 10:8 ("our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification"); 1 Cor. 9:16; Rom. 15:18, where the Vulgate has *efficit* (DR "worketh") for Wyclif's *effecit*. A in marg.: *Potestatem apostoli quam se dicunt habere*.
19. *Quasi contritus* (31.13): *quasi* in its common medieval sense "as, inasmuch as [he is]"; translated "as one contrite". S. Matt. 6:12–15, 18:21–35 (forgiving one's brother). B reads *ita fuerit* (31.10); A *similiter potestatem* (31.20); A and B in marg.: *Dimittere peccata*.
20. *A pena et a culpa*, "from penalty and from guilt", is the formula of the plenary indulgence, which Wyclif attacks.
21. Loserth: rightly Ps.-Augustine, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, q. 11 (editor; *Opp.* III, 2), not *De mirabilibus*. Num. 6:27: the Vulgate has *Invocabuntque nomen meum super filios Israhel, et ego benedicam eis* (DR "And they shall invoke my name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them"); the quotation's wording is translated. Gen. 27 (Isaac's blessing).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 28: *mundi*
  - 28: *intendebat* (hyphenated inten-/debat; main token covers whole word)
  - 28: *erant*
  - 28: *levita* (print has v) [NW]
  - 28: *Levita* (print has capital L, v)
  - 28: *ligantur*
  - 28: *Deus*
  - 29: *tu*
  - 29: *tamen amplius* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 29: *graciam*
  - 30: *precipit*
  - 28: *fluvio* (LEFT-nw: italic, v as printed; stop after not carried)
  - 31: *Augustinus* (LEFT-nw: Augu- | stinus split by line break; whole word per main-scan token; 30 is line number)

- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 5 Num. VI, 27. (32.33).**

Part 3: How the apostles were made priests, and the order of powers

Loserth pp. 32.9–36.27

¶1 32.9–33.5
32.9 *How the power of orders is conferred.*
32.13 *God grants it by his inspiration, and outward signs are unimportant.*
33.15 *In such matters we may be content with what Scripture tells us.*
33.23 *Christ probably oppointed them without any sensible sacrament.*

[32]**Sed tercio principaliter arguitur de modo committendi potestates nec non de ordine et perdicione potestatum ecclesie; et que potestas sit alia prestancior? Quantum ad primum patet, cum Deus dat omnem potestatem vicariam, qualem solum Deus communicat creature, non refert sive in signo sensibili, sive inspiracione interna Deus potestatem talem communicaverit creature quia oportet omnino quod insensibiliter communicet sive sacramentum sensibile affuerit sive non. Unde vana est concencio, quando et quomodo apostoli facti fuerant sacerdotes, ut Ardmacanus libro II De Questionibus Armenorum recitat septem opiniones in ista materia. Prima dicit quod, quando Christus dixit eis Math. XVIII, 18: Quodcunque ligaveritis super terram erit ligatum et in celis, secunda dicit, quando in cena dixit apostolis de confeccione eukaristie, hoc facite in meam commemoracionem, de quo Luce XXII, 19; tercia opinio dicit quod, quando Christus inflavit in eos dicens: Accipite Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis, Joh. XX, 22, 23. Quarta opinio dicit quod die Penthecostes, quando Spiritus Sanctus apparuit eis in linguis** [33]**igneis Act. II; quinta opinio dicit quod in ascensione, quando dixit: Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos Matth, ult.; sexta opinio dicit quod, quando primo misit apostolos ad predicandum Matth. X, 8 dicit: Infirmos curate.**

But in the third principal place it is argued about the manner of committing powers, and also about the order and the loss of the powers of the church; and which power is more excellent than another. As to the first it is clear: since God gives every vicarial power, such as God alone communicates to a creature, it makes no difference whether God has communicated such power to a creature in a perceptible sign or by inward inspiration, since he must altogether communicate it imperceptibly, whether a perceptible sacrament is present or not. Hence the contention is vain over when and how the apostles were made priests, as Armachanus, in book 2 *On the Questions of the Armenians*, recites seven opinions on this matter.[1] The first says [it was] when Christ said to them, Matthew 18:18: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven"; the second says, when at the supper he said to the apostles, of the confection of the eucharist, "Do this for a commemoration of me", of which Luke 22:19; the third opinion says [it was] when Christ breathed on them, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they shall be forgiven them", John 20:22–23.[2] The fourth opinion says [it was] on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit appeared to them in tongues [33]**of fire, Acts 2; the fifth opinion says [it was] at the ascension, when he said: "Go, teach ye all nations: baptizing them", Matthew, the last [chapter]; the sixth opinion says [it was] when he first sent the apostles to preach, Matthew 10:8, [where] he says: "Heal the sick."[3]**

¶2 33.6–33.14

[33]**Sed doctor reprobat omnes istas sex opiniones per hoc quod, quando fecit eos apostolos dedit eis potestatem sui officii, que est potestas sacerdocii; nec sequitur quod primo, quando precipit eis hec facere, habuerunt huiusmodi potestatem. Nam Joh. IV, legitur quod vivente Baptista apostoli baptizarunt et sic predicarunt et multa sacerdotis officia ante mortem Christi exercuerant, cum Yudas fuit episcopus, ut dicitur Actuum primo.**

But the doctor rejects all these six opinions on the ground that, when he made them apostles, he gave them the power of their office, which is the power of the priesthood; nor does it follow that they first had power of this kind when he commanded them to do these things. For in John 4 it is read that while the Baptist was living the apostles baptized, and so they preached and had exercised many offices of a priest before Christ's death, since Judas was a bishop, as is said in Acts 1.[4]

¶3 33.15–34.6
34.7 *Fitzralph argues that they must have been made priests at once and completely, or the sacraments would be divisible.*
34.17 *There is no real objection to such division.*
34.27 *We must allow that powers are given according the need of each case,*
34.32 *We do not know what powers are necessary to a priest.*

[33] **In ista materia videntur mihi tria dicenda: Primo quod sentencia ista doctoris sit satis probabilis, secundo videtur mihi vanum nimis discutere quando apostoli baptizabantur, ordinabantur in sacerdotes vel sacramenta alia ministraverant sive receperant ultra quod est in evangelio expressatum. Scivit enim Christus quod infideles christiani signa querentes ad sacramentalia sensibilia, dimissa re sacramenti, attenderent; ideo de ministerio sacramentorum huiusmodi facit modicam mencionem, sed ut ego credo insensibiliter sine sacramento sensibili, tamquam primus magister ordinavit suos apostolos sacerdotes. Sic enim insensibiliter ordinavit Moysen in veteri testamento; ipse autem fuit sacerdos, licet non Aaronita sensibiliter ordinatus; et ita ignoramus locum; tempus et formam, quibus apostoli ordinati fuerant sacerdotes; debemus tamen credere quod si fuisset plus necessarium ad fidem** [34] **ecclesie, Spiritus Sanctus in evangelio expressisset. Unde vana curiositas videtur, plus quam evidenter ex scriptura elicitur, tractare huiusmodi questiones, sed ignoranciam nostram confitendo humiliter debemus gracias agere Deo; qui noticiam nostram sic salubriter moderavit.**

On this matter it seems to me that three things are to be said. First, that this teaching of the doctor is quite probable; second, it seems to me exceedingly vain to discuss when the apostles were baptized, were ordained priests, or ministered or received other sacraments, beyond what is expressed in the gospel.[5] For Christ knew that faithless Christians, seeking signs, would attend to perceptible sacramentals, letting go the reality of the sacrament; therefore he makes little mention of the ministry of sacraments of this kind; but, as I believe, he ordained his apostles priests imperceptibly, without a perceptible sacrament, as the first master. For so he imperceptibly ordained Moses in the old testament; and he was a priest, although not an Aaronite perceptibly ordained; and so we are ignorant of the place, time and form in which the apostles were ordained priests; yet we ought to believe that, if it had been more necessary to the faith [34] **of the church, the Holy Spirit would have expressed it in the gospel.[6] Hence it seems a vain curiosity to treat questions of this kind beyond what is evidently drawn from scripture; but, confessing our ignorance humbly, we ought to give thanks to God, who has so wholesomely moderated our knowledge.**

¶4 34.7–34.11

[34] **Sed tercio videtur doctorem arguere ex inconveniencia quod oportuit simul et plene fieri sacerdotes, quia aliter (ut inquit) sacramentum sacerdocii foret partibile et non indivisibile ut reliqua sacramenta.**

But thirdly the doctor seems to argue from an absurdity that they had to be made priests at once and fully, since otherwise (as he says) "the sacrament of priesthood would be divisible and not indivisible, like the other sacraments".[7]

¶5 34.12–35.16
35.5 *Our legislators should not burden the Church beyond what. Scripture clearly bids.*
35.12 *The Pope often errs in absolving or or excommunicating).*
35.21 *St. Paul tells us that our Lord grants various graces,*

[34] **Sed hic videtur mihi iuxta dicta de potestate ordinis quod, quotquot sunt genera officiorum presbyteri, tot sunt genera potestatum, ymo respectu cuiuscunque actus quem debet facere ex potestate huiusmodi est dare unam insensibilem; et omnes ille tamquam partes integrales vel aggregata eidem subiecto unam potestatem constituunt. Nec videtur illud insensibile sed signum sensibile quod facit ordinans esse ecclesiasticum sacramentum. Nec est inconveniens sed veritati consonum quod quotlibet parcialia constituunt unum sacramentum, licet sint disparium specierum, nam per se notum videtur fidelibus quod Deus posset dare homini potestatem ad unum et subtrahere potestatem ad aliud. Ex quibus sequitur cum dictis de quiditate potestatis, quod oportet dare particulares potestates secundum numerum obiectorum terminancium, quia diceretur aliter quod preter liberum arbitrium nemo acquireret vel perderet potestatem. Ulterius videtur incertum**

But here it seems to me, in keeping with what was said about the power of order, that as many as are the kinds of offices of a presbyter, so many are the kinds of powers; indeed, with respect to each act which he ought to do from power of this kind, there is one imperceptible [power] to be posited; and all of them, as integral parts, or as aggregated to the same subject, constitute one power.[8] And it seems that not that imperceptible [power] but the perceptible sign which the one ordaining makes is the ecclesiastical sacrament. Nor is it an absurdity, but consonant with truth, that any number of partial [powers] constitute one sacrament, although they are of disparate species; for it seems self-evident to the faithful that God could give a man power for one thing and withdraw power for another. From these, together with what has been said about the quiddity of power, it follows that one must posit particular powers according to the number of the terminating objects; for otherwise it would be said that

quantam potestatem oporteret viantem habere, ad hoc quod sit sacerdos, vel si omnes sacerdotes sunt paris [35] potestatis ordinis, quia certum est quod Deus dat vel non dat, ut sibi placuerit, ordinis potestatem. Unde caracterem sacerdotalis ordinis supponimus communiter consequi par officium sacerdotis. In qua materia vellem nostros solempnizantes constituciones humanas ad fidem scripture et puram racionem attendere et non amplius fingere ad onus ecclesie, nisi quod exinde scirent clare deducere, quia potissimum in talibus quod summus sacerdos potest facere, est mereri vel preconizare quod tale sit Dei iudicium, a quo sensu sepe exorbitat; ideo sepe creditur quod absolvit vel excommunicat, et tamen totum contrarium evenit aput Deum, et dum nos viantes sumus ecclesie triumphanti contrarii, necesse est quod sit controversia in universali ecclesia.

apart from free choice no one would acquire or lose power.[9] Further, it seems uncertain how much power one on the road would need to have in order to be a priest, or whether all priests are of equal [35] power of order, since it is certain that God gives or does not give the power of order as it pleases him. Hence we commonly suppose that the character of priestly order follows upon an equal office of priest.[10] In this matter I would wish our men who solemnize human constitutions to attend to the faith of scripture and to pure reason, and not to feign more, to the burden of the church, than they could clearly deduce from there; for the most that the highest priest can do in such things is to merit, or to proclaim, that such is God's judgment, from which sense he often strays; therefore it is often believed that he absolves or excommunicates, and yet the whole contrary comes about with God; and while we who are on the road are contrary to the church triumphant, there must be controversy in the universal church.[11]

¶6 35.17–36.27
36.3 *which he enumerates,* 36.10
1. Apostles.

[35] Quantum ad tercium, scilicet ordinem potestatum, dicitur communiter quod sicut sunt novem ordines angelorum, sic sunt novem ordines potestatum; et hoc elicitur ex Apostolo I. Corinth. XII, 6 ubi declarans unitatem corporis ecclesie ostendit, primo quod divisio graciarum, ministracionum et operacionum procedit ab uno spirituali Domino, qui operatur in omnibus; oportet enim graciam precedere, que sit principium ministrandi in clericis et operandi in laycis. Spiritus autem dat graciam, Dominus recipit ministracionem, Deus exigit ministracionem. Alii, inquit, per Spiritum datur sermo sapiencie, alii vero sermo sciencie secundum eundem Spiritum. Alteri fides in eodem Spiritu, alii gracia sanitatum in uno Spiritu, alii [36] operacio virtutum, alii prophecia, alii discrecio Spirituum, alii genera linguarum, alii interpretacio sermonum. Et hec novem videtur Apostolus consequenter ordine suo in subiectis suis exprimere. Quosdam, inquit, Deus posuit in ecclesia, primo apostolos, secundo prophetas, tercio doctores, demum virtutes, exinde gracias curacionum, opitulacioues, gubernaciones, genera linguarum, interpretaciones sermonum. Que novem videntur aptanda novem prioribus. Apostoli autem sunt primi post Christum, quorum officium est preeminenter secundum sapienciam et missionem capitis ministrare, et eorum officium gerunt episcopi, sicut dicitur papam gerere vicem Christi. Nec oportet contendere circa gradum disposicionis requisite ad esse apostoli, quia certum est quod est latitudo supereminentis disposicionis ad statum apostolicum requisita, qua deficiente non est apostolus sive episcopus; nec

As to the third, namely the order of powers, it is commonly said that, just as there are nine orders of angels, so there are nine orders of powers; and this is drawn from the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 12:6, where, declaring the unity of the body of the church, he shows first that the division of graces, of ministries and of operations proceeds from one spiritual Lord, "who worketh all in all"; for grace must come first, which is the principle of ministering in clerics and of working in laymen.[12] And the Spirit gives grace, the Lord receives ministry, God demands ministry.[13] "To one indeed," he says, "by the Spirit, is given the word of wisdom: and to another, the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit: to another, faith in the same spirit: to another, the grace of healing in one Spirit: to another [36] the working of miracles: to another, prophecy: to another, the discerning of spirits: to another, diverse kinds of tongues: to another, interpretation of speeches." And these nine the Apostle seems to express in sequence, in their order, in his subjects. "God," he says, "hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors: after that miracles: then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches."[14] Which nine seem to be fitted to the nine before. And the apostles are first after Christ; their office is to minister pre-eminently according to the wisdom and the mission of the head; and the bishops bear their office, as the pope is said to bear the place of Christ.[15] Nor need one contend about the degree of disposition required for being an apostle, since it is certain that there is a latitude

requiritur quod Christus viando ipsum elegerit, ut patet de Paulo, Barnaba, Luca, Marco et Matthia; nec obest quod habeat multa officia, cum debeat propinquius sequi Christum assumentem summe ministratorie officium septem ordinum, ut patet libro IV capitulo VIII. Ideo officia cleri debent esse supereminenter in apostolis aggregata, sicut sapiencia excedit alia bona.

of surpassing disposition required for the apostolic state, and where it is lacking there is no apostle or bishop; nor is it required that Christ chose him while on the way, as is clear of Paul, Barnabas, Luke, Mark and Matthias; nor does it stand in the way that he has many offices, since he ought to follow more nearly Christ, who took on himself, in the highest and most ministering way, the office of the seven orders, as is clear in book IV, chapter 8.[16] Therefore the offices of the clergy ought to be aggregated in the apostles in a surpassing way, as wisdom exceeds the other goods.

Notes

1. Richard FitzRalph (Armachanus, archbishop of Armagh), *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* II; Loserth gives no chapter; the place is not in book II of the Paris 1512 print, which concerns the Messiah. He lists six opinions to reject them; the seventh is his own (¶2). A and B in marg.: *Apostoli quando facti sunt sacerdotes*; B reads *dicit quod* (32.26).
2. Matt. 18:18 (Wyclif's *Quodcunque ligaveritis ... erit ligatum*, singular, for the Vulgate's *quaecumque alligaveritis ... erunt ligata*); Luke 22:19; John 20:22–23, where the Vulgate has *remittuntur* (DR "they are forgiven"); Wyclif's future *remittentur* is translated.
3. Acts 2:3. Matt. 28:19 (editor's reference): the Vulgate has *euntes ergo docete* (DR "Going therefore, teach ye"); Wyclif's *Ite, docete* is translated. Matt. 10:8.
4. John 4:1–2 ("though Jesus himself did not baptize, but his disciples"); Acts 1:20, "his bishopric (*episcopatum*) let another take", of Judas. T. The print's stop after *facere* (33.10) falls inside the sentence and is disregarded.
5. Three things are announced, but only *Primo* and *secundo* are marked; the third is taken to be the conclusion *debemus tamen credere ...* (33.32), that what scripture does not express was not necessary to the church's faith.
6. Moses as priest: Ps. 98:6, "Moses and Aaron among his priests". A and B in marg.: *Moises fuit sacerdos, non Aaronita*. C. *Infideles christiani* renders *infideles* with "faithless" (glossary: *infidelis*): Christians who lack faith, not unbelievers outside the church.
7. *Inconveniencia* here is an absurdity in argument (glossary: CONTEXTUAL): FitzRalph's reductio, that otherwise priesthood would be divisible. The quotation follows Loserth's italics. B in marg.: *de unitate sacerdotalis ordinis*.
8. *Est dare unam insensibilem*: the scholastic *est dare*, "there is one to be posited"; the feminine agrees with *potestatem* understood. *Partes integrales*: integral parts, which make up a whole by aggregation, as against subjective parts.
9. *Obiectorum terminancium*: the objects in which each power terminates; a power is counted by its objects (cf. 24.8, 02-a). B reads *ex quiditate* (34.27) and *quoniam preter* (34.30); A *oportet* for *oporteret* (34.33).
10. *Consequi par officium*: the character of order is supposed to follow an equal office, so that all priests are equal in the power of order; Wyclif doubts that this is certain.
11. *Solempnizantes constituciones humanas*: those who make human constitutions solemn, the canonists and legislators (Loserth's side-note: "our legislators"). *Summus sacerdos*, "the highest priest", is the pope (side-note 35.12).
12. 1 Cor. 12:4–6: "there are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit; ... diversities of ministries, but the same Lord; ... diversities of operations, but the same God, who worketh all in all" (Loserth refers to 12:5). A and B in marg.: *Novem genera potestatum*. B reads *spiritu alio dominio* (35.23–24).
13. *Deus exigit ministracionem* (35.27) repeats the noun of the clause before; the Pauline triad (12:4–6) assigns operations (*operaciones*) to God, and *operacionem* may be the true reading. Translated as printed. B reads *recepit* for *recipit*.
14. 1 Cor. 12:8–10; 12:28, where the Vulgate has *exinde doctores, deinde virtutes*; Wyclif's *tercio ... demum* is followed by DR's "thirdly ... after that". *Virtutes* is DR's "miracles". A and B in marg. at 36.14: *Prima ierarchia*.
15. *Capitis*: of the head, Christ. *Gerere vicem Christi*, "to bear the place of Christ", the formula of the vicar.
16. Loserth prints *habeat* (36.22); the codices read *habeant*, as the plural *apostoli*. S. Loserth says the place is not found in book IV (*De civili dominio* II), but it is there: ch. 8 (ed. Loserth, p. 73), where Wyclif names the seven orders and says that Christ gathered every mode of correction in himself, exercising it *ministratorie*. Barnabas, Acts 14:13; Matthias, Acts 1:26. "The seven orders": the seven orders of the church, which Christ is said to have fulfilled in his own person (so Lombard, *Sent.* IV d.24, of each order: *hoc officio usus est Christus*).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 32: ∅ (English side-note word (it))
  - 32: *18*
  - 32: *facite*
  - 32: ∅ (re-/miseritis is one word, already whole at pos 192 (remiseritis))
  - 32: *Quarta*

- **33: *Primo***
- **33: *probabilis* (hyphenated pro-/babilis; main token covers whole word) [NW]**
- **33: *Aaronita* (30 is the line number)**
- **34: *hic***
- **35: *datur***
- **36: *prophecia***
- **36: *primo***
- **36: *opitulacioues* (print has open-topped u for n (misprint), zoomed on leaf 97) [NW]**
- **36: *debent* (25 is the line number glued on) [NW]**
- **32: *communicaverit creature quia* (three words; comma after creature not carried)**
- **35: *attendere* (one word, print = attendere)**

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 5 Num. VI, 27. (32.33); reference 3. Matth. XXVIII, 19. (33.33).**

Part 4: The nine gifts: prophets, doctors, the second and third hierarchies, the body

Loserth pp. 36.28–40.30

¶1 36.28–37.11

36.28 *2. Prophets.* 37.12 *3. Doctors.* 37.19 *A second hierarchy. 1. Lower members of the Church who manifest the Spirit by various virtues.*

[36]**In secundo gradu ponuntur prophete, qui possunt intelligi secundum scienciam evangelizantes prophecias de preterito et futuro; predicatores quidem debent procul fari vulgo abscondita, et secundum scienciam aptare auditorio** [37]**sermonem; et sic habuerunt apostoli alciorem propheciam, vivaciorem et magis fructiferam quam prophete veteris testamenti, ut patet II. Petri I; et illud credo esse supremum officium apostolorum ad extra post sapiencialem contemplacionem ad intra, ideo Christus et eius apostoli instanter exercuerunt illud officium, ut patet Marc. ult, et I. Corinth. I. Et ad istum sensum intelligunt quidam illud Matth. XXIII, 34: Ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas, sapientes et scribas et apostolos et evangelistas.**

In the second degree are placed the prophets, who can be understood as those who, according to knowledge, preach as gospel prophecies of the past and of the future; for preachers indeed ought to speak out from afar things hidden from the common people, and according to knowledge to fit their [37]**sermon to the audience; and so the apostles had a higher prophecy, more lively and more fruitful, than the prophets of the old testament, as is clear from 2 Peter 1; and I believe this to be the highest office of the apostles outwardly, after wise contemplation inwardly; therefore Christ and his apostles exercised that office urgently, as is clear from the last chapter of Mark and from 1 Corinthians 1.[1] And in this sense some understand that of Matthew 23:34: "Behold I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes and apostles and evangelists."[2]**

¶2 37.12–37.18

[37]**In tercio autem gradu sunt doctores qui seorsum ad partem sive scolastice sive private docent evangelizatum vel prophetizatum publice. Et illis correspondet donum fidei, cum debent constanter docere rudes instar Christi, qui domi docebat suas predicatas parabolas, ut patet Marc. IV.**

And in the third degree are the doctors, who apart, to one side, whether in the schools or privately, teach what has been preached as gospel or prophesied publicly. And to them corresponds the gift of faith, since they must steadfastly teach the unlearned after the likeness of Christ, who at home taught the parables he had preached, as is clear from Mark 4.[3]

¶3 37.19–38.20

38.5 *2, Those who heal the sick,* 38.12 *3. Who aid the poor.* 38.21 *Third hierarchy. Prelates who need 1. discernment of Spirits, 2. tongnes, 3. and their interpretation.*

[37]**Habito itaque pastu triplici secundum primam yerarchiam recipientem a Deo sibi tres gradus exemplariter ad primam yerarchiam celestem, consequenter ponit quomodo suffragatur virtus inferior. Et omnia ista manifestant quomodo Deus qui est spiritus rutilat varie in hominibus donis suis. Sicut enim fumus indicat ignem a quo efficitur, sic quelibet creatura habens variabiliter lumen virtutis sicut radius dicit lucem. Ideo Apostolus vocat hec**

Having thus [treated] the threefold feeding according to the first hierarchy, which receives from God three degrees on the pattern of the first heavenly hierarchy, he next sets out how the lower power aids.[4] And all these show how God, who is a spirit, shines variously in men by his gifts. For as smoke indicates the fire by which it is produced, so every creature that has the light of power in varying measure declares the light,

dona manifestacionem spiritus. Alii autem habent virtutem ut Deus faciat per eos mirabilia; per hoc enim spiritus pascitur et virtus anime roboratur, sed hoc est modicum in comparacione ad priora, sicut modicum sit quod Spiritus Sanctus apparuit apostolis in linguis igneis, nisi eos illustrasset interius; [38] talem autem virtutem habuerunt patres in primitiva ecclesia plus vel minus. Sed non ascribebant sibi virtutes nisi ut organis ex humilitate magis capacibus. In secundo vero gradu secunde yerarchie est gracia curandi corporaliter infirmos, et sic duo sensus extremi, scilicet visus et tactus, in ordine ad animam erant pasti. Unus autem sensus quoad ordinem dignitatis et propinquitatem ad spiritum est prior, sed alius sensus genere, generalitate et carnis propinquitate preponitur. Sed alie due habent virtutem opitulandi egentibus, pascendi medios cunctos sensus; et hoc fit firmitate fidei, qua auditur, adoratur et gustatur Christus in membris. Apostolus enim corporalis elemosyne pascit tres sensus medios quo auditur vox Christi Matth. XXV, 40: Quamdiu uni de minimis meis fecistis, mihi fecistis, tunc enim Christi bonus odor sumus Deo, si gustamus internam Christi dulcedinem.

as a ray does. Therefore the Apostle calls these gifts "the manifestation of the Spirit".[5] And others have the power that God works wonders through them; for by this the spirit is fed and the power of the soul strengthened, but this is little in comparison with the former, just as it would be little that the Holy Spirit appeared to the apostles in tongues of fire, had he not enlightened them inwardly; [38] and such power the fathers in the primitive church had, more or less. But they ascribed the powers to themselves only as to instruments made more capable by humility. And in the second degree of the second hierarchy is the grace of healing the sick bodily, and so the two outermost senses, namely sight and touch, were fed in their order to the soul. And the one sense, as to the order of dignity and nearness to the spirit, is prior, but the other sense is put before it in kind, in generality and in nearness to the flesh. But the other two have the power of helping the needy, of feeding all the middle senses; and this is done by the firmness of faith, by which Christ is heard, worshipped and tasted in his members.[6] For the apostle of bodily alms feeds the three middle senses, in that the voice of Christ is heard, Matthew 25:40: "As long as you did it to one of my least, you did it to me"; for then "we are the good odour of Christ unto God" (2 Corinthians 2:15), if we taste the inward sweetness of Christ.[7]

¶4 38.21–39.5
39.5 *These gifts correspond to the members of the body.*
39.24 *Interdependence of all members;*

[38] Sed quoad terciam yerarchiam, qua populus a prepositis regulatur, Deus dedit quibusdam gubernaciones sicut prepositis utriusque membrorum ecclesie; ad quod requiritur discrecio donorum spiritualium et per consequens spirituum movencium ad illud officium, ponendo; servando et protegendo quemlibet in illo gradu, ad quem Deus per dona sua disposuit; hoc enim maxime pertinet ad officium prelatorum. Et quia homo est naturaliter animal communicativum in sermonibus et civile, ideo oportet secundo quod talis prepositure curatus habeat genera linguarum, [39] quibus communicabit cum subditis, quia aliter foret eis barbarus. Nec hoc sufficit, cum avis posset voces formare, ideo requiritur ultimo interpretacio sermonum, nam viva vox habet ex cooperacione spiritus multum latentis energie.

Now as to the third hierarchy, by which the people is ruled by superiors, God gave to some governments, as to the superiors of both [kinds] of the church's members; for this is required the discerning of spiritual gifts, and consequently of the spirits that move [men] to that office, by placing, keeping and protecting each one in that degree to which God has disposed him by his gifts; for this pertains most of all to the office of prelates.[8] And since man is by nature an animal that communicates in speech, and a civil one, therefore it is needful secondly that the curate of such an office of superior have kinds of tongues, [39] by which he will communicate with his subjects, since otherwise he would be a barbarian to them. Nor is this enough, since a bird could form sounds; therefore lastly the interpretation of speeches is required, for the living voice has, from the cooperation of the spirit, much hidden energy.[9]

¶5 39.6–39.23

[39] Et aptantur hec novem dona spiritualia ad membra humani corporis, ita quod trinarius prime yerarchie correspondeat cerebro, in quo sunt tres ventriculi vasa lucidorum spirituum, et quinque sensuum interiorum, quibus sapiencia, id est Dei noticia, tamquam

And these nine spiritual gifts are fitted to the members of the human body, so that the triad of the first hierarchy corresponds to the brain, in which are three ventricles, vessels of the lucid spirits and of the five inner senses, by which wisdom, that is, the knowledge of God, is perceived

sol vel dies ad intra percipitur. Sed organa quinque spirituum situatorum in capite figurant secundum spiritum dicentem scienciam mundanorum, collum vero quod est organum vociferandi signat donum fidei ex auditu, sed in regione pectoralium cor, stomachus et pulmo ex proprietate correspondent secundo trinario. In regione vero nutritivorum splen et intestina correspondent tercie yerarchie, ymo sicut Apostolus factus est omnia omnibus, ut omnia lucrifaceret; sic non est membrum ecclesie, quin pertinenter possit cuicunque membro corporis cooperari.

inwardly as the sun or the day. But the organs of the five spirits situated in the head figure the second, the spirit that speaks the knowledge of worldly things; and the neck, which is the organ of uttering, signifies the gift of faith that comes by hearing; but in the region of the breast the heart, stomach and lung correspond by their property to the second triad.[10] And in the region of the nutritive [members] the spleen and intestines correspond to the third hierarchy; indeed, as the Apostle "became all things to all", that he might gain all, so there is no member of the church that cannot fittingly cooperate with any member of the body whatever.[11]

¶6 39.24–40.17
40.4 *all are bound, to serve Christ, each in his own way.*

[39] Triplex tamen conveniencia et triplex differencia est notanda. Sicut enim membra constituunt unum corpus cui anima copulatur, et iterum sicut omne membrum est cuicunque necessarium, cum iuvant se reciproce in suis officiis, sic est de membris ecclesie ex vi communionis et vinculo caritatis. Tercio vero sicut membra se habent in suo regimine, sic et membra ecclesie, cum secundum Crist. Omel. XXII Operis Imperfecti homo sit liber quidam, cui tota religio christiana [40] inscribitur. Sicut igitur est affinitas capitis ad pedes, sic racio et affeccio connectuntur, sicut eciam omne membrum nobile vel ignobile sine contencione servit spiritui, sic omne membrum ecclesie sine contencione minoritatis et obediencie servit Christo, et sicut membra preeminencia non de sua nobilitate superbiunt, sed faciunt suum officium secundum regimen anime ad suffragium singulorum, sic debet esse de membris ecclesie; oculi quidem et facies carent tali tegimine, ne velatum deturpent et preparent ad ruinam: sic Christus et apostoli ex fervore caritatis et alienacione a fervore cupiditatis non erant temporalibus seculariter involuti. Sed membra minus nobilia ut pudenda sunt absconsius, multiplicius et tenerius cooperta, et sic est de contemptibilibus per quos feces ecclesie expurgantur.

Yet a threefold agreement and a threefold difference must be noted. For as the members make up one body to which the soul is joined, and again as every member is necessary to every other, since they help one another in their offices, so it is with the members of the church by force of communion and the bond of charity. And thirdly, as the members behave in their governance, so too do the members of the church, since according to Chrysostom, homily 22 of the *Opus imperfectum*, "man is a kind of book in which the whole Christian religion [40] is written".[12] As therefore there is an affinity of the head to the feet, so reason and affection are joined; and as every member, noble or ignoble, serves the spirit without contention, so every member of the church serves Christ without contention over lesser standing and obedience; and as the members of preeminence do not grow proud of their nobility but do their office according to the governance of the soul for the aid of each, so it should be with the members of the church.[13] The eyes indeed and the face lack such covering, lest a veil disfigure them and prepare them for ruin: so Christ and the apostles, from the fervour of charity and estrangement from the fervour of covetousness, were not entangled in temporal goods in a worldly way. But the less noble members, like the private parts, are covered more hiddenly, more manifoldly and more tenderly, and so it is with the contemptible persons by whom the dregs of the church are purged.[14]

¶7 40.18–40.30

[40] Alii autem dividunt membra ecclesie in spiritualia vel dextera sicut clerum et membra corporalia vel sinistra ut laycos, et prima pars que debet esse ut tectum domus ecclesie, eo quod non capit in se incisionem dominii, remanet indivisa. Sed secunda pars dividitur in prepositos et operarios ut parietes et fundamentum ecclesie, et sic habemus

And others divide the members of the church into spiritual or right-hand, such as the clergy, and bodily or left-hand, such as the laity; and the first part, which ought to be like the roof of the house of the church, because it does not admit into itself the cutting up of lordship, remains undivided. But the second part is divided into superiors and workers,

tres yerarchias ecclesie cum suis subdivisionibus, in partem infimam, mediam et supremam. Alii autem ex textu apostoli trahunt novem partes ecclesie ad novem partes simplices et spermaticas in humano corpore et alii aptant ipsas ad organa propter conveniencias naturales.

like the walls and foundation of the church, and so we have three hierarchies of the church with their subdivisions, into a lowest, a middle and a highest part. And others draw from the Apostle's text nine parts of the church [answering] to the nine simple and spermatic parts in the human body, and others fit them to the organs on account of natural correspondences.[15]

Notes

1. ***Procul fari***, "to speak out from afar", plays on the etymology of ***propheta*** as one who speaks forth or from afar (Isidore, ***Etym.*** 7.8.1, PL 82, 283B: prophets are ***quasi praefatores, quia porro fantur***, who foresaw ***ea quae in mysterio abscondita erant***). ***Secundum scienciam*** echoes "the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:8). Wyclif is following the order of 1 Cor. 12:28 (DR "first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors"). 2 Pet. 1:19 ("the more firm prophetical word"); Mark 16:20; 1 Cor. 1:17 ("Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel"); Wyclif gives chapters only.
2. Matt. 23:34. The Vulgate has only ***prophetas, et sapientes, et scribas*** (DR "prophets and wise men and scribes"); ***et apostolos et evangelistas*** is not in it (cf. Luke 11:49, ***prophetas et apostolos***). Wyclif's added words are translated.
3. The third degree of 1 Cor. 12:28 (DR "thirdly doctors"); the gift of faith, 1 Cor. 12:9; Mark 4:34 (DR "but apart, he explained all things to his disciples"). B omits ***doctores***; A in marg.: ***tercius*** (37.12).
4. The three degrees of the first hierarchy (apostles, prophets, doctors) are patterned, as Wyclif says (***exemplariter ad primam yerarchiam celestem***), on the first of the three angelic hierarchies of Pseudo-Dionysius, ***De caelesti hierarchia*** 6.2 (thrones, cherubim, seraphim). "He" is the Apostle, whose list (1 Cor. 12:28) Wyclif now follows into the second hierarchy, DR "miracles ... graces of healings, helps". ***Virtus*** here is "power" in the sense of those "miracles" (***virtutes***), the "working of miracles" (***operatio virtutum***) of 12:10. AB in marg.: ***Ierarchia secunda*** (37.29).
5. 1 Cor. 12:7 (DR "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit"); John 4:24 ("God is a spirit"); the tongues of fire, Acts 2:3.
6. ***Alie due***, "the other two", does not fit the count: one gift (helps, ***opitulaciones***) remains in this hierarchy, and the middle senses are three; the reference is uncertain. ***Adoratur***, "worshipped", stands in a list of the middle senses (hearing, smell, taste) where ***odoratur***, "smelled", is expected, and the next sentence turns on "odour"; the print is translated.
7. ***Apostolus ... corporalis elemosyne***, "the apostle of bodily alms", is translated as printed; the phrase is doubtful (perhaps one who gives bodily alms). Matt. 25:40, where the Vulgate reads ***uni ex his fratribus meis minimis*** (DR "to one of these my least brethren"); Wyclif's shorter words are translated. 2 Cor. 2:15 is the reference printed in the margin (38.32).
8. ***Prepositis utriusque membrorum ecclesie***: "both" is taken to mean the two kinds of members, clergy and laity (cf. ¶7). The gifts are those of 1 Cor. 12:10, 28 (DR "the discerning of spirits"; "governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches"). AB in marg.: ***Tertia ierarchia***; A in marg. sup.: ***Membra ecclesie quam habent similitudinem ad membra corporis humani*** (38.18).
9. Aristotle, ***Politics*** 1.2, 1253a2–18 (man a political animal; speech, not mere voice, proper to man); 1 Cor. 14:11 (DR "I shall be to him to whom I speak a barbarian"). ***Curatus*** here is the one charged with such an office of superior, not only a parish priest.
10. ***Figurant secundum spiritum dicentem scienciam mundanorum***: ***secundum*** is taken as "the second [gift]", knowledge, after wisdom (1 Cor. 12:8); it may instead be the preposition: "figure, according to the spirit, [the gift] that speaks the knowledge of worldly things". ***Quinque spirituum*** may stand for the five outer senses. "Faith that comes by hearing": Rom. 10:17.
11. Loserth queries ***coequari***, "be matched with", for the printed ***cooperari*** (39.23); the print is translated. 1 Cor. 9:22 (DR "I became all things to all men, that I might save all"); ***ut omnia lucrifaceret*** echoes ***ut infirmos lucrifacerem*** in the same verse. Wyclif's words are translated.
12. Pseudo-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 22; Loserth: Chrysostom, ***Opera*** (ed. Migne) VI (Migne's Chrysostom vol. VI = PG 56; the column is illegible in the OCR of Loserth's foot). B in marg.: ***Membrum*** (39.30).
13. ***Sine contencione minoritatis et obediencie***: taken as contention over lesser standing and obedience (no member disputes its lower place); the genitives may instead describe the service itself, "without contention, in lowliness and obedience". A in marg. numbers the three agreements 1, 2, 3 (40.1, 40.4, 40.6).
14. 1 Cor. 12:23 (DR "those that are our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness"); ***temporalibus seculariter involuti*** recalls 2 Tim. 2:4 (DR "No man, being a soldier to God, entangleth himself with secular businesses").
15. "Simple and spermatic parts": the homogeneous parts of the body (bone, flesh, nerve and the like), which medieval medicine held to be formed from the seed, as against the composite organs (***organa***) of the next clause.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 36: ***preterito***
  - 37: ***ego*** (print: Ecce ego mitto; missing from main scan)
  - 37: ***ad*** (print: exemplariter ad primam; missing from main scan)
  - 37: ∅ (25 is the line number)

- **37: *linguis***
- **38: ∅ (English side-note word)**
- **38: *mihi* (h ascender clear, zoomed)**
- **40: *inscribitur***

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 17. II. Cor. II, i5. (38.32).**

Part 5: Body and church compared; power lost by mortal sin

Loserth pp. 40.31–43.9

¶1 40.31–42.5
40.31 *Difference between membership of the body and of the Church.*
41.20 *Members who tall into mortal sin lose their power.*
42.26 *Although the wicked lose power, the righteous may profit by their ministrations,*

[40]**Sed quomodocunque loquimur, est notanda diversitas inter membra istorum corporum. Prima, cum partes ecclesie continuantur per graciam, non respiciunt posicionem vel ubicacionem situs** [41] **corporei ut membra hominis; secunda cum membra sint mistica, non repugnat sed convenit quod unum membrum habeat diversorum generum officia; homo enim est quasi universitas, ideo sibi convenit instanter agere quantum potest. Tercia diversitas est, licet membra ecclesie habeant virtutes influxas a Christo, sicut membra corporis habent virtutes influxas ab anima, a quibus ponuntur in esse membrorum, tamen influencia prior et membrorum operacio est voluntaria et graciosa et meritoria, et secundo influencia anime et membrorum operacio sunt naturales et permanencius perdurantes; licet enim membrum ecclesie posset facillime mutari ex sua vertibilitate ab uno membro in aliud vel ex variacione operis desinere esse membrum vivum, hoc tamen non potest contingere ex differencia spiritus influentis, unde quia tota materia ista est insensibilis, est plena illusione zophistica. Sed quantum ad ultimum scilicet perdicionem potencie, videtur, cum potestas illa sit licencia operandi, quod generaliter perditur per mortale, cum sit illicitum tali aliquid operari. Et ista videtur sentencia beati Gregorii posita in decretis XI, q. III: Ipse, inquit, ligandi atque solvendi potestate se privat, qui hanc pro suis voluntatibus et non subditorum moribus exercet. Et sequitur: Iudicare digne de subditis nequeunt, qui in subditorum causis sua vel odio vel gracia sequuntur. Tunc, inquit vera est absolucio presidentis, cum interni sequitur arbitrium iudicis, quod bene quadriduani mortui resuscitacio illa signat, quia prius Dominus mortuum suscitavit** [42] **et vivificavit dicens: Lazare, veni foras et postmodum is, qui vivus fuerat, egressus a discipulis est solutus. Et patet cum cursu ecclesie quomodo maior pars ecclesie tam in foro penitencie quam iuris caret potestate iudicii.**

But however we speak, a diversity must be noted between the members of these bodies.[1] The first: since the parts of the church are continuous by grace, they do not regard the position or location of bodily [41] **place, as the members of a man do; the second: since the members are mystical, it is not repugnant but fitting that one member have offices of diverse kinds; for man is as it were a universe, therefore it befits him to act urgently as much as he can. The third diversity is that, although the members of the church have powers flowed in from Christ, as the members of the body have powers flowed in from the soul, by which they are set in the being of members, yet the former influence and the members' operation is voluntary, gracious and meritorious, and in the second the influence of the soul and the operation of the members are natural and endure more permanently; for although a member of the church could very easily be changed, by its changeability, from one member into another, or by a variation of its work cease to be a living member, yet this cannot happen from a difference in the spirit flowing in; hence, since this whole matter is imperceptible, it is full of sophistical illusion.[2] But as to the last [point], namely the loss of power, it seems, since that power is a licence to act, that it is generally lost by mortal [sin], since it is unlawful for such a one to do anything.[3] And this seems to be the teaching of blessed Gregory placed in the Decretum, C. 11 q. 3: "He deprives himself," he says, "of the power of binding and loosing, who exercises it for his own wishes and not for the conduct of his subjects." And it follows: "They cannot judge worthily of their subjects, who in their subjects' cases follow their own hatred or favour." "Then," he says, "is the absolution of the one presiding true, when it follows the judgement of the inward judge; which that raising of the man four days dead well signifies, for the Lord first raised the dead man** [42] **and gave him life, saying, 'Lazarus, come forth', and afterwards he who had come out alive was loosed by the disciples."[4] And it is clear**

from the course of the church how the greater part of the church, both in the court of penance and in that of law, lacks the power of judgement.[5]

¶2 42.6–42.16

[42]Confirmatur secundo ex hoc quod potestas talis cum dativo a Deo ad tam excellens ministerium, est quoddam singulare privilegium. Sed secundum beatum Gregorium ibidem: privilegium omnino meretur amittere qui permissa sibi abutitur potestate. Cum igitur quilibet potentatus abutitur sua potestate, dum illam exercuerit in mortali, videtur quod meretur potestatem talem amittere, et cum Deus qui dat insensibiliter potestatem non defert meritum sive dignum, videtur quod eo ipso Deus aufert ab homine potestatem.

It is confirmed secondly from this, that such power, [given] by God for so excellent a ministry, is a certain singular privilege.[6] Now according to blessed Gregory in the same place, "he deserves to lose his privilege altogether, who abuses the power permitted him". Since therefore every potentate abuses his power while he exercises it in mortal [sin], it seems that he deserves to lose such power; and since God, who gives power imperceptibly, does not defer what is merited or deserved, it seems that by that very fact God takes the power away from the man.[7]

¶3 42.17–42.33

[42]Item, Deus potest auferre licenciam vel potestatem ab homine pro delicto, sed quando auferret graciosus dominus si non quando se ipsum dampnificat per abusum ad quod non habet licenciam? ideo cum nemo potest abuti tali licencia nec virtute, videtur quod Gregorius equivocat vocando potestatem, posse vel potenciam aut liberum arbitrium, et alias vocat potestatem amissam ipsam licenciam. Et idem videtur ex decreto beati Augustini posito XXIV, q. prima, ubi dicit omnes hereticos, id est, peccato mortali ab ecclesia divisos, non habere aliquid potestatis. Sed notandum est; ut alias declaravi, quod opus heretici vertitur dignis ad commodum, sicut Deus per se supplet, quando prepositi excommunicati a Deo subditis suis deficiunt.

Again, God can take away a licence or power from a man for a fault; but when would a gracious lord take it away, if not when the man harms himself by an abuse for which he has no licence? Therefore, since no one can abuse such a licence or power, it seems that Gregory speaks equivocally, calling "power" the capacity or power or free choice, and elsewhere calling the power that is lost the licence itself.[8] And the same seems [to follow] from the decree of blessed Augustine placed at C. 24 q. 1, where he says that "all heretics", "that is, those divided from the church by mortal sin, have nothing of power".[9] But it must be noted, as I have declared elsewhere, that the work of a heretic is turned to the profit of the worthy, as God supplies by himself when superiors excommunicated by God fail their subjects.[10]

¶4 43.1–43.9
43.1 *The greatest power God grants is that of predestination.*

[43]Et ex istis videtur quod potestas predestinacionis (de qua Joh. primo et sepe alibi) est maxima potestas, quam Deus communicat viatori. Potestas autem, quam Deus dat beato ad plene fruendum dominio, et in ipso qualis creatura est potestas hominis consumata, de qua quidam intelligunt illud Matth. ult: Data est mihi omnis potestas in celo et in terra, beati enim habent fructum cuiuslibet potestatis.

And from these things it seems that the power of predestination (of which John 1 and often elsewhere) is the greatest power that God communicates to the wayfarer.[11] And the power which God gives to the blessed for the full enjoyment of lordship, and in him, such as a creature is, is the consummated power of man, of which some understand that of the last chapter of Matthew: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth"; for the blessed have the fruit of every power.[12]

Notes

1. B in marg.: *Diversitas in membris corporis organici et ecclesie* (40.31). The "last" point taken up in ¶1 is the loss of powers, announced earlier in the chapter.
2. *Influxas*, "flowed in" (glossary: *influere*); *influencia*, "influence". *Influencia prior ... et secundo influencia anime*: "the former" is Christ's inflow into the church, "the second" the soul's into the body. *Universitas*: man as a whole world in little.
3. *Perdicionem potencie ... potestas illa*: Wyclif uses *potencia* and *potestas* of the same thing here, "power" both times. *Per mortale*: by mortal sin, as *in mortali* at 42.11. B in marg.: *Perdere potestatem*; A in marg.: *Potestatem homo perdit per peccatum mortale* (41.20).

4. Gregory, *Hom. in Evang.* 26.5–6, as excerpted in the Decretum, C. 11 q. 3 cc. 60–62 (Loserth "Decreti secunda pars, Causa XI, q. III, cap. LX–LXII"; the modern form is ours; PL 187, 861B–862A; the homily is PL 76, 1200B–C). John 11:43–44 (DR "Lazarus, come forth"; "Loose him"). The printed *Indicare* (41.27) is read as *iudicare*, "judge".
5. *Cum cursu ecclesie*: "from the course of the church", its present practice. *Tam in foro penitencie quam iuris*: the court of penance and the court of law.
6. *Cum dativo* (42.7) does not construe; the plate confirms the print. We take the sense to be "given" (perhaps for *cum detur* or *tamquam data*) and supply it in brackets.
7. Gregory, as excerpted in the Decretum, C. 11 q. 3 c. 63 (*Idem in Regesto*; PL 187, 862A; Loserth "Ibid. cap. LXIII"); the maxim is Pope Simplicius's, and Gratian gives it under his name at D. 74 c. 7. *Non defert meritum sive dignum*: "does not defer", i.e. delays no requital; it may instead mean "does not pay regard to".
8. *Vocando potestatem, posse vel potenciam aut liberum arbitrium*: in one place Gregory's "power" names the bare capacity (*posse*, *potencia*), which no sin removes, and in another the licence, which is lost; *potencia* is "power" in the sense of capacity. *Nec virtute*: *virtus* as faculty.
9. Decretum, C. 24 q. 1 c. 31 (*Didicimus*; Loserth, 42.27; PL 187, 1279C: *omnes omnino haereticos et schismaticos nil habere potestatis ac iuris*); Gratian's inscription is Cyprian, to Magnus, not Augustine as Wyclif has it. His italics run over the gloss *id est … divisos*, which may be Wyclif's own; we follow them.
10. *Ut alias declaravi*: the place is not identified.
11. John 1:12 (DR "he gave them power to be made the sons of God") is the likeliest reference. A in marg.: *Potestas predestinacionis est maxima potestas viatoris*; B in marg.: *Potestas predestinacionis maxima* (43.1).
12. *Dominio*: the manuscripts read *domino*, "for the full enjoyment of the Lord" (43.5); Loserth prints *dominio*, which we translate. *Et in ipso qualis creatura est*: taken as "in him, so far as a creature can have it"; the clause is compressed. Matt. 28:18 (Loserth). B in marg.: *Consummata potestas* (43.6).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 40: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 41: *illa*
  - 41: *subditis*
  - 41: *nequeunt*
  - 41: *qui*
  - 41: *in*
  - 41: *subditorum*
  - 41: *causis*
  - 41: *sua*
  - 42: *Lazare*
  - 42: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 42: *prepositi*
  - 43: *Joh* (abbreviation point dropped per no-trailing-punctuation rule)
  - 41: *sequuntur* (italic; stop after not carried)
- Translator's plate check: 42.7 *cum dativo* confirmed as printed (see note 6).

Chapter 3

Part 1: Peter's primacy: the sifting, the faith that fails not, the order of the names

Loserth pp. 43.11–47.26

¶1 43.11–45.12
43.11 *The power of the Pope.*
43.16 *We must first decide which of the apostles held the primacy,*
43.22 *Fitzralph's proofs of Peters preeminence.*
44.6 *Explanation of the 'sifting'.*
45.13 *Christ suggests the primacy of Peter in addressing him as if he were the Church.*

[43]Habito generali sermone de potestate membrorum ecclesie cum suis subditis et eorum singulis superest videre de potestate summi sacerdotis, quem alii vocant papam et alii Romanum pontificem. Et quia tota moderna ecclesia exemplata est ab ecclesia peregrinante pro tempore Christi, ideo restat videre in isto explicari, quis apostolorum post ascensionem Christi primatum tenuit; et arguit dominus Ardmacanus VII libro De Questionibus Armenorum viginti racionibus quod Petrus inter omnes habuit preeminenciam capitalem, primo per illud Math. XX, quando facta est contencio inter discipulos Jesu, quis illorum videtur esse maior, in determinando questionem docet ut qui maior est eorum fiat ut minor; quod dictum implicat aliquem esse inter eos maiorem ceteris. Unde postquam ostenderit quod maioritas, quam ipse definitive diligit [44]attenter penes maioritatem mitis et humilis ministerii vertitur verbum ad Symonem: Ecce, inquit, sathanas expetivit vos, ut cribraret sicut triticum, ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos. Ecce post generalem solucionem facta est particularis applicacio preminencie ad Petrum, cum non aliter pertinenter magister optimus decideret questionem sedando brigam et instruendo eos in regulis religionis sue, quas in posterum observaverunt; unde relinquens exemplum suis; ne superbiant de prepositura ecclesiastica, sed pocius timeant propter annexum periculum, sub quodam velamine includente periculum adiutorium atque officium insinuat Petro primatum. Per cribrum intelligunt doctores ad sensum misticum naturam lapsam corpoream. Ipsa enim est quasi caminus temptacionis, in qua spiritus humanus colliditur, sicut in cribro triticum ventilatur. Curvitas ligni signat declinacionem hominis a rectitudine originalis iusticie per peccatum. Tegule dicto ligno infixe que se intersecant ex adverso sunt versucie diaboli et fraus mundi, quibus sensualitati infixis spiritus temptacionibus periculosis concutitur, et eo timorosius quo gradus prepositure est alcior; foramina vero spatulis intercepta sunt genera virtutum, quibus temptatus cognoscit humiliter vitam suam esse ventum aut vacuum. Per istas siquidem rimas patet temptati subterfugium, ut ex gracia et gravedine humilitatis evadat

Having had a general discourse on the power of the members of the church with their subjects, and of each of them, it remains to see about the power of the highest priest, whom some call pope and others Roman pontiff. And since the whole modern church is patterned on the church as it was a pilgrim in the time of Christ, it therefore remains to see set out in this [place] which of the apostles held the primacy after Christ's ascension; and the lord of Armagh argues in book 7 of the *De questionibus Armenorum*, by twenty reasons, that Peter had among all a preeminence as head:[1] first by that of Matthew 20, when a contention arose among the disciples of Jesus which of them seemed to be the greater, in settling the question he teaches "that he who is the greater among them should become as the lesser"; which saying implies that someone among them was greater than the rest.[2] Hence, after he had shown that the greatness which he definitively loves [44] [is weighed] attentively by the greatness of a meek and humble ministry, the word is turned to Simon: "Behold," he says, "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren."[3] Behold, after the general solution a particular application of preeminence to Peter was made, since otherwise the best master would not have decided the question fittingly, settling the quarrel and instructing them in the rules of his religion, which they observed afterwards; hence, leaving an example to his own, that they should not grow proud of an ecclesiastical office of superior but rather fear on account of the peril annexed to it, under a certain veil that includes peril, help and office he intimates the primacy to Peter. By the sieve the doctors understand, in the mystical sense, fallen bodily nature. For it is as it were a furnace of temptation, in which the human spirit is dashed about, as wheat is tossed in a sieve. The curve of the wood signifies man's turning aside from the rectitude of original justice through sin. The laths fixed in the said wood, which cross one another from opposite sides, are the wiles of the devil and the fraud of the world; with these fixed in sensuality the spirit is shaken by perilous temptations, and the more fearfully the higher

collisionis hostilis periculum, si fuerit horreandus in terra vivencium, quia aliter ventus superbie exsufflat [45]ipsum ab area virtutum comburendum ut paleam vel bestiis civitatis dyaboli devorandum. Expetivit igitur sathanas ut post percussionem pastoris posset eos temptando concutere vento superbie, perplexitate diffidencie et aliis collusionibus spiritualibus, non ad expurgacionem predestinatorum, licet hoc sciverit, sed ad dampnificandum prescitos relictos ut palea, quod obtinuit in Juda. Et sic licencia concessa a Deo sathane ad temptandum apostolos preter eius propositum sicut in beato Job cessit eis ad commodum, cum erant cribrati sicut triticum.

the degree of the office of superior; and the holes caught between the slats are the kinds of virtues, by which the tempted man knows humbly that his life is wind or emptiness.[4] Through these chinks, indeed, a way of escape lies open to the tempted, so that by grace and the weight of humility he may escape the peril of the enemy's collision, if he is to be gathered into the barn in the land of the living, since otherwise the wind of pride blows [45]him off the threshing floor of virtues, to be burned like chaff or devoured by the beasts of the devil's city.[5] Satan therefore desired that after the striking of the shepherd he might shake them, by tempting, with the wind of pride, the perplexity of distrust and other spiritual collusions, not for the purging of the predestinate, though he knew this [would follow], but to harm the foreknown left behind like chaff, which he obtained in Judas.[6] And so the licence granted by God to Satan to tempt the apostles turned, beyond his purpose, to their profit, as in blessed Job, since they were sifted as wheat.[7]

¶2 45.13–47.8
46.2 Behaviour of Peter and John at the Sepulchre, 46.12 John more fervent in contemplative, Peter in practical love.
47.9 Peters primacy confirmed from other parts of Scripture.

[45]Sed secundo, ut cognoscat ecclesiam non a se hoc habere, sed a fide et gracia domini Jesu Christi, ut vel sic postposita superbia celebret eius laudem, statim subiungit: Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua in quo videtur innuere primatum Petri in hoc quod nomine suo exprimit totam ecclesiam militantem; semper enim manet fides ecclesie in una persona vel in alia, sicut in sancto sabbato, quando defecit in Petro; servata fuerat in Maria. Ista igitur negacio accomoda, verificans dictum Christi, docet quod nomine suo tamquam capitanei expressit ecclesiam. Sed tercio (ut exposui in capitulo V huius) limitat prelacie officium, cum subinfert: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos quod officium post Joh. XXI, 17 exponit expressius, cum sibi singulariter iniungit tribus vicibus pascere oves suas; unde Joh. XX, 1 9 dicitur quod apostoli audito a Magdalena sublatum esse corpus Domini Petrus et Johannes, in quibus fides remissius est extincta, cucurrerunt, ut haberent experienciam [46]rei gestae. Et quamvis Johannes, virgo et sterilis, synagogam singnificans, precucurrit citius Petro, tamen Petrus ex fervore amoris in effectu posito introivit et ab experiencia cum inspiracione interna edoctus resurreccionem credidit, et sic Johannem qui fuit post eum precipuus confirmavit. Unde sequitur in textu: Tunc inquit, introivit et ille discipulus, qui venerat primus ad monumentum, et vidit et credidit; nondum enim sciebant scripturam, quia oportuit eum a mortuis resurgere. Quamvis enim Johannes quoad devocionem amoris contemplantis fervencius Petro Christum dilexerit, tamen Petrus quantum ad amorem practicum plus ceteris

But secondly, that he may know that the church has this not of itself but from the faith and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that thus at least, setting pride aside, he may celebrate his praise, he immediately adds: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not"; in which he seems to hint at Peter's primacy in this, that under his name he expresses the whole church militant; for the faith of the church always remains in one person or another, as on Holy Saturday, when it failed in Peter, it had been kept in Mary.[8] This fitting negation, therefore, verifying Christ's saying, teaches that he expressed the church under his name as under a captain's.[9] But thirdly (as I set out in chapter 5 of this [work]) he assigns the office of prelacy, when he adds: "And thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren"; which office he sets out more expressly afterwards, John 21:17, when he enjoins on him singly, three times, "to feed his sheep";[10] hence in John 20:1–9 it is said that, when the apostles had heard from Magdalene that "the body of the Lord" had been "taken away", Peter and John, in whom faith was less fully extinguished, ran, that they might have experience [46]of what had been done.[11] And although John, virgin and barren, signifying the synagogue, "did outrun" Peter "more swiftly", yet Peter, from the fervour of love put into effect, went in, and, taught by experience together with inward inspiration, believed the resurrection, and so confirmed John, who was the chief after him. Hence it follows in the text: "Then," he says, "that disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre: and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the

apostolis diligebat. In cuius signum Johannes, tamquam speculativus ad percipiendum archana Dei magis dispositus; de Jesu stante in littore ad signandum cursum mundane viacionis sibi transactum, prius percepit quam Petrus, quia dominus est, ut dicitur Joh. ultimo, verumtamen Petrus, audito quia dominus est, misit se fervencius in mare. Et propter magnitudinem istius amoris practici et experienciam fragilitatis humane, cum ipsemet ter negavit Christum Math. XXVI, fuit racioni consonum, ut ipse preficeretur caput ecclesie, Johannes autem virgo et contemplativus a mundo abstractus habuit custodiam matris et virginis que fuit locale sponsi preciosissimum. Et sic habuit signum preeminencie amoris in hoc, quod de tam prope quietus factus est celestis coniugii paranymphus, et preter hec habuit cum ceteris apostolis generalem custodiam matris ecclesie; sed quadam prerogativa Petrus. Et sic secundum unam racionem amandi videtur catholicum quod Johannes plus Petro dilexit celeste coniugium [47]et sine huiusmodi repugnancia quoad aliam racionem amandi Petrus plus hiis diligens plus dilexit Christum atque ecclesiam quam Johannes; et proporcionaliter erant a sponso ecclesie readamati; racione cuius Johannes tam crebro dicit, non quod Jesus eum maxime diligebat; ut patet Joh. XIX, XX et XXI, sed quod eum quodam amoris privilegio precipue diligebat.

scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." For although John, as to the devotion of contemplative love, loved Christ more fervently than Peter, yet Peter, as to practical love, loved more than the other apostles. In sign of which John, as one speculative and more disposed to perceive the secrets of God, perceived sooner than Peter, of "Jesus standing on the shore" (to signify that the course of worldly wayfaring was over for him), that it is the Lord, as is said in the last chapter of John; nevertheless Peter, having heard that it is the Lord, cast himself more fervently into the sea.[12] And on account of the greatness of this practical love and his experience of human frailty, since he himself thrice denied Christ (Matthew 26), it was consonant with reason that he should be set over [it] as head of the church; and John, virgin and contemplative, withdrawn from the world, had the keeping of the mother and virgin, who was the bridegroom's most precious dwelling. And so he had a sign of preeminence of love in this, that, from resting so near, he was made groomsman of the heavenly marriage; and besides these things he had, with the other apostles, the general keeping of mother church; but Peter [had it] by a certain prerogative.[13] And so, according to one way of loving, it seems catholic that John loved the heavenly marriage more than Peter, [47]and, without any such conflict, as to another way of loving, Peter, loving "more than these", loved Christ and the church more than John; and in proportion they were loved in return by the bridegroom of the church; by reason of which John says so often, not that Jesus loved him most, as is clear from John 19, 20 and 21, but that he loved him especially by a certain privilege of love.[14]

¶3 47.9–47.26

[47]Ex ista ranga potest pius theologus tamquam fundamento colligere quod Petrus habuit quendam primatum apostolice dignitatis; secundo confirmatur idem ex serie verborum sacre scripture et prerogativa pre ceteris data Petro. Nam Math. X, 2 sic dicitur: Duodecim apostolorum nomina sunt hec Primus Symon, qui dicitur Petrus, et Andreas frater eius. Cum autem nec ordo verborum nec sillaba in scriptura ponatur, quin sit omissa sentencia, quid pertinencius daretur intelligi; quod Petrus dicitur primus apostolorum, nisi quod ipse singulariter tenet primatum apostolice dignitatis; cum vocacione Andreas Petrum precesserit, ut patet Joh. I. Non igitur ex indifferencia preposuit Christus Petrum in vocacione; tercio; ut patet Math. X et Luce VI, ymo communiter connumerando apostolos Petrus preponitur ab eo, qui dixit et facta sunt.

From this ranking a pious theologian can gather, as from a foundation, that Peter had a certain primacy of apostolic dignity; secondly the same is confirmed from the order of the words of holy scripture and the prerogative given to Peter before the rest.[15] For in Matthew 10:2 it is said thus: "The names of the twelve apostles are these: The first, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother." Now since neither an order of words nor a syllable is placed in scripture without some teaching being put forth in it, what more fitting could be given to be understood by Peter's being called the first of the apostles, than that he singly holds the primacy of apostolic dignity, since in the calling Andrew preceded Peter, as is clear from John 1?[16] Not without distinction, therefore, did Christ put Peter first in the naming; thirdly, as is clear from Matthew 10 and

Luke 6, indeed in commonly enumerating the apostles Peter is put first by him who "spoke, and they were made".[17]

Notes

1. Richard FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* VII; VII.3–5 (Paris 1512, fol. XLVv–XLVI; ch. 3 opens from Luke 22, *facta est autem contentio inter eos quis eorum videretur esse maior … Simon ecce sathanas expetiit vos*); Loserth gives no chapter. *Primatus* is rendered "primacy" throughout; *preeminenciam capitalem*, "a preeminence as head" (cf. *capitaliter*). A in marg.: *Petrus si ut caput ecclesie primatum tenuit* (43.21).
2. Wyclif cites Matt. 20 (the request for the sons of Zebedee, 20:20–28), but the contention and the answer are Luke 22:24, 26 (DR "which of them should seem to be the greater"; "he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger"). His *fiat ut minor* is translated.
3. The period does not construe as printed at the turn of pp. 43–44: *maioritas … attenter penes maioritatem … ministerii* lacks a verb; we supply "[is weighed]" (perhaps *attenditur* lies behind *attenter*). The plate confirms *attenter*. Luke 22:31–32 (DR); Wyclif omits *Simon, Simon*.
4. The sieve is described as a framed instrument: a bent wooden rim (*curvitas ligni*), crossing strips (*tegule*, literally "tiles"; here laths) and the holes between the slats (*spatule*). Job 7:7 (DR "my life is but wind"). A in marg.: *Cribrum mistice quid signet?*; B in marg.: *Per cribrum intelligitur* (44.16).
5. B reads *ruinas* for *rimas*, "chinks" (44.30). *Horreandus*, a non-classical gerundive from *horreum*, "barn": "to be gathered into the barn". "The land of the living": Ps. 26:13.
6. The striking of the shepherd: Matt. 26:31 (DR "I will strike the shepherd"). *Presciti*, "the foreknown": those whom God foreknows will be damned; not "the reprobate".
7. Job 1:12, the licence given to Satan.
8. The subject of *cognoscat* and *celebret* is taken to be Peter (*ecclesiam … habere* is the accusative and infinitive); it may be any hearer. The faith kept in Mary alone on Holy Saturday is a medieval commonplace.
9. The manuscripts read *negacio accomoda aconda* (sic); Loserth omits *aconda* (45.22–23). *Negacio*: the negative "fail not". A reads *vel alia* (45.20–21); B *deiicit* for *defecit* (45.21).
10. *Ut exposui in capitulo V huius*: chapter 5 of this treatise comes later, and the place is there: the third of its three conclusions on the pastoral office, that pope and bishops must feed Christ's sheep, *patet ex officio ter limitato Petro Johannis ultimo* (102.2–5); the past tense is translated as printed. John 21:17 (DR "Feed my sheep"); Wyclif's indirect *pascere oves suas* is quoted, as the italics have it. B omits *tu* (45.26).
11. "John 20:1–9": the print has *Joh. XX, 1 9*. The quoted words are not the Vulgate's: John 20:2 has *Tulerunt Dominum de monumento* (DR "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre").
12. John 20:4 (DR "that other disciple did outrun Peter"), 20:8–9; John 21:4, 7 (DR "Jesus stood on the shore"; "It is the Lord … cast himself into the sea"); Loserth gives John 21:4 (46.17).
13. Matt. 26:69–75 (the denials); John 19:26–27 (the mother given to John); John 13:23 (DR "leaning on Jesus' bosom"), which *de tam prope quietus* recalls. *Paranymphus*: the friend of the bridegroom, groomsman; *locale*: a place to dwell in.
14. John 21:15 (DR "lovest thou me more than these?"); "the disciple whom Jesus loved", John 19:26, 20:2, 21:7, 21:20. *Racio amandi*: "way of loving".
15. *Ranga*: Loserth compares *De veritate sacrae scripturae* p. 124 l. 4 and takes the word, with Matthew, from English "range" or "rank" (47.9).
16. *Quin sit omissa sentencia* (47.18; the plate confirms *omissa*) gives the opposite of the needed sense ("without a teaching being omitted"); we translate *emissa*, "put forth" (our emendation). Matt. 10:2 (DR, without the Vulgate's *autem*); John 1:40–42 (Andrew called before Peter).
17. *In vocacione*: here the naming in the list, against the calling (*vocacione*) in which Andrew came first. *Tercio*: the manuscript reads *tercia* (47.24). Luke 6:14; Ps. 148:5 (DR "he spoke, and they were made").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 43: *CAPITULUM TERCIUM.*
  - 43: *facta*
  - 43: *ut*
  - 43: *ut*
  - 44: *sicut*
  - 44: *tua*
  - 44: *tu*
  - 44: *confirma* (5 is the line number)
  - 44: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 44: *subterfugium* [NW]
  - 45: *ı* (old-style arabic 1, x-height, zoomed)
  - 46: *effectu*
  - 46: *dilexerit*
  - 46: *archana* [NW]

- **46: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar before quadam)**
- **46: *coniugium* (35 is the line number)**
- **47: *hec Primus* (one token covers two printed words)**
- **46: *Christum* (Chnstum -> Christum (scans: christum | chnstum | chnstum | chnstum))**
- **45: *suas* (italic; 30 is line number; semicolon not carried)**
- **46: *singnificans* (ink shows -gn- spelling as in main scans; kept as printed; comma not carried)**

- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter in (45.14).**
- **Translator's plate checks: 44.1 *attenter* and 47.18 *omissa* confirmed as printed (notes 3, 16).**

Part 2: Peter's primacy: the rock, the keys, and the gospel's figures

Loserth pp. 47.27–51.10

¶1 47.27–49.31
48.4 *Only to Peter Were given the keys of heaven.*
49.8 *Peter's confession a check to Antichrist.*
49.32 *Peter's Walking on the water.*

[47]**Quantum ad privilegia dignitatis ecclesie Math. XVI; 18— 19 post confessionem Petri de filiacione Christi naturali, respondit Christus, quasi pro arris mercedis fidei: Et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam et porte inferi non prevalebunt adversus eam, et tibi dabo claves regni celorum, et quodcunque ligaveris super terram erit ligatum et in** [48]**celis, et quodcunque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in celis. Sed post Math. XVIII et Joh. XX dat apostolis communiter potestatem. Sed nusquam legitur in scriptura quod alteri quam Petro dedit dominus claves celi; per hoc igitur quod Petrus ex approbacione Christi respondit pro omnibus in precipua materia fidei, que est fundamentum spirituali preposito, et per hoc quod Christus mutato nomine a Symone in Petrum quod nomen contraxit a se ipso, qui est Petra et fundamentum ecclesie, ut patet I. Corinth. X et I. Corinth. Ill, videtur concedere Petro quandam prerogativam super ceteros apostolos ad regendam suam ecclesiam, ac si diceret secundum exposicionem Augustini De Verbis Domini sermone XIII: Ego sum petra, (quia Christus) a qua tu es Petrus, id est christianus in fide firmus, inmediatus mei vicarius, super quam petram, quam confessus es, per te ut proximum eius capitaneum fundabo ecclesiam meam. Ideo, dicit Augustinus, a petra petrus non a petro petra, sicut a Christo Christianus, non a Christiano Christus. Ideo super me edificabo ecclesiam meam, non super te, nam volentes edificare super homines dicebant: Ego quidem sum Pauli, ego quidem Apollo, ego vero Cephe, sed apostolus dicit se esse lapidis, qui est Christus. Cum igitur Christus nominat Petrum primo nomine suo; videtur concedere primitatem, ideo dicit Augustinus quod apostolatus tenuit principatum in signum cuius possessionis et preeminencie subdit Christus: Dabo tibi post mortem meam claves ecclesie, quam fortificabo** [49]**super ecclesiam malignancium, dando tibi potestatem ligandi atque solvendi; ut non superflue**

As to the privileges of the dignity of the church: in Matthew 16:18–19, after Peter's confession of Christ's natural sonship, Christ answered, as if in earnest of the wages of faith: "And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in [48]**heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."[1] But afterwards, in Matthew 18 and John 20, he gives power to the apostles in common. Now nowhere is it read in scripture that the Lord gave the keys of heaven to another than Peter; by this, therefore, that Peter with Christ's approval answered for all in the chief matter of faith, which is the foundation for a spiritual superior, and by this, that Christ changed his name from Simon to Peter, a name he drew from himself, who is the Rock and foundation of the church, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 10 and 1 Corinthians 3, he seems to grant Peter a certain prerogative over the other apostles for ruling his church, as if he said, according to the exposition of Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, sermon 13: "I am the rock (since [I am] Christ), from which you are Peter, that is, a Christian firm in faith, my immediate vicar, upon which rock, which you have confessed, I will found my church through you as its nearest captain."[2] Therefore, says Augustine, "from *petra* comes *Petrus*, not *petra* from *Petrus*, as Christian from Christ, not Christ from Christian. Therefore upon me will I build my church, not upon thee; for those who wished to build upon men said: I indeed am of Paul, I indeed of Apollo, and I of Cephas; but the apostle says that he is of the stone, which is Christ."[3] Since therefore Christ names Peter first by his own name, he seems to grant him firstness; therefore Augustine says that "he held the principate of the apostolate", in sign of which possession and**

occupes claves ecclesie, quas dedi tibi racione confessionis meritorie humanitatis et deitatis qua a Spiritu Sancto edoctus dixisti, tu es Christus et per consequens verus homo filius Dei vivi; quod non fuisset pertinenter additum, nisi intelligeretur de filio naturali. Et ista confessio est maxime pertinens christiano preposito, ut patet Joh. IV; eo quod maxime obviat Antichristo, cum ipse negabit divinitatem et infatuabit; quantum in ipso erit, Christi pauperiem et voluntariam passionem. Ubi enim nos christiani docemur a Christo et ecclesia expetere constanciam, prospera mundi despicere et nulla eius adversa formidare, Antichristus econtra cum multis suis docet homines ad mundi prospera aspirare et penalitates contempnere, unde Petrus, quia dixit Christo; absit hoc a te Domine ut vadas Jerusalem crucifigi, vocatus est ab eo Sathanas paulo post hoc privilegium singulare, ut patet Math. XVI; 23, ad denotandum quod ipse est potissime Christo adversans tamquam alter Antichristus, qui in paupertate et penalitate abnuit sequi Christum. Unde isto scuto fidei armatus est Petrus postmodum, cum pro Christo reliquit uxorem et omnia, sequendo ipsum Math. XIX, 27, pro Christo promisit se mori percuciendo servum pontificis Joh. XVIII, 10; pro Christo exposuit se in aquam Math. XIV et Joh. ultimo et demum in capite mundi Roma pro Christo pertulit mortem acerbam.

preeminence Christ adds: "I will give thee", after my death, "the keys of the church", which I will fortify [49] over the church of the malignant, giving you the power of binding and loosing; so that you may not hold idly the keys of the church which I have given you by reason of the meritorious confession of humanity and Godhead, by which, taught by the Holy Spirit, you said, "Thou art Christ", and consequently true man, "the Son of the living God"; which would not have been fittingly added unless it were understood of the natural son.[4] And this confession pertains most of all to a Christian superior, as is clear from John 4, because it most opposes Antichrist, since he will deny the divinity and will make foolish, as far as in him lies, Christ's poverty and voluntary passion.[5] For where we Christians are taught by Christ and the church to seek constancy, to despise the prosperity of the world and to fear none of its adversities, Antichrist on the contrary, with many of his own, teaches men to aspire to the world's prosperity and to scorn hardships; hence Peter, because he said to Christ, "Lord, be it far from thee" that thou go to Jerusalem to be crucified, was called Satan by him shortly after this singular privilege, as is clear from Matthew 16:23, to denote that he is most of all adverse to Christ, as another Antichrist, who refuses to follow Christ in poverty and hardship.[6] Hence Peter was afterwards armed with this shield of faith, when for Christ he left his "wife and all things", following him (Matthew 19:27); for Christ he promised to die, "striking the servant of the high priest" (John 18:10); for Christ he exposed himself in the water (Matthew 14 and the last chapter of John); and finally in Rome, the head of the world, he suffered for Christ a bitter death.[7]

¶2 49.32–50.27
50.4 *His plunging into the sea.*
50.12 *Christ's address to him in Gethsemane.*
50.17 *His dragging the net to land.*

[49] Quid igitur datur intelligi, quod solus Petrus videbatur a domino Math. XIV venire ad ipsum supra mare, nisi quod presens seculum per mare [50] signatum ipse a Deo adiutus, singulariter presidens navicule significanti ecclesiam Christi, subiceret servituti; et istum sensum ponit Augustinus Sermone IV. Quid autem per secundam in mari missionem, de qua Johannis ultimo, aliis discipulis navigio ad Christum venientibus, ipse solus tunica succinctus audacter misit se in mare, daretur nobis intelligi vere quod omnes alii Christi discipuli ducatu Petri tunica virtutum et zona potencie ligandi ornati fuerant in via tendendi ad terminum regulandi? Hoc eciam figuratur per hoc, quod soli tempore passionis Salvator dixerit Marc. XIV, 37: Simon dormis? Non potuisti una hora vigilare mecum? per hoc innuens quod ipse solus pre ceteris et pro ceteris haberet capitaliter in cura pastoralis officii vigilare. Et hoc idem figuratur per hoc,

What, then, is given to be understood by this, that Peter alone was seen by the Lord (Matthew 14) coming to him upon the sea, except that, helped by God and presiding singly over the little ship that signifies the church of Christ, he should bring under servitude the present world, [50] signified by the sea? And this sense Augustine sets out in Sermon 4.[8] And what is given us to understand by the second casting into the sea, of which the last chapter of John speaks, when, "the other disciples" coming to Christ "in the ship", he alone, girt with his coat, boldly cast himself into the sea, unless truly that all the other disciples of Christ, under Peter's leadership, were adorned with the coat of virtues and the girdle of the power of binding, on the way that tends to the goal of ruling?[9] This too is figured by this, that in the time of the passion the Saviour said to him alone, Mark 14:37: "Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one

quod ipse solus in secunda piscacione traxit ad litus rete plenum centum quinquaginta tribus magnis piscibus, ut dicitur Joh. ult; per hoc enim figuratur quod ipse solus inter apostolos trahit capitaliter sponsam Christi ad terram vivencium in retibus legis Dei. Magnum itaque privilegium vicarii, qui potest trahere animas ad beatitudinem, cum ista secunda piscacio significat capcionem hominum ad ecclesiam triumphantem, sicut prima piscacio signat capcionem hominum ad ecclesiam militantem.

hour with me?", thereby intimating that he alone, before the rest and for the rest, should keep watch as head in the care of the pastoral office.[10] And the same is figured by this, that he alone, in the second fishing, drew to land the net "full of a hundred and fifty-three great fishes", as is said in the last chapter of John; for by this it is figured that he alone among the apostles draws, as head, the bride of Christ to the land of the living in the nets of God's law. Great, then, is the privilege of the vicar, who can draw souls to blessedness, since this second fishing signifies the catching of men for the church triumphant, as the first fishing signifies the catching of men for the church militant.[11]

¶3 50.28–51.10
51.6 *Christ's charge to him to feed the sheep.*

[50]Idem eciam figuratur per hoc quod Christus doctrinam correpcionis, quam voluit tradi cunctis fidelibus, per Petrum voluit in alios derivari. Nam Math. XVIII, 15 legitur: Aspiciens Ihesus in discipulos suos dixit Simoni Petro: Si peccaverit in te frater tuus, vade et corripe eum inter te et [51]ipsum solum, ut exposui VIII capitulo IV huius et XXIV cap. V libri. Idem figuratum est Joh. ultimo, ubi in conventu duodecim discipulorum universitatem fidelium Christi signancium post triplicem examinacionem amoris ipse singulariter recepit a pastore summo curam et pastum simpliciter tam ovium quam agnorum; ut sicut ter Christum negaverat; sic ostendat eius amorem in pascendo magnates, vulgus et clericos verbo; opere et exemplo.

The same is also figured by this, that Christ willed the doctrine of correction, which he willed to be handed down to all the faithful, to be passed on to others through Peter. For in Matthew 18:15 it is read: "Jesus, looking upon his disciples, said to Simon Peter: If thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between thee and [51]him alone", as I set out in chapter 8 of the fourth [book] of this [work] and in chapter 24 of the fifth book.[12] The same is figured in the last chapter of John, where, in the gathering of the twelve disciples, signifying the whole body of the faithful of Christ, after the threefold examination of love he singly received from the chief shepherd the care and feeding, without qualification, of both sheep and lambs; so that, as he had thrice denied Christ, so he might show his love for him in feeding magnates, the common people and clerics by word, work and example.[13]

Notes

1. A in marg.: *Petra Christus, non Petrus* (47.27). Matt. 16:18–19 (DR). *Arris*, "earnest": a pledge paid in advance.
2. Matt. 18:18; John 20:22–23; 1 Cor. 10:4 (DR "the rock was Christ"); 1 Cor. 3:11. Augustine, *Sermo* 76 (on Matt. 14), Maurist *Opera* V, 415, which Wyclif cites as *De verbis Domini* sermon 13; cf. Hus, *Opera*, fol. 210a (Loserth, 48.15; *Sermo* 76.1, PL 38, 479: *Super me aedificabo te, non me super te*; the Hus parallel is Loserth's). The words put in Christ's mouth are Wyclif's expansion; Loserth's italics begin at *a petra*. B reads *peter* for *per te* (48.19).
3. The *petra/Petrus* passage is from the same sermon of Augustine (*Sermo* 76.1, PL 38, 479; the 1 Cor. 1:12 sentence follows in 76.2, PL 38, 479–80). 1 Cor. 1:12 (DR "I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I of Cephas"); Augustine's wording is translated. B omits *Petrum* (48.28).
4. "He held the principate of the apostolate": Augustine, *Sermo* 76, *Opera* V, 416 (Loserth, 48.30; *Sermo* 76.3, PL 38, 480: *apostolatus principatum tenens*). *Primitatem*, "firstness", a non-classical abstract beside *primatus*, "primacy". The italics mark only *Dabo tibi* and *claves ecclesie*; the rest is Wyclif's expansion of Matt. 16:19. "The church of the malignant": Ps. 25:5 (DR "the assembly of the malignant"). Matt. 16:16 (DR "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God").
5. "John 4" as printed; the sense fits 1 John 4:2–3 (DR "every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist").
6. Matt. 16:22 (DR "Lord, be it far from thee, this shall not be unto thee"); the words about going to Jerusalem to be crucified are Wyclif's (cf. 16:21). Matt. 16:23 (Loserth). B omits *aspirare* (49.17).
7. Eph. 6:16 (DR "the shield of faith"). Matt. 19:27 has "all things" only (DR "we have left all things"); "wife" comes from 19:29. The promise to die, Matt. 26:35; John 18:10 (DR "struck the servant of the high priest"); Matt. 14:29; John 21:7. Peter's death at Rome: no source is given.
8. Matt. 14:29. Augustine, "Sermon 4": Loserth refers to the same volume, p. 320 (*ubi supra*); the sermon is not identified, and the sense (the sea the present world, Peter on it the figure of the church) is in the two sermons on Matt. 14, *Sermo* 75.9–10 and 76.1, PL 38, 478–79. *Videbatur a domino ... venire*: "was seen by the Lord coming"; it may be "seemed ... to come".

9. ***Ad Christum*: the manuscripts read *ad dominum* (50.11); Loserth's print is translated. John 21:7–8 (DR "girt his coat about him ... cast himself into the sea"; "the other disciples came in the ship"). *Potencia* is here "power", the power of binding, used as *potestas* is.**
10. **The manuscripts give *Marci XXVI* (50.13); Loserth prints Mark 14. Mark 14:37 (DR "Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one hour?"); *mecum*, "with me", comes from Matt. 26:40.**
11. **John 21:11 (DR "full of great fishes, one hundred and fifty-three"); Wyclif's order is translated. The first fishing is Luke 5:1–11. "The land of the living": Ps. 26:13.**
12. **Matt. 18:15 (DR "If thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between thee and him alone", without *autem*). The opening words, *Aspiciens Ihesus in discipulos suos dixit Simoni Petro*, are not in the Vulgate; they are the liturgical incipit of this gospel, *Respiciens Iesus discipulos suos dixit Simoni Petro* (*Liber comitis*, PL 30, 500C; also the gospel of the synodal ordo, PL 140, 1066D). For the cross-reference Loserth gives *De civili dominio* II, 62 and III, 519; Wyclif's chapters are *De civili dominio* II, ch. 8 (from p. 69, on correction; Loserth's p. 62 falls in ch. 7) and III, ch. 24 (p. 519, God's correction of his sons, Heb. 12:5–6): the books are counted within Wyclif's *Summa*. B reads 34 for XXIV (51.2).**
13. **A in marg., another hand: *Nota quod sensus figuraliter equivalet literali* (51.2). John 21:15–17 (DR "Feed my lambs", "Feed my sheep"); John 21:2 names seven disciples, not twelve. *Simpliciter*: the care of the whole flock, without qualification.**
How the Latin of this passage was established
- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **48: *et***
  - **48: *dominus***
  - **49: *absit***
  - **49: *10* (old-style arabic 10)**
  - **50: *Simon***
  - **50: *Non***
  - **50: *potuisti***
  - **47: *18*— (box on the dash of 18—19; print has 19 after it)**

Part 3: Peter's primacy: the mystical sense, Peter's acts after the Ascension, and the witness of the saints

Loserth pp. 51.11–55.26

¶1 51.11–52.2
51.11 *A mystical sense was intended in these passages.*
52.3 *Peter's distinction continued after the Ascension.*
52.10 *His vision of the great sheet.*
52.16 *Meaning of that vision.*

[51]**Quamvis enim sensus misticus scripture non sit de se evidens ignaris ad probandum scolastice figuratum, tamen si probari potest ex racione vel scriptura alia quod sensus iste misticus intentus fuerat ab autore; tunc sensus ille est equivalens literali; et sic sepe probat Apostolus ex figuris veteris testamenti figuratum allegorice in novo, ut patet I. Cor. X. Gal. IV et Heb. VII. Cum igitur non dicetur quid pertinencius figurarunt ista singulariter facta Petro quam prerogativam Petri super alios; videtur quod iste suasiones quietarent fidelem theologum ad fidem questioni proposite adhibendam. Dicat igitur adversarius istam sentenciam, vel quod aliquid est a Christo inpertinenter factum; aut ex indifferencia positum in scriptura; vel aliter dicat quid ordo et singularitas prenarratorum operum quoad Petrum pertinencius quam eius preeminenciam super alios figuraret. Cum enim scriptura sacra exprimit et racio necessitat oportere aliquem apostolum esse talem, ecclesia autem generaliter credat hoc de Petro, Deus notabiliter permitteret** [52]**ecclesiam suam a principio oberasse, si isti fidei falsitas sit substrata.**

For although the mystical sense of scripture is not of itself evident to the unlearned for proving scholastically the thing figured, yet if it can be proved from reason or from another scripture that this mystical sense was intended by the author, then that sense is equivalent to the literal; and so the Apostle often proves from figures of the old testament what is figured allegorically in the new, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 10, Galatians 4 and Hebrews 7.[1] Since therefore it will not be said what these things done singularly to Peter figured more fittingly than Peter's prerogative over the others, it seems that these persuasions would set a faithful theologian at rest so as to lend faith to the question proposed.[2] Let the adversary therefore either affirm this teaching, or say that something was done by Christ to no purpose, or put in scripture at random; or else let him say what the order and singularity of the works narrated above, as regards Peter, would figure more fittingly than his preeminence over the others.[3] For since holy scripture expresses, and reason necessitates, that some apostle must be such, and the church generally believes this of Peter, God would notably have permitted [52]**his church to have erred from the beginning, if falsehood underlay this faith.**

¶2 52.3–55.26
53.4 *Peter's lead in electing Matthias,*
53.9 *and on the day of Pentecost.*
53.17 *Other Instances.*
54.10 *Testimony of St. Dionisyus.*

[52]**Item, secundo ex opinionibus Petri post ascensionem eadem veritas probabiliter convinci poterit, nam soli Petro ostensum est lintheum submissum de celo, in quo erant omnia quadrupedia et repencia terre et volatilia celi, ut patet Act. X, 13 et XI, 7 et sibi soli dictum est de omnibus illis animalibus: Surge Petre, occide et manduca. Lintheum autem quatuor iniciis submissum signat superficiem terre habitabilis hominum, cuius planicies est contexta et trita ut lintheum descendente influencia celi ab oriente, occidente, borea et austro ad temperandum soli planiciem ad usum hominum. Illa autem tria genera animalium submissa in lintheo signant per ordinem seculares dominos ut quadrupedia, vulgus ut terre repencia, et clerum ut volatilia in consideracionem contemplativam temporum volancia. Ista quidem tria genera hominum integrant incolas huius mundi. Petrus autem surrexit armatus virtutibus et occidit de istis tribus generibus, cum extinxit in eis mundialitatem et fecit eos non homines quoad mundum. Sic enim accipitur homo sepius in scriptura, ut patet I. Corinth. III, 3: Cum sint inter vos zelus et contencio, nonne carnales estis et secundum hominem ambulatis? Unde beatus Petrus verbo et opere interpretatus fuit visionem ymaginativam ad hunc sensum, quod manducare suum erat perversos mores in eis prescindere et eos personaliter incorporare ecclesie; sic enim dicit Christus Joh. IV, 32: Ego cibum habeo manducare quem vos nescitis. Quando enim predicator, qui Canticorum IV, 2 dicitur dentes sponse, gladio spiritus occidit carnalitatem et ore ecclesie conterit ad penitenciam convertendos: tunc spiritualiter comedit conversos assimilando eos in** [53]**membra matris ecclesie, quod officium pertinuit Petro primarie. Unde Actuum I, 15 legitur quod exsurgens Petrus in medio fratrum ostendit per scripturam veteris testamenti quod oportet loco Yude proditoris alium episcopum eligere, qui suppleat vices suas; et sic secundum prioritatem dignitatis celebravit eleccionem Mathie. Item, Act. II, 14 legitur quomodo Petrus cum undecim elevavit vocem suam loquens pro omnibus contra imponentes eis ebrietatem, ostendens ex scriptura quod sit spiritualis replecio per Spiritum Sanctum Yohelis III prelocuta. Item, Act. II, 31 consequenter predicavit Judeis de resurreccione et predixit eis pre omnibus apostolis quid esset eis necessarium ad salutem, et infra capitulo tercio, 1, 2, Petro et Johanne ascendentibus in templum Petrus habuit preposituram locucionis in claudi sanacione sicut et prenominacionem in serie scripture, Petrus eciam pro omnibus respondit magistratibus templi, ut patet Act. capitulo IV, et pro omnibus protulit mortis sentenciam in Ananiam et Saphiram, ut patet V capitulo, et sic in Symonem magum, Act.**

Again, secondly, from Peter's opinions after the Ascension the same truth could be established with probability; for to Peter alone was shown the sheet let down from heaven, in which were all four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and fowls of the air, as is clear from Acts 10:13 and 11:7, and to him alone was it said of all those animals: "Arise, Peter. Kill and eat."[4] Now the sheet let down by four corners signifies the surface of the earth habitable by men, whose plane is woven together and worn like a sheet, the influence of heaven descending from east, west, north and south to temper the plane of the soil for the use of men. And those three kinds of animals let down in the sheet signify in order the secular lords as the four-footed beasts, the common people as the creeping things of the earth, and the clergy as the fowls, flying up into the contemplative consideration of the times.[5] These three kinds of men indeed make up the inhabitants of this world. Now Peter arose armed with virtues and killed of these three kinds, when he extinguished the mundanity in them and made them not men as regards the world. For so "man" is often taken in scripture, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 3:3: "Whereas there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal and walk you not according to man?"[6] Hence blessed Peter interpreted the imaginative vision by word and deed to this sense: that his eating was to cut away the perverse morals in them and to incorporate them personally into the church; for so Christ says, John 4:32: "I have meat to eat which you know not." For when the preacher, who in Canticles 4:2 is called the "teeth" of the bride, kills carnality with the sword of the spirit and with the mouth of the church grinds those who are to be converted to penance, then he spiritually eats the converted, assimilating them into [53]**members of mother church; and this office belonged to Peter primarily.[7] Hence in Acts 1:15 it is read that Peter, "rising up in the midst of the brethren", showed by the scripture of the old testament that in the place of Judas the traitor another bishop must be chosen, to fill his place; and so, according to priority of dignity, he conducted the election of Matthias.[8] Again, in Acts 2:14 it is read how Peter with the eleven "lifted up his voice", speaking for all against those who charged them with drunkenness, showing from scripture that this is the spiritual filling by the Holy Spirit foretold in Joel 3.[9] Again, in Acts 2:31 he next preached to the Jews "of the resurrection", and foretold to them, before all the apostles, what was necessary for them for salvation; and below, in chapter 3:1–2, when Peter and John went up into the temple, Peter held**

VIII. Item, in consilio generali, de quo Act. XV, Petrus protulit pro omnibus sentenciam quod conversi ex gentibus non debeant circumcidi nec legis cerimonias observare. Talem autem preposituram usurpare non presumeret tam sanctus apostolus post missionem Sancti Spiritus docentis ipsum omnem veritatem et confirmantis in ipso omnem a Christo instructam humilitatem, nisi sciret pertinere suo officio accipere magnanimiter huiusmodi dignitatem, que videtur specificata a Christo Math. [54]XVII, 23, 26, quando exactores didragmatis in presencia apostolorum singulariter dicunt Petro tamquam eorum maximo: Magister vester non solvit didragma? quod Salvator docuit in effectu, quando Petrum solum in solucione census sibi coniunxerat: Vade, inquit, ad mare et mitte hamum, et piscem qui primo ascenderit tolle et aperto ore eius invenies staterem, illum sumens da illis pro me et pro te. Tercio confirmatur ista sentencia ex testimonio sanctorum. Nam beatus Dionysius post autores scripture testis precipuus in libro suo De Divinis Nominibus capitulo tercio vocat beatum Petrum verticalem, id est, capitalem seu capitaneum, motus ex dicto Christi Joh. I, ubi in prima vocacione Petri nominat eum Cephas, quod sonat caput. Et libro suo De Ecclesiastica Yerarchia V capitulo vocat eciam beatum Petrum discipulorum verticalem, quod ostendit ex hoc quod ipse principaliter celebravit eleccionem Mathie loco Yude, ut patet Act. I. Unde iste sanctus beati Pauli precipuus discipulus et in morte assistens in libello quem scripsit De Morte Apostolorum sic alloquitur Thimoteum: Cum separarentur ab invicem ducti ad loca supplicii, Paulus Petrum alloquitur in hec verba: Pax tecum, fundamentum ecclesiarum et pastor ovium et agnorum Christi. Hec testimonia non testaretur tam sanctus et tam subtilis theologus se sensibiliter audivisse et tam diligenter notasse, nisi crederet beatum Petrum fuisse caput collegii Apostolorum post [55] mortem Christi, sicut ecclesia sepe inculcat in servicio huius sancti. Et eandem sentenciam tenent leges ecclesie, nam XXIV, q. I Rogamus Marcellus papa sic loquitur: Rogamus vos fratres, non aliud doceatis quam quod a beato Petro et a reliquis apostolis accepistis, ipse est enim caput tocius ecclesie, cui ait Dominus: Tu es Petrus. Et idem patet XXI dist. capitulo. In novo, et XXII dist. capitulo. Omnes et Sacrosancta. Item, XXIV, q. III De illicita. Item beatus Augustinus in De questionibus veteris et nove legis, LXXIX capitulo, dicit, quod Petrus erat primus inter apostolos. Ideo dicit Christus quod Petrus solveret pro se didragma, ipsum, inquit Augustinus, constituit caput eorum, ut pastor esset gregis dominici. Et idem dicit cap. finali, et in libello Ad Spiritum Sanctum dicit: flere fecisti apostatam et ordinasti in summum pontificem. Nec oporteret tantum immorari

the office of superior in speaking at the healing of the lame man, as he had also the first naming in the sequence of scripture; Peter also answered for all to the magistrates of the temple, as is clear from Acts chapter 4, and for all pronounced the sentence of death on Ananias and Sapphira, as is clear from chapter 5, and so on Simon Magus, Acts 8.[10] Again, in the general council of which Acts 15 speaks, Peter pronounced for all the sentence that converts from the gentiles ought not to be circumcised nor to observe the ceremonies of the law.[11] Now so holy an apostle would not presume to usurp such an office of superior after the sending of the Holy Spirit, who taught him all truth and confirmed in him all the humility instructed by Christ, unless he knew that it belonged to his office to accept such a dignity magnanimously; and this dignity seems to be specified by Christ in Matthew [54]17:23, 26, when the collectors of the didrachma, in the presence of the apostles, say singularly to Peter, as to the greatest of them: "Doth not your master pay the didrachma?" This the Saviour taught in effect when he joined Peter alone to himself in the payment of the tribute: "Go," he says, "to the sea, and cast in a hook: and that fish which shall first come up, take: and when thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt find a stater: take that, and give it to them for me and for thee."[12] Thirdly, this teaching is confirmed from the testimony of the saints. For blessed Dionysius, after the authors of scripture the chief witness, in his book *On the Divine Names*, chapter 3, calls blessed Peter the summit (*verticalis*), that is, chief or captain, moved by Christ's saying in John 1, where at Peter's first calling he names him Cephas, which means "head".[13] And in his book *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, chapter 5, he also calls blessed Peter "the summit of the disciples", which he shows from this, that he principally conducted the election of Matthias in the place of Judas, as is clear from Acts 1.[14] Hence this saint, blessed Paul's chief disciple, who stood by him at his death, in the little book he wrote *On the Death of the Apostles* addresses Timothy thus: "When they were being separated from each other, led to the places of execution, Paul addresses Peter in these words: Peace be with thee, foundation of the churches and shepherd of the sheep and lambs of Christ."[15] So holy and so subtle a theologian would not testify that he had heard these testimonies with his senses and noted them so diligently, unless he believed that blessed Peter was head of the college of the Apostles after [55]Christ's death, as the church often inculcates in the service of this saint. And the laws of the church hold the same teaching; for in *Causa* 24, question 1, *Rogamus*, Pope Marcellus speaks thus: "We ask you, brethren, teach nothing other

in declaracione istius sentencie, nisi fuerit propter tria: primo pro declaracione autoritatum scripture per quas questio ista ostenditur, secundo ut cognoscatur sensus ecclesie, ad quem concedit Petrum habere super alios apostolos preeminenciam dignitatis, et tercio ut Petri vicarii cognoscant formam, secundum quam potestas Petri est ad pastores derivata.

than what you received from blessed Peter and from the other apostles; for he is head of the whole church, to whom the Lord said: Thou art Peter."[16] And the same is clear from Distinction 21, chapter *In novo*, and Distinction 22, chapters *Omnes* and *Sacrosancta*. Again, *Causa* 24, question 3, *De illicita*.[17] Again, blessed Augustine, in *On the Questions of the Old and New Law*, chapter 79, says that "Peter was first among the apostles". Therefore Christ says that Peter should pay the didrachma for him: "him", says Augustine, "he appointed their head, that he might be shepherd of the Lord's flock".[18] And he says the same in the last chapter, and in the little book *To the Holy Spirit* he says: "Thou madest the apostate weep and didst ordain him highest pontiff."[19] Nor would it be needful to dwell so long on the declaration of this teaching, were it not for three things: first, for the declaration of the authorities of scripture by which this question is shown; second, that the sense of the church may be known, according to which it grants that Peter has a preeminence of dignity over the other apostles; and third, that the vicars of Peter may know the form according to which the power of Peter is derived to the pastors.[20]

Notes

1. 1 Cor. 10:1–11; Gal. 4:22–31; Heb. 7:1–17. *Tamen si*: the manuscripts read *tamen sic* (51.13); Loserth's print is translated.
2. *Dicetur*, future where a subjunctive is expected, is the reading of both manuscripts (51.19), kept by Loserth. *Ad fidem ... adhibendam*: "so as to lend faith", i.e. to assent to Peter's primacy, the question of the chapter.
3. *Dicat ... istam sentenciam*: literally "let him state this teaching", i.e. concede it, against the two alternatives that follow.
4. *Ex opinionibus Petri* is the print (read on the plate); what follows is Peter's acts, and the sense may want *operacionibus*, "works"; the print is translated. Acts 10:11–13 (DR "a great linen sheet let down by the four corners from heaven", "all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and fowls of the air", "Arise, Peter. Kill and eat"); 11:7. Wyclif's *repencia* for the Vulgate's *serpentia* is translated "creeping things" as in DR.
5. *Influencia* is the heavens' influence on the earth, not the *influxus* of grace. *In consideracionem contemplativam temporum*: "of the times", perhaps "of the seasons"; the clergy as birds rise to contemplate the course of time.
6. 1 Cor. 3:3 (DR); Wyclif omits *enim* and has *sint*. "Not men as regards the world": the figure takes *homo* in Paul's sense of the carnal man.
7. Cant. 4:2 (DR "Thy teeth as flocks of sheep"); "the teeth of the bride" is the interpretive tradition's reading of the verse, not its words. The sword of the spirit: Eph. 6:17. *Matris ecclesie*, "mother church", is the church as mother, not the *matrix ecclesia* of a diocese.
8. Acts 1:15 (DR "Peter rising up in the midst of the brethren"); the rest is Wyclif's summary of Acts 1:16–26 (1:20, "his bishopric let another take"). Loserth's italics run on over the summary to *eligere*; only the scriptural words are quoted. B omits *ostendit* (53.3); the print *oslendit* is translated as *ostendit*. A margin note "Matthias" stands at 53.5.
9. Acts 2:14 (DR "But Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice"); the charge of drunkenness, Acts 2:13–15. "Joel 3" as printed; Loserth: rightly Joel 2:28 (Acts 2:17).
10. Acts 2:31; "of the resurrection", of Christ, as Loserth notes (53.13). Acts 3:1–12; 4:8–12; 5:1–11; 8:18–24. *Prepositura locucionis* is the lead in speaking, the precedence a superior holds; "the first naming" is Peter named before John in Acts 3:1. *Sentencia* here is a judicial sentence.
11. Acts 15:7–11; the "sentence" is Peter's decision for the council (*sentencia* as a judgement given, not a teaching). B reads *exigentibus* for *ex gentibus* (53.25).
12. Matt. 17:23, 26 (DR); Wyclif reads *pro me et pro te* (Vulgate *pro me et te*). *Quod Salvator docuit* takes up the collectors' treating Peter as "greatest of them": Christ taught the same "in effect" by joining Peter alone to himself.
13. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* 3: Loserth notes that the chapter only reads that Peter was present, "the supreme and most venerable summit of theologians" (*summa et porrectissima theologorum summitas*), ed. Cologne 1536 (54.12); the Greek is *hē koryphaia kai presbytatē tōn theologōn akrotēs*, *De div. nom.* 3.2 (PG 3, 681D), and *koryphaia* lies behind Wyclif's *verticalem*. John 1:42 (DR "Cephas, which is interpreted Peter"); Wyclif takes *Cephas* as "head", the medieval etymology from Greek *kephalē*.

14. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 5: Loserth gives the more correct form *discipulorum summum* (54.18); the Greek is *ho tōn mathētōn koryphaios*, *De eccl. hier.* 5.3.5 (PG 3, 512C), of Peter at the election of Matthias. Acts 1:15–26.
15. The letter of Dionysius to Timothy on the deaths of Peter and Paul is apocryphal; Loserth refers to Pitra, *Analecta sacra* IV (54.24), which prints it, with a Latin version from the Syriac, as the letter to Timothy *de morte apostolorum Petri et Pauli*; Paul's parting greeting there is *Pax tecum, fundamentum ecclesiarum et pastor ovium et agnorum Christi*.
16. *Decretum* C. 24 q. 1 c. 15 (*Rogamus*), under the name of Pope Marcellus; Loserth gives "cap. XV" (55.3); the modern form is ours. Matt. 16:18.
17. Loserth: D. 21 c. 2 (*In novo*); D. 22 c. 1 (*Omnes*; the manuscript reads *Omnis*, 55.9) and c. 2 (*Sacrosancta*); C. 24 q. 3 c. 6 (*De illicita*) (55.9–10; modern forms ours). *In* of *In novo* is lost from our Latin at 55.9 (the plate reading shows *In novo*); it is translated.
18. Ps.-Augustine (Ambrosiaster), *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti*: Loserth corrects the chapter to 75 (55.11): q. 75, PL 35, 2269–70, *qui primus inter Apostolos erat ... Ipsum enim constituit esse caput eorum, ut pastor esset gregis dominici*. Matt. 17:26.
19. "The last chapter" of the same work, and the prayer *Ad Spiritum Sanctum*: the last question, q. 127 (PL 35, 2384), says that Peter received the primacy among the apostles; the prayer has not been found, and Loserth's references (*Opera* III, App., and *Tract. in Ioh.*, *Opera* III, 2, 724) belong to the *Quaestiones* citation at 55.10, not to this line. The apostate is Peter after his denial.
20. *Ad quem concedit*: the subject of *concedit* is the church. The manuscripts read *propterea* at 55.20, probably at *propter tria*; Loserth's print is translated.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 51: *Quamvis*
  - 51: *literali* [NW]
  - 51: *figurarunt* (hyphenated figura-/runt; main token covers whole word)
  - 52: *veritas*
  - 52: *lintheum* [NW]
  - 52: *Illa*
  - 52: *dominos* [NW]
  - 52: *cibum*
  - 52: *habeo*
  - 52: *manducare* (hyphenated man-/ducare; main token covers whole word)
  - 52: *con-* (hyphenated con-/terit; main token holds first half (35 is the line number))
  - 53: *oslendit* (leaf 114 zoomed: 3rd letter is tall like the d ascender, no crossbar, unlike the short crossed final t = l)
  - 53: *Yude*
  - 53: *eis* (15 is the line number)
  - 53: *I* (old-style arabic 1, x-height, zoomed)
  - 53: *prenominacionem* [NW]
  - 54: *et*
  - 54: *mitte*
  - 54: *et*
  - 54: *aperto*
  - 54: *illum*
  - 54: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 54: *testimonio* (10 is the line number)
  - 54: *ovium*
  - 55: *non*
  - 55: *aliud*
  - 55: *doceatis*
  - 55: *quam*
  - 55: *Petro*
  - 55: *novo* (box covers In novo: the word after In)
  - 52: *superficiem* (supernciem -> superficiem (scans: supernciem | superficiem | supernciem | supernciem))
  - 53: *in Symonem* (inSymonem -> in Symonem (x1 in the volume; scans: insymonem | insymonem | in | insymonem))
  - 52: *probabiliter* (LEFT-nw: print = probabiliter (scan readings are OCR noise))
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Matthias, (53.5).

Part 4: Peter's faith, the first of his three virtues

¶1 55.27–58.7
55.27 *Christ chose Peter for his fitness to rule the Church.*
56.5 *He excelled in faith, humility and charity.*
56.11
1. Faith.
57.20 *St. Gregory's allegorical interpretation.*

[55]Quantum ad primum, expeditum est in parte, sed pro secundo notandum quod racio quare Petrus ordinatus fuit a Christo post eum caput ecclesie fuit preeminencia virtutum ad regendum [56] ecclesiam; aliter enim sapiencia patris inprovide eum constituisset ecclesie sue episcopum. Et cum omnes virtutes in genere sint connexe, patet quod Petrus habuit quandam preeminenciam in omni genere virtutum. Tres autem erant virtutes in quibus pertinencius Petrus precellerat, scilicet fides, humilitas, caritas; fides, quam oportet esse petram ecclesie, precellebat in Petro, propter quod ordinavit magister Matth. XVI, 16 quod ad questionem, qua quesivit de se ipso, quem dicunt homines esse filium hominis, Petrus pro omnibus responderet: Tu es, inquit; filius Dei vivi. Ubi orthodoxe confitetur humanitatem in Christo, quia signat illum prophetam promissum patribus vel Messiam. Et secunda pars confitetur Christum Dei filium naturalem, quia aliter impertinens foret confessio. Et inter omnes articulos fidei nullus est ad edificandum ecclesiam Christi pertinencior quam secundum beatum Joh. I. Joh. V, 4 Dei filius vincit mundum: Quis est inquit, qui vincit mundum, nisi qui credit quoniam Ihesus est filius Dei. Nam hoc fundamento habito consequenter credendum, quod omnia, que fecit vel docuit; sunt sine calumpnia possibili a tota ecclesia acceptanda. Ideo audivit Petrus a Domino: Beatus es Symon Baryona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed pater meus, qui est in celis. Et ex ista fide accepit arras prefecture ecclesie. Et ego dico tibi, inquit, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam. De quo August, super Johannem sermone ultimo sic loquitur: Ecclesia quatitur sed non cadit, quando fundatur super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit, [57]non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, petra autem erat Christus. Et propter istas raciones tenentur superiores prepositi predicare fidem ecclesie, unde Luce XXII, 32: Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos. Ecce quomodo Christus exauditus pro sua reverencia singulariter rogavit pro fide Petri; et secundo iniunxit sibi primatum officii et per hoc fundamentum operatus est Petrus singulariter supra ceteros apostolos; per hanc; ut supra dixi, fidem extraxit Petrus gladium et percussit servum pontificis auferendo dextram eius auriculam, ut patet Joh. XVIII; per hanc eciam introivit in monumentum Evangelista, qui prius venerat stante foras, per hanc audito ab Evangelista, quia dominus est, misit se in mare, aliis discipulis venientibus navigio ad littus, ubi Christus stabat, ut patet Joh. ultimo, et sic de aliis superexcessivis operibus, que ex vehemencia

As to the first, it has been dealt with in part; but for the second it is to be noted that the reason why Peter was ordained by Christ head of the church after him was his preeminence in virtues for ruling [56]the church; for otherwise the wisdom of the Father would have improvidently appointed him bishop of his church.[1] And since all virtues are connected in their kind, it is clear that Peter had a certain preeminence in every kind of virtue. And there were three virtues in which Peter more fittingly excelled, namely faith, humility, charity. Faith, which must be the rock of the church, excelled in Peter; on account of which the master ordained, Matthew 16:16, that to the question he asked about himself, "Whom do men say that the Son of man is?", Peter should answer for all: "Thou art," he says, "[Christ,] the Son of the living God."[2] Here he confesses, as the orthodox do, the humanity in Christ, since [the name] signifies that prophet promised to the fathers, or the Messiah. And the second part confesses Christ the natural Son of God, since otherwise the confession would be beside the point. And among all the articles of faith none is more fitting for building the church of Christ than [that] the Son of God overcomes the world, according to blessed John, 1 John 5:4: "Who is he," he says, "that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"[3] For with this foundation held, it is consequently to be believed that all things which he did or taught are to be accepted by the whole church without possible challenge. Therefore Peter heard from the Lord: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." And from this faith he received the earnest of charge over the church: "And I say to thee," he says, "That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church." Of which Augustine, on John, in the last sermon, speaks thus: "The church is shaken but does not fall, since it is founded upon the rock from which Peter received his name; [57]for the rock is not from Peter, but Peter from the rock; and the rock was Christ."[4] And for these reasons the higher superiors are bound to preach the faith of the church; hence Luke 22:32: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." Behold how Christ, "heard for his reverence", prayed singularly for Peter's faith; and secondly enjoined on him the primacy of office; and by this foundation Peter worked singularly above the other apostles.[5] By this faith, as I said above, Peter drew the sword and struck the servant of the high priest,

sue fidei processerunt. Primum autem allegorizatur a sancto Gregorio, ut patet XXIV, q. I, Si Petrus: Primo inquit, docetur quod aurem in specie habere non debent, quam in ministerio non habebant. Sed bonus dominus ipsi refundit auditum demonstrans et ipsos, si convertantur, posse sanari qui in passione Christi vulnerati sunt; tollit eciam gladio spirituali interiorem auriculam male intelligentis de passione Domini, dum vel prescindit errorem quo putant esse dexterum non pati pro Christo, vel quod eius divinitas paciatur. Per secundum allegorizatur quod Petrus, gentes signans, licet tardius venit ad thesaurum fidei quam Johannes ex virginitate [58]sterilis, signans synagogam, tamen prius plenius introivit copiosius ad credendum in Christum. Per tercium vero signatur anagogice quod imitatores Petri et specialiter martyres in sermone fidei citius veniunt ad Christum stantem in littore eternitatis quam alii navigio, qui arte confessorum prudenter certant diu in vita cum hostibus.

cutting off his right ear, as is clear from John 18; by this also he went into the sepulchre, while the Evangelist, who had come first, stood outside; by this, having heard from the Evangelist "that it is the Lord", he cast himself into the sea, while the other disciples came in the ship to the shore where Christ stood, as is clear from the last chapter of John; and so of the other surpassing works which proceeded from the vehemence of his faith.[6] And the first is allegorized by St Gregory, as is clear from *Causa* 24, question 1, *Si Petrus*: "First," he says, "it is taught that they ought not to have in outward form the ear which they did not have in ministry. But the good Lord restores to him his hearing, showing that they too can be healed, if they are converted, who were wounded in the passion of Christ." He also takes away with the spiritual sword the inner ear of one who understands the Lord's passion wrongly, when he cuts off either the error by which they think it the right thing not to suffer for Christ, or [the error] that his divinity suffers.[7] By the second it is allegorized that Peter, signifying the gentiles, although he came later to the treasure of faith than John, barren from [58]virginity, signifying the synagogue, yet went in first, more fully and more abundantly, to believe in Christ. And by the third it is signified anagogically that the imitators of Peter, and especially the martyrs in the word of faith, come more quickly to Christ standing on the shore of eternity than the others in the ship, who by the art of confessors contend prudently and long in life with the enemies.[8]

Notes

1. A and B in marg.: *Petrus caput ecclesie quare nominatur*, "why Peter is named head of the church" (55.27). "The first" and "the second" are the first two of the three purposes just stated (55.21–26): the authorities of scripture, and the sense of the church. "Head of the church after him" is said of Peter under Christ, as the chapter's argument has it.
2. Matt. 16:13, 16 (DR). Loserth's print has *Tu es, inquit, filius Dei vivi* without *Christus* (56.14), but the next sentence expounds a first part that names the Messiah, which presupposes the Vulgate's *Tu es Christus*: we supply "[Christ,]" (our emendation). *Pre cellebat* is one word, *precellebat*.
3. 1 John 5:5 (DR); Loserth gives 5:4; the manuscripts read *I. Joh. IV* and *quia quam* (56.19). The construal of *quam secundum beatum Joh.* is ours: the article meant is "the Son of God overcomes the world". B in marg.: *Excellencia Petri in tribus virtutibus* (56.20).
4. Matt. 16:17–18 (DR). *Arras prefecture*, "the earnest of charge": a pledge of the office to come. Augustine on John, "the last sermon": *Tractatus in Iohannem* 124.5; PL 35, 1973 (*quatitur, et non cadit, quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra*); Loserth gives *Opera* IV, 1207, which does not agree with his own *Opera* III, 2, 820 for the same tractate at 61.4. 1 Cor. 10:4 (DR "and the rock was Christ").
5. Luke 22:32 (DR); B reads *unde* for *ut* (57.5). Heb. 5:7 (DR "was heard for his reverence"). B omits *Petri* (57.8).
6. John 18:10 (the reference *Joh.* is Loserth's; the manuscripts omit it, 57.13); John 20:4–6; John 21:7–8 (DR "It is the Lord ... cast himself into the sea"). *Evangelista ... stante* is read as an ablative absolute: John stood outside the tomb.
7. *Decretum* C. 24 q. 1 c. 17 (*Si Petrus*), which Wyclif gives to Gregory; Gratian's inscription is Ambrose, *In Lucam* X (PL 187, 1271A); Loserth gives "Cap. XVII" (57.22; modern form ours). A reads *allegorizant* (57.21). *Sanari*: the manuscripts read *saciari* (57.26); Loserth's print is translated. Where the quotation ends is Loserth's: the italics stop at *habebant*. *Dexterum*, "the right thing", plays on Malchus's right ear. The subject of *tollit* is Peter as preacher.
8. The allegory of John 20:4–6 follows Gregory, *Homilia in evangelia* 22 (*Hom.* 22.2–3, PL 76, 1175B–C: *Quid ergo per Joannem nisi Synagoga, quid per Petrum nisi Ecclesia designatur?*): John, who came first, the synagogue; Peter, who entered first, the gentiles. John 21:4–8: Christ on the shore, the others in the boat. *Martyres in sermone fidei* may also be construed "come in the word of faith".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **55: *Quantum***
  - **56: *illum***
  - **56: *a Domino* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **56: *meus***
  - **57: *pro* (no letter before pro on the print; 5 is the line number) [NW]**
  - **57: *te***
  - **57: *non* (zoomed: closed-top n)**
  - **57: *fides* [NW]**
  - **57: *non* (zoomed: closed-top n)**
  - **57: *in***
  - **57: *habebant* (zoomed)**
  - **57: *Petrus* (Petrns -> Petrus (scans: petrus | petrns | petrus))**
- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference st. Gregory's (57.20); reference 2. Peter's bumility. m (58.8).**

Part 5: Peter's humility and charity

Loserth pp. 58.8–62.8

¶1 58.8–60.9
58.8 *2. Peter's humility.*
59.8 *Grosseteste's 8 conditions of humility.*
59.25 *Peter's humility shewn in submitting to Paul's reproof;*
59.31 *in his behaviour to Cornelius.*
60.10 *3. Peters charity.*
60.23 *Different ways of love.*

[58]**Quantum ad secundam virtutem que est humilitas, patet quod necesse est cementem fidei coniungi lapidi ad construccionem celestis edificii, unde Math. XVIII. 1, 2, quando mota est questio, quis maior est in regno celorum magister decreverat, quod parvulus in mente humilior; ideo cum Petrus sit post Christum fundamentum ecclesie, necesse est quod sit quodammodo fratribus suis humilior. Et istam leccionem didicerunt apostoli a magistro Math. XI, 29: Discite, inquit, a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde, quod Petrus quia eminenter didicerat constitutus est fundamentum primum inter apostolos; unde Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone X: Discite a me non mundum fabricare, non creare, non miracula facere, nec mortuos suscitare, sed quoniam mitis sum et humilis corde. Quamvis autem istam leccionem convenit et oportet quemlibet salvandum advertere, oportet tamen Petrum, si debet esse fundamentum substratum aliis, profundius illam cognoscere, oportet enim fundamentum ecclesie esse humillimum, quia aliter tanta fabrica cuius fundus in terra capitur et cacumen usque ad summum celum erigitur non stabit solidum; fabrica igitur tam gravis in moribus requirit fundacionem** [59]**in summo gradu humilitatis possibili. Et hec racio quare Christus noluit fundare suam ecclesiam in mundi diviciis tamquam stercoribus vel aquis labilibus nec in mundi gloria vel fastu seculi tamquam ventis, sed in stabili paupertate, que securius, brevius et statui innocencie conformius facit humiles regnum celorum acquirere. Unde, ut declarat Lincolniensis in quodam sermone de humilitate, quod vere humilem iste octo condiciones inseparabiliter**

As to the second virtue, which is humility, it is clear that the cement of faith must be joined to the stone for the construction of the heavenly building; hence in Matthew 18:1–2, when the question was raised who "is the greater in the kingdom of heaven", the master had decided that [it is] the "little child", humbler in mind; therefore, since Peter is, after Christ, the foundation of the church, he must be in a certain way humbler than his brethren.[1] And the apostles learned this lesson from the master, Matthew 11:29: "Learn," he says, "of me, because I am meek, and humble of heart"; and because Peter had learned it eminently, he was appointed the first foundation among the apostles; hence Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, sermon 10: "Learn of me, not to fabricate the world, not to create, not to do miracles, nor to raise the dead, but that I am meek and humble of heart."[2] And although it is fitting and needful for everyone who is to be saved to heed this lesson, yet Peter, if he is to be the foundation laid beneath the others, must know it more deeply; for the foundation of the church must be the humblest, since otherwise so great a fabric, whose base is taken in the earth and whose summit is raised up to the highest heaven, will not stand firm; therefore a fabric so weighty in morals requires a foundation [59]**in the highest degree of humility possible. And this is the reason why Christ would not found his church on the riches of the world, as on dung or slipping waters, nor on the glory of the world or the pomp of the age, as on winds, but on stable poverty, which makes the humble acquire the kingdom of heaven**

consequuntur: Discutiat, inquit, unusquisque se ipsum diligenter, an vere humilitatis signa ipsum sequuntur. Vere namque humilis hiis signis dinoscitur: Si correptus a minori non dedignatur, si non insolescat honoribus, si non elevetur vel delectetur in suis laudibus, si non reddat malum pro malo, nec maledictum pro maledicto sed e contrario benedicit. Si inter equales primus est in ope et ultimus in ordine, primus in labore et ultimus in requie, primus in ministrando et ultimus in recumbendo. Si gracias agit divine benevolencie, si tam libenter obedit quam precipit, si in potestate constitutus prius se noscit subiectum quam prepositum, sicut fecit centurio, de quo Luce VII. Et inter omnes scolas pertinentes preposito et Petri vicario non est alia pertinencior, sicut enim Petrus acute correptus a Paulo, ut patet Gal. II, humiliter toleravit, quando eciam missum est pro illo ad confirmandum centurionem Act. X. non petiit constipacionem comitive elegantis equestrium sed humiliter resedit in Yoppen pedester et requisitus in domo Simonis coriarii iuxta mare venit sibi humilius et instruxit, non expectans ab eo retribucionem temporalium vel [60]donorum, et quando crebro se exposuit ante alios apostolos, non sic fecit gracia mundani honoris vel commodi, sed humiliter, obedienter et serviliter pro supportando onere Christi. Et sic quicquid de ipso legimus sonans in eius maioritatem super alios apostolos dicit maioritatem sue humilitatis atque servicii, quia iuxta hoc debet in eis maioritas attendi, ut patet Math. XVII et Luce XXII ex diffinicione magistri.

more securely, more quickly, and more in conformity with the state of innocence.[3] Hence, as Lincoln declares in a certain sermon on humility, these eight conditions follow the truly humble man inseparably: "Let each one," he says, "examine himself diligently, whether the signs of true humility follow him. For the truly humble man is discerned by these signs: if, rebuked by a lesser man, he does not disdain it; if he does not grow insolent with honours; if he is not lifted up or delighted in his own praises; if he does not render evil for evil, nor railing for railing, but contrariwise blesses; if among equals he is first in help and last in rank, first in labour and last in rest, first in serving and last in reclining at table; if he gives thanks to the divine benevolence; if he obeys as willingly as he commands; if, set in power, he knows himself a subject before [he knows himself] a superior, as the centurion did, of whom Luke 7 speaks."[4] And among all the schools pertinent to a superior and vicar of Peter there is none more pertinent. For as Peter, sharply rebuked by Paul, as is clear from Galatians 2, humbly bore it, [so] also when he was sent for to confirm the centurion, Acts 10, he did not seek the press of an elegant mounted company, but humbly stayed on foot at Joppa, and, sought out in the house of Simon the tanner by the sea, he came to him the more humbly and instructed him, not expecting from him any return of temporal goods or [60]gifts; and when he often put himself forward before the other apostles, he did not do so for the sake of worldly honour or advantage, but humbly, obediently and as a servant, to bear the burden of Christ.[5] And so whatever we read of him that sounds toward his greatness over the other apostles speaks of the greatness of his humility and service, since it is according to this that greatness ought to be regarded among them, as is clear from Matthew 17 and Luke 22, from the master's definition.[6]

¶2 60.10–60.22

[60]Quantum ad terciam virtutem, scilicet caritatem, patet quod Petrus socios suos precesserat, patet ex fervore operum, quod oportet correspondenter ex maiori dileccione procedere; et confirmatur ex hoc quod aliter Petrus foret nimis ingratus nisi magistrum tam singulariter eum diligentem a tanta blasphemia abstergentem et super oves suas generose preficientem correspondenter magis dilexerit. Et confirmatur tercio ex hoc; quod aliter magister Joh. ultimo inpertinenter quereret: Symon Johannis, diligis me plus hiis, et statim ex maioritate dileccionis committit sibi suam ecclesiam ad pascendum.

As to the third virtue, namely charity, it is clear that Peter had surpassed his companions; it is clear from the fervour of his works, which must proceed correspondingly from a greater love; and it is confirmed from this, that otherwise Peter would be exceedingly ungrateful unless he had loved correspondingly more the master who loved him so singularly, wiped him clean of so great a blasphemy, and generously set him over his sheep.[7] And it is confirmed thirdly from this, that otherwise the master, in the last chapter of John, would ask beside the point: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?"; and at once, from the greatness of his love, he commits his church to him to feed.[8]

¶3 60.23–61.12
61.13 *Peter represents the active part of the Church, John the contemplative,*

[60]Sed notandum (ut supra tetigi) quod multiplex est racio amandi: quidam enim plus amant Christum secundum racionem divinitatis, ut creditur de Evangelista, quidam vero plus amant eum secundum racionem sue humanitatis, ut creditur de Philippo, et quidam secundum racionem dileccionis sui corporis, quod est ecclesia; et sic de infinitis aliis racionibus et istorum subdivisionibus, pro quibus de quolibet sancto dicunt illud Ecclesiastici XLIV, 20 verificari: Non est [61]inventus similis illi. Et sic quilibet humilior est caritativior, et sic de aliis virtutibus; et quoad aliquam earum eminenciam. Videtur tamen Augustinum super Joh. Omeliam CXXIV difficultare istam materiam in hoc, quod inpertinenter tam crebro diceret Johannes de se ipso quod ipsum diligebat Ihesus, nisi eum ultra alios preeminenter diligeret. Et certum est quod proporcionaliter ut Deus quicquam prius diligit est ipsum melius et e contra, et ex alio latere videtur quod si Petrus plus diligit Ihesum suum est ipse melior, et per consequens plus amatur.

But it is to be noted (as I touched on above) that the ground of loving is manifold: for some love Christ more under the aspect of his divinity, as is believed of the Evangelist; some love him more under the aspect of his humanity, as is believed of Philip; and some under the aspect of love of his body, which is the church; and so of infinitely many other aspects and their subdivisions, on account of which they say of every saint that the word of Ecclesiasticus 44:20 is verified: "There was not [61]found the like to him."[9] And so anyone who is humbler is more charitable, and so of the other virtues; and [this] as regards some eminence among them.[10] Yet Augustine, on John, homily 124, seems to make this matter difficult in this, that John would say of himself so often, beside the point, that Jesus loved him, unless he loved him preeminently beyond the others. And it is certain that in proportion as God loves anything sooner, it is the better, and conversely; and on the other side it seems that if Peter loves his Jesus more, he is himself better, and consequently is loved more.[11]

¶4 61.13–62.8

[61]In ista materia videtur sanctum sic dicere, quod isti duo apostoli signant duas partes ecclesie, Petrus activam et Johannes contemplativam, quarum prima imperfecta finitur in via; et secunda perfeccior consumatur in patria, et sic ad sensum anagogicum Christus plus diligit Johannem dum plus amat vitam in patria, sed Petrus plus amat Christum, quia senciendo miseriam nostram plus diligimus Dei misericordiam, veritatem autem contemplacionis, quia nondum apparet nobis, minus diligimus. Et ad istum sensum Christus plus amavit Johannem, quia minus, inquit Augustinus, amat nos Christus miseros quam beatos, sed quam personam de illis plus diligit in celo non innotescit. Ex isto dicto videtur tamen quod in vita activa plus amoris Christi presbiter hic indicat in effectu, et sic Deus eternaliter plus amat membrum suum esse in beatitudine quam in via; et tamen quidquid amaverit eternaliter eque amat; et sic non est nostrum modo cognoscere utrum Deus simpliciter plus amat Petrum [62]in beatitudine quam Johannem. Non, inquit Augustinus, quantum ab alio quolibet Christus diligitur scire poterat, qui cor alterius videre non poterat, et ideo prudenter non dicit Petrus: Domine, Tu scis, quia amo te plus hiis sed asseruit: Domine, inquit, Tu scis, quia amo te; caritatem itaque et alias virtutes Petrus habuit in via secundum aliquam racionem ceteris apostolis plus perfectas.

In this matter the saint seems to say thus: that these two apostles signify two parts of the church, Peter the active and John the contemplative, of which the first, imperfect, is ended in the way, and the second, more perfect, is consummated in the homeland; and so in the anagogical sense Christ loves John more, inasmuch as he loves more the life in the homeland, but Peter loves Christ more, because, feeling our misery, we love God's mercy more, and the truth of contemplation, because it does not yet appear to us, we love less. And in this sense Christ loved John more, "because", says Augustine, "Christ loves us less wretched than blessed"; but which person of those he loves more in heaven is not made known.[12] From this saying, however, it seems that in the active life the presbyter here shows in effect more of the love of Christ; and so God eternally loves more that his member be in blessedness than in the way; and yet whatever he has loved, he loves eternally and equally; and so it is not ours now to know whether God without qualification loves Peter [62] more in blessedness than John.[13] "For he could not know," says Augustine, "how much Christ is loved by any other, since he could not see another's heart; and therefore Peter prudently does not say: Lord, thou knowest that I love thee more than these, but asserted: Lord," he says, "thou knowest that I love thee." Peter, therefore, had charity and the other virtues in the way, in some respect, more perfect than the other apostles.[14]

Notes

1. AB in marg.: *Humilitas* (58.8). *Cementem* is Loserth's print (read on the plate); B reads *cernentem* (58.9); neither construes, and we translate as *cementum*, "cement" (our emendation). Matt. 18:1–4 (DR "Who, thinkest thou, is the greater in the kingdom of heaven?"; "as this little child"). B reads *fit* for *sit* (58.14).
2. Matt. 11:29 (DR). A in marg.: *Fundamentum ecclesie quomodo dicitur Petrus* (58.18). Augustine, *De verbis Domini* sermon 10 (now *Sermo* 69); Loserth compares *Opera* V, 1688 (58.21); the words are *Sermo* 69.2, PL 38, 441 (*discite a me: non mundum fabricare ... sed quoniam mitis sum et humilis corde*). B omits *in* (58.21).
3. *Fundus in terra capitur*: "whose base is taken in the earth", i.e. laid in it. Riches as dung and waters, glory as winds: the house on sand, Matt. 7:26–27, is perhaps in view.
4. Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, a sermon on humility, which Wyclif names elsewhere as the sermon *Beati pauperes spiritu* (*Opus evangelicum* I, p. 17; the same signs are quoted in *De civili dominio* III, p. 40) (the manuscript reads *Lincon.*, 59.8); Loserth compares Wyclif's *Trialogus* p. 166 and *Sermones* II, 149. A in marg.: *Humilis vere habet octo condiciones*; B: *Octo signa vere humilitatis* (59.13). 1 Pet. 3:9 (DR "Not rendering evil for evil, nor railing for railing, but contrariwise, blessing"); Luke 7:8 (DR "I also am a man subject to authority").
5. Gal. 2:11–14; Acts 10:5–33 (Cornelius at Caesarea; Peter lodged with Simon the tanner at Joppa, 10:6). *Sicut enim ... toleravit, quando eciam*: the correlative is not expressed; we supply "[so]". *Constipacionem comitive elegantis equestrium*, "the press of an elegant mounted company".
6. "Matthew 17" as printed; the dispute over greatness is Matt. 18:1–4 (or 20:26); Luke 22:24–26 (DR "he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger"). A in marg.: *Petro quidquid ascribitur super alios apostolos dicit maioritatem sue humilitatis et servicii* (60.4).
7. AB in marg.: *Caritas* (60.10). The blasphemy is Peter's denial (Matt. 26:69–75); B omits *blasphemia* (60.16). Set over his sheep: John 21:15–17. *Dileccio* and *diligere* are "love"; *caritas* is "charity".
8. John 21:15 (DR). The "second" confirmation is the one introduced by *et confirmatur ex hoc*; the text counts it implicitly.
9. B in marg.: *Racio amandi multiplex* (60.23). *Racio* is the ground or aspect under which one loves; untagged, since the the glossary's "aspect" row is the technical sense against *substancia*. John the Evangelist and the divinity, Philip and the humanity (cf. John 14:8–9): no source is given. Ecclus. 44:20 (DR "there was not found the like to him in glory"), said there of Abraham, and applied in the liturgy to each confessor.
10. The clause *et quoad aliquam earum eminenciam* (61.2–3) does not construe as it stands and may have lost a word. Alternative construal: each saint is humbler and more charitable [than another] in some respect, in which he has an eminence among the virtues. B reads *eorum* for *earum* (61.3).
11. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 124.4–5 (PL 35, 1971–75: John's repeated *quem diligebat Iesus* is the question of 124.4, the two lives the answer of 124.5; Loserth: *Opera* III, 2, 820, 61.4). *Prius diligit* is the print (read on the plate); *plus*, "more", would suit the argument, but "sooner" is translated. *Ihesum suum*, "his Jesus", is the print.
12. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 124.5–6 (PL 35, 1973–75; *minus nos amat Christus miseros quam beatos* is 124.6): Peter loves more, John is loved more; Christ loves us less in our misery than he will in blessedness.
13. *Presbiter hic*: Peter, figure of the active life (cf. 1 Pet. 5:1, where Peter calls himself a fellow *senior*); the referent is not certain. *Eque amat*: what God loves he loves eternally, and with an equal love.
14. Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 124.4 (PL 35, 1972: *Non enim quantum ab alio quolibet diligeretur scire poterat, qui cor alterius videre non poterat*); Loserth: "loosely quoted" (62.1). John 21:15 (DR "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee"). *Plus perfectas* agrees with *virtutes*: the virtues, not Peter, are "more perfect" than [those of] the other apostles.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 58: *edificii* (10 is the line number) [NW]
  - 58: *1* (old-style arabic 1, x-height)
  - 58: *celorum*
  - 59: *non* (zoomed: closed-top n)
  - 59: *malo*
  - 59: *equales*
  - 59: *instruxit* [NW]
  - 60: *preficientem* [NW]
  - 61: *amat*
  - 62: *ab*
  - 62: *te plus* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 62: *hiis*
  - 62: *caritatem*
  - 62: *Petrus*
  - 61: *quod isti* (quodisti -> quod isti (two words run together))
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 2. Peter's bumility. m (58.8); reference 3. Peters charitv. ^ , _ . (60.10); reference Peter's (62.10).

Chapter 4

Part 1: The vicar of Peter and what election is worth

Loserth pp. 62.10–66.18

¶1 62.10–63.8
62.10 *Peter's primacy was continued to his successors.*
62.21 *What is required of Peter's vicar and what makes him such.*
63.9 *We must follow Peter in his way of life, and must have authority from God.*
63.27 *Human choice avails nothing unless it declares God's will.*

[62]**Supposito quod beatus Petrus habuit primatum inter apostolos ad regendum, arbitror quod non solum accepit primatum pro se ipso sed pro eius vicariis succedentibus in ecclesia militante. Cum enim Christus non potest ecclesiam suam deserere et oporteat ipsam militantem post Christum exemplari ab ecclesia apostolica, mandatum est quod, sicut Christus fuit capitaneus cetus apostolici et post ipsum Petrus, sic oportet continue esse capitaneum in ecclesia militante. Sed antequam discuciatur utrum oporteat ipsum esse Romanum pontificem necessarium, arbitror precognoscere aliquas sentencias premittendas. Et primo, qualem oportet esse beati Petri archivicarium et per quid constituitur Petri vicarius. Nec debet fideli verti in dubium quin sicut Petrus ex hinc per se fuit Christi vicarius; quod magistrum suum quoad actus et mores secutus fuit similius, sic oportet Petri vicarium similius sequendo Petrum de corpore ecclesie derivari.** [63]**Vicarius enim in quantum huiusmodi gerit vicem superioris a quo capit vicariam potestatem. Si igitur in principio quod debet regulare sequencia Petrus non fuisset sic Christi vicarius nisi quia secutus fuit eum propinquius, per locum a sufficienti similitudine oportet quod Petri archivicarius de propinquiori sequatur Christum et per consequens Petrum in moribus.**

Supposing that blessed Peter had the primacy among the apostles for ruling, I think that he received the primacy not only for himself but for his vicars succeeding him in the church militant. For since Christ cannot desert his church, and it must, militant after Christ, be modelled on the apostolic church, it is enjoined that, as Christ was captain of the apostolic company, and after him Peter, so there must continually be a captain in the church militant.[1] But before it is discussed whether he must necessarily be the Roman pontiff, I think [we must] know beforehand certain teachings to be set out first.[2] And first, what sort of man the archvicar of blessed Peter must be, and by what a vicar of Peter is constituted. Nor ought a believer to call into doubt that, just as Peter was in his own right vicar of Christ from this, that he followed his master more nearly in likeness as to acts and morals, so Peter's vicar must be derived from the body of the church by following Peter more nearly in likeness.[3] [63]**For a vicar, as such, bears the stead of the superior from whom he takes vicarial power. If therefore in the beginning, which ought to regulate what follows, Peter would not have been thus vicar of Christ except because he followed him more nearly, then by the topic from sufficient likeness Peter's archvicar must follow Christ, and consequently Peter, more nearly in morals.[4]**

¶2 63.9–63.26

[63]**Item, illius est homo vicarius cuius vicem gerit et a quo procuratoriam potestatem legitime accepit, sed nemo gerit vicem Christi vel Petri nisi sequatur eum in moribus, cum nulla alia sequela sit pertinens nec aliter recipit a Deo procuratoriam potestatem, igitur ad illud officium vicarium requiritur et morum conformitas et instituentis auctoritas. Cum enim Deus necessario agit omnem accionem creature, patet quod impossibile est habere quemquam talem vicariam potestatem nisi Deus ipsam dederit, sicut dicit Apostolus Rom. XIII, ymo cum illa potestas sit tam excellens dominium supernaturale, videtur quod oportet ipsum singulariter et supernaturaliter dari a Deo. Deus autem non daret provide potestatem huiusmodi illi quem sciret esse prodituram**

Again, a man is the vicar of him whose stead he bears and from whom he has lawfully received proctorial power; now no one bears the stead of Christ or of Peter unless he follows him in morals, since no other following is pertinent, nor does he otherwise receive proctorial power from God; therefore for that vicarial office there is required both conformity of morals and the authority of the one who institutes.[5] For since God necessarily does every action of a creature, it is clear that it is impossible for anyone to have such vicarial power unless God has given it, as the Apostle says, Romans 13; indeed, since that power is so excellent a supernatural lordship, it seems that it must be given by God singularly and supernaturally.[6] Now God would not providently give power of this

suam ecclesiam, sicut nec dat graciam predestinacionis illi quem scit finaliter periturum.

¶3 63.27–65.7
64.20 *Rulers are to be obeyed so far as they set forth the life and will of Christ.*
65.8 *The success of an election is to be judged by the good works of the elected.*

[63]Ex quibus patet quod humana eleccio nichil valet in eligendo talem prepositum; nisi forte de quanto promulgaverit conformiter ad divinum iudicium. Et ista est secunda sentencia supponenda. Item suppono quod electores devient eligendo unum inhabilem propter affeccionem persone, pecunie vel in penam peccati populi, non concordando divine sentencie, tunc cum Deus non approbat nec confirmat quod peccator [64]quem eligunt sit eius vicarius, patet quod eorum activa eleccio non dat electo iusticiam quoad Deum. Sic enim possent electores perverti quod eligunt in Christi vicarium pessimum Antichristum. Et hinc credo quod ritus ecclesie religiose nominant talem electum permissione divina episcopum; non presumunt dicere approbacione vel gracia divina; quod sepius mentiretur. Si dicatur quod eo ipso quis eligitur aput Deum autorizantem eleccionem, quo in eum maior pars consenserit electorum, eo ipso subditi debent sequi eum quomodocumque viaverit, patet quod nichil infidelius, quia non solum membra dyaboli cogerent Deum ad malum; sed fides consequentis subverteret statum ecclesie, ideo absit a fidelibus hoc porisma; tunc enim posset currus Dei ex principiis fidei duci in precipicium, descendendo per latitudinem itineris Antichristi. Ideo debet esse maxima fideli quod precise de tanto debet subditus sequi suum privatum prepositum vel sibi aut sue prepositure legitime consentire, de quanto imitatus est Christum vel docuerit legem suam, aut conversacione et opere ostendit signum vivum sui officii. Patet ex decreto sancti pape Cypriani distinccione VIII Si solus Christus, et docet apostolus prima Cor. XI, 1: Estote imitatores mei sicut ego Christi. Ecce quam breviter forma exprimitur imitandi. Et hec racio quare apostoli, ne eclipsarent, sed declararent visionem ad sequendum Christi vestigia, non ediderunt novas leges sed legem quam a Christo acceperant sedule docuerunt; dixerunt se esse vacuos et dyasones quasi nichil, ut patet prima Cor. XIII, 2, [65]et Christum non se vigilancius predicabant, ut patet II. Cor. IV. Nichil enim periculosius in ecclesia quam obumbrare viam sequendi Christi vestigia, ducendo populum ab eius semita, quia error talis secundum imaginacionem Aristotelis primo De Celo et Mundo cresceret in declinacionem maximam Antichristi.

kind to one whom he knew would betray his church, just as he does not give the grace of predestination to one whom he knows will finally perish.

From which it is clear that human election avails nothing in electing such a superior, unless perhaps in so far as it has promulgated in conformity with the divine judgement. And this is the second teaching to be supposed.[7] Again, I suppose that electors go astray by electing an unqualified man out of affection for a person or for money, or in punishment for the sin of the people, not agreeing with the divine sentence; then, since God neither approves nor confirms that the sinner [64]whom they elect is his vicar, it is clear that their active election does not give the one elected justice as regards God. For electors could be so perverted that they elect the worst Antichrist as vicar of Christ. And hence I believe that the rites of the church religiously name such a one, once elected, "bishop by divine permission"; they do not presume to say "by divine approval" or "by divine grace", which would very often be a lie.[8] If it is said that by the very fact that the greater part of the electors has consented to someone, he is elected before God, who authorizes the election, [and that] by that very fact the subjects must follow him however he has walked, it is clear that nothing is more faithless; for not only would members of the devil compel God to evil, but faith in the consequent would overturn the state of the church; therefore far be this porism from the faithful; for then the chariot of God could, from principles of faith, be driven over a precipice, going down along the broadness of the road of Antichrist.[9] Therefore it ought to be a maxim for the believer that a subject ought to follow his private superior, or lawfully consent to him or to his office of superior, precisely in so far as he has imitated Christ or taught his law, or by manner of life and work shows a living sign of his office.[10] It is clear from the decree of the holy pope Cyprian, distinction 8, *Si solus Christus*, and the apostle teaches it, 1 Corinthians 11:1: "Be ye imitators of me, as I of Christ."[11] See how briefly the form of imitating is expressed. And this is the reason why the apostles, so as not to eclipse but to make clear the vision for following Christ's footsteps, did not put out new laws, but diligently taught the law that they had received from Christ; they said that they were empty and *dyasones*, as it were "nothing", as is clear from 1 Corinthians 13:2, [65] and they preached Christ, not themselves, the more watchfully, as is clear from 2 Corinthians 4.[12] For nothing is more dangerous in the church than to overshadow the way of following Christ's footsteps, leading the people

away from his path, for such an error, according to Aristotle's image in the first book of ***On the Heaven and the World***, would grow into the greatest deviation, [that] of Antichrist.[13]

¶4 65.8–65.27

[65]**Et ex isto quarto colligitur quod, sive electores bene vel male elegerint, operibus bonis debemus credere et quicumque modus perficiendi prepositum fuerit iudicio Christi conformior est eo melior. Nam ex dictis secundo capitulo de potestate eo ipso quo quis copiosius operatur meritorie habet a Deo ad hoc copiosius potestatem. Et hinc dicit Christus Joh. X, 38: Operibus credite, et hinc dicit Crisostomus in De laude Pauli: Si, inquit, magisterii atque primatus adipiscendi gracia ad procuranda tanta negocia apostoli prosiluissent, consequenter essent de ambicione culpabiles. Sequitur: Sicut enim, qui princeps fuerit ordinatus, nisi digne sibi impositum ministret officium, meretur eciam maiora supplicia, sic alter etsi non ordinetur, suscipiat tamen et sicut oportet impleat non dico sacerdocium sed solicitudinem curamque multorum, tunc profecto honore est dignissimus. Iste sanctus non ponderavit elecciones nostras sed recta officia.**

And from this it is gathered, fourth, that whether electors have elected well or ill, we ought to believe good works, and whatever mode of making a superior is more in conformity with the judgement of Christ is by so much the better.[14] For from what was said in the second chapter on power, by the very fact that someone works the more abundantly meritoriously, he has from God the more abundantly the power for it. And hence Christ says, John 10:38: "Believe the works"; and hence Chrysostom says in *De laude Pauli*: "If," he says, "the apostles had leapt forward to manage such great affairs for the sake of gaining rule and primacy, they would consequently be guilty of ambition." It continues: "For as he who has been ordained a prince, unless he administers worthily the office laid on him, deserves even greater punishments, so another, even if he is not ordained, should he yet take up and fulfil as he ought (I do not say the priesthood, but the solicitude and care of many), then he is surely most worthy of honour." This saint did not weigh our elections, but offices rightly done.[15]

¶5 65.28–65.30

[65]**Sed contra illud arguitur per hoc, quod iuxta istam sentenciam perirent de eleccionibus multe leges et multa legum principia.**

But against that it is argued by appeal to this, that according to this teaching many laws on elections, and many principles of laws, would perish.

¶6 66.1–66.18

66.1 *Laws would not be set aside except so far as they were heretical.*

[66]**Sed negetur illud, nisi forte vocentur leges hereses, quibus intricatur ecclesia. Nichil enim est magis hereticum quam pertinaciter defendere quod eo ipso quo electores vel maior pars eorum consenserit viva voce secundum ritus hominum in personam aliquam, eo ipso illa persona legittime est electa; oportet enim subducere subduccionem, quia stat in culpatis electoribus quod electus sit pessimus antichristus et stat illos amore vel odio eligere personam in quam Deus non consenserit, sicut stat ipsos male eligere personam cuius eleccionem passivam Deus approbat. Ideo idem hoc foret credere et electores extollere super Deum; quia ratificare per eos eleccionem quoad personam apud Deum inhabilem, quod Trinitas non potest facere. Ideo illi qui religiosius eligunt subducta revelacione solum probabili reputacione pronuncciant pro electo.**

[66]But let that be denied, unless perhaps heresies, by which the church is entangled, are called laws. For nothing is more heretical than to defend obstinately that by the very fact that the electors, or the greater part of them, have consented by living voice, according to the rites of men, to some person, by that very fact that person is lawfully elected; for the exclusion must be made, since it can be, when the electors are culpable, that the one elected is the worst antichrist, and it can be that they elect, from love or hatred, a person to whom God has not consented, just as it can be that they elect wrongly a person whose passive election God approves. Therefore to believe this would be the same as to exalt the electors above God, since [it would be] to ratify through them an election as regards a person unqualified before God, which the Trinity cannot do. Therefore those who elect more religiously, revelation being absent, pronounce for the one elected only by a probable reckoning.[16]

Notes

1. ***Mandatum est quod***, "it is enjoined that" (c. 62.15), is the print; it construes only loosely, and ***manifestum est***, "it is manifest", would suit the argument better. ***Post Christum*** may go with ***militantem*** ("militant after Christ") or with ***exemplari***. A in marg.: ***Capitulum 4*** (62.9). At 62.18 B reads or adds ***oportet esse***; the note is unclear in the scan.
2. ***Arbitror precognoscere***: the infinitive has no subject; we supply "[we must]". B reads ***permittendas*** for ***premittendas*** (62.22).
3. The print's semicolon after ***vicarius*** divides ***ex hinc ... quod***, "from this, that"; we construe across it. ***Similius***, "more nearly in likeness", is the comparative of ***similis***; ***per se***, "in his own right". ***Archivicarius***, "archvicar": Peter's chief vicar. B in marg.: ***Qualis debet esse archivicarius Petri***; A in marg.: ***Vicarius Petri per quid constituatur*** (62.22).
4. ***Per locum a sufficienti similitudine***: the dialectical topic (***locus***) from likeness; what made Peter vicar at the beginning makes his successor vicar after him. ***Mores***, "morals": conduct, way of life.
5. ***Sequela*** (printed broken, 63.13) is here the following of Christ, not the logician's "what follows" (the glossary), so it is untagged. B reads ***fit*** for ***sit*** (63.13). ***Procuratoria potestas***, "proctorial power": the power of one who acts as proctor (***procurator***) for another.
6. Rom. 13:1 (DR "there is no power but from God"). ***Agit omnem accionem creature***: God as first agent in every act of a creature.
7. ***De quanto promulgaverit***: an election counts only as a declaration of what God has already judged. The first teaching is the one on the vicar's likeness to Peter (¶¶1–2).
8. ***Divine sentencie*** is God's verdict on the person, so "sentence" (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), against "teaching" just before it. ***Nominant*** is Loserth's correction; the manuscript reads ***nominat*** (64.5–6). The manuscripts read ***talem episcopum*** (64.6–7), the print ***talem electum ... episcopum***: we translate the print. ***Permissione divina*** is set against ***gracia divina***, the two formulas of a bishop's style.
9. ***Quomodocumque viaverit***, "however he has walked": whatever way of life he has taken. ***Fides consequentis***: belief in the consequent of the conditional just stated (that subjects must follow the one so elected). The broad road: cf. Matt. 7:13 (DR "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction").
10. ***Suum privatum prepositum***: perhaps "his own particular superior"; ***privatum*** may also point to the superior of a ***religio privata***, an order (the glossary).
11. Gratian, ***Decretum*** D.8 c.9, ***Si solus Christus*** (from Cyprian); Loserth: "Decreti Prima pars, dist. VIII, cap. IX" (64.25); the modern form is ours. 1 Cor. 11:1: the Vulgate reads ***Imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi*** (DR "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ"); Wyclif changes the order and drops ***et***, and we keep "imitators" for the "form of imitating" that follows.
12. ***Dyasones*** (64.33) is the print, confirmed on the plate; it does not construe and no variant is given. It may be a corruption touching 1 Cor. 13:1 (***aes sonans***, DR "sounding brass"), and is left untranslated. 1 Cor. 13:2 (DR "I am nothing"); Loserth italicises ***nichil***. 2 Cor. 4:5 (DR "For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord").
13. The manuscripts read ***et ducendo*** (65.4); the print omits ***et***. Aristotle, ***De caelo*** I.5 (271b8–13): a small error at the outset becomes great at the end.
14. ***Ex isto quarto***: "fourth" counts the suppositions (the vicar's likeness to Peter; election as declaration only; the electors' error). A in marg.: ***Officii explecio debita ostendit prelatum habere potestatem*** (65.8).
15. John 10:38 (DR "believe the works"). Chrysostom, ***De laudibus sancti Pauli***; Loserth: ***Opp.*** (ed. Migne) I, 830, 931, cf. IX, 205 (65.16); for the second passage cf. ***In ep. ad Titum*** 1, hom. 2 (65.17). ***Magisterium*** is "rule" here (the glossary). ***Sequitur*** introduces the continuation of the quotation, not an inference, so it is untagged. B in marg.: ***Nota*** (65.17); A in marg.: ***Ministrans sollicite ecclesie est honore dignissimus*** (65.20). ***Recta officia***: offices rightly discharged.
16. ***Oportet enim subducere subduccionem***, literally "one must subtract the subtraction": the rule holds only once the case of culpable electors is taken out (cf. ***subducto errore instituentis***, 69.12). ***Stat ... quod***, "it can be that". ***Eleccionem passivam***: the person's being elected, as against the electors' active election (64.1). ***Quia ratificare***: the infinitive hangs on an understood ***foret***; we supply "[it would be]". ***Subducta revelacione***, "revelation being absent".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 62: ***CAPITULUM QUARTUM.***
  - 63: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar before quela)
  - 63: ***illa***
  - 64: ***ı*** (old-style arabic 1, x-height)
  - 64: ***mei***
  - 65: ***ministret***
  - 65: ***non*** (zoomed: closed-top n)
  - 65: ***honore*** (zoomed: closed-top n)
  - 66: ***defendere*** (zoomed: f with crossbar and ascender)
  - 66: ***illa persona*** (one token covers two printed words)
  - 64: ***dyasones*** (checked at translation: the print reads so, roman; ***nichil*** follows in italic)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter's (62.10).

Part 2: Election by lot, the apostles and Matthias

Loserth pp. 66.19–69.29

¶1 66.19–68.7
66.19 *It is argued that without elections order would fail in the Church.*
66.26 *This is doing evil that good may come.*
66.32 *God has not engaged to confirm any election made.*
67.4 *Electors often err.*
67.10 *The apostles elected Matthias by lot.*
68.8 *Four ways of choice: 1. Lot. 2. Bishop's appointment. 3. Hereditary succession; 4. Election as as now practised.*
68.24 *It may be well to select to the best of our judgement and then cast lots, as did the apostles.*

[66]Sed secundo replicatur per hoc quod oportet pro salvando cursu et statu ecclesie incidere in tales errores absconditos, ne ecclesia destituatur regimine. Sed iste est communior lapsus in heresim, qua dogmatizatur peccandum esse ut bonum eveniat. Constat quidem ex fide quod pro toto mundo non consentiret fidelis mendacio electorum, sicut nec electores contra veritatem eligerent unum inhabilem quem Deus prius non elegerit et habilitaverit. Et patet quod sentencia electivarum legum debet supponere cetera paria et conformia in preeleccione divina, quia aliter est dicta maxima summe impossibilis et fidelium seductiva. Nec aliquis fidelis ad tantum infatuatur, ut credat Deum ex pacto electoribus assistere et suam eleccionem qualiscumque fuerit confirmare; [67]tunc enim forent electores inpeccabiles, cum in eligendo facilius errare potuerunt. Nec tunc convinci poterit error eleccionis nec esset eius confirmacio ab homine expectanda. Ideo nichil fideli nocius quam quod in eleccionibus huiusmodi contingit errare crebrius; quod regulariter contingit, quando electores eligunt personam quam Deus non approbat vel habilitat ad tale officium. Et hec racio quare apostoli elegerunt Mathiam per sortem, ut patet Actuum Ubi sunt notanda misteria, primo quomodo beatus Petrus ex illo Psalmo CVIII, 8 episcopatum eius accipiat alter concludit quod oportet ex hiis viris, qui viderunt conversacionem apostolorum cum Christo; unum institui loco Jude et, quia nondum habuerunt revelacionem de persona; constituerunt duos plus habiles scilicet Barsabam et Mathiam, relinquentes divino iudicio quem illorum voluerit per sortem ostendere electum penes eum; cuius arbitrio oportet in eleccionibus dare fidem. Unde triginta electores sequentes dixerunt verba notabilia sepe dicte sentencie expressiva. Tu Domine, inquiunt, qui nosti corda hominum, ostende quem elegeris ex hiis duobus unum accipere locum ministerii huius, ubi patet quod oportet Deum eligere et secundum alios ritus eligentes valde ecquivoce eleccionem Dei fideliter promulgare, ideo dicit, ostende quem elegeris non ad dignitatem sed ministerium. Sed tercio obicitur, cum eleccio nostra debet exemplari et autorizari ab apostolis; a quibus trahimus ritus alios, videtur quod debemus in nostris eleccionibus sequi illos; nam magis autenticam [68]formam eligendi non possumus cogitare; et obiectus eque moverent contra apostolos. Et iterum videtur quod non plus in isto quam in illis que sonant commodum et honorem licet a ritu apostolorum recedere, quia sic pertinenter imponeretur nobis quod deserentes fidem scripture exequimur infideliter ritus gentilium.

But secondly it is rejoined, by appeal to this, that to save the course and state of the church one must fall into such hidden errors, lest the church be left destitute of government.[1] But this is the commoner lapse into the heresy by which it is taught as dogma that "one must sin, that good may come".[2] It is evident indeed, as faith teaches, that a believer would not, for the whole world, consent to the lie of the electors, just as electors would not, against the truth, elect an unqualified man whom God has not first elected and qualified.[3] And it is clear that the teaching of the laws on election ought to suppose all else equal and conformed to the divine pre-election, since otherwise the said maxim is supremely impossible and a seducer of the faithful. Nor is any believer so far infatuated as to believe that God by covenant assists electors and confirms their election, whatever it may be; [67]for then electors would be impeccable, although in electing they could the more easily err. Nor then could the error of an election be proved, nor would its confirmation have to be awaited from man. Therefore nothing is more harmful to the believer than that in elections of this kind error happens rather often; which happens regularly when electors elect a person whom God does not approve or qualify for such an office.[4] And this is the reason why the apostles elected Matthias by lot, as is clear from Acts [1]; where mysteries are to be noted: first, how blessed Peter, from that [verse of] Psalm 108:8, "his bishopric let another take", concludes that one must be instituted in the place of Judas from these men who saw the manner of life of the apostles with Christ; and, because they did not yet have revelation about the person, they appointed two more qualified [men], namely Barsabas and Matthias, leaving to the divine judgement which of them he would by lot show to be elected in his sight, to whose decision faith must be given in elections.[5] Hence thirty electors, following, said notable words expressive of the teaching often stated: "Thou, Lord," they say, "who knowest the hearts of men, shew which one of these two thou hast chosen to take the place of this ministry"; where it is clear that God must elect, and that those electing according to other rites must, very equivocally, faithfully promulgate God's election; therefore he says, "shew whom thou hast chosen", not to a dignity but to ministry.[6] But thirdly it is objected: since our election ought to be modelled on and authorized by the apostles, from whom we draw other rites, it seems that we ought to follow them in our elections; for we cannot think of a more authentic [68]form of electing; and the objections would tell equally against the apostles.[7] And

again it seems that it is no more lawful in this than in those things that sound of advantage and honour to depart from the rite of the apostles, for so it would pertinently be charged against us that, deserting the faith of scripture, we faithlessly carry out the rites of the gentiles.

¶2 68.8–68.34

[68] Quantum ad istam materiam diffuse tractat eam dominus Ardmacanus libro VII De questionibus Armenorum, recitans quatuor vias constituendi pontifices: una via est per sortem, secunda via per episcopi institucionem, tercia via per hereditariam successionem et quarta via per eleccionem: quod variatur secundum diversitatem variam electorum. Nec movet triplex obiectus istius materie. Primo quod sic temptaretur Deus, si non habentibus ad hec revelacionem liceret sortes mittere, quia ista argumenta procederent contra factum apostolorum et contra sortem veteris testamenti. Nec est Dei temptacio, ubi devotus Dei orator ignorat quid sit Dei voluntati conformius; qualis ignorancia communiter est in electoribus. Secundus obiectus est quod apostoli elegerunt duos scilicet Barsabam et Mathiam, ideo nos debemus operari conformiter. Quantum ad illud non contendo si ordinare multitudinem ut Deus de illa digniorem eligat vocetur eleccio, sed scriptura sic loquitur: Statuerunt duos etc. Sed rogo sic arguentem ut consenciat quod utrobique fiat conformiter nisi subsit racio diversitatis; statuant igitur de humilioribus, quantum adest illis certitudo, et de incerto residuo mittant sortem.

As to this matter, the lord of Armagh treats it at length in book 7 of *De questionibus Armenorum*, reciting four ways of constituting pontiffs: one way is by lot, the second way by a bishop's institution, the third way by hereditary succession, and the fourth way by election, which varies according to the varied diversity of the electors.[8] Nor does the threefold objection on this matter move [me]. First, that God would be tempted in this way if it were lawful for those who have no revelation for these things to cast lots; for these arguments would proceed against the deed of the apostles and against the lot of the old testament. Nor is it a tempting of God where a devout suppliant of God is ignorant of what is more conformed to God's will; and such ignorance is commonly in electors.[9] The second objection is that the apostles chose two, namely Barsabas and Matthias; therefore we ought to act in conformity. As to that, I do not dispute whether ordering a multitude, so that God may choose the worthier from it, be called election; but scripture speaks thus: "They appointed two", etc. But I ask the one who argues thus to agree that it be done in conformity in both cases unless there is a ground for difference; let them therefore appoint from the humbler, so far as they have certainty, and on the uncertain remainder let them cast lots.[10]

¶3 69.1–69.11
69.1 *This would prevent the objection that the lot might fall on one quite unfit.*
69.12 *Appointment by bishops might be good, but is now ruined by all kinds of traditions.*

[69] Et per hoc patet racio ad tercium obiectum, quo arguitur sorte sepe contingeret ineptum eligi; non nominentur, inquam, primo aliqui nisi apti et tunc indubie sors communius indicabit apciorem quem Deus elegerit quam faciunt elecciones hodie celebrate, et preter hoc tradiciones humane de eleccionibus, occupaciones superflue ad illos regulandum et conspiraciones, contenciones nec non deviaciones a divino arbitrio delete multum exonerarent et prosperarent ecclesiam.

[69] And by this the answer to the third objection is clear, by which it is argued [that] by lot it would often happen that an unfit man is elected: let none, I say, be named first except fit men, and then without doubt the lot will more commonly indicate the fitter man whom God has elected than do the elections held today; and besides this, human traditions about elections, superfluous occupations in regulating them, and conspiracies, contentions, and also deviations from the divine decision, once deleted, would greatly unburden and prosper the church.[11]

¶4 69.12–69.29

[69] Secunda via est probabilis subducto errore instituentis, cum Petrus sic instituit Marcum et Clementem Antiochie et Rome, Paulus autem Thimoteum et Tytum. Ceteri vero apostoli ordinarunt episcopos super populos quos evangelizando converterunt, modo autem superadduntur sicut in ordinibus clericorum, de eleccionibus,

The second way is probable, error on the part of the one instituting being excluded, since Peter thus instituted Mark and Clement at Antioch and Rome, and Paul Timothy and Titus.[12] And the other apostles ordained bishops over the peoples whom they converted by evangelizing; but now [ceremonies] are added, as in the orders of clerics: of elections, of

de presentacionibus, de institucionibus; de induccionibus et confirmacionibus, que pharisei tantum ponderant ut sacramenta ecclesie; et certum est quod totum est tradicio gentilis superflua nisi forte sit medium ducens ad exequendum divinum arbitrium, sic quod rite exequens opus talis officii sine tali cerimonia introducta, sicut dicit Crisostomus, est tam autentice a Deo electus, sicut aliquis cum quotlibet tradicionibus phariseicis quantumlibet sollempniter celebratis.

presentations, of institutions, of inductions and confirmations, which the pharisees weigh as much as sacraments of the church; and it is certain that the whole is a superfluous gentile tradition, unless perhaps it is a means leading to the carrying out of the divine decision; so that one who duly carries out the work of such an office without such a ceremony introduced, as Chrysostom says, is as authentically elected by God as anyone with however many pharisaic traditions, however solemnly celebrated.[13]

Notes

1. *Replicatur per*, "it is rejoined, by appeal to", parallel to *arguitur per* (the glossary): the second objection to the teaching of 63.27–65.7 (the first is at 65.28). A in marg.: *2. Eleccionis leges quomodo sunt intelligende. Eleccionis modus in prelatum* (66.19).
2. Rom. 3:8 (DR "let us do evil that there may come good"), named as a heresy.
3. *Habilitaverit* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *humilitaverit* (66.28). The same confusion recurs: *habilitat*, MSS *humilitat* (67.8); *habiles*, MSS *humiles* (67.17).
4. B reads *irregulariter* (67.6–7). The harm is that error is frequent where no one may question the election once made.
5. *Actuum* stands without a chapter number; we supply "[1]" (Acts 1:15–26). Ps. 108:8 (DR), quoted by Peter at Acts 1:20; the eyewitnesses, Acts 1:21–22; the two appointed, Acts 1:23. *Petrus* is Loserth's expansion of the manuscripts' *P.* (67.12). *Penes eum*, "in his sight": with God, by his judgement.
6. *Triginta*, "thirty", is the print, confirmed on the plate (67.21); Acts 1:15 gives about a hundred and twenty, and the number is unexplained. Acts 1:24–25: Wyclif reads *corda hominum* (Loserth: "rightly *corda omnium*", 67.23–24; DR "the heart of all men") and stops before *et apostolatus* (DR "To take the place of this ministry and apostleship"). *Valde ecquivoce*: what men do is called "election" only equivocally, since God is the one who elects.
7. The third objection argues from the apostles' example for the lot; *obiectus eque moverent contra apostolos*: the objections to the lot would tell equally against the apostles' own practice.
8. Richard FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum*, book 7, chs. 18–21 (election, ch. 18; nomination or ordination by the predecessor, ch. 19; lot, ch. 20; hereditary succession, ch. 21; Paris 1512, fol. L); Loserth gives no reference. A in marg.: *Eleccio pontificis quatuor modis*; B in marg.: *Quatuor vie eligendi pontifices* (68.8).
9. *Quia ista argumenta procederent*: Wyclif's answer to the first objection follows at once, without a formula. *Orator* is here one who prays to God over the lot ("suppliant", the glossary, CONTEXTUAL), not a *bedesman* praying for a benefactor. A in marg.: *1* (68.16).
10. Acts 1:23 (DR "And they appointed two"). A in marg.: *2* (68.24). A reads *nos debemus nos* (68.25–26). *De humilioribus*, "from the humbler", is the print; given the *habil-*/*humil-* confusion at 66.28, 67.8 and 67.17, *habilioribus*, "the more qualified", may be meant.
11. A in marg.: *3* (69.1). *Delete ... exonerarent*: the participle carries the condition, "once deleted, would unburden". *Ad illos regulandum* refers to the elections (*illos* as printed).
12. A in marg.: *Secunda via* (69.12). The pairs run in order, Mark at Antioch and Clement at Rome, as printed; the common tradition puts Mark at Alexandria, and so does FitzRalph, Wyclif's source in this chapter (*Summa* VII.16: *beatus petrus clementem voluit in urbe roma et marcum in alexandria episcopos remanere*).
13. Loserth notes that a word is missing after *superadduntur* ("deest verbum", 69.17); we supply "[ceremonies]" from *tali cerimonia* below. *Sicut dicit Crisostomus*: the passage from *De laudibus sancti Pauli* at 65.17–20, where the unordained man who fulfils the care of many is most worthy of honour.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 66: *ut*
  - 66: *bonum*
  - 67: *duobus* [NW]
  - 67: *unum* (25 is the line number)
  - 68: *dominus*
  - 68: *pontifices*
  - 68: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 68: *Quantum*
  - 68: *illa*
  - 69: *Petrus*
  - 67: *triginta* (checked at translation: the print reads so at 67.21)

Part 3: Chrysostom on the lot; the hereditary priesthood

Loserth pp. 69.30–72.15

¶1 69.30–71.27
70.4 *Chrysostom is in favour of lot where choice is doubtful.*
71.5 *The apostles had divine guidance in their choice.*

[69]Et quantum ad omnes leges que videntur sonare contrarium, omnes intelliguntur de legibus humanis in quantum conferunt ut ordinetur conformiter ad divinum iudicium et de inobedientibus ecclesie triumphanti; ideo ne sit contencio de [70]istis, ordinavit Spiritus Sanctus quod teneremus nos in limitibus legis sue. Unde istam materiam de eleccionibus tangit beatus Crisostomus super I. Thim. V: Dignitas, inquit, magisterii et sacerdocii magna est et mirabilis et vere sentencia Dei indigens ut eum qui dignus est in medium deducat. Nec audivi alios tam insanos, quod dissentirent isti sentencie. Unde quantum ad eleccionem sic loquitur iste sanctus: Ita antiquitus fiebat, ita et modo fit, cum sine passione humana elecciones facimus, cum ad nil vite huius respicimus, non ad amiciciam, non ad odium; et si in discrecione non tanto spiritu participamus, sufficit voluntas bona in Deo ponere intronizacionem, quia neque apostoli spiritu participabant, cum Mathiam elegerant, sed oracioni rem committentes in cathalogo apostolorum Mathiam annumeraverunt neque ad dileccionem humanam aspiciebant. Et ita in omni eleccione fieri oporteret, ubi electores sunt ambigui quis est habilior apud Deum. Videtur michi quod debent instar apostolorum sortes mittere; devote committendo sibi iudicium, sicut dicit iste sanctus, quia nemo diffiniret contra divinam sentenciam nec in materia ambigua, in qua non habuerit racionem naturalem, testimonium scripture vel revelacionem. Nec est factum apostolorum, a Deo tam crebro in lege veteri exemplatum; magis cerimoniale vel reprobandum, quam leges gentiles in ecclesia minori auctoritate vel evidencia introducte. Ideo secundum [71]Crysostomum cum ista via sit secura et magis utilis propter multa et illam despicimus, qualiter Deus abscondita revelabit? Est enim intencio huius sancti quod apostoli in eligendo episcopos habuerunt revelacionem vel propheciam. Que, inquit, opera secundum nil humanum fiebant, a prophecia et spiritu sancto fiebant. Prophecia enim non est solum dicere futura sed presencia, cum Saul secundum propheciam monstratus est in vasis occultatus; Deus enim iustis revelat et prophecia fuit hec dicere: Separate, inquit, michi Paulum et Barnabam; ita et Thimoteus electus est a Paulo, qui multas prophecias habuit, ut quando circumcidit Thimoteum et intronizavit. Et ideo dicit, quod Deus eum elegit, non humanum iudicium, quod intronizatus recoleret custodiendo Dei depositum. Quando igitur electores spiritu ducuntur, alieni a vento calliditatis humane, tunc est

And as to all the laws that seem to sound the contrary, they are all understood of human laws in so far as they contribute to [an election's] being ordered in conformity with the divine judgement, and of those disobedient to the church triumphant; therefore, lest there be contention about [70]these, the Holy Spirit ordained that we should keep ourselves within the limits of his law.[1] Hence blessed Chrysostom touches this matter of elections on 1 Timothy, [homily] 5: "The dignity," he says, "of the teaching office and of the priesthood is great and wonderful, and truly in need of God's sentence, that it may bring forth into the midst the one who is worthy."[2] Nor have I heard of others so insane as to dissent from this teaching. Hence, as to election, this saint speaks thus: "So it was done of old, and so it is done now, when we make elections without human passion, when we look to nothing of this life, not to friendship, not to hatred; and if in discernment we do not share in so great a spirit, a good will suffices to place the enthronement in God; for neither did the apostles share in the spirit when they elected Matthias, but, committing the matter to prayer, they numbered Matthias in the catalogue of the apostles, nor did they look to human affection. And so it ought to be done in every election where the electors are in doubt who is more qualified before God."[3] It seems to me that they ought, after the pattern of the apostles, to cast lots, devoutly committing the judgement to him, as this saint says; for no one should define against the divine sentence, nor in a doubtful matter in which he has neither natural reason, nor the testimony of scripture, nor revelation. Nor is the deed of the apostles, so often exemplified by God in the old law, more ceremonial or more to be rejected than the gentile laws introduced into the church with less authority or evidence.[4] Therefore, according to [71]Chrysostom, "since this way is secure and more useful for many reasons, and we despise it, how will God reveal hidden things?"[5] For this saint's meaning is that the apostles, in electing bishops, had revelation or prophecy. "Which works," he says, "were done according to nothing human; they were done by prophecy and the Holy Spirit. For prophecy is not only to tell things to come but things present, as when Saul, according to prophecy, was shown hidden among the vessels; for God reveals to the just; and it was prophecy to say these things: 'Separate me,' he says, 'Paul and Barnabas'; so also

simplex institucio vel multorum eleccio legitima; et aliter est infecta. Ideo debent electores postposito omni humano iudicio committere se divino regimini, sicut geromantici in punctuando suspendunt fantasiam propriam et committunt impulsum ad motum influencie celestis corporis. Et patet quod quilibet istorum trium modorum eligendi est laudibilis, quando fit conformiter ad eleccionem divinam.

Timothy was elected by Paul, who had many prophecies, as when he circumcised Timothy and enthroned [him].“[6] And therefore he says that “God elected him, not human judgement, so that, enthroned, he might call it to mind by guarding God’s deposit”.[7] When, therefore, electors are led by the spirit, strangers to the wind of human craft, then a simple institution or an election by many is lawful; and otherwise it is infected. Therefore electors ought, setting aside all human judgement, to commit themselves to divine governance, as geomancers in pricking out their points suspend their own fancy and commit the impulse to the motion of the influence of a heavenly body.[8] And it is clear that each of these three modes of electing is praiseworthy when it is done in conformity with the divine election.

¶2 71.28–72.7
72.8 *Hereditary succession was allowed in the old law.*

[71]Patet insuper quod eleccio adinventa humanitus est artificiosior sed callidior et postquam avari plus sunt terrenis dediti quam merito et labori officii est periculosior. Eleccio vero per sortem est securior, magis autentica et per consequens [72]nunc eligibilior. Sed cupiditas et fastus obviant; dicitur enim quod nostri electores discernunt melius sicut apostoli; nec tales blasfemias credo cessare antequam status prelatorum sint tantum extenuati a commodo temporali quod officium capiatur propter meritum et non honorem vel commodum temporale.

It is clear moreover that election devised humanly is more artful but craftier, and, since the avaricious are given more to earthly things than to the merit and labour of the office, it is more dangerous. But election by lot is more secure, more authentic, and consequently [72]now more to be chosen.[9] But cupidity and pride stand in the way; for it is said that our electors discern better, as the apostles [did]; nor do I believe that such blasphemies will cease before the estates of prelates are so far thinned of temporal advantage that the office is taken for merit and not for honour or temporal advantage.[10]

¶3 72.8–72.15

[72]Quantum ad quartum modum instituendi summum sacerdotem iure hereditario patet quod hoc fuit ex ordinacione Dei olim autenticum, quia Exod. XXVIII et XXIX docetur quomodo filii Aaron forent sacerdotes iure perpetuo, et idem patet Numeri XXV de Finees, filio Eleazari, filii Aaron cum genere suo; quod fungeretur sacerdocio iure perpetuo.

As to the fourth mode of instituting the high priest, by hereditary right, it is clear that this was once authentic by God’s ordinance, since Exodus 28 and 29 teaches how the sons of Aaron should be priests by perpetual right; and the same is clear in Numbers 25 of Phinees, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, with his race, that he should exercise the priesthood by perpetual right.[11]

Notes

1. ***Intelliguntur de legibus humanis***: the contrary laws are to be read as human laws, binding only so far as they serve conformity with God’s judgement, and as aimed at those disobedient to the church triumphant. The construal is uncertain: *de legibus humanis* may instead mean “[as] concerning human [elections]”.
2. Chrysostom, ***Homilies on 1 Timothy***, hom. 5; Loserth: “In Epist. I ad Timoth. cap. I, Hom. V (Migne), tom. XI” (70.4): Wyclif’s “V” is the homily, not the chapter. *Magisterium* is the teaching office here, beside the priesthood (the glossary); *sentencia Dei* is God’s decision, “sentence” (CONTEXTUAL), and *isti sentencie* in the next sentence is “teaching”. B in marg.: *Nota* (70.7).
3. The manuscripts read *respicientes* (70.11) and B *participant* (70.15); at 70.17 the manuscripts read *cum Mathiam* (the note is unclear in the scan). They lack *fieri oporteret*, which Loserth supplied from Chrysostom’s text (70.19). The quotation runs to *apud Deum* by Loserth’s italics.
4. ***Committendo sibi***: committing the judgement to God. ***Diffiniret***, “should define”: determine the case.
5. Loserth gives Chrysostom’s words: ***si vero manifesta pretermittimus, quomodo nobis Deus obscura et incerta revelabit?*** (71.1, where Loserth’s foot gives the sentence from ***Ad nos in extremam ignaviam delapsi***). Wyclif paraphrases; we follow Loserth’s italics in quoting.

6. 1 Kings (1 Sam.) 10:22: the Vulgate reads *ecce absconditus est domi* (DR "Behold he is hidden at home"); "among the vessels" (*in vasis*) is the Greek Bible's wording (LXX 1 Kgdms 10:22, *idou autos kekryptai en tois skeuesin*), which Wyclif has by way of Chrysostom. *Iustis* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *in istis* (71.10). Acts 13:2: Wyclif reads *Paulum* for the Vulgate's *Saulum* (DR "Separate me Saul and Barnabas"). Acts 16:3 (Timothy circumcised).
7. 1 Tim. 6:20 (DR "keep that which is committed to thy trust"). *Recoleret*, "might call it to mind": that God, not man, chose him.
8. *Simplex institucio*: the second way, institution by one man; *multorum eleccio*: election, the fourth way of 68.12. *Geromantici*: geomancers, who mark points at random and read figures from them (the print's spelling). B in marg.: *Nota* (71.20).
9. *Eligibilior*, "more to be chosen", plays on *eleccio*. *Postquam* is causal, "since". *Vero* is adversative here: "but".
10. *Discernunt melius sicut apostoli*: either "discern better [than the lot], as the apostles [did]" or "discern as well as the apostles"; we translate the first. *Status prelatorum*, "the estates of prelates".
11. Exod. 29:9 (DR "they shall be priests to me by a perpetual ordinance"); Num. 25:13 (DR "the covenant of the priesthood for ever"). *Ius* here is a right of succession. "Fourth": after the three ways just discussed (lot, institution, election); in Armachanus's list (68.10–12) hereditary succession is third. A in marg.: *Summi pontificis institucio iure hereditario* (72.8).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 70: *ut*
  - 70: *fiebat*
  - 70: *fit*
  - 71: *et*
  - 71: *Deus*
  - 71: *Que*
  - 71: *nil*
  - 71: *fiebant*
  - 71: ∅ (print has nothing between a and prophecia; main already has prophecia et spiritu sancto fiebant at 40–44) [GAP]
  - 71: *enim*
  - 71: *cum*
  - 71: *Saul*
  - 71: *Deus*
  - 71: *et*
  - 71: *Thimoteus*
  - 71: *electus*
  - 71: *non*
  - 72: *iure*

Part 4: Many bishops over one people

Loserth pp. 72.16–76.11

¶1 72.16–74.11
72.16 *Reasons against its present use.*
73.7 *There may be more than one bishop in a diocese if all work together usefully.*
74.12 *No essential distinction between priests and bishops.*

[72]Sed triplex ponitur causa quare tempore legis gracie sacerdocium non sic vadit iure hereditario. Prima quia sacerdotes nostri et specialiter summi pontifices debent caste vivere instar Christi et per consequens non relinquere sue carnali soboli ius ad quicquam. Secunda causa est quia Christus noluit eius vicarios habere seculare dominium vel honorem sed omnino specie hereditatis celestis, que solum datur patrissantibus in moribus spiritualibus filiis adoptivis. Tercia causa est ut nos tempore legis gracie spiritualius procedentes, discamus eligere meliores et amare duplicem virginitatem, et quod spiritualis prepositura vel dignitas sacerdotis non sit carnalis sed spiritualis ex filiacione in moribus; cum hereditas illa sit cuicumque promerenti indifferens. Necesse est igitur quod summus sacerdos

But a threefold cause is assigned why, in the time of the law of grace, the priesthood does not pass in this way by hereditary right. The first, because our priests, and especially the highest pontiffs, ought to live chastely after the pattern of Christ, and consequently not to leave to their carnal offspring a right to anything. The second cause is that Christ did not will his vicars to have secular lordship or honour, but [to have] wholly the likeness of the heavenly inheritance, which is given only to spiritual adoptive sons who take after their father in conduct.[1] The third cause is that we, proceeding more spiritually in the time of the law of grace, may learn to choose the better men and to love the twofold virginity, and [learn] that the spiritual office of superior or dignity of a priest is not

noster sit in se totus collectus circa edificacionem ecclesie et non [73] divisus ad placendum uxori sue; ut loquitur Apostolus I. Cor. VII. Et hec racio quare oportuit legem illam cessare et novam introduci, ut dicitur Heb. VII. Sed illud calliditate dyaboli est frustratum, cum episcopi nostri gravius fornicantur cum seculo. Sed quarto obicitur per hoc quod iuxta dictam sentenciam contingit duos episcopos super eodem populo legittime ordinari; quod concedo; cum Christus animarum necessario est episcopus cuiuslibet populi christiani et habet multos episcopos vicarios super eodem populo adiutores. Ipse tamen excellenter et differenter est episcopus ecclesie triumphantis et tocius ecclesie militantis. Similiter, eedem persone, quas Petrus, Paulus et ceteri apostoli ordinarunt episcopos, non excluserunt eos a superintendencia populi sed iuverunt, ut beatus Clemens quem beatus Petrus ordinavit prudenter ut oportet dicere episcopum Romanorum fuit episcopatui Petri nedum conpossibilis, sed adiutor, nam in quadam epistola beati Clementis directa Jacobo Jerusalimitano sic scribitur: Beatus Petrus morte sibi appropinquante in collegio fratrum positus ipsum Clementem per manum accipiens dixit, hunc Clementem episcopum vobis ordino, qui ab inicio mecum fuit. Nec dubium quin tanti capitis ordinacio quam oportuit ex Spiritu Sancto procedere non instituisset Clementem episcopum, nisi de facto foret episcopus; ymo videtur quod sicut actus episcopales non repugnant tam simul quam paulative super eodem populo, sic nec [74] pontificum dignitates, sicut videtur de Christo et Petro, cum simul cum eo fuit summus pontifex. Sic enim beatus Johannes fuit episcopus continue ecclesie Asyane et tamen habuit septem episcopos adiutores. Actus ergo spirituales non repugnant et per consequens potestates vel habitus respectu eiusdem populi. Sed tota repugnancia videtur civilitas et dominium, quod haberent in populo. Hec enim fuit racio quare Abraham et Loth scilicet propter proprietates possessionum non potuerunt habitare simul, ut Gen. XIII.

carnal but spiritual, from sonship in conduct; since that inheritance lies open to whoever merits it, without distinction. It is necessary, therefore, that our high priest be wholly gathered in himself about the edification of the church, and not [73] divided in order to please his wife, as the Apostle says, 1 Cor. 7. And this is the reason why that law had to cease and a new one be brought in, as is said in Heb. 7.[2] But that has been frustrated by the cunning of the devil, since our bishops commit fornication more grievously with the world. But it is objected fourthly, by appeal to this: that according to the said teaching it comes about that two bishops are lawfully ordained over the same people. This I grant; since Christ is necessarily bishop of souls of every Christian people,[3] and has many vicar bishops as helpers over the same people. Yet he is bishop, excellently and in a different way, of the church triumphant and of the whole church militant. Likewise, the same persons whom Peter, Paul and the other apostles ordained bishops did not exclude them from the oversight of the people, but helped them;[4] as blessed Clement, whom blessed Peter ordained (prudently, as one must say) bishop of the Romans, was not only compossible with Peter's episcopate but a helper to it. For in a certain letter of blessed Clement addressed to James of Jerusalem it is written thus: "Blessed Peter, when death was drawing near to him, placed in the company of the brethren, took Clement himself by the hand and said, This Clement I ordain bishop for you, who was with me from the beginning."[5] Nor is there doubt that the ordination of so great a head, which had to proceed from the Holy Spirit, would not have instituted Clement bishop unless he were in fact a bishop; indeed, it seems that just as episcopal acts are not incompatible over the same people, whether at once or by turns, so neither are [74] the dignities of pontiffs, as appears of Christ and Peter, since he was highest pontiff together with him.[6] For thus blessed John was continuously bishop of the church of Asia, and yet had seven bishops as helpers. Spiritual acts therefore are not incompatible, and consequently neither are powers or habits with respect to the same people. But the whole incompatibility seems to be the civil standing and lordship which they would have among the people. For this was the reason why Abraham and Lot, namely because of the property of their possessions, could not dwell together, as Gen. 13.[7]

¶2 74.12–76.11
75.8 *Peter and Paul were Roman bishops at the same time.*

[74] Tercio confirmatur de rectoribus et suis episcopis, qui sunt simul episcopi eiusdem parrochie, et Deus scit quis quoad Deum est suo adiutore superior, quia certum est quod ille qui magis spiritualiter

Thirdly, it is confirmed from rectors and their bishops, who are at once bishops of the same parish; and God knows which of them, as regards God, is superior to his helper, for it is certain that he who profits the

75.21 *We need not concern ourselves about clash of jurisdictions.*
76.2 *The apostles preached and suffered without asking authority from Peter.*

prodest parrochie est episcopus superior quoad Deum; et certum est quod profectus suus est extensior. Nec valet dicere quod sacerdos talis non est episcopus, quia iuxta decretum Jeronimi positum 95 distinccione Olim; Olim, inquit, erat idem presbiter, qui et episcopus, et antequam dyaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent et diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego sum Cephe, communi presbiterorum consilio ecclesie gubernabantur. Postquam autem unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos esse putabat, non Christi, decretum est ut unus de presbiteris superponeretur et scismatum semina tollerentur. Nec est fingendum quod propter adinventas preposituras secundum dignitates reputacionis humane fit novus ordo supra sacerdotum, sed manent septem ordines antiqui humanitus alterati. Non enim princeps secularis per viam dotacionis et maioritatis reputacionis mundane [75] instituit novum ecclesiasticum sacramentum. Multi igitur sunt episcopi super eodem populo se iuvantes, quia aliter non liceret habere episcopum suffraganeum, cum ille sit episcopus non Nullatensis, sed illius loci quem incolit et illius populi, cui superintendit. Et idem est iudicium de Petro et Paulo qui simul erant Romani episcopi. Paulus enim erat episcopus sicut Scarioth et omnes apostoli, sed cuius populi si non gentium quas tantum edificando superintendit predicacionibus, miraculorum faccionibus et scriptura, et hec consumavit excellenter et finaliter cum Romanis. Ideo non beatus Petrus sed ipse fuit precipue episcopus Romanorum. Sic igitur non repugnat sed consonat multos angelos deputari ad unius custodiam, sed fides scripture testatur Deum, Paulum et ceteros apostolos habere in eodem officio spirituali plurimos adiutores; sic est de spirituali episcopatus officio senciendum; sed oportet illum excellere qui spiritualiter magis servit. Nec est credendum institucionibus civilibus vel ficticiis de repugnancia iurisdicionum, nisi de quanto fundata fuerint in scriptura, quomodo preeminencia Petri super ceteros apostolos stat in universali iurisdiccione super totam militantem ecclesiam, aut quod certa potestas iurisdicionalis debet esse in alios apostolos, per illam potestatem ad locum et populum limitata. Nam ceteri apostoli edificarunt ecclesiam in regionibus variis, non petita licencia a Petro, Paulus vero universalius quam Petrus convertit gentes, eciam antequam vidit Petrum, ut patet Actuum IX et infra, Galat. [76] primo et infra; Joh. in Asya minori diu post Petri martirium. Nec oportuit vel decuit illum, qui tam crebras revelaciones Spiritus Sancti habuit; quomodo agendum fuerit, querere instruccionem a suo conservo et consocio Petro vel eius vicario qui instruccione eiusdem magistri indiguit. Et idem est iudicium de sancto Thoma, quando Christus in

parish more spiritually is the superior bishop as regards God; and it is certain that his profit reaches further. Nor does it avail to say that such a priest is not a bishop, for according to Jerome's decree placed in the 95th distinction, *Olim*: "Formerly," he says, "the presbyter was the same as the bishop; and before, by the prompting of the devil, factions arose in religion and it was said among the peoples, I am of Paul, I of Apollo, I am of Cephas, the churches were governed by the common counsel of the presbyters. But after each one thought that those whom he had baptized were his own and not Christ's, it was decreed that one of the presbyters should be set over [the rest], and the seeds of schisms be removed."[8] Nor is it to be feigned that, because of offices of superior devised according to the dignities of human reputation, a new order is made above that of priests; but the seven ancient orders remain, altered in human fashion. For a secular prince does not, by way of endowment and the greatness of worldly reputation, [75] institute a new ecclesiastical sacrament. There are, therefore, many bishops over the same people helping one another, since otherwise it would not be lawful to have a suffragan bishop; for he is a bishop not "of Nowhere", but of that place which he inhabits and of that people over which he has oversight.[9] And the same judgement holds of Peter and Paul, who were at the same time bishops of Rome. For Paul was a bishop, as Iscariot was and all the apostles; but of what people, if not of the gentiles, over whom he had oversight, building them up so greatly by preachings, the working of miracles and scripture? And these he brought to completion, excellently and finally, with the Romans. Therefore not blessed Peter but he was chiefly bishop of the Romans.[10] Thus, then, it is not incompatible but consonant that many angels be deputed to the guard of one [person]; now the faith of scripture testifies that God, Paul and the other apostles have very many helpers in the same spiritual office; so one must think of the spiritual office of the episcopate; but he must excel who serves more spiritually.[11] Nor is credence to be given to civil or feigned institutions concerning the incompatibility of jurisdictions, except in so far as they are founded in scripture: [such as] that the preeminence of Peter over the other apostles consists in a universal jurisdiction over the whole church militant, or that a definite jurisdictional power must extend to the other apostles, limited to place and people by that power.[12] For the other apostles built up the church in various regions without asking licence from Peter; and Paul converted the gentiles more universally than Peter, even before he saw Peter, as is clear from Acts 9 and following, Gal. [76] 1 and following; [and] John in

foro venalium precepit sibi, quod transiret in Yndiam, et sic de ceteris apostolis, ut patet ex fideli eorum cronica quam legit et sollempnizat ecclesia.

Asia Minor long after Peter's martyrdom. Nor was it needful or fitting for him who had such frequent revelations of the Holy Spirit as to how he should act to seek instruction from his fellow servant and companion Peter, or from his vicar, who himself needed the instruction of the same master. And the same judgement holds of Saint Thomas, when Christ in the market of the sellers commanded him to go over into India; and so of the other apostles, as is clear from their faithful chronicle, which the church reads and keeps solemnly.[13]

Notes

1. ***sed omnino specie hereditatis celestis***: the ablative ***specie*** hangs loosely on ***habere***; taken as "to have ... the likeness (form) of the heavenly inheritance". It could also be read adverbially, "but altogether in the manner of the heavenly inheritance". ***Patrissantibus*** ("who take after their father") is the medieval verb ***patrissare***.
2. 1 Cor. 7:33 (DR "he that is with a wife is solicitous ... how he may please his wife. And he is divided"); Heb. 7:12 ("the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation also be made of the law"). Neither is quoted; Wyclif gives the sense.
3. 1 Pet. 2:25, "the shepherd and bishop of your souls". The point of ***animarum ... episcopus*** is that Christ's oversight never excludes his vicars'.
4. The subject is ***eedem persone*** (those ordained), and ***eos*** the apostles who ordained them: the new bishops did not shut the apostles out of their oversight but helped them. A reading with ***eos*** = the new bishops (the apostles did not exclude them) would need ***persone*** as object, which the nominative does not allow.
5. The pseudo-Clementine ***Epistola Clementis ad Iacobum*** (Clement I, ***Epist. decret.***), cited by Loserth from Migne, ***PG*** 1, 464; FitzRalph tells the story from the same letter, ***Summa*** VII.19.
6. ***cum simul cum eo fuit summus pontifex***: Peter is the subject, Christ the ***eo***: Peter was highest pontiff at the same time as Christ. ***Paulative***, "little by little", is set against ***simul***: taken as successive tenure.
7. Gen. 13:6 (DR "for their substance was great, and they could not dwell together"). John's seven bishops are the angels of the seven churches of Asia, Apoc. 1–3.
8. Jerome, in ***Decretum*** D.95 c.5 ***Olim*** (Loserth: "Decreti prima pars, dist. XCV, cap. V"; the modern form is ours). The quoted strife is 1 Cor. 1:12. T. ***superponeretur*** is Loserth's correction; A and B read ***supponeretur*** ("be set under").
9. For the titular bishop "of Nowhere" (***Nullatensis***), consecrated without a see, Loserth compares ***De ecclesia*** p. 583 and ***Sermones*** II, 65.
10. Loserth notes at 75.13 that the manuscripts lack ***non*** ("Codd.: non deest"), so a ***non*** on that line is his supplement; the likeliest is ***non beatus Petrus***, translated as printed. S. Judas's "bishopric", Acts 1:20.
11. The second ***sed*** (***sed fides scripture testatur***) does not oppose what precedes; it is rendered "and". The period runs as a comparison ("as ... the faith of scripture testifies ..., so one must think ..."), which a lost ***sicut*** would make explicit.
12. The ***quomodo*** (medieval "that", as the parallel ***quod*** shows) and ***quod*** clauses give examples of the feigned institutions, not of what scripture founds. ***Limitata*** agrees with ***potestas***: the power that reaches the other apostles is bounded to place and people by Peter's power. ***Ficticiis*** is the adjective with ***institucionibus*** ("feigned"), not the noun ***ficticia***.
13. Thomas sold in the market as a builder for India is the legend of the ***Acts of Thomas***; Loserth notes that the Sarum Breviary lesson says instead ***Apparuit ei Dominus in visu noctis***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 72: ***hereditario*** [NW]
  - 72: ***illa***
  - 73: ***necessario***
  - 73: ∅ (178^{d} is the folio mark)
  - 74: ***qui***
  - 74: ***Olim***
  - 74: ***fierent*** [NW]
  - 74: ***ecclesie***
  - 75: ***episcopatus*** (hyphenated episco-/patus; main token covers whole word)
  - 75: ***illum***
  - 76: ***Petri***
  - 76: ***illum***
  - 76: ***tam***
  - 76: ***habuit***

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter and Pau] (75.8).**

Part 5: The apostles had no recourse to Peter

Loserth pp. 76.12–80.22

¶1 76.12–78.3
77.1 *They acted on Christ's command given with promise.*
77.9 *Paul's rejection of human authority,*
78.16 *Christ's commission to the apostles extended to the whole world.*

[76]**Unde Januensis in suo Katholicon narrat ex quadam cronica conformiter ad cantum ecclesie, quomodo apostoli per orbem post ascensionem Domini sunt dispersi: Petrus Romam venit, Andreas Achaiam et uterque ibi crucifigitur, Johannes Ephesum vivus intrat sepulcrum, Jacobus maior Jerusolimis decollatur, Thomas in Yndia lancea transfigitur, Philippus in Frigia crucifigitur, Jacobus minor partica fullonis Jerusolimis occiditur, Bartolomeus in maiori Yndia excoriatur et decollatur, Matheus in Ethiopia in altari lancea perforatur, Symon et Yudas in Persyde a pontificibus ydolorum tumultu populi interimuntur, Mathias in Yndia pro Christo patitur, Lucas in Bythinia, obiit, Marcus Alexandrie martirium complevit, Barnabas in Salamia occisus est. Stultum autem et infidele mendacium foret fingere quod omnes alii apostoli habuerunt recursum ad Petrum vel eius vicarium; et ex eorum precepto ac auctoritate fecerunt quicquid fecerant, primo quia habuerunt magistrum omnium eis continue assistentem; iuxta** [77]**promissum suum Math, ultimo: Ecce ego vobiscum sum, omnibus diebus usque ad consumacionem seculi. Quomodo igitur foret necessarium tam ambigue querere auctoritatem sive consilium, quando tanta copia fontis sapiencie continue fuit presens. Secundo quia Paulus testatur Gal. I, 17 quod post conversionem suam non venit statim Jerusolimam ad apostolos sed continuo predicavit in Arabya. Deinde post annos tres venit Jerusalem videre Petrum et mansit cum eo diebus quindecim, quia (ut dicit in principio) non fuit factus apostolus ab hominibus neque per hominem, eleccione vel instrumentali institucione, sed per Ihesum Christum secundum deitatem, per cuius revelacionem evangelium suum didicerat, deinde (ut narrat cap. II, I, 2 post annos quatuordecim iterum ascendit per revelacionem in Jerusalem cum Barnaba et Tito contulitque cum precipuis apostolis. Michi, inquit, qui videbantur esse aliquid nichil contulerunt, sed e contra cum vidissent, quod creditum est michi evangelium prepucii, sicut Petro circumcisionis, cum cognovissent graciam Dei, que data est michi, Jacobus et Cefas et Johannes, qui videbantur esse columpne, dextras dederunt michi et Barnabe societatis. Cum, inquit, venisset Cephas Antiochiam, in faciem ei restiti, quia reprehensibilis erat, Numquid credimus vas eleccionis et scribam Spiritus Sancti qui vidit quanta mala futura**

Hence Januensis in his *Catholicon* relates from a certain chronicle, in agreement with the chant of the church, how the apostles were dispersed through the world after the ascension of the Lord: "Peter came to Rome, Andrew to Achaia, and both are crucified there; John at Ephesus enters his tomb alive; James the greater is beheaded at Jerusalem; Thomas is pierced with a lance in India; Philip is crucified in Phrygia; James the less is killed at Jerusalem with a fuller's pole; Bartholomew is flayed and beheaded in greater India; Matthew is run through with a lance at the altar in Ethiopia; Simon and Jude are slain in Persia by the priests of the idols in a tumult of the people; Matthias suffers for Christ in India; Luke died in Bithynia; Mark completed his martyrdom at Alexandria; Barnabas was killed at Salamis."[1] And it would be a foolish and faithless lie to feign that all the other apostles had recourse to Peter or his vicar, and did by his precept and authority whatever they did: first, because they had the master of all continually standing by them, according to [77]**his promise, Matt. last: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." How then would it be necessary to seek authority or counsel so uncertainly, when so great a plenty of the fount of wisdom was continually present? Secondly, because Paul testifies, Gal. 1:17, that after his conversion he did not come straightway to Jerusalem to the apostles, but at once preached in Arabia. Then after three years he came to Jerusalem to see Peter, and stayed with him fifteen days,[2] because (as he says at the beginning) he was not made an apostle "of men, neither by man", by election or instrumental institution, "but by Jesus Christ" according to the Godhead, by whose revelation he had learned his gospel. Then (as he relates in ch. 2:1–2) after fourteen years he went up again by revelation to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, and conferred with the leading apostles. "To me," he says, "they who seemed to be some thing added nothing. But contrariwise, when they had seen that to me was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter [that] of the circumcision, when they had known the grace of God that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."[3] "When," he says, "Cephas**

erant in ecclesia pro primatu usus fuit falsitate vel levitate in verbis fidei? quin pocius ad destruendum hereses quas sciverat postmodum pullulare premittens Jacobum dicit quod omnes illi tres [78] nichil sibi contulerant? Cuius sensus repugnaret isti quod Paulus necessitatus fuit accipere autoritativam potestatem a Petro.

was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." Do we believe that the vessel of election and scribe of the Holy Spirit, who saw how great evils were to come in the church for the sake of primacy, made use of falsehood or levity in words of faith? Rather, to destroy the heresies which he knew would afterwards spring up, does he not, putting James first, say that all those three [78] had conferred nothing on him?[4] The sense of which would be incompatible with this: that Paul was compelled to receive authoritative power from Peter.

¶2 78.4–80.22
79.14 *He gave no charge to Peter to control the other apostles.*
79.28 *Our prelates quarrel over limits of jurisdiction for the sake of gain.*
80.1 *It is said that none can be saved who do not pay the Papal dues.*
80.12 *He who loves Christ, and only he, will be saved.*

[78] Et ad idem vadit secundum verbum quod illi apostoli gaudebant quod habuerunt tales socios in dextero brachio sancte ecclesie, ista (inquam) apostolorum societas excluderet eosdem esse subditos a paritate potestatis non auctoritative vel iurisdicionalis super consocios. Et idem patet per hoc quod Paulus reprobavit Petrum in sua parrochia; ideo absit fidelem credere hoc de Petro, cum ipse apostolorum humillimus fecit cuncta sua opera post ascensionem auctoritate et nomine Ihesu nichil auctoritati sue attribuens, quia aliter tota scriptura illud obmittens foret nimium defectiva. Tercio confirmatur de iurisdiccione data comuniter cunctis apostolis Matth. ultimo tam quoad locum quam populum. Data est, inquit, michi potestas in celo et in terra, euntes igitur docete omnes gentes servare omnia quecunque mandavi vobis. Et Mar, ultimo limitatur iurisdicionis locus: Euntes, inquit, in mundum universum, predicate evangelium omni creature; ubi patet primo quod alloquitur omnes apostolos pro se et suis vicariis. Apostoli enim iverunt in Asyam, Africam et Europam: et per omnem terram habitabilem exivit virtus sermonis eorum, quia (ut patet ex sepedictis) non est aliqua pars terre vel mundi, quin spiritualiter aleretur ex predicacione evangelii per potestatem datam Christo. Et sic docuerunt mediate vel immediate omnia genera gentium: Grecos, Latinos et barbaros. [79] Et patet secundo quomodo Christus tempore quo apostoli magis recolerent; dedit eis preponderantem sentenciam; quomodo fideliter docerent populum ex integro servare mandata et consilia sua que ad hoc eos docuit. Omnis enim gens debet servare ipsa in una parte vel alia. Quidam tamen apostolorum peragrarunt plures regiones et quidam pauciores, ut Paulus; qui plus omnibus laboravit, visitavit corporaliter et convertit plures provincias. Et breviter cuilibet apostolo vel eius vicario fuit nedum licitum, sed debitum tantum de populo vel terra convertere vel confirmare in fide Christi quantum sufficeret, et non fuit restriccio iurisdicionis nisi ex insufficiencia. Non enim dicit singulariter Petro: vade tu et singulariter predica

And to the same point goes the second saying, that those apostles rejoiced that they had such companions on the right arm of holy church: this fellowship of the apostles (I say) would rule out the same men's being subjects, on account of the parity of a power that is not authoritative or jurisdictional over their fellows.[5] And the same is clear from this, that Paul reproved Peter in his own parish; therefore far be it from a believer to believe this of Peter, since he, the humblest of the apostles, did all his works after the ascension by the authority and name of Jesus, attributing nothing to his own authority; for otherwise the whole of scripture, in leaving that out, would be exceedingly defective.[6] Thirdly, it is confirmed from the jurisdiction given in common to all the apostles, Matt. last, as much as regards place as people. "Power," he says, "is given to me in heaven and in earth: going therefore, teach ye all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."[7] And in Mark last the place of the jurisdiction is assigned: "Go ye," he says, "into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature."[8] Here it is clear, first, that he addresses all the apostles, for themselves and their vicars. For the apostles went into Asia, Africa and Europe, and through all the habitable earth the power of their word went forth;[9] for (as is clear from what has often been said) there is no part of the earth or of the world that was not spiritually nourished from the preaching of the gospel, through the power given to Christ. And so, mediately or immediately, they taught all kinds of nations: Greeks, Latins and barbarians. [79] And it is clear, secondly, how Christ, at the time which the apostles would best remember, gave them a teaching of preponderant weight: how they should faithfully teach the people to keep, in their entirety, his commandments and counsels, which he taught them for this purpose.[10] For every nation ought to keep them in one part or another. Yet some of the apostles travelled through more regions and some fewer; as Paul, who "laboured more than all", visited in the body and converted more

toti mundo limitaque ceteros apostolos quantum sub iurisdicione sua de terra vel populo subiacebit, quin pocius Spiritus Sanctus dixit Paulo quod predicaret lacius inter gentes; Petro vero quod striccius iret in Judeos, uterque tamen sicut omnes apostoli et eorum vicarii sunt debitores omni homini, ut sibi prosint meliori modo quo poterint. Absit quin rector vel episcopus debeat proficere populo de alia parrochia sive dyocesi, et in casu quo crederet plus prodesse ecclesie et placere Christo, debet parochiam suam dimittere, et aliis in quibus magis proficeret se gratis adiungere. Sed heu ista religiosa regula primeva temporalium cupiditate disrumpitur; et nostri satrape vertunt evangelizacionem in pecunie collecionem et propter questum circa limites iurisdicionis contenditur, cuius civilitatis origo dicitur cepisse a capite Romane ecclesie. Dicitur enim in nobis [80] occiduis, quod Romanus pontifex vendicat infideliter quod nemo salvabitur nisi subiaceat taxis suis; sed nichil plus horribile vel blasfemum; cum sine personarum accepcione, quecunque persona vel populus de Yndia, Ethiopia, Grecia vel quantumcunque remota insula crediderit in dominum Ihesum Christum salvabitur, per quemcunque apostolum vel Christi discipulum conversa fuerit nisi finaliter ad infidelitatem redierit; ideo omnes tales fideles, ubicunque terrarum fuerint, sunt imitatores Petri, Pauli, et cuiuscunque apostoli, ita quod sufficiat diligere caput Christum, cum diligendo ipsum universitas diligitur ordinate. Nec valet alterius obediencia vel subieccio, nisi de quanto docuerit legem et dileccionem Christi servare, in tantum quod sive dyabolus sive paganus sive inmediate Christus ipsam anuncciaverit subducto quocumque apostolo vel eius vicario sufficit ad salutem, cum amor Christi sit per se sufficiens. Et ista est concors apostolorum sentencia qui se ipsos parvipenderant et magnificaverant nomen Ihesu.

provinces.[11] And in brief, for each apostle or his vicar it was not only lawful but owed to convert or confirm in the faith of Christ as much of the people or the land as he could manage; and there was no restriction of jurisdiction except from insufficiency. For he does not say to Peter alone: "Go thou and preach alone to the whole world, and limit the other apostles to as much of land or people as will lie under thy jurisdiction"; rather, the Holy Spirit told Paul to preach more widely among the gentiles, and Peter to go more narrowly to the Jews; yet each of them, like all the apostles and their vicars, is a debtor to every man, to profit them in the best way they can.[12] Far be it that a rector or bishop should not be bound to profit the people of another parish or diocese; and in case he believed he would profit the church more and please Christ more, he ought to leave his parish and join himself freely to others in whom he would profit more. But alas, this first religious rule is broken by greed for temporal goods; and our satraps turn the preaching of the gospel into the collecting of money, and for gain there is strife about the limits of jurisdiction; and the origin of this civil standing is said to have begun from the head of the Roman church.[13] For it is said among us [80] westerners that the Roman pontiff faithlessly claims that no one will be saved unless he is subject to his taxes. But nothing is more horrible or blasphemous; since, without respect of persons, whatever person or people of India, Ethiopia, Greece, or however remote an island, shall have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ will be saved, by whatever apostle or disciple of Christ it was converted, unless it finally returns to unbelief. Therefore all such believers, wherever on earth they are, are imitators of Peter, of Paul and of any apostle whatever, so that it suffices to love Christ the head, since in loving him the whole is loved in due order.[14] Nor does the obedience or subjection of another avail, except in so far as he has taught [men] to keep the law and the love of Christ; so much so that, whether the devil or a pagan or Christ immediately has announced it, with any apostle or his vicar set aside, it suffices for salvation, since the love of Christ is of itself sufficient.[15] And this is the concordant teaching of the apostles, who had made little of themselves and had magnified the name of Jesus.

Notes

1. Johannes Balbus of Genoa (*Januensis*), *Catholicon*; Loserth compares *De civili dominio* III, 425. The list is the italic run of the print, so Loserth takes it as quotation; the *Catholicon* has not been checked. *Partica* is *pertica*, the fuller's pole; *Salamia* is Salamis in Cyprus. R. B in the margin: *Natalicia apostolorum*; A: *Apostolorum mortes*.

2. Gal. 1:17–18, retold in the third person (DR "Neither went I to Jerusalem, to the apostles who were before me: but I went into Arabia ... Then, after three years, I went to Jerusalem to see Peter: and I tarried with him fifteen days"). Wyclif's *predicavit* ("preached") for the Vulgate's *abii* ("went") is his own.
3. Gal. 1:1 (the quoted phrases), Gal. 2:1–2, then Gal. 2:6–7, 9 with v. 8 left out; Wyclif's *graciam Dei* adds "of God" to the Vulgate's *gratiam*. Gal. 2:11 follows. Loserth's references: Gal. I, 1; II, 6–8; II, 11. T. The print's parenthesis "(ut narrat cap. II, 1, 2" is not closed.
4. "Vessel of election", Acts 9:15. C. *Premittens Jacobum*: in Gal. 2:9 James is named before Cephas, which Wyclif reads as a deliberate check on Petrine claims. The *quin pocius* clause is read as a second question expecting "yes".
5. A doubtful period. *Excluderet eosdem esse subditos* is "would rule out their being subjects"; *a paritate potestatis* is taken causally ("on account of the parity"), with *non auctoritative vel iurisdicionalis* agreeing with *potestatis*. A word may have been lost (e.g. *sed ponit eos* before *a paritate*); the sense is the same: equal apostles, none with jurisdiction over the others.
6. *humillimus* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *humilius* ("more humbly", 78.12). C. *hoc* is the claim just refuted: that Peter held authority over his fellows.
7. Matt. 28:18–20, abridged: Wyclif drops *omnis* ("All power"), the baptismal clause and *docentes eos*, so that *docete ... servare* runs together. Loserth: Matt. XXVIII, 18–20.
8. Mark 16:15 (Loserth's "Marc. XV, 15" in the OCR); Wyclif adds only *inquit*. G. *limitatur*: the place is assigned, not restricted: it is the whole world.
9. After Ps. 18:5 (Vulg.; cf. Rom. 10:18), DR "Their sound hath gone forth into all the earth"; Wyclif's *per omnem terram habitabilem exivit virtus sermonis eorum* is his own wording.
10. *tempore quo apostoli magis recolerent*: the last words before the ascension, which they would best remember. B lacks *tempore* (79.1). *Sentencia* is taken as "teaching", qualified as weightier than any other.
11. 1 Cor. 15:10, DR "I have laboured more abundantly than all they"; Wyclif's *plus omnibus laboravit*. C. The print's semicolon after *ut Paulus* would set Paul among those who travelled less; the relative clause shows he is the example of *plures*.
12. Rom. 1:14, "I am a debtor"; the division between Paul and Peter is Gal. 2:7–9. G. *limitaque* here restricts: "limit".
13. *satrape*: Wyclif's derogatory word for church-court officials with delegated power (the glossary).
14. Loserth's apparatus at 80.12 has the lemma *ita quod*, with B *quod si*; we follow the print, *ita quod*. C. *universitas* is the whole (of the faithful) loved in Christ.
15. For *ipsam* (80.17) B reads *iam* ("already"); the print is followed, *ipsam* taken as the law of Christ. R. A in the margin: *Romano pontifici subesse non est de necessitate salutis* ("To be subject to the Roman pontiff is not of necessity for salvation").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 76: *sepulcrum*
  - 77: *17*
  - 77: *non*
  - 77: *tres*
  - 77: *non*
  - 77: *fuit*
  - 77: *factus*
  - 77: *2* (print: cap. II, 1, 2) post; main has the 1 only)
  - 77: *levitate* (30 is the line number)
  - 78: *docete*
  - 78: *evangelium* [NW]
  - 79: ∅ (page-opening slip: end of p.78 (sic docuerunt ... barbaros) re-matched; nothing between Et and patet)
  - 79: *omnibus*
  - 79: *laboravit*
  - 79: *dyocesi* [NW]
  - 79: *primeva* [NW]
  - 80: *quod*
  - 80: *apostoli* (hyphenated apo-/stoli; main token (aposto^, next token quod) stands for the whole word)
  - 80: *quod*
  - 77: *annos* (LEFT-nw: italic; print = annos)

Chapter 5

Part 1: The chief vicar must live without property

Loserth pp. 80.24–83.27

¶1 80.24–83.27
80.26 *Christ's chief-vicar should be free from all worldly cares.*
81.5 *The apostles did not endow churches, though St. John could easily have done so.*
81.19 *Christ chose a poor lite for himself and his apostles. Nicholas III. praised the Minorites for their poverty.*
82.1 *The utmost we can infer from the contradiction of John XXII is that neither pope speaks with authority.*
82.24 *The emperors are pontiffs and if endowment of pontiffs is good, they should keep it for themselves,*
83.4 *The clergy should not accept a gift which injures the giver.*
83.15 *There is no perfection in wealth save in ordering it properly, but this is not the duty of the clergy*

[80]Supersunt alie tres sentencie premittende: prima sive Romanus pontifex sive quicumque alius fuerit Christi archivicarius, debet vivere maxime exproprietarie et esse a mundo maxime elongatus; patet ex hoc, quod debet esse inter viantes maxime virtuosus et in conversacione Christo similior. Ipse autem sic vixit, ut ex fide [81] scripture sepe declarata supponitur; quomodo igitur non oportet eius proximum vicarium conversari conformiter. Hoc enim movebat Petrum, Johannem et ceteros apostolos, qui potuerunt facillime, copiosissime et splendidissime fuisse dotati et tamen ex religione et debito imitandi magistrum illud omiserant. Johannes autem, qui post ascensionem Domini septuaginta annis et amplius in maiori parte vixit fixe in pace, potuit dotasse suam ecclesiam, si fuisset expediens, cum silvestres frondes mutavit in aurum et fragmina saxorum in gemmas, sed in detestacionem amoris pecunie. Et revera ista sentencia de verbis et factis apostolorum daret fidem fidelibus, quod proximi Christi et Petri vicarii debent exire de mundo et conversari similiter et quod conversacio illa perficeret statum cleri. Christus enim ipsam elegerat in se et suis apostolis: quod omnipotens et omnisciens non faceret, nisi quia scivit quod perficeret statum suorum militum. Et idem confirmatur ex decretali ecclesie, quam papa Nicolaus tercius in sexto incorporat, Exiit qui seminat, ubi declarat quod status fratrum Minorum est ideo celestis et perfectissimus, quia statui Christi et apostolorum simillimus. Et ex istis credo quod ecclesia Romana, decretiste et fratres, sed specialiter fratres Minores, defenderent istam sentenciam. Aliter enim non crederetur alicui decretali, cum illam que evidencius fundatur ex scriptura ipsimet parvipendunt. Et conformiter dicitur ad obiectum quo dicitur Johannem XXII ordinasse decretales multas [82]contra istam sentenciam. Quis, inquam, crederet talibus prepositis, quorum unus sine fundacione alteri contradicit? Scolares igitur legis papalis defenderent decretalem predictam, quia aliter non crederetur alicui ipsorum textui, sed eo ipso quo textus eorum sic asserit foret sentencia minus credibilis et de mendacio plus suspecta; nec dat fidem quod papa subsequens approbat hoc vel illud, quia sequentes sunt communiter minus religiosi et plus ignari; ideo debet eis minor fides

There remain three other teachings to be set out first. The first: whether the Roman pontiff or whoever else is Christ's archvicar, he ought to live most fully without property and be most removed from the world.[1] It is clear from this, that he ought to be the most virtuous among those on the road and the most like to Christ in manner of life. Now he lived thus, as is supposed from the faith [81]of scripture, often set out; how then must not his nearest vicar live in conformity [with him]? For this moved Peter, John and the other apostles, who could most easily, most copiously and most splendidly have been endowed, and yet, out of religion and the duty of imitating the master, had forgone it. And John, who after the ascension of the Lord lived seventy years and more, for the greater part settled in peace, could have endowed his church if it had been expedient, since he changed the leaves of the woods into gold and fragments of stones into gems; but [he did so] in detestation of the love of money.[2] And indeed this teaching, from the words and deeds of the apostles, would give faith to the faithful that the nearest vicars of Christ and of Peter ought to go out of the world and live likewise, and that that manner of life would perfect the state of the clergy. For Christ had chosen it in himself and his apostles: which the almighty and all-knowing would not have done, except because he knew that it would perfect the state of his soldiers.[3] And the same is confirmed from the decretal of the church which Pope Nicholas III incorporates in the Sext, *Exiit qui seminat*, where he declares that the state of the Friars Minor is heavenly and most perfect for this reason, that it is most like the state of Christ and the apostles.[4] And from these [premisses] I believe that the Roman church, the decretists and the friars, but especially the Friars Minor, would defend this teaching. For otherwise no decretal would be believed, since they themselves make light of the one which is more evidently founded on scripture. And in conformity [with this] the answer is given to the objection by which it is said that John XXII ordained many decretals [82] against this teaching.[5] Who, I say, would believe such superiors, one of whom contradicts another without foundation? The scholars of papal

in talibus adhiberi. Et istam sentenciam credo fratres et specialiter Minores velle defendere, quia aliter indubie ipsi tamquam mendaces ypocrite multipliciter perturbarent et molestarent ecclesiam. Item, quantum ad scolasticos in fide ecclesie credo quod ipsi consentirent eidem sentencie; nam bonum quod afferunt seculares divicie, non est nisi mundi prosperitas. Sed illam tam sancti doctores quam oraciones ecclesie docent despicere, igitur cum pauperies affert bonum spirituale, videtur quod superhabundans dotacio magis imperficeret clerum Christi. Confirmatur primo per hoc quod, cum imperatores sint pontifices, ut patet distinccione De Capitulis, videtur quod ante dotacionem ecclesie ipsi erant summi pontifices, quia tunc episcopi exproprietarie viventes erant miseri et egeni, cum caruerunt perfeccione quam modo ecclesia habet ex mundi diviciis. Illam autem perfeccionem diviciarum pertinencius tunc habuerunt cesares, igitur undequaque ipsi erant perfecciores pontifices, et sic summi dupliciter tam quoad seculum quam ad Deum. Et ex isto videtur dotacionis imperfeccio quod recipientes illam inperfecerant dominos qui dotarunt. Sed dominium [83]Christi, quia spirituale fuit, nulli perfeccioni incompossibile, fuit perfeccius. Cum igitur secundum legem ecclesie XIV q. V Denique si non potest sacerdos non debet illi officio vel arti intendere, per quam sequitur deterioracio proximi, videtur quod non debent intendere proprietati civili. Si enim renunciacio temporalium per viam elemosine sit perfecta in laico, multo magis in clerico. Illi igitur qui tantum imperfecerunt laicos, remitterent illis sua dominia ex causa multiplici. Omnis enim, qui se regem facit, per quod diminueretur imperium, contradicit cesari. Oportet igitur quod temporale dominium ponat plus imperfeccionis quam perfeccionis in clerico. Similiter, ultra vite necessaria non est perfeccio in mundi diviciis, nisi ad eas debite regulandum, sed hoc officium est alienum clerico, igitur et superhabundans possessio, sicut docet Apostolus Thim. VI. Regimen enim spirituale et regimen corporale, sicut et occupacio eorum, mutuo se retardant. Et hinc dicunt sancti quod divicie sunt pondus anime. Et quantum ad securitatem habendam et clerum multiplicandum, patet quod illa mundi insecuritas est meritoria et pertinens Christi discipulo, ut patet Math. VI. Mundi autem securitas est fallax et irreligiosa et solum affectabilis imperfectis.

law, therefore, would defend the aforesaid decretal, since otherwise no text of theirs would be believed; but by the very fact that their text so asserts, the teaching would be less credible and more suspect of falsehood. Nor does it give faith that a later pope approves this or that, for those who come after are commonly less religious and more ignorant; therefore less faith ought to be given them in such matters. And I believe that the friars, and especially the Minors, wish to defend this teaching, since otherwise they would without doubt, as lying hypocrites, disturb and trouble the church in many ways. Again, as to those schooled in the faith of the church, I believe that they would consent to the same teaching; for the good that secular riches bring is nothing but the prosperity of the world. Now both the holy doctors and the prayers of the church teach [us] to despise that; therefore, since poverty brings a spiritual good, it seems that superabundant endowment would rather make the clergy of Christ imperfect.[6] It is confirmed, first, by this: since emperors are pontiffs, as is clear in the distinction *De capitulis*, it seems that before the endowment of the church they were the highest pontiffs, because then the bishops, living without property, were wretched and needy, since they lacked the perfection which the church now has from the riches of the world. Now the caesars at that time had that perfection of riches more fittingly; therefore in every respect they were the more perfect pontiffs, and so highest in two ways, as regards the world as well as as regards God.[7] And from this the imperfection of endowment appears, that those who received it made imperfect the lords who endowed [them]. But the lordship [83]of Christ, because it was spiritual, [and so] incompossible with no perfection, was the more perfect. Since, therefore, according to the law of the church, 14 q. 5 *Denique si non potest*, a priest ought not to give himself to that office or craft through which the deterioration of his neighbour follows, it seems that they ought not to give themselves to civil property.[8] For if the renunciation of temporal goods by way of alms is perfect in a layman, much more so in a cleric. Those therefore who have made the laity so imperfect should remit their lordships to them, for many reasons. For "whosoever maketh himself a king", whereby the empire would be diminished, "speaketh against Caesar."[9] It must be, therefore, that temporal lordship sets more imperfection than perfection in a cleric. Likewise, beyond the necessaries of life there is no perfection in the riches of the world, except for ruling them duly; now this office is foreign to a cleric; therefore superabundant possession is too, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Tim. 6.[10] For spiritual rule and bodily rule, like their

occupations, hinder each other. And hence the saints say that riches are a weight on the soul.[11] And as for having security and multiplying the clergy, it is clear that that insecurity of the world is meritorious and befits a disciple of Christ, as is clear in Matt. 6. But the security of the world is deceptive and irreligious, and desirable only to the imperfect.

Notes

1. ***archivicarius***: "chief vicar", as Loserth's side-note has it; a coinage beside *vicarius Christi* that leaves open whether the pope holds the office. R. A in the margin: *Exproprietarie vivere debet vicarius Christi*.
2. The legend of John turning branches into gold and pebbles into gems; Loserth cites the first lesson for St John's day in the Sarum Missal and compares *De ecclesia* p. 189. C. *Sed in detestacionem amoris pecunie* is elliptical: the miracle was done to shame the love of money, not to enrich the church.
3. ***militum***: Christ's "soldiers" in the Pauline figure, not the knightly estate (glossary: *milicia; milites*).
4. Nicholas III, *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), in the *Liber Sextus*, *De verborum significatione*, Sext 5.12.3 (Loserth "De Verborum Signif. V, 12, 3"; the modern form is ours). R. A in the margin: *Decretales invicem contradicunt scilicet Nicolai III et Johannis XXII*.
5. John XXII's decretals on Franciscan poverty (e.g. *Ad conditorem canonum*, *Cum inter nonnullos*), Extrav. Ioann. XXII 14.3 and 14.4, which Loserth does not name.
6. ***imperficeret***, "would make imperfect": Wyclif's coinage against *perficere*; it returns as *inperfecerant* and *imperfecerunt*.
7. ***Decretum*** D.10 c.9 (Loserth "Dist. X, cap. IX: Leges imperatorum custodiri oportet"; the modern form is ours). C. The argument runs on the opponent's premiss that riches perfect a pontiff: if so, the endowed caesars were the better pontiffs.
8. ***Decretum*** C.14 q.5 c.10 *Denique* (Ambrose, *De officiis* III.9; PL 187, 963A) (Loserth "Decreti Secunda pars, causa XIV, q. V, cap. X"; the modern form is ours). C. *si non potest* is read with the canon's incipit, as Loserth's italic run takes it; *sacerdos* begins the rule Wyclif draws from it.
9. John 19:12 (DR "whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar"), with Wyclif's clause *per quod diminueretur imperium* inserted: the endowing lord diminishes his own lordship.
10. 1 Tim. 6:8–9 (DR "having food, and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content. For they that will become rich fall into temptation ..."), given by sense.
11. "Riches are a weight on the soul": not identified by Loserth; a commonplace of the fathers (Gregory the Great?). Matt. 6 is the sermon on solicitude, 6:25–34.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 80: *CAPITULUM QUINTUM.*
  - 80: *quicumque* (25 is the line number)
  - 81: *illa*
  - 81: *scivit*
  - 82: *Capitulis*
  - 83: *deterioracio*
  - 83: ∅ (15 is the line number)
  - 83: *clerico*
  - 83: *igitur*
  - 83: *illa*
  - 80: *exproprietarie* (LEFT-nw: one word; print = exproprietarie)
  - 82: *exproprietarie* (one word, no split in print)

Part 2: Charity would leave civil lordship to the laity

Loserth pp. 83.28–86.17

¶1 83.28–86.17
83.28 *who should desire all civil rule to be in the laity.*
84.23 *Would that our bishops like the apostles set an example of perfection and drew others to it.*

[83]Ex istis quarto colligitur, cum quilibet ex lege caritatis debet appetere maius bonum, sed maius bonum foret tam clero quam laicis, quod laici occuparent totam civilitatem secularis dominii, videtur quod clerici ex caritatis regulis hoc optarent. Ipsi enim forent exinde exonerandi et layci forent circa laycum officium in

From these, fourth, it is gathered that, since everyone by the law of charity ought to desire the greater good, and now the greater good, for clergy and laity alike, would be that the laity should occupy the whole civil standing of secular lordship, it seems that the clerics would wish

85.8 *Evangelical poverty does not consist in having no wealth, but in the spirit in which wealth is held,*
85.25 *For our work as priests we need no civil dominion.*
86.3 *Alms sufficed for the priests when Christians were fewer and there were no tithes.*
86.14 *Christ's ordinances are explained away or disregarded.*

temporalibus meritorie occupati, quomodo igitur non dictaret [84] caritas, que non querit que sua sunt, quod tota civilitas foret contenta in manibus laycorum. Nam nulli dubium quin secularia iudicia, contenciones, pugne et alia laboriosa manualia sunt laycis plus pertinencia, illud igitur magis bonum debet clerus appetere. Et quantum ad arbitrium cleri variantis in perfeccione ac utilitate bonorum seculi, standum est plus Christi et apostolorum arbitrio et non arbitrio nostrorum spiritualiter infirmorum. Et patet horrenda dampnacio istius sentencie tamquam heretice, quod seculares iuvent clericos exonerando eos a temporalibus, quibus nimis onerati sunt ex stultis dotacionibus dominorum. Et quantum ad obiectum quod per idem, cum layci conversi tempore apostolorum vixerunt exproprietarie, clerici debent ex habundanciori caritate auferre bona a laycis, constat quod pauci layci perfecte conversi per apostolos reliquerunt omnia temporalia sua et devenerunt clerici illiterati; et sic apostoli titulo elemosine auferebant illa relinquentes imperfectum, scilicet proprietatem civilem ut eis inconsonum. Et utinam nostri episcopi recolerent quomodo apostoli quorum officio funguntur taliter converterint laycos ad perfeccionem regule christiane, relinquendo laycis coaccionem civilem. Perfecti enim debent niti assimilare inferiores ad suam perfeccionem et non per media illicita inducendo in eorum imperfeccionem. Papa igitur qui debet esse proximus vicarius Christi ducendo christianum exercitum ad eius sanctitatem debet ista principaliter facere tam opere quam sermone. Item, secundum principia philosophorum melius est [85] philosophari quam ditari, sed quam bonum est philosophari tam bonum est amare sapienciam incarnatam, igitur melius est ipsam diligere quam ditari. Sed de quanto christianus diligit legem suorum consiliorum sequendo ipsum in moribus, de tanto diligit ipsum, igitur hoc est melius quam ditari, cum stat hominem esse peccato miserrimum cum quantumlibet mundi multis diviciis. Ideo (ut sepe dixi) paupertas evangelica non stat in non habere temporalia, sed in moderate habere quoad modum habendi et multitudinem habiti propter amorem Christi, si quod quantumcumque temporalia iuverint ad faciendum opus viatoris officii, tantum precise Deus vult ut habeat. Unde cum in statu innocencie et statu patrie deficiet talis civilitas, videtur quod ipsa sapit imperfeccionem et est officio cleri dissonum; nec enim est necessarium ad humiliacionem nec evangelisacionem nec aliam sacerdotalem ministracionem sed ad vite ministracionem ad quam pauca ex promissione Dei sufficiunt. Ideo sapiens Proverb. XXX, 8 petit a Domino: Divicias et mendicitatem ne dederis michi, sed tantum viciui meo prebe necessaria. Consideremus

this by the rules of charity.[1] For they would thereby be relieved [of the burden], and the laity would be meritoriously occupied with the lay office in temporal things; how then would [84] charity, which "seeketh not her own", not dictate that the whole civil standing should be held in the hands of the laity?[2] For no one doubts that secular judgements, disputes, fights and other laborious manual [tasks] belong more to the laity; therefore the clergy ought to desire that greater good. And as for the judgement of the clergy, which wavers on the perfection and usefulness of the goods of the world, we must stand rather by the judgement of Christ and the apostles, and not by the judgement of our spiritually sick. And the condemnation of this teaching as heretical is plainly horrible: [the teaching] that seculars should help clerics by relieving them of the temporal goods with which they are overburdened through the foolish endowments of lords.[3] And as for the objection that, by the same token, since lay converts in the apostles' time lived without property, clerics ought out of more abundant charity to take goods away from the laity, it is evident that the few laymen perfectly converted by the apostles left all their temporal goods and became unlettered clerics; and so the apostles took those [goods] by title of alms, [the converts] leaving what is imperfect, namely civil property, as unbefitting them.[4] And would that our bishops recalled how the apostles, whose office they discharge, converted laymen in such a way to the perfection of the Christian rule, leaving civil coercion to the laity. For the perfect ought to strive to make their inferiors like themselves in their perfection, and not, by unlawful means, by leading [them] into their imperfection.[5] Therefore the pope, who ought to be the nearest vicar of Christ, leading the Christian army to his holiness, ought to do these things principally, in deed as well as in word.

Again, according to the principles of the philosophers it is better [85] to philosophize than to be enriched; now it is as good to love incarnate wisdom as it is to philosophize; therefore it is better to love it than to be enriched.[6] Now in so far as a Christian loves the law of his counsels, following him in conduct, in so far he loves him; therefore this is better than to be enriched, since it is possible for a man to be most wretched through sin with however many of the world's riches. Therefore (as I have often said) evangelical poverty does not consist in not having temporal goods, but in having them moderately, as to the manner of having and the quantity of what is had, for the love of Christ, [so] that however much temporal goods help toward doing the work of the wayfarer's office, just

igitur equalitatem iusticie, si aliquid habemus preter necessarium ad nostrum officium, et indubie senciemus quod superfluit nobis quodcumque civile dominium, cum multi clerici vivunt operosius sine tali; quare igitur non nos qui debemus scire quod Dei filius naturalis venit in mundum ob amorem nostrum in artissima paupertate, et hoc ad exemplandum nobis de sorte sua, ut ob eius amorem ac nostrum immensum commodum conversemur conformiter. Nec dubium quin sic multiplicaretur clerus ut olym, cum [86]talis non foret familia secularibus onerosa nec in sustentacione subducto globo monstruose multitudinis sumptuosa. Si enim private elemosine, quando mundus fuit irreligiosior et clerus necessarior, suffecerunt ad sustentandum totum clerum Christi, quanto magis hodie superaddite oblaciones et decime. Subducamus itaque in clero avariciam, fastum et officio suo impertinens ac superfluum, et non dubium quin satis sufficerent et commodum spirituale ex hinc in secularibus et clericis circumcrescens infinitum excederet prosperitatem et gloriam mundanam ex opposito contingentem. Affecciones itaque personales caritati contrarie faciunt quod ordinacio Christi contempnitur et tot scripturarum ac sanctorum testimonia vel sunt sinistre glossata vel a clero infideliter parvipensa.

so much precisely God wills that he should have.[7] Hence, since in the state of innocence and the state of the homeland such civil standing will be lacking, it seems that it savours of imperfection and is out of keeping with the office of the clergy; for it is not necessary to humbling, nor to preaching the gospel, nor to any other priestly ministry, but to the ministry of life, for which, by God's promise, little suffices.[8] Therefore the wise man asks of the Lord, Proverbs 30:8: "Give me neither riches nor beggary, but give me only the necessaries of life."[9] Let us then consider the equality of justice, whether we have anything beyond what is necessary to our office, and without doubt we shall perceive that any civil lordship whatever is superfluous to us, since many clerics live more laboriously without such; why then do not we [do so], who ought to know that the natural Son of God came into the world for love of us in the narrowest poverty, and this to give us an example from his lot, so that for love of him and for our own immense advantage we should live in conformity [with him]?[10] Nor is there doubt that the clergy would then be multiplied as of old, since [86]such a household would not be burdensome to seculars, nor costly to maintain, the mass of a monstrous multitude being taken away. For if private alms, when the world was more irreligious and the clergy more necessary, sufficed to maintain the whole clergy of Christ, how much more today the offerings and tithes added on top! So let us take away from the clergy avarice, pomp, and what is foreign to its office and superfluous, and there is no doubt that [these] would amply suffice, and the spiritual advantage growing up from this around seculars and clerics would infinitely exceed the prosperity and worldly glory that comes from the opposite [course].[11] So personal affections contrary to charity bring it about that Christ's ordinance is despised, and that so many testimonies of the scriptures and of the saints are either perversely glossed or faithlessly made light of by the clergy.[12]

Notes

1. *civilitas*, "civil standing" (the glossary): here the holding of civil lordship as a whole, possession with the rule that goes with it. The minor premiss (*sed maius bonum foret*) stands inside the *cum* clause; "now" marks it, and *videtur* draws the conclusion.
2. 1 Corinthians 13:5 (Loserth's reference, 84.1), DR "seeketh not her own".
3. *Et patet horrenda dampnacio istius sentencie tamquam heretice*: construed "the condemnation ... is plainly horrible"; also possible, "the horrible condemnation ... is evident". *dampnacio* is here a judicial condemnation of a teaching, not "damnation" (glossary: *dampnacio*); the *quod* clause states the condemned teaching. Perhaps Gregory XI's condemnation of Wyclif's conclusions in the bulls of 1377; the text does not name it.
4. *quod per idem ...*: the objection is that, if lay converts gave up their property, clerics should all the more take goods from laymen. *relinquentes* has no expressed noun; construed of the converts, who left civil property, not of the apostles.

5. *inducendo* (84.28): so the print; the manuscripts read *induendo* (Loserth), "putting on [themselves] their imperfection", i.e. the perfect taking on the civil property of their inferiors. Translated as printed; *eorum* is the inferiors'.
6. The maxim is Aristotle, *Topics* III.2 (118a10–11), "to philosophize is better than to make money", as current in the schools. At 85.4 the manuscripts read *ditare*; the print's *ditari* is translated.
7. *si quod* (85.9): so the print; read as *sic quod*, "so that" (our construal), since *si* gives no sense. B in the margin (85.8): *Paupertas evangelica in quo stat*, "In what evangelical poverty consists".
8. *humiliacionem*: "humbling" (perhaps humility); *vite ministracionem*, the supply of what life needs. *necessarium* refers to civil lordship.
9. Proverbs 30:8: Wyclif reverses the Vulgate's order (*mendicitatem et divitias*) and has *prebe* for *tribue*; DR's wording, in his order.
10. *quare igitur non nos ...*: the question has no verb; "[do so]" supplies the sense of the clause before (live without civil lordship).
11. *quanto magis hodie superaddite oblaciones et decime*: elliptical; *sufficerent* is understood. Loserth's side-note (86.3) adds "there were no tithes"; the Latin says only that offerings and tithes are now "added on top".
12. *ordinacio Christi*: "Christ's ordinance" (the glossary), his appointment that the clergy live without civil lordship.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **83: *caritatis***
  - **84: *elemosine* (20 is the line number)**
  - **84: *illa***
  - **84: *relinquendo* (hyphenated relin-/quendo; main token covers whole word)**
  - **85: ∅ (1^{d} is part of the folio mark 181^{d})**
  - **85: *ministracionem***
  - **85: *prebe* (zoomed: b with closed bowl) [NW]**
- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 1. I. Cor. XIII, 5. (84.33).**

Part 3: Objections from the papal dignity and from the saints who approved endowment

Loserth pp. 86.18–89.20

¶1 86.18–89.20
87.11 *Let prelates devote themselves to Christ's service and welcome the contempt of the world.*
87.20 *We are so blinded that we persecute those who teach Christ's doctrine.*
88.9 *It is urged that many saints have approved of endowment.*
88.22 *All saints are not to be followed in all things; even the apostles committed faults.*
89.1 *Another folly is the weight laid on portents as a proof of saintliness.*
89.8 *A third folly is to argue that if alms were rightly received they must not be withdrawn, even though the conditions of the gift are disregarded.*

[86]**Sed contra illud arguitur, primo de papa quomodo non sufficeret dignitati sui officii nisi haberet regna et copiosa dominia pro se et suis officiariis limitata. Et idem est iudicium de nostris episcopis atque abbatibus. Sed ad istud sepe dictum est quod officiariorum superfluitas et apparatuum sumptuositas est in causa. Unde correspondenter ad istorum crementum decrescit religiositas et edificatoria officiositas. Unde Bernhardus libro IV ad Eugenium: Inter hec tu pastor procedis deauratus, tam multa circumdatus varietate. Oves quid capiunt? Si auderem dicere, demonum magis quam ovium pascua hec sunt. Non sic factitabat Petrus vel Paulus ludebat. Et sequitur: Pastorem te populo aut nega aut exhibe; non negabis, ne cuius sedem tenes te neges heredem; Petrus hic est, qui nescitur processisse** [87]**vel gemmis ornatus vel sericis, non tectus auro vel vectus equo albo nec stipatus milite nec circumstrepentibus ministris; absque hiis tamen credidit satis posse impleri salutare mandatum. Si amas me, pasce oves meas. In hiis successisti non Petro sed Constantino. Inconsequens igitur foret quod sequitur quod in prelatis mundi gloria sit sepulta vita edificatoria instar Christi et apostolorum in ipso abscondita et undique conversacio consona ac lucrifactiva in clero et laycis copulata. Sed donemus autori isti iniuriam. Non querat igitur prelatus mundanam excellenciam**

But against this it is argued, first concerning the pope: how he would not suffice for the dignity of his office unless he had kingdoms and abundant lordships assigned to himself and his officers. And the judgement is the same of our bishops and abbots. But to this it has often been said that the superfluity of officers and the costliness of trappings is the cause. Hence, in step with their increase, religiousness and edifying diligence decrease. So Bernard, *On Consideration*, book IV, to Eugenius: "Amid these things you, the shepherd, go forth gilded, surrounded with so much variety. What do the sheep get? If I dared say it, these are pastures of demons rather than of sheep. Not so did Peter act, nor Paul play." And there follows: "Either deny that you are shepherd to the people, or show it; you will not deny it, lest he whose seat you hold deny that you are his heir. This is Peter, who is not known to have gone forth [87]**adorned either with gems or with silks, not covered with gold, nor carried on a white horse, nor attended by soldiery, nor by ministers clamouring round him; yet without these he believed that the saving commandment could well enough be fulfilled: 'If thou lovest me, feed my sheep.' In these you have succeeded not Peter but Constantine."[1] It would therefore be an inconsequence [to say] what follows: that in prelates the glory**

sed iuxta regulam Christi inferioritatem ministerii et pacienciam contemptus mundani et iniurie, si contingat propter fervorem anhelandi celestia et totum reputatum mundo inconveniens erit dulce; et loco momenti mundane glorie accrescet nomen vite et operum sanctitate et quod est maius gaudium eterna inscripcio libro vite. Unde racio quare non insequimur istam sentenciam est infidelitas, qua non credimus scriptis sanctorum et iudicio sapientum. Ad tantum enim pulvis mundi et suorum sensibilium nos cecat et diutina delectacio innaturalis in illis sopita palatum animi discrasiavit, quod ad magnum Ve nobis iuxta vaticinium Ysaie V, 20 dicimus bonum malum; et sic de illorum contrariis perversum est nostrum iudicium maniace in contrarium iudicium racionis, et tam multi ac magni inciderunt in istam rabiem, quod maior pars mundi arguet docentes et servantes istam sentenciam ut insanos, sic quod generalior, accusacior et perseverancior est persecucio in paucos docentes licet remisse [88]istam sentenciam quam olim fuerat in prophetas. Cuius causa est quia superiores ecclesie qui videntur esse aliquid perseveranter dogmatizant oppositum, cum summe odiunt recedere a mundi deliciis, quibus ex declinacione a Christi vestigiis tam diu subdole sunt sopiti. Quomodo igitur non duceretur currus in precipicium cuius veredus et auriga ducit tam fervide ad deorsum? Secundo obicitur per hoc quod multi sancti dotacionem huiusmodi approbarunt; cum igitur in secularibus sit licita, foret in clericis magis sancta; quamvis igitur quibusdam expediat vivere exproprietarie, tamen decorat totum corpus cleri quod docetur ut regina celi sit circumdata varietate. Ad illud sepe dictum est quod tales argucie non procedunt, ideo cum sanctus sanctorum docet verbo et opere quod clerus suus debet omnem secularem modum habendi relinquere, patet quod sibi debemus in isto plene credere. Nam iuxta dicta non debemus credere vel imitari alium sanctum ecclesie, nisi de quanto in ipso sua sentencia est fundata. Specialiter autem debemus credere et exemplum capere ab illis sanctis, qui primicias spiritus habuerunt, modo autem ordine nimis prepostero fundamus nos in sanctis infimis et postremis, qui magis declinarunt ad seculum, supponentes infideliter si ipsi sic fecerant igitur bene, nam apostoli multa culpabiliter fecerunt de quibus posterius sunt purgati; et multo evidencius posteriores confessores commiserunt multa crimina, de quibus finaliter penitebant. Magna itaque cecitas in nostris arguere: ipsi sic fecerant, igitur bene. Quis igitur color, si isti per magnam partem vite sue appropriaverint [89]dotacionem ecclesie, tunc non fuit illicita. Secunda stulticia est; qua plus credimus portentis quomodocumque factis, ut imponimus virtuti corporum

of the world is buried, an edifying life after the pattern of Christ and the apostles hidden in him, and everywhere a harmonious and gainful manner of life joined together in clergy and laity.[2] But let us forgive this author the wrong [he does].[3] Let the prelate, then, not seek worldly excellence, but, according to the rule of Christ, lowliness of ministry and patience under the world's contempt and injury, if it should come; through the fervour of longing for heavenly things, all that the world reckons troubles will be sweet; and in place of the moment of worldly glory there will grow up a name for holiness of life and works, and, what is a greater joy, an eternal inscription in the book of life.[4] Hence the reason why we do not follow this teaching is unbelief, by which we do not believe the writings of the saints and the judgement of the wise. For the dust of the world and of its perceptible things blinds us so far, and long unnatural delight, lulled asleep in them, has so distempered the palate of the mind, that, to our great Woe, according to the prophecy of Isaiah 5:20, we call "good evil"; and so concerning their contraries our judgement is maniacally perverted into the contrary of reason's judgement; and so many and such great men have fallen into this madness that the greater part of the world will accuse those who teach and keep this teaching as madmen, so that the persecution against the few who teach, though slackly, [88]this teaching is more general, more accusing and more persevering than it once was against the prophets.[5] The cause of this is that the superiors of the church, who "seemed to be some thing", persistently dogmatize the opposite, since they supremely hate to withdraw from the world's delights, in which, by turning aside from Christ's footsteps, they have so long been craftily lulled asleep.[6] How then would the chariot not be driven over the precipice whose horse and charioteer drive so hotly downward?

Second, it is objected, by appeal to this, that many saints approved endowment of this kind; since therefore it is lawful in seculars, it would be holier in clerics; although therefore it is expedient for some to live without property, yet it adorns the whole body of the clergy, as is taught, that the queen of heaven should be "surrounded with variety".[7] To this it has often been said that such quibbles do not hold; and so, since the holy of holies teaches by word and deed that his clergy ought to leave every secular manner of having, it is clear that we ought to believe him fully in this. For according to what has been said, we ought not to believe or imitate any other saint of the church except in so far as his teaching is founded in him. And especially ought we to believe and take example from those

mortuorum, quam signis vivacibus sanctorum evangelizancium, peccatores plurimos convertendo, in tantum quod si portentum tale sancto nostro ascribimus, cece arguimus quod quicquid fecerat non pecavit. Sed tercia stulticia est qua arguimus, si illi meritorie susceperunt elemosinas donatas ecclesie sub condicione, quam oportet intelligi, quod tunc nec licet ipsas auferre nostris, nec phas est negare, quin licet nobis ipsas expendere quomodolibet consumendo. Notaremus igitur formam, condicionem et usum sanctorum et equaremus ista in nobis, antequam concluderemus per locum a simili. Nec est color, si cerimonia sit in laycis meritoria, quod foret in clericis magis sancta. Sicut patet de homicidiis, de connubiis et multiplici meritorio ritu in laycis, qui foret in clericis venenosus.

saints who had "the firstfruits of the Spirit"; but as it is, in an exceedingly preposterous order we found ourselves on the lowest and last saints, who turned aside more to the world, faithlessly supposing: if they did so, then [it was] well. For the apostles did many things culpably, of which they were afterwards purged; and much more evidently later confessors committed many crimes, of which they repented at the end.[8] So it is great blindness in our [people] to argue: they did so, therefore [it was] well. What colour, then, [is there for saying that], if these men appropriated [89] the church's endowment for a great part of their life, then it was not unlawful?[9] The second folly is that by which we believe portents, however they were done, as we ascribe them to the power of dead bodies, more than the living signs of saints preaching the gospel by converting very many sinners, so far that, if we ascribe such a portent to our saint, we blindly argue that whatever he had done, he did not sin.[10] But the third folly is that by which we argue, if they meritoriously received alms given to the church under a condition (which must be understood), that then it is neither lawful to take them away from our [people], nor right to deny that it is lawful for us to spend them, consuming them in any way whatever.[11] We should therefore note the form, condition and use of the saints and match these in ourselves, before we infer by the topic from likeness. Nor is there colour, if a ceremony is meritorious in the laity, [for saying] that it would be holier in clerics; as is clear of killings, of marriages and of many a meritorious rite in the laity which would be poisonous in clerics.[12]

Notes

1. Bernard, *De consideratione* IV.3.6 (PL 182, 776A: *Si amas me, pasce oves meas. In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino*; Loserth here "cap. II", but "Cap. III" at 92.30; Migne, Opp. I, p. 776). *Si amas me, pasce oves meas* is Bernard's compression of John 21:15–17 (Loserth: John 21:15; DR 21:17 "lovest thou me? ... Feed my sheep"). One manuscript has *implere* for *impleri* (87.4). A in the margin (86.17): *Papa ornatus seculariter*, "The pope adorned in secular fashion". Loserth: cf. Hus, Opp. 212b.
2. A doubtful construal. *Inconsequens igitur foret quod sequitur quod ...*: taken as Wyclif's comment that, prelates having succeeded Constantine, it would not follow that worldly glory is buried in them; *quod sequitur* may instead mean "what follows [in Bernard]". *in ipso abscondita*: cf. Colossians 3:3, "your life is hid with Christ in God".
3. *donemus autori isti iniuriam*: construed "let us forgive this author the wrong", i.e. let Bernard's harshness pass; alternatively "let us grant that this author does [us] wrong". Either way the next sentence draws its rule from him.
4. *inconveniens*: here what the world reckons "troubles" (the glossary, the sense in affairs). *si contingat* refers to the contempt and injury. *inscripcio libro vite*: cf. Philippians 4:3.
5. Isaiah 5:20, DR "Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil"; Wyclif quotes *bonum malum* (Loserth's italics) inside his own sentence. *sentenciam* here and in *docentes ... istam sentenciam* is the teaching that the clergy should live without civil lordship.
6. *qui videntur esse aliquid*: Galatians 2:6, DR "them who seemed to be some thing"; not italicised by Loserth, and Wyclif has the present *videntur*.
7. Psalm 44:10 (Vulgate numbering), DR "surrounded with variety"; Bernard's *circumdatus varietate* (86.28) answers it. A in the margin (88.9): *Secunda obieccio pro dotacione*; B lacks *-modi* in *huiusmodi* (88.10).
8. *sanctus sanctorum*: Christ. *primicias spiritus*: Romans 8:23, DR "the firstfruits of the Spirit". *in ipso*: in Christ, the foundation of any saint's teaching.
9. *appropriaverint* (88.34): so the print; Loserth queries *approbaverint*, "approved", which matches the objection (88.9); translated as printed. *color*: a plausible ground (the glossary), as again at 89.17.

10. ***virtuti* (89.3)**: so the print; the manuscripts read ***virtute***, without change of sense. ***virtus***: power, the faculty (the glossary).
11. ***sub condicione, quam oportet intelligi***: the condition on which alms are given (that they serve the poor and the clerical office), set out at 89.21–27. ***nostris***: "from our [people]", the clergy.
12. ***locus a simili***: the dialectical topic from likeness. ***homicidiis***: lawful killings by laymen (in war or in judgement), which would be poisonous in clerics.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 86: ***Inter hec*** (one token covers two printed words)
  - 86: ***tenes*** (zoomed: t with crossbar)
  - 87: ***teclus*** (leaf 148 zoomed: 4th letter tall, no crossbar, unlike the short crossed t of vectus below = l (misprint))
  - 87: ***auro***
  - 87: ***stipatus***
  - 87: ***hiis***
  - 87: ***Petro***
  - 87: ***iniurie***
  - 87: ***iudicium***
  - 88: ***odiunt*** [NW]
  - 88: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 89: ∅ (quo-/modocumque is one word, already whole at pos 13 (quomodocumque))
  - 89: ***nostris***
  - 89: ***nec***
  - 89: ***phas***
  - 86: ***correspondenter*** (box covers only a speck/tick before ad; no word [the box was the junk glued to the word; the word stands])

Part 4: Lawful use, the more perfect state, and the likeness of Peter's vicar

Loserth pp. 89.21–93.30

¶1 89.21–93.30

89.21 *Endowments would be quite other if we recognized that they are the common property of the poor.*
90.1 *We claim wealth as Christ's heritage but use it as worldly property.*
90.13 *Danger of riches.*
91.11 *It may be best for a given man to be in a state that is not the best.*
91.20 *Even the devils profit the church accidentally.*
92.1 *All priests should live alike and only on alms.*
92.16 *The pope should set the example.*
93.10 *That the pope should have so much wealth is against charity,*
93.18 *If like Peter, he had not gold or silver, God might give him the power of healing.*

[89] **Notandum tamen quod temporalia non occasione ab eis data sed male accepta venenant ecclesiam. Si enim totus clerus diceret effectualiter quod omnia temporalia que habemus ut clerici forent pure elemosine secularium et bona communia pauperum, secundo effectualiter et indifferenter ministraremus de illis magis egentibus et tercio consumeremus precise de illis quantum est necessarium ad nostrum clericale officium, possemus proprietate usus et ministerii occupare licite omnia temporalia que habemus. Et sic occuparunt omnes sancti episcopi ex mundi diviciis commendandi. Quod si blasfemamus quod nude materia** [90] **successionis Christi et apostolorum qui dominati sunt seculariter omnibus mundi diviciis habemus hec omnia, et secundo consumimus illa differenter seculariter et proprietarie, et tercio dimittimus vel remittimus exinde debitum officium clericale, manifestum est quod irreligiose, iniuste et proditorie consumimus bona Dei; et hoc totum inportaret in clerico monstruosa civilitas. Sed dubitatur supposito usu legitimo, quis modus vivendi foret perfeccior; nec dubium quin modus vivendi parcior et exproprietarius, quia est securior et vite Christi ac innocencie utrique conformior. Vix enim reperies mundi divitem quin vel nimis afficiatur et occupetur circa eius divicias vel inique**

It is to be noted, however, that temporal goods poison the church not through an occasion given by them but through one wrongly taken.[1] For if the whole clergy said in effect that all the temporal goods we have as clerics were purely alms of seculars and the common goods of the poor; [if] secondly we ministered from them effectually and impartially to those in greater need; and [if] thirdly we consumed of them precisely as much as is necessary to our clerical office, we could lawfully occupy all the temporal goods we have with property of use and of ministry. And so all the holy bishops who are to be commended occupied [what they had] of the world's riches.[2] But if we blaspheme [by saying] that we have all these things barely on the ground of [90] **succession to Christ and the apostles, who exercised lordship in a secular way over all the riches of the world, and secondly consume them with partiality, in a secular and proprietary way, and thirdly thereby abandon or remit the clerical office that is due, it is manifest that we consume God's goods irreligiously, unjustly and treacherously; and monstrous civil standing in a cleric would bring all this with it.[3] But it is doubted, lawful use being supposed, which manner of living would be more perfect; and there is no doubt [that it is] the sparer and propertyless manner of living, since it is safer and**

ipsas distribuat vel tercio voluptuose atque superflue ipsas consumat, in tantum quod de divite evadente ista pericula scribitur Eccli. XXXI, 9: Quis est hic et laudabimus eum? fecit enim mirabilia in vita sua. Et hec fuit racio quare sapiencia Dei patris ob amorem nostri sic vixit exproprietarie et docuit suos cariores sic vivere. Ex quo invincibiliter colligitur quod status cuiuscumque cleri vel episcopi foret subducta appropriacione dotantis perfeccior, licet aliqui sancti in hoc evadant periculum, quia indubie predicta triplex occupacio temporalium foret ad onus cuiuscumque clerici qui intenderet perficere officium clericale; nam multitudo familie et mundani honoris nimis distraherent. Distribucio vero corporalis elemosine pertinet ad ministerium laycale, clerico intento ad distribuendum spirituales elemosinas pociores. Et sic ex dotacione sparguntur in clero macule, que ultra varietatem, quam Christus instituit, non pulcrificant matrem [91] nostram. Et si dicatur quod alicui clerico foret melius sic dotari, revera hoc est valde remotum ad inferendum quod status dotati cleri sit statu exproprietarie viventis perfeccior. Sic enim expediret alicui clerico quod foret laycus, ymo ut dicit Christus Math. XVIII: Expedit scandalizanti ut suspendatur mola asinaria circa collum eius et demergatur in profundum maris. Hoc est secundum beatum Gregorium in De Cura Pastorali II expediret prelato prescito quod ob errorem laycalis officii sit dampnatus. Non igitur sequitur: Utilius foret Petro esse in statu tali; igitur status ille est alio statu perfeccior. Nam iuxta istam vesaniam quilibet gradus turpis status foret statu honesto perfeccior, quia status perfeccior, quem statuatus deturpat, facit per accidens quod deturpatori peius eveniat, sicut inferioritas status potest cum gracia Dei esse causa per accidens unde homo amplius mereatur: ymo necesse est ut status dyaboli ac membrorum suorum prosit per accidens ecclesie, sicut status peccandi Petri et aliorum sanctorum secundum Augustinum fuit multum expediens. Numquid propterea servabimus talem statum? Notato igitur illo clerico, quem decorat imperatoris dotacio, patet quod ipse posset eque perficere opus predicandi, orandi et contemplandi sine tanta copia terrenorum; cum omne quod per se superaddit sonat in mundi gloriam et retardat ab officio clericali, quomodo igitur non foret status signancius ex dotacione imperfeccio? Et idem est argumentum de quocumque clerico signato; ex quo colligitur quod si status tocius cleri dotati foret alteratus [92] in statum exproprietarium similis statui apostolorum vel rectorum in communi vivencium pure de oblacionibus, decimis et privatis elemosinis, uniformitas faceret ad decorem ecclesie, quia pulchrius pulchriori additum, facit totum aggregatum pulchrius quam totum minus pulcrum additum minus

more conformed to both, the life of Christ and innocence.[4] For you will scarcely find a rich man of the world who is not either too much attached to and occupied about his riches, or distributes them unjustly, or thirdly consumes them voluptuously and superfluously; so much so that of the rich man who escapes these dangers it is written, Ecclesiasticus 31:9: "Who is he, and we will praise him? for he hath done wonderful things in his life." And this was the reason why the wisdom of God the Father, for love of us, lived thus without property and taught his dearer [disciples] to live thus. From which it is invincibly gathered that the state of any clergy or bishop would be more perfect with the endower's appropriation taken away, although some saints in this [state] escape the danger; for without doubt the aforesaid threefold occupation with temporal goods would be a burden to any cleric who intended to accomplish the clerical office; for the multitude of the household and of worldly honour would distract [him] exceedingly.[5] And the distribution of bodily alms belongs to the lay ministry, the cleric being intent on distributing the better spiritual alms. And so from endowment spots are scattered in the clergy, which, beyond the variety which Christ instituted, do not beautify our [91] mother.[6] And if it is said that it would be better for some cleric to be so endowed, in truth this is very far from inferring that the state of an endowed clergy is more perfect than the state of [one] living without property. For in that way it would be expedient for some cleric that he were a layman; indeed, as Christ says, Matthew 18: "It is better for him that scandalizeth, that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea." That is, according to blessed Gregory in *Pastoral Care* II, it would be expedient for a foreknown prelate that he be damned for the error of a lay office.[7] Therefore it does not follow: it would be more useful for Peter to be in such a state; therefore that state is more perfect than another state.[8] For according to this madness any grade of a base state would be more perfect than an honourable state, since the more perfect state, which the one placed in it disgraces, brings it about accidentally that it turns out worse for the disgracer; just as lowliness of state can, with the grace of God, be an accidental cause whereby a man merits more; indeed it is necessary that the state of the devil and of his members should profit the church accidentally, as the state of sinning of Peter and of other saints was, according to Augustine, very expedient.[9] Shall we then on that account keep such a state? Taking note, then, of that cleric whom the emperor's endowment adorns, it is clear that he could equally accomplish the work of preaching, praying and contemplating

pulchro. Unde igitur auctoritas membris ecclesie sic strangulare contra exemplum vel autoritatem Domini clerum suum, cum in veteri testamento non licuit; arare in bove et asino nec indui vestimento ex lana et lino, ut patet Numeri XII et Deutronomii XXII. Si igitur levite et sacerdotes legis veteris et Christi discipuli vixerunt conformiter, quare non sic viveret clerus sequens? quam uniformitatem Christi vicarius debet incipere, ut coraula; Christus enim fuit homo pauperrimus sic quod nemo potuit esse pauperior; ut hic supponitur, quomodo igitur non eius sequax in terris simillimus, cum paupertas illa sonat perfeccionem virtutis viancium. Sicut igitur oportuit Petrum in fide, in humilitate, in caritate evidencius sequi Christum ex dictis in fine tercii capituli, sic oportet Petri vicarium sequi ipsum. Sed que fides est regulam perfeccionis, quam Christus instituit, tam cito propter mundum deserere? Vel que humilitas est sine auctoritate Christi supra alios mortales, eciam supra elemosinantem seculariter se extollere? Nam libro IV dicit Bernhardus ad papam Eugenium, ut recitavi superius: In hiis, inquit, successisti Constantino non Petro. Et beatus Jeronimus, ut recitatum est XCII distinccione Olim, et XCV distinccione Absit, dicit quod tale sacramentum [93]superioritas non est a Deo et tunc indubie est a dyabolo. Si igitur papa viveret recte exproprietarie cum ceteris paribus sicut Petrus, quomodo non omnes eius subditi conversarentur conformiter? Et istam doctrinam dat Petrus I Pet. IV precipiens quod seniores et prepositi non sint dominantes in clero sed forma gregis. Et illud verbum notaret Petri vicarius propter reverenciam dignitatis. Quantum ad caritatem non video quin repugnat perfectissime caritati viantis quod in Petri vicario sit tam dominativa et copiosa possessio, quia cum caritas non querit proprietatem huiusmodi, ut dicit apostolus I. Corint. XIII, patet quod si Petri vicarius ex fervore caritatis omnia illa propter amorem Christi relinqueret, sicut fecerunt apostoli, quod cum paribus foret in eo caritas intensior et foret Petro similior, qui Actuum III, 6 confitetur: Argentum, inquit, et aurum non est michi. Et tunc liberalis dominus donaret sibi meliorem possessionem, scilicet virtutem faciendi miracula, sic quod curatus dicere possit cum Petro: Quod autem habeo, hoc tibi do, scilicet sanitatem; qui enim habet virtutem sanandi, habet eius fructum, licet non formaliter. Cum igitur iste gradus caritatis foret vicario Petri possibilis et ab illo deficit in magnum dampnum ecclesie, videtur quod propter dissimilitudinem non sit Petri vicarius et per consequens neque heres.

without so great a plenty of earthly things; since everything that it adds of itself sounds toward the world's glory and holds [him] back from the clerical office, how then would [his] state not be, more signally, an imperfection from endowment?[10] And the argument is the same of any designated cleric; from which it is gathered that, if the state of the whole endowed clergy were altered [92]into a propertyless state like the state of the apostles or of rectors living in common purely on offerings, tithes and private alms, the uniformity would make for the beauty of the church, since the more beautiful added to the more beautiful makes the whole aggregate more beautiful than the less beautiful whole added to the less beautiful.[11] Whence then [have] the members of the church authority so to deck his clergy in motley, against the Lord's example or authority, since in the Old Testament it was not lawful "to plough with an ox and an ass" nor to wear "a garment ... of woollen and linen", as is clear from Numbers 12 and Deuteronomy 22?[12] If then the Levites and priests of the old law, and Christ's disciples, lived in conformity, why should not the clergy that follows live so? And the vicar of Christ ought to begin this uniformity, like a choir-leader;[13] for Christ was the poorest of men, so that no one could be poorer, as is supposed here; how then [should] his follower on earth not [be] most like him, since that poverty sounds the perfection of the virtue of those on the road? As therefore it behoved Peter to follow Christ more evidently in faith, in humility, in charity, from what was said at the end of the third chapter, so it behoves the vicar of Peter to follow him. But what faith is it to desert so quickly, for the world's sake, the rule of perfection which Christ instituted? Or what humility is it, without Christ's authority, to exalt oneself above other mortals, even in a secular way above the almsgiver?[14] For in book IV Bernard says to Pope Eugenius, as I recited above: "In these," he says, "you have succeeded Constantine, not Peter." And blessed Jerome, as is recited in distinction 92, *Olim*, and distinction 95, *Absit*, says that such a sacrament, [93]superiority, is not from God, and then without doubt it is from the devil.[15] If then the pope lived rightly without property, other things being equal, like Peter, how would not all his subjects live in conformity? And Peter gives this doctrine, 1 Peter 4, commanding that the elders and superiors be not "lording it over the clergy, but ... a pattern of the flock".[16] And the vicar of Peter should note that word, out of reverence for the dignity. As to charity, I do not see but that it is repugnant to the most perfect charity of one on the road that there should be in the vicar of Peter a possession so lordly and so abundant; for since charity does not seek property of this

kind, as the apostle says, 1 Corinthians 13, it is clear that if the vicar of Peter, out of the fervour of charity, left all those things for the love of Christ, as the apostles did, then, other things being equal, charity would be more intense in him and he would be more like Peter, who confesses, Acts 3:6: "Silver," he says, "and gold I have none." And then the liberal Lord would give him a better possession, namely the power of working miracles, so that the curate could say with Peter: "But what I have, I give thee", namely health; for he who has the power of healing has its fruit, though not formally.[17] Since, then, this degree of charity would be possible to the vicar of Peter, and he falls short of it, to the great harm of the church, it seems that because of the unlikeness he is not the vicar of Peter, and consequently not his heir either.

Notes

1. ***occasione ... data sed male accepta***: the distinction of occasion given and occasion taken, as of scandal given and taken. A in the margin (89.21): ***Divicie quomodo venenant ecclesiam***, "How riches poison the church".
2. A in the margin (89.23): ***Nota quomodo clerus potest cum Deo habere omnia bona que habet et quomodo ea sancti habuerunt***, "Note how the clergy can with God have all the goods it has, and how the saints had them". ***proprietate usus et ministerii***: property of use and ministry, against civil property. ***commendandi***: "to be commended".
3. ***nude materia successionis***: "barely on the ground of succession"; the relative ***qui dominati sunt ...*** belongs to the claim Wyclif calls blasphemy. ***differenter*** answers ***indifferenter***, "impartially", above. ***remittimus***: "remit", let slacken.
4. A in the margin (90.8): ***Nota quod perfeccior modus est vivere clero exproprietarie, id est, nihil horum sibi appropriando vel ecclesie***, "Note that the more perfect way is for the clergy to live without property, that is, appropriating none of these things to itself or to the church". ***utrique***: both the life of Christ and the state of innocence.
5. ***subducta appropriacione dotantis***: the endower's appropriating [of goods to the clergy] taken away. ***intenderet***: of purpose, "intended".
6. ***varietatem***: the "variety" of Psalm 44:10 (88.13 above), which Christ instituted, against the spots added by endowment. ***matrem nostram***: the church as our mother (glossary: ***mater nostra***).
7. Matthew 18:6: Wyclif's ***Expedit scandalizanti*** compresses the Vulgate (***qui autem scandalizaverit ... expedit ei***); DR's wording otherwise. Gregory, ***Regula pastoralis*** I.2 (Loserth: "I pars, cap. II. Loosely quoted"; Wyclif's ***II*** stands as printed; the modern form is ours) (PL 77, 16A): better for such a man to fall in a lay state than in sacred office. ***prelato prescito***: B reads ***clerico prescito***; translated as printed. ***prescitus***: one whom God foreknows will be damned (the glossary).
8. ***Petro***: Peter as the logicians' sample name, any man.
9. ***membrorum suorum*** (91.20): so the print; the manuscripts read ***membrorum ecclesie***, "of the members of the church"; translated as printed. Augustine on the profit of Peter's fall: no reference in Loserth; ***De civitate Dei*** XIV.13: ***superbis esse utile cadere in aliquod apertum manifestumque peccatum ... Salubrius enim Petrus sibi displicuit quando flevit, quam sibi placuit quando praesumpsit***.
10. ***quod per se superaddit***: what the endowment adds of itself (***per se***, against ***per accidens*** above). ***signancius***: "more signally", more markedly.
11. ***rectorum ... in communi vivencium***: rectors living in common on the parish's dues; ***uniformitas***: one manner of life for the whole clergy. Loserth notes ***pulcrus*** in the manuscripts (92.5).
12. ***strangulare*** (p. 92): so the print ("to strangle"); we translate the manuscripts' ***stragulare*** (AB), "to deck in motley" (as with a striped coverlet), which suits the ox and ass, and the wool and linen, of the next clause: the clergy decked out with lordship. Deuteronomy 22:10–11, DR; Wyclif's ***Numeri XII*** is not the place; the mixed garment is also forbidden at Leviticus 19:19.
13. ***coraula***: the leader of a chorus (***choraula***, the piper who leads the dance).
14. ***ex dictis in fine tercii capituli***: ch. 3 (Loserth). ***elemosinantem***: one manuscript has ***eliantem*** (Loserth). ***elemosinans***: the giver of the endowment (glossary: "almsgiver").
15. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** IV.3.6 (PL 182, 776A), quoted at 87.5 (Loserth "Cap. III. V. p. 87"). Jerome: Loserth identifies ***Olim*** as Decretum D.95 c.5 (Jerome, on Titus, ***Olim idem presbyter qui episcopus***) and finds the words not in the distinction ***Absit***; Wyclif's "XCII" stands as printed. ***tale sacramentum superioritas***: so the print, construed with ***superioritas*** in apposition; the phrase may be corrupt.
16. 1 Peter 5:3 (Loserth; Wyclif "IV"), DR "Neither as lording it over the clergy but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart". Loserth's italics include ***seniores et prepositi***, which Wyclif makes the subject; the quotation marks keep the scriptural words.
17. 1 Corinthians 13:5 (***non quaerit quae sua sunt***), paraphrased as ***non querit proprietatem huiusmodi***. ***quin*** (93.10): Loserth's emendation; the manuscripts read ***quando***; B lacks ***-modi*** (93.13–14). Acts 3:6, DR. Loserth at 93.10: cf. Hus, Opp. 212b. ***curatus***: the curate, a priest with the cure of souls; here the pope as Peter's vicar.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **90: *illa***
  - **90: *hic***
  - **91: *ut***
  - **91: *ille***
  - **92: *exproprietarium***
  - **92: *similis***
  - **92: *levite* (print has v) [NW]**
  - **92: *coraula* [NW]**
  - **92: *fuit***
  - **92: *illa***
  - **92: *hiis***
  - **92: *et XCV* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **93: *dyabolo***
  - **93: *illa***
  - **93: *sanandi* (hyphenated sa-/nandi; main token covers whole word)**
- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Danger ot (90.13).**

Part 5: The saints' venial fault, and the powers of order and of jurisdiction

Loserth pp. 93.31–97.12

¶1 93.31–96.20

93.31 *Examples of Silvester and Gregory.*
94.9 *They sinned venially.*
94.24 *Let us follow the Holiest and the virtues shown in his members,*
95.5 *I am said to have admitted the distinction between powers given by orders and powers of government; and the pope is said to have the latter over the whole Church.*
95.19 *I do not dispute the fact, but deny the authority.*
95.27 *Every priest of Christ has the same power by his orders.*
96.3 *There is a varying power of government. but in thus Gods ordinance should be followed.*
96.21 *Fitzralph argues that there must be a head to rule the Church.*

[93]**Et quantum ad beatos Silvestrem, Gregorium et similes dicitur quod cum pena habuerunt tantum tumultum temporalium exproprietarie per** [94]**medias personas distribuendo bona ecclesie, ipsi autem servabant vitam humilem et pauperem in se ipsis, quod si scivissent peccatores sequentes sic obtinuisse illas divicias, firmiter credo quod ipsas pro se et posteris reliquissent. Et stultus est qui sompniat et defendit quod non in hoc venialiter peccaverunt. Non enim repugnat quod remisse in gracia occuparunt illud officium sicut meritorie, sed defectu veniali occuparunt temporalia et in posteris propter profundiorem maliciam in occupacionem mortalem et simpliciter Deo odibilem est perversa. Periculum igitur foret trahere in exemplum vel consequenciam modum agendi venialiter culpabilem, quia sic ex pietate doceremus cum Petro gentes iudaizare, propter quod fuit a Paulo, ut patet capitulo II ad Gal., reprehensus. Et credo quod longe maius peccatum fuit in dotatis episcopis ex hoc quod dotacionem huiusmodi admiserunt, Caveamus igitur exempla capere sanctorum ab operibus eorum mixtim laudabilibus et venialiter culpabilibus secundum disparem racionem, quia nescimus si in nobis sit predestinacionis gracia vel excusandi racio a mortali. Ideo debemus sequi secure sanctum sanctorum et virtutes in membris suis, nec non in operibus sic mixtis debemus colare racionem laudabilem et illi inniti racione alia separata. Et credo quod ignorancia huius sentencie fecit multos a via Domini declinare. Noverunt sophiste quomodo eadem res est simul laudabilis et culpabilis secundum**

And as to the blessed Silvester, Gregory and the like, the answer is that, since they had with pain so great a turmoil of temporal goods, distributing the goods of the church without property through [94] **intermediate persons, while they themselves kept a humble and poor life in themselves, [it follows] that, if they had known that the sinners following would so obtain those riches, I firmly believe that they would have left them, for themselves and their successors.[1] And he is a fool who dreams and maintains that they did not sin venially in this.[2] For it is not incompatible that they held that office slackly in grace, as [they did] meritoriously, but held the temporal goods with a venial defect; and in their successors, because of a deeper malice, [the holding] was perverted into a mortal holding, hateful to God without qualification.[3] It would therefore be a danger to draw into an example or a precedent a way of acting that is venially culpable, for so, out of piety, we should teach the gentiles with Peter to judaize, for which he was rebuked by Paul, as is clear in chapter 2 of Galatians.[4] And I believe that the sin was far greater in the endowed bishops in that they admitted an endowment of this kind. Let us therefore beware of taking examples of the saints from their works that are, in mixed fashion, praiseworthy and venially culpable under different aspects, for we do not know whether there is in us the grace of predestination or a reason for being excused from mortal [sin]. Therefore we ought to follow securely the holy of holies and the**

disparem racionem, ut Petrus et operacio sua est laudabilis, quia sub aliquo gradu bona moraliter, et est cum hoc culpabilis et reprobabilis propter defectum habundancie [95] virtutis et fervorum amoris. Sic enim sumus omnes in vita continue increpandi; et talis tepiditas, ut dicitur Apocalipsis III, 16 causat vomitum, quia indubie inducit plurimos in mortale. Sed tercio arguitur contra dicta per hoc quod iuxta sepe et publice dicta a me alia est potestas iurisdicionis et alia ordinis; sicut declarat dominus Ardmacanus libro VII De Questionibus Armenorum VI capitulo, ubi dicitur, quod potestates ordinis in omnibus sacerdotibus sunt equales. Sed potestates regiminis variantur, cum Petro et suis successoribus qui soli habent universalem potestatem regiminis data est sic potestas super universalem ecclesiam; et consonat factum ecclesie cum multis legibus de regimine vel iurisdicione loquentibus; oportet igitur docere quod officium Petro conveniat et quid sit ab eo vetitum. Quantum ad illud non discucio, quid fiat de facto, sed quid auctoritate scripture vel racione debet fieri. Unde Deum contestor, nec ex scriptura nec ex sanctis doctoribus fundari video istius iurisdicionis extensionem tam vanam, sed ex ritu gentilium sicut institucionem pape et cardinalium introductam. Concedo igitur distinccionem predictam. Pro quo notandum quod multi sacerdotes et episcopi habent dispares potestates. Sed potestas ordinis, que est par in quolibet sacerdote, est potestas quam clericus habet in quantum est Christi sacerdos, quam oportet esse communem et quodlibet eius iudicium est potestas sic remissa, qua sacerdos non potest carere manente suo sacerdocio; et illa potestas non potest maius et [96] minus suscipere. Et preter illam est dare aliam maneriem potestatis iurisdicionis sive regiminis, que fuit dispar in diversis apostolis et continue est dispar in diversis episcopis. Sed illa non attenditur penes institucionem humanam, sed penes hoc quod Deus ordinavit episcopum intensius vel remissius debere regere maiorem partem ecclesie vel minorem. Et non attenditur in isto ad humanum primatum sed ad quantitatem potestatis quam Deus attribuit ad edificandum suam ecclesiam, et (ut dictum est) omnes habuerunt commixtam potenciam super eodem populo sine repugnancia, Petrus primatum non propter amplitudinem iurisdiccionis sed propter fervorem dileccionis Christi et sue ecclesie. Nam ut credo ceteri extensius laborarunt, ita quod turpissime et inevidentissime arguitur quod, si Petrus habuit primatum inter apostolos, tunc ille habuit iurisdiccionem universalem tocius ecclesie, et alii particularem a Petro et eius vicariis limitatam.

virtues in his members; and in works so mixed we ought to strain out the praiseworthy aspect and lean on it, the other aspect being separated. And I believe that ignorance of this teaching has made many turn aside from the way of the Lord. The sophists know how the same thing is at once praiseworthy and culpable under different aspects: as Peter and his working is praiseworthy, because morally good in some degree, and is with this culpable and reprovable for want of an abundance [95] of virtue and of the fervours of love.[5] For so we are all, in this life, continually to be rebuked; and such lukewarmness, as is said in Revelation 3:16, causes vomiting, for without doubt it leads very many into mortal [sin].[6] But, thirdly, it is argued against what has been said, by appeal to the fact that, according to what I have often and publicly said, the power of jurisdiction is one thing and that of order another; as the lord of Armagh declares in book 7 of the *Questions of the Armenians*, chapter 6, where it is said "that the powers of order are equal in all priests".[7] But the powers of government vary, since to Peter and his successors, who alone have universal power of government, power was thus given over the universal church; and the practice of the church agrees with many laws that speak of government or jurisdiction; it is therefore necessary to teach what office befits Peter and what is forbidden him.[8] As to that, I do not discuss what is done in fact, but what ought to be done by the authority of scripture or by reason. Hence I call God to witness: I see so vain an extension of this jurisdiction grounded neither in scripture nor in the holy doctors, but introduced from the rite of the gentiles, as [was] the institution of the pope and the cardinals. I grant, therefore, the aforesaid distinction. For which it is to be noted that many priests and bishops have unequal powers. But the power of order, which is equal in every priest, is the power that a cleric has inasmuch as he is a priest of Christ, which must be common, and every judgement of it is a power so remitted, which a priest cannot lack while his priesthood remains; and that power cannot admit more and [96] less.[9] And besides it there is another kind of power, of jurisdiction or government, which was unequal in different apostles and is continually unequal in different bishops. But that [power] is not reckoned according to human institution, but according to God's having ordained that a bishop should rule, more intensely or more slackly, a greater or a lesser part of the church.[10] And regard is paid in this not to human primacy but to the quantity of power that God assigned for building up his church; and (as has been said) all had a mingled power over the same people without incompatibility, Peter [having] the primacy

not because of the breadth of his jurisdiction but because of the fervour of his love of Christ and of his church.[11] For, as I believe, the others laboured more extensively, so that it is most shamefully and with the least evidence argued that, if Peter had the primacy among the apostles, then he had universal jurisdiction over the whole church, and the others a particular one assigned by Peter and his vicars.

¶2 96.21–96.24

[96] Tres tamen evidencias innuit dominus Ardmacanus ad roborandum istam arguciam, primo quod oportet aliquem capitaliter sic regere ex auctoritate domini, sed ille potissime foret Petrus.

Yet the lord of Armagh hints at three pieces of evidence to strengthen this quibble: first, that someone must so rule as head by the authority of the Lord; now that one would above all be Peter.[12]

¶3 96.25–97.5

97.6 It is said that special powers were given by Christ to Peter,

[96] Ad illud dicitur et in futurum declarabitur quod hodierna gentilis iurisdiccio fuit preter autoritatem Domini ex superbia introducta, quia iuxta decretum beati Jeronimi XCV distinccione: Olim ecclesia regulabatur in principio communi sacerdotum consilio, sicut fuit tempore apostolorum subducta dominacione. Et ad docendum nos istam sentenciam credo Spiritum Sanctum ordinasse, quod in lege Christi preponeretur quandoque [97] ante Petrum alius Christi apostolus, ut Gal. II Paulus preponit Jacobum fratrem Domini et Act. VIII miserunt apostoli Petrum et Johannem Samariam. Et Act. II docetur eleccionem Matthie ex communi apostolorum consilio processisse.

To that the answer is, and it will be declared in future, that today's gentile jurisdiction was introduced out of pride beyond the authority of the Lord; for according to the decree of blessed Jerome in distinction 95, "Formerly the church was ruled in the beginning by the common counsel of the priests", as it was in the time of the apostles, the exercise of lordship being withdrawn.[13] And to teach us this teaching I believe the Holy Spirit ordained that in the law of Christ another apostle of Christ should sometimes be set [97] before Peter: as in Galatians 2 Paul puts James, the brother of the Lord, first, and in Acts 8 the apostles sent Peter and John to Samaria. And in Acts 2 it is taught that the election of Matthias proceeded from the common counsel of the apostles.[14]

¶4 97.6–97.12

[97] Secundo arguitur per hoc quod Petro singulariter dicta sunt et concessa multa a Domino; oportet igitur quod illa dicant in Petro quandam preeminenciam, sed nullam pertinencius quam regimen universale predictum; et illud multum notatur, quod soli Petro dictum est Math. XVI, 19: Tibi dabo claves regni celorum.

Secondly, it is argued by appeal to the fact that many things were said and granted singularly to Peter by the Lord; therefore they must signify some preeminence in Peter, but none more pertinently than the aforesaid universal government; and this is much noted, that to Peter alone it was said, Matthew 16:19: "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."[15]

Notes

1. The period runs *dicitur quod cum … quod si scivissent … firmiter credo quod*: the second *quod* resumes the first after the long *cum*-clause, and *firmiter credo* breaks in, so the construction is left open in the English. *scivissent* (94.3): Loserth's reading; the manuscripts have *scissent*, the same sense. *per medias personas*: through intermediaries, not handling the goods themselves.
2. A in the margin (94.7): *Sancti suscipiendo dotacionem venialiter peccaverunt*, "The saints sinned venially in accepting the endowment".
3. *sicut meritorie*: their holding of the office stayed meritorious though slack; the venial defect lay in the holding of temporal goods. The subject of *est perversa* is not expressed; we supply "the holding" from *occuparunt … occupacionem*.
4. Galatians 2:11–14 (DR 2:14 "how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"). *trahere in … consequenciam*: the legal idiom "to draw into a precedent"; not the logical *consequencia* "inference" of the glossary.
5. B lacks *et culpabilis* (94.31). *Petrus* is the apostle, whose fault at Antioch is in view; the logicians' sample name would also fit.
6. Loserth notes *3° causat* in the manuscripts (95.3). Revelation 3:16, DR "I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth"; the words are not quoted.

7. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* VII.6, as Wyclif cites it; no reference in Loserth. The 1512 print, VII.6 (scan p. 100), distinguishes *duplicem potestatem*, of order and of rule (*ordinis … regiminis*). B spells the name *Archidmanus* (95.9). A in the margin (95.8): *Nota de duplici potestate scilicet iurisdiccionis et ordinis*, "Note on the twofold power, namely of jurisdiction and of order".
8. Where the objection ends is not marked; we take it to run to *vetitum*. *quod officium* is read as an interrogative, "what office", beside *quid sit … vetitum*.
9. *quodlibet eius iudicium est potestas sic remissa*: so the print, rendered word for word; the sense is doubtful (perhaps every judgement made by the power of order is power at this lower, equal degree). AB in the margin (95.27): *Potestas dispar in episcopis et sacerdotibus*, "Power unequal in bishops and priests".
10. B reads *quod Deus est* (96.6) for the print's wording; translated as printed.
11. *potenciam*: "power" (glossary: *potencia*, CONTEXTUAL), here the same as the *potestas* of the sentence; not Aristotle's potency. *Petrus primatum*: the verb *habuit* is understood. AB in the margin (96.13): *Petrus quomodo primatum habuit inter apostolos*, "How Peter had the primacy among the apostles".
12. *sed ille*: the minor premiss of FitzRalph's first argument, so "now". A in the margin (96.21) numbers it *1*; the second follows at 97.6.
13. Jerome, *Olim*: Decretum D.95 c.5, to which Loserth refers back ("Vide supra pag. 92"; the modern form is ours) (PL 187, 448C: *communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur*). Jerome's own words (on Titus 1:5) speak of the common counsel of presbyters; Wyclif writes *sacerdotum*.
14. Galatians 2:9 names James first among the pillars. Acts 8:14. The election of Matthias is Acts 1:15–26 (DR 1:26); Wyclif's *Act. II* stands as printed.
15. Matthew 16:19, DR. A in the margin (97.6): *2*, the second of FitzRalph's arguments. *dicant*: "signify, imply".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 94: *sed*
  - 94: *habundancie* (hyphenated habun-/dancie; main token covers whole word)
  - 95: *alia*
  - 95: *sacerdotibus*
  - 95: *illa*
  - 96: *que*
  - 96: *fuit*
  - 96: *est*
  - 96: *illa*
  - 96: *tur* (print: tur | pissime, turpissime split by the folio bar (184[d]); main token holds the first part) [NW]
  - 97: *illa*
  - 95: *mor* (mor- | tale at line end; hyphen not carried, other half tale on next line)

Part 6: The keys given for the church, Paul's licence from God, and three conclusions

Loserth pp. 97.13–102.24

¶1 97.13–98.26
97.13 *Such primacy was given only because he was more loving and humble than the rest.*
97.26 *The power of the keys was given to him as representing the priesthood and confers no privilege on the Roman pontiff.*
98.28 *Paul did not accept authority or licence from Peter.*

[97]Quantum ad illud, patet quod turpiter petitur quod probaretur, quia, ut patet in parte ex dictis, propter spiritualem primatum, quo ceteris fuit humilior, servicior et ecclesie Christi amancior, et non propter aliquam dignitatem mundanam Deus dedit sibi primatum ecclesie, et sic fuit ad laborem et sollicitudinem suam, quod habuit illam preeminenciam, et hoc fuit obligare obedire minoribus. Et hinc sumitur racio, quare sic meruit paciendo humiliter reprobacionem Apostoli, de qua Gal. II, ut declarat Augustinus Epistola IX. Quilibet igitur apostolus habuit regimen quodammodo universale viantis ecclesie, sed Paulus Petro extensius. Et quantum ad illud dictum Petro Mar. XVI Tibi dabo claves regni celorum, patet quod fuit dictum in persona ecclesie sacerdotum, quod aliter nos non gauderemus hoc privilegio virtute horum verborum Domini; unde miror quod aliquis habens fidem scripture retorqueret ex isto verbo

As to that, it is clear that what was to be proved is shamefully begged; for, as is clear in part from what has been said, it was because of a spiritual primacy, by which he was humbler than the others, more serviceable and more loving of the church of Christ, and not because of any worldly dignity, that God gave him the primacy of the church; and so it was for his labour and solicitude that he had that preeminence, and this was to bind [him] to obey lesser men.[1] And hence is taken the reason why he so merited, by humbly suffering the reproof of the Apostle, of which Galatians 2 [speaks], as Augustine declares in Letter 9.[2] Every apostle, therefore, had a government in a way universal over the church on the way, but Paul more extensively than Peter.[3] And as to that saying to Peter, Mark 16, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven", it is clear that it was said in the person of the church of priests, since otherwise

singulare privilegium Romani pontificis in solvendo. Hoc enim fuit singulariter [98]dictum Petro tamquam generali procuratori ecclesie sacerdotum et non tamquam singulari recipienti pro se solum hoc privilegium, sed limitatum et diffinitum fuit a Christo preter ordinacionem humanam quomodo sacerdotes sibi habiles privilegio isti participent. Et ista est sentencia Augustini super X, Omelia CXXIV: Petrus, inquit, apostolus propter apostolatus sui primatum gerebat figurata generalitate personam ecclesie; quod enim ad ipsum proprie pertinet, natura unus homo erat gracia christianus, habundanciori gracia unus idemque primus apostolus. Sed quando ei dictum est: Tibi dabo claves regni celorum, et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in celis, et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in celis, universam signat ecclesiam, que in hoc seculo diversis temptacionibus ut ymbribus et tempestatibus quatitur, et non cadit, quoniam fundatur super petram; unde Petrus nomen accepit, que fundatur in Christo. Horrenda itaque et infidelis seduccio simplicium laycorum foret ex isto textu evangelii episcopum irracionabiliter reservare sibi potenciam ad ligandum et cecare populum cum laxacione potestatis proprie et suspensione potestatis alterius, ut patet in materia de sacramento penitencie.

we should not enjoy this privilege by virtue of these words of the Lord; hence I marvel that anyone having the faith of scripture should twist out of this word a singular privilege of the Roman pontiff in loosing.[4] For this was said singularly [98]to Peter as to the general proctor of the church of priests, and not as to a singular recipient of this privilege for himself alone; but it was assigned and defined by Christ, apart from human ordinance, how priests qualified for it should share in this privilege.[5] And this is the teaching of Augustine on [John], Homily 124: "Peter the apostle," he says, "because of the primacy of his apostleship, bore in a figurative generality the person of the church; for as to what belongs to him properly, by nature he was one man, by grace a Christian, by more abundant grace one and the same first apostle. But when it was said to him, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven', he signified the whole church, which in this world is shaken by divers temptations as by rains and storms, and does not fall, because it is founded upon the rock, whence Peter received his name"; which is founded in Christ.[6] It would therefore be a horrible and unbelieving seduction of simple laymen, from this text of the gospel, for a bishop unreasonably to reserve to himself the power of binding, and to blind the people by loosing his own power and suspending the power of another, as is clear in the matter on the sacrament of penance.[7]

¶2 98.28–99.34
99.4 He had preached three years before he met Peter.
99.15 Peter was sent to Samaria by the apostles.

[98]Sed tercio nimis leviter sollempnisatur quod Paulus accepit autoritatem et licenciam a Petro ad predicandum in gentibus ex textu Gal. II, 9: Cum cognovissent, inquit, graciam que data est [99]michi, Jacobus et Cephas et Johannes, qui videbantur esse columpne, dexteras dederunt michi et Barnabe societatis, ut nos in gentes, ipsi vero in circumcisionem. Sed notet rogo arguens ex isto textu, quomodo Paulus triennio ante illud tempus sine eorum auctoritate predicavit in gentibus, de quo non cepit penitenciam vel reprobacionem a Petro, quia Paulus cicius illud insereret quam reprehensionem Petri. Notet secundo quomodo communi consilio et auctoritate Christi, ut dicit Jeronimus, locuti sunt apostoli in ecclesia primitiva. Petrus autem ex decreto cetus apostolici fuit paracior ad laborem, ut patet Act. VIII, 14 ubi dicitur, quod apostoli, qui erant Jerusolimis, miserunt Petrum et Johannem in Samariam ad confirmandum populum, qui prius receperat verbum Dei; ubi non notatur Petro humana dignitas, quod apostoli eum miserunt ad illud officium, sicut papa non acceptaret

But thirdly, it is exceedingly lightly made a solemn matter that Paul received authority and licence from Peter to preach among the gentiles, from the text of Galatians 2:9: "When they had known," he says, "the grace that was given [99]to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship: that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision."[8] But let him who argues from this text note, I pray, how Paul for three years before that time preached among the gentiles without their authority, for which he received no penance or reproof from Peter; for Paul would sooner have inserted that than the rebuke of Peter.[9] Let him note secondly how, by common counsel and the authority of Christ, as Jerome says, the apostles spoke in the primitive church.[10] And Peter, by decree of the apostolic company, was the readier for labour, as is clear from Acts 8:14, where it is said that "the apostles, who were in Jerusalem", "sent Peter and John" into Samaria to confirm the people, who had earlier received

sibi dignitatem et honorem, quod cardinales mitterent eum et unum episcopum socium ad convertendum unam gentem. Et patet quod minus inevidenter eliceretur ex isto textu quod Petrus et Johannes cepissent autoritatem ab apostolis qui residebant Jerusolimis; non enim est magna auctoritas cursorem mitti ad operam. Sed tercio notet falsarius verba textus Apostoli et videat si sequatur: Jacobus, Petrus et Johannes dederunt Paulo et Barnabe dextram societatis, igitur dederunt eis autoritatem sive licenciam; dederunt, inquam, eis bonam societatem, gaudentes quod dedit eis Deus graciam predicandi gentibus, sicut Petro Judeis, ymmo precepit separare sibi Paulum et Barnabam ad illud officium.

the word of God; where no human dignity is marked in Peter in that the apostles sent him to that office, just as the pope would not take it as dignity and honour to himself that the cardinals should send him, with one bishop as companion, to convert one nation. And it is clear that it would be drawn from this text with less want of evidence that Peter and John had received authority from the apostles who stayed in Jerusalem; for it is no great authority for a runner to be sent to a task. But thirdly let the falsifier note the words of the Apostle's text and see whether it follows: "James, Peter and John gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; therefore they gave them authority or licence". They gave them, I say, good fellowship, rejoicing that God had given them the grace of preaching to the gentiles, as to Peter [that of preaching] to the Jews; indeed, he commanded that Paul and Barnabas be separated to him for that office.[11]

¶3 100.1–100.22
100.1 *The apostles would not have given licence to one who had already received it of God.*
100.23 *The apostles consorted on terms of mutual service and honour.*
100.30 *So should our priests and bishops do.*

[100] Unde nimis magna stulticia foret apostolos presumere dare illis vasis licenciam, postquam cognoverunt quod Deus prius dedit ad hoc licenciam et preceptum. Maniaca, inquam, foret stulticia, nos dare licenciam angelis ad exequendum suum officium, quod Deus preceperit. Sufficit igitur Christi auctoritas sive licencia, qua cognita licet rogare et hortari ad illam sedule exequendum. Unde oportet notare pro intellectu istius historie apostolice benedicte, quomodo Apostolus incipit calculare a conversione sua; de quaAct...: tunc enim segregatus fuit ex utero matris sue synagoge, pro cuius defensione infideliter laboravit; et hinc vocat se ipsum abortivum prima Cor. XV, 8: Novissime, inquit, tamquam abortivo Christus visus est michi, quia de matre sua synagoga prodiit ipsa ocasione illius exitus pereunte, quia, ut dicitur Act. IX, 10: Mansit cum discipulis diebus aliquot; quos absit credere fuisse apostolos, et continue invalescebat confundens Judeos propter amorem indubie, quo dilexerat matrem suam.

Hence it would be exceedingly great folly for the apostles to presume to give those vessels licence, after they knew that God had earlier given them licence and command for this.[12] It would be, I say, a maniacal folly for us to give licence to the angels to carry out their office, which God had commanded. Christ's authority or licence therefore suffices; once it is known, it is lawful to ask and exhort [them] to carry it out diligently. Hence, for the understanding of this blessed apostolic history, it must be noted how the Apostle begins to reckon from his conversion, of which Acts [speaks]: for then he was separated from the womb of his mother the synagogue, for whose defence he had laboured in unbelief; and hence he calls himself one born out of due time, 1 Corinthians 15:8: "Last," he says, "as to one born out of due time, Christ was seen by me"; because he came forth from his mother the synagogue, she perishing on the occasion of that going forth.[13] For, as is said in Acts 9:10, "He stayed with the disciples some days", whom God forbid we should believe to have been apostles; and he continually grew stronger, confounding the Jews, without doubt because of the love with which he had loved his mother.[14]

¶4 100.23–101.12
101.1 *If Christ were to revisit the earth, he would find few faithful servants.*
101.13 *We priests ought to devote ourselves entirely to priestly duties.*

[100] Ex istis colligitur, quod sicut omnes apostoli preter Scarioth erant socii sibi obedientes, honore invicem prevenientes et superiores invicem arbitrantes, qui inmediate a Deo potestatem et licenciam ad evangelizandum acceperunt; sic debet esse de sacerdotibus et episcopis ecclesie iam instantis, ita quod disparitas ditacionis societatem et amiciciam evangelicam non dissolvet, quia per idem Christus per

From these things it is gathered that, just as all the apostles except Iscariot were companions obedient to one another, "with honour preventing one another" and esteeming one another superiors, who received power and licence to evangelize immediately from God, so it ought to be with the priests and bishops of the church now present, so that disparity of enrichment shall not dissolve fellowship and evangelical friendship.[15] For

101.23 *The pope should not judge in secular business.*
101.29 *He should give up all cesarean endowments.*

possibile reconversans nobiscum, observans scolam suam ex integro sicut olim, non haberet papam vel dotatos episcopos socios vel amicos sed dominos, quibus solveret tributum sicut olim fecit cesari. Non enim consonat [101]scole sapientis habere familiam tam discordem a capite quod monstruose et contra policiam humanam servicium ab eis exigeret, et in propria familia doctrine capitis repugnaret, quod si veniens in mundum illum non invenerit episcopos in conversacione sibi consentaneos et amicos, quomodo laudaret eos ut fideles vicarios, nec ut fideles negociatores in die iudicii beatitudine premiandos; a multis creditur quod nullos vel paucos inveniet, in quibus scintilla sue conversacionis sit propter antichristianam declinacionem ad seculum exemplata.

by the same token Christ, if, as is possible, he were living among us again and keeping his school entire as of old, would have the pope or the endowed bishops not as companions or friends but as lords, to whom he would pay tribute as once he did to Caesar.[16] For it does not befit [101]the school of a wise man to have a household so discordant from its head that, monstrously and against human polity, it should exact service from them, and in his own household be incompatible with the doctrine of the head. And if, coming into the world, he does not find bishops agreeing with him in manner of life, and friends, how would he praise them as faithful vicars, or as faithful dealers to be rewarded with blessedness on the day of judgement? It is believed by many that he will find none or few in whom a spark of his manner of life is copied, because of the antichristian decline towards the world.[17]

¶5 101.13–101.22

[101]Si autem queritur quid nos sacerdotes debemus facere, dicitur indubie quod debemus in conversacione sequi ipsum quantum sufficimus. Sic quod primo abraderemus quantum sufficimus omnem occupacionem mentis aut corporis, que fuerit inpertinens aut contraria officio sacerdotis. Secundo vero poneremus omnem sacerdotalem potestatem quantum sufficeremus efficaciter in effectum, et omnium istorum exemplar et specula debet esse dominus Jhesus Christus.

And if it is asked what we priests ought to do, the answer is, without doubt, that we ought to follow him in manner of life as far as we are able: so that, first, we should shave away, as far as we are able, every occupation of mind or body that is irrelevant or contrary to the office of priest; and secondly, we should put every priestly power, as far as we are able, effectually into effect; and of all these the exemplar and mirror must be the Lord Jesus Christ.[18]

¶6 101.23–102.24

[101]Ex istis sequerentur tres conclusiones graciose ecclesie, primo quod papa non intromitteret se iudicando de negocio seculari, quia est alienum a sacerdotali officio iuxta illud II Thim. II, 4: Nemo militans Deo implicat se negociis secularibus, Secundo quod renueret omnem dotacionem cesaream, cum ex facto Christi et Petri patet quod foret impertinens papali officio; et per consequens omnes alii episcopi ut sit conformitas ad caput, et revera necessarior foret conformitas paparum sequencium in ista pauperie ad Christum, sicut [102]Petrus et alii sub quibus crevit ecclesia se Domino conformarunt. Tercio quod papa et omnes alii episcopi debent evangelizacione, oracione et sancte vite exemplacione assidue pascere oves Christi; patet ex officio ter limitato Petro Johannis ultimo. Unde Augustinus Epistola CXLI ad Paulinum notat, quomodo in textu Apostoli Ephe. IV, ii officium pastoris et doctoris iunguntur: Pastores, inquit, et doctores quos maxime discernere voluisti eosdem puto esse et non alios pastores et alios doctores intelligamus; et ideo cum predixisset pastores, subiunxit doctores, ut pastores intelligerent ad officium suum pertinere doctrinam. Ideo vero non ait: quosdam vero pastores

From these would follow three conclusions gracious to the church.[19] First, that the pope would not meddle in judging a secular business, for it is alien to the priestly office, according to 2 Timothy 2:4: "No man, being a soldier to God, entangleth himself with secular businesses." Secondly, that he would renounce every caesarean endowment, since from the deed of Christ and of Peter it is clear that it would be irrelevant to the papal office; and in consequence all the other bishops [would], that there may be conformity to the head; and in truth the conformity of the popes who follow to Christ in this poverty would be more necessary, as [102]Peter and the others under whom the church grew conformed themselves to the Lord.[20] Thirdly, that the pope and all the other bishops ought to feed the sheep of Christ assiduously by evangelizing, by prayer, and by the example of a holy life; this is clear from the office thrice assigned to Peter in the last [chapter] of John.[21] Hence Augustine, Letter 141 to Paulinus, notes how in the Apostle's text, Ephesians 4:11, the office of pastor and of doctor are joined: "Pastors," he says, "and doctors, whom you most

et quosdam doctores, ut superiori locucionis genere, sed quosdam pastores et doctores, tamquam unum aliquid duobus nominibus amplexus est, quosdam, inquit, pastores et doctores. Et sic spoliatis superfluis, pateret quis episcopus remaneret habilis ex thesauro Domini et quis remaneret vacuus prescisso organo et officio laycali; et forte reperirentur plures pastores cesarei quam fideles vicarii domini Jhesu Christi. Et utinam talis discernendi monstracio foret facta.

wished me to distinguish, I think are the same, and let us not understand some to be pastors and others doctors; and therefore, when he had spoken of pastors, he added doctors, that pastors might understand that doctrine belongs to their office. And therefore he does not say: 'and some pastors, and some doctors', as in the earlier kind of expression, but 'some pastors and doctors', as though he embraced one thing under two names: 'some', he says, 'pastors and doctors'."[22] And so, the superfluities being stripped away, it would be clear which bishop remained qualified from the treasury of the Lord, and which remained empty, the instrument and the lay office being cut off; and perhaps more caesarean pastors would be found than faithful vicars of the Lord Jesus Christ. And would that such a muster for discerning had been made.[23]

Notes

1. ***turpiter petitur quod probaretur***: the fallacy of begging the question. ***hoc fuit obligare obedire minoribus***: the preeminence was itself a bond to obey those beneath him. Loserth reports a corrupt A reading at 97.15–16 (***fiunt humilior***); translated as printed.
2. Augustine on Peter's humility under Paul's rebuke; Loserth: "St. Augustini Opp. tom. II, 85"; Wyclif's *Epistola IX* stands as printed. A in the margin (97.23): ***Petrus habuit primatum super apostolos***, "Peter had primacy over the apostles".
3. ***viantis ecclesie***: the church of those on the road (glossary: ***vians***, row ***viare; vians***), the church in this life.
4. The words are Matthew 16:19, DR; *Mar. XVI* stands as printed. ***in persona ecclesie***: as representing the church. ***in solvendo***: in the power of loosing.
5. B reads ***diffinitum fuerit modo preter*** (98.4). ***limitatum***: "assigned", laid down (glossary: ***limitare***), not restricted. ***habiles***: qualified (glossary: ***habilis***). C. ***sibi habiles***: taken as "qualified for it"; ***sibi*** may instead be reflexive to Christ, the agent of ***limitatum*** ("priests qualified in his sight").
6. Augustine, ***In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*** 124.5; Loserth refers instead to ***Enarr. in Ps.*** 108 (PL 35, 1973: ***gerebat figurata generalitate personam***, Wyclif's wording). The print's ***super X*** and the manuscripts' ***super 10*** (98.7) both seem to stand for ***super Jo[hannem]***; we supply "John" (our emendation). B lacks ***apostolus*** (98.12). Matthew 16:19, DR. ***que fundatur in Christo***: the feminine relative after the quotation takes ***petram***, the rock founded in Christ; B's ***qui*** (98.19) makes it Peter. Loserth at 98.20: cf. Hus, Opp. 210.
7. ***potenciam ... potestatis***: both "power" here (glossary: ***potencia***, CONTEXTUAL; Wyclif uses the two words interchangeably). The reserved cases of penance: the bishop widens (***laxacio***, "loosing", as against ***restringere***, cf. 16.22 in 01-e) his own power and suspends the priest's. ***in materia de sacramento penitencie***: Wyclif's cross-reference, not identified; the reservation of absolution is attacked later in ***De eucharistia et poenitentia*** (ed. Loserth 1892, p. 340), but as reservation to the curia. B lacks ***populum*** (98.24).
8. Galatians 2:9, DR. The print's stray parenthesis after ***cognovissent*** is not carried.
9. Galatians 1:17–18: Paul went to see Peter "after three years".
10. Jerome on the common counsel of the apostles and priests: the ***Olim*** of Decretum D.95 c.5, cited at 96.27 (PL 187, 448C: ***communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur***).
11. Acts 13:2, DR "Separate me Saul and Barnabas". The subject of ***precepit*** is God (the Holy Ghost in Acts). ***ymmo***: "indeed", correcting upward. ***falsarius***: the opponent's epithet.
12. ***illis vasis***: Paul and Barnabas; Paul as "a vessel of election", Acts 9:15, DR.
13. Galatians 1:15, DR "who separated me from my mother's womb"; Wyclif makes the womb the synagogue's. The print has ***de qua Act...*** with the reference wanting. 1 Corinthians 15:8: Wyclif departs from the Vulgate (***novissime autem omnium tamquam abortivo visus est et mihi***, DR "And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time"); his Latin is translated. ***ipsa ... pereunte***: the mother dying in the untimely birth.
14. Acts 9:19 (Wyclif "IX, 10"): Vulgate ***fuit autem cum discipulis qui erant Damasci per dies aliquot***; Wyclif's ***mansit ... diebus aliquot*** recalls Galatians 1:18 (***mansi apud eum diebus quindecim***). ***invalescebat confundens Judeos***: Acts 9:22 (DR "Saul increased much more in strength and confounded the Jews"), not quoted.
15. Romans 12:10, DR; ***superiores invicem arbitrantes*** recalls Philippians 2:3. ***ditacionis***: enrichment, the endowing of some above others.
16. ***per possibile***: so the print, "as is possible"; the usual formula for such a supposition is ***per impossibile***, "if, per impossibile". ***per idem***: "by the same token". The tribute: Matthew 17:26; 22:21.
17. The subject of ***exigeret*** and ***repugnaret*** is taken to be the household, which would exact service of them (the head and his own), against human polity; if the subject is the head, the sense is that Christ would demand service of the endowed. ***negociatores***: the servants who traded with the talents (Matthew 25; Luke 19:13).
18. B in the margin (101.13): ***Sacerdotes quid debent facere***, "What priests ought to do". ***abraderemus***: "shave away".
19. ***graciose***: Loserth's reading; the manuscripts read ***gloriose***, "glorious" (101.23). A in the margin: ***prima conclusio***; B in the margin at 101.28: ***Secundo***; at 102.2: ***3***. C. ***graciose ecclesie***: taken as ***graciose*** nominative plural with ***conclusiones*** and ***ecclesie*** dative; it may be genitive with ***ecclesie***, "of the gracious church" (with codd. ***gloriose***, "of the glorious church").

20. 2 Timothy 2:4, DR. B lacks *II* before *Tim.* (101.26). *dotacionem cesaream*: the endowment from Caesar (Constantine), cf. *clerus cesareus*. *necessarior … sicut*: the comparison is loose: as necessary for the popes now as it was for Peter and the others.
21. John 21:15–17 (DR 21:17 "Feed my sheep"). *limitato*: "assigned" (glossary: *limitare*).
22. Augustine, Ep. 149 to Paulinus (Loserth: "Ep. CXLIX. Opp. tom. II, pag. 508"; Wyclif's *CXLI* stands as printed; Ep. 149.11, PL 33, 635, whose *intelligamus* confirms Loserth's supplement). Ephesians 4:11, DR "other some pastors and doctors". *intelligamus* (102.11) is Loserth's supplement, lacking in the manuscripts; translated. B reads *agit* for *ait* (102.14). AB in the margin (102.6): *Pastores debent esse doctores plebem exemplo et verbo docentes*, "Pastors ought to be doctors, teaching the people by example and word".
23. *prescisso organo et officio laycali*: the worldly means and lay office cut away, the bishop is left empty. B lacks *facta* (102.26). A in the margin (102.25): *C. VI.*, the next chapter.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 97: *celorum*
  - 98: *figurata*
  - 98: *quodcumque* [NW]
  - 98: *in*
  - 98: *quodcumque*
  - 98: *Sed*
  - 99: *Jacobus*
  - 99: *in*
  - 99: *miserunt* (15 is the line number)
  - 100: *abortivum* (print has v) [NW]
  - 100: *10* (old-style 10)
  - 100: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 101: *policiam* [NW]
  - 101: *illum*
  - 101: *in*
  - 101: *iudicando* (25 is the line number)
  - 101: *implicat*
  - 102: *se Domino* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 102: *ut*
  - 102: *ut*
  - 102: *inquit*
  - 97: *virtute* (LEFT-nw: 30 is the line number)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference met Peter. . . (99.5).

Chapter 6

Part 1: The seventh teaching: no apostle had Christ's human power, nor every pope an apostle's

Loserth pp. 102.26–106.28

¶1 102.26–103.7
102.26 *No apostle had all Christ's human powers, nor has every pope all the*
103.1 *powers of an apostle.*
103.8 *Christ could lay down his life and take it again, which only God can do,*
103.20 *Christ had power to redeem the human race.*

¶2 103.8–104.8
104.1 *This power was due to the two natures in Christ.*
104.9 *Some argue that God can give toa man the grace and power given to Christ's humanity.*

[102]**Septima facta sentencia premittenda est hec: Sicut nullus apostolorum habuit tantam potestatem quantam habuit Christus humanitus, sic nec omnes** [103]**pape habent tantam potestatem quantam habuit beatus Petrus vel alius Christi apostolus. Prima pars patet ex primogenitura Christi, que non potest communicari alicui eius vicario, cum tunc foret Deus et homo; cum igitur Christus habuit illam potestatem primogeniture humanitus, sequitur probandum.**

The seventh teaching to be set out first is this: just as none of the apostles had as much power as Christ had in his humanity, so neither do all [103] **popes have as much power as blessed Peter or another apostle of Christ had.[1] The first part is clear from the primogeniture of Christ, which cannot be communicated to any vicar of his, since then he would be God and man; since therefore Christ had that power of primogeniture in his humanity, what was to be proved follows.[2]**

[103]**Item, Christus habuit potestatem ponendi animam suam et iterum sumendi eam, ut patet Johan. X, et sic non potuit aliquis eius vicarius, ut declarat Augustinus Omelia XLVII, ergo conclusio. Si enim Petrus haberet potestatem iterum sumendi animam suam prius positam, oporteret Petrum esse naturam terciam a corpore et anima cui inesset potestas resumendi animam sic positam, quod soli Deo potest competere, quia oportet dare subiectum cui competeret sic assumere, corpus vero exanime, non habet huiusmodi potestatem nec anima potest se ipsam assumere. Item, Christus habet per se potestatem ad redimendum genus humanum et ad principiandum graciam cuilibet alteri de suo genere, sed sic non habet aliquis eius vicarius, ergo conclusio. Antecedens patet per illud Johan. I, 14: Vidimus gloriam eius quasi unigeniti a patre plenum gracie et veritatis; de cuius plenitudine nos omnes accipimus, graciam pro Gracia. Sic igitur nullus alius potest mutari in Deum et hominem, ut sit per se fons gracie, a quo oportet omnem graciam datam ecclesie derivari, quia sic nec potest alius homo vel angelus Jhesu nostro in potencia, in plenitudine gracie vel preeminencia coequari.** [104]**Nec hoc verti debet fideli in dubium, qui credit, quod nullus alius potest idemptificari personaliter Jhesu nostro, et quod natura divina ac humana idemptificantur in persona filii, licet ille nature infinite distinguantur, quodammodo necesse est divinitatem Christi in humanitatem eius ex vi unionis supereminenter incomunicabiliter aliis personis influere.**

Again, Christ had power to lay down his soul and to take it up again, as is clear from John 10, and so no vicar of his could, as Augustine declares in Homily 47; therefore the conclusion.[3] For if Peter had the power of taking up again his soul once laid down, Peter would have to be a third nature, apart from body and soul, in which the power of resuming the soul so laid down would inhere, which can belong to God alone; for a subject must be given to which it would belong so to take [it] up, and the lifeless body has no such power, nor can the soul take itself up.[4] Again, Christ has of himself the power to redeem the human race and to originate grace for any other of his kind; now no vicar of his has [it] so; therefore the conclusion.[5] The antecedent is clear from John 1:14: "We saw his glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; of whose fulness we all receive, grace for grace."[6] So therefore no other can be changed into God and man, so as to be of himself the fount of grace, from which all grace given to the church must be derived; for so neither can another man or angel be made equal to our Jesus in power, in plenitude of grace or in preeminence.[7] [104]**Nor ought this to be brought into doubt by the faithful man who believes that no other can be made identical in person with our Jesus, and that the divine and human nature are made identical in the person of the Son, although those natures are infinitely distinguished; in a certain way it is necessary that the divinity of Christ flow into his humanity, by force of the union, supereminently, incommunicably to other persons.[8]**

¶3 104.9–106.10
105.1 *In treating of the Incarnation we have said that Christ was of the same species with his brothers but by the hypostatic union his power and beauty were other than man's,*
105.27 *A quality cannot exist without a subject and those who fancy it may do so in the Host injure the Church.*
106.11 *The popes have not all the powers of the apostles.*
106.14 *Our prelates cannot work miracles, which are not needed now.*

[104] **Nec sunt obiectus, quos ignari obiciunt digni memoria. Arguunt enim quidam: cum gracia et potestas date Christo humanitus sint tantum finite, derogaretur infinite divine potencie nisi posset eandem vel tantam ponere in quocumque. Et confirmacio est quod Christus sicut est eiusdem speciei nobiscum sic et quelibet gracia vel potestas quam habet humanitus. Stat igitur Deum ex omnipotencia sua augere potestatem vel graciam in Petro, quousque parificata fuerit qualitati in Christo. Tercio confirmatur per hoc quod omnem qualitatem, potest per se ponere et per consequens in quocumque subiecto voluerit et cum anima Petri sit tante capacitatis, ut anima Christi, Deus potest facere qualitates tales positas in aliis spiritibus informare. Sed et istud arguunt ex hoc quod verbum Dei potest quamcumque naturam humanam seorsum vel simul assumere; quo facto inessent sibi tanta gracia et potestas sicut Christus habet humanitus, igitur non posita illa unione Deus potest faciliter facere qualitates huiusmodi informare hominem non assumptum. Sed benedictus dominus qui nos liberavit de istis arguciis. Dictum est autem in materia de** [105] **incarnacione, quod Christus non potuit aliam humanitatem assumere, verumtamen potuit facillime si voluisset, dictum est eciam quod ipse tam secundum corpus quam animam est eiusdem speciei cum quolibet alio fratre suo. Et dictum est tercio quod ex vi unionis ipostatice gracia, potestas et pulchritudo vel speciositas in Christo est alterius speciei quam aliqua qualitas consimilis nominis in alio homine potest esse. Et ideo incarnacio Christi perfecit totam universitatem creatam tam secundum individua quam universalia, cum multa talia aliter non fuissent. Sicut igitur individuum unius speciei licet infinitum creverit, non potest in toto parificari individuo alterius speciei, sic est de gracia Christi, de potestate, speciositate sue humanitatis. Qualitates autem multe, sicut patet de corporali pulchritudine, principiantur a relacione, ideo idem esset querere istas qualitates in alio homine et querere alium hominem qui simul sit Deus et homo. Ideo errant, qui nude arguunt idemptitatem specificam qualitatum ex idemptitate specifica subiectorum. Oportet enim principia rerum tendere ad maiorem unitatem quam sit in suis effectibus, cum summa unitas sit in primo principio et summa diversitas in sua universitate creata. Nec est michi sermo de qualitate que potest per se esse, quia certum est quod est dare unam naturam qualitatis, que non potest esse nisi informet substanciam, cum non sit nisi substanciam accidentaliter esse qualem. Et qui sompniant aliam ex vanitate subtilitatis circa sacramentum eukaristie, ultra hoc quod sciunt fundare in scriptura sacra, in antiquis sanctis doctoribus**

Nor are the objections which the ignorant raise worthy of memory. For some argue: since the grace and power given to Christ in his humanity are only finite, it would derogate from the infinite divine power unless it could place the same, or as great, in anyone whatever.[9] And the confirmation is that, just as Christ is of the same species with us, so too is any grace or power that he has in his humanity. It stands, therefore, that God by his omnipotence [can] increase power or grace in Peter until it has been made equal to the quality in Christ. Thirdly, it is confirmed by the fact that he can place any quality by itself, and in consequence in whatever subject he will; and since the soul of Peter is of as great capacity as the soul of Christ, God can make such qualities, placed in other spirits, inform [them].[10] And they also argue this from the fact that the Word of God can assume any human nature whatever, separately or together; and when that is done there would be in it as much grace and power as Christ has in his humanity; therefore, without that union being posited, God can easily make qualities of this kind inform a man not assumed. But blessed be the Lord, who has freed us from these quibbles. Now it has been said in the matter of the [105] **incarnation that Christ could not assume another humanity, though he could most easily have done so had he willed; it has also been said that he, as much according to body as to soul, is of the same species with any other brother of his.[11] And it has been said, thirdly, that by force of the hypostatic union the grace, power, and beauty or comeliness in Christ is of another species than any quality of like name can be in another man. And therefore the incarnation of Christ perfected the whole created universe, as much in individuals as in universals, since many such would not otherwise have been.[12] As, therefore, an individual of one species, although it should grow infinitely, cannot be made wholly equal to an individual of another species, so it is with the grace of Christ, with the power [and] comeliness of his humanity. Now many qualities, as is clear of bodily beauty, originate from relation; therefore it would be the same to seek these qualities in another man and to seek another man who is at once God and man. Therefore they err who barely argue the specific identity of qualities from the specific identity of their subjects. For the principles of things must tend to greater unity than there is in their effects, since the highest unity is in the first principle and the highest diversity in its created universe. Nor am I speaking of a quality that can exist by itself; for it is certain that there is a nature of quality that cannot be unless it informs a substance, since it is nothing but a**

vel racionis efficacia, debilitant scolam Christi. Paratus sum tamen eis annuere si illud probaverint et non ante. Et credo quod scola possit aliunde occupari [106] circa fidem scripture ut olim usque ad tubam novissimam, antequam rima ad fundandum illud in scriptura sacra in qua est omnis veritas sit reperta; et tamen, si foret utile, autor scripture non omississet illud inserere nec quatuor sancti doctores illud detegere neglexissent; unde oportet ecclesiam cavere ab huiusmodi novitate. Et colligi potest solucio ad tres predictas argucias; quomodo vel peccant in materia vel in forma. Et patet prima pars predicte sentencie.

substance's being accidentally of such a kind.[13] And those who dream of another [kind], out of the vanity of subtlety concerning the sacrament of the eucharist, beyond what they know how to ground in holy scripture, in the ancient holy doctors or in the force of reason, weaken the school of Christ. Yet I am ready to assent to them if they prove it, and not before. And I believe that the school could be otherwise occupied [106] about the faith of scripture, as of old, until the last trumpet, before a chink for grounding that in holy scripture, in which is all truth, would be found; and yet, if it were useful, the author of scripture would not have omitted to insert it, nor would the four holy doctors have neglected to expose it; hence the church must beware of novelty of this kind.[14] And the solution to the three aforesaid quibbles can be gathered: how they sin either in matter or in form. And the first part of the aforesaid teaching is clear.[15]

¶4 106.11–106.13

[106] Et secunda pars patet ex potestate faciendi miracula et ex potestate autorizandi scripturam sacram et ex potestate edificandi ecclesiam.

And the second part is clear from the power of working miracles, from the power of authorizing holy scripture, and from the power of building up the church.[16]

¶5 106.14–106.28

[106] Quantum ad miracula, patet quod cessant hodie in nostris episcopis, cum satis est post fidem in evangelio divulgatam ipsam impressam sanctis exhortacionibus confirmare. Cum igitur Deus non dat quicquam superflue, sequitur quod Deus non dat nostris prepositis, ut olim dedit discipulis, potestatem faciendi miracula; et per consequens nunc non habent; hec autem fuit racio; quare Apostolus non miraculose sed per viam naturalis medicine sanavit Thimoteum, bonum regimen iniungendo. Utere, inquit; modico vino propter stomachum tuum et frequentes tuas infirmitates prima Thim. V. Sed communicando cum infidelibus convertendis per miracula exercuit illam potestatem; ut patet Actuum ultimo copiose.

As to miracles, it is clear that they cease today in our bishops, since it is enough, after the faith has been spread abroad in the gospel, to confirm it, once impressed, with holy exhortations. Since therefore God gives nothing superfluously, it follows that God does not give to our superiors, as he once gave to the disciples, the power of working miracles; and in consequence they do not now have [it]; and this was the reason why the Apostle healed Timothy not miraculously but by way of natural medicine, enjoining a good regimen: "Use," he says, "a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thy frequent infirmities", 1 Timothy 5.[17] But in communicating with unbelievers who were to be converted he exercised that power through miracles, as is clear abundantly in the last [chapter] of Acts.[18]

Notes

1. ***Septima facta sentencia premittenda***: ***facta*** does not construe easily ("the seventh teaching, [now] made, to be set out first"); translated without it. ***nec omnes pape***: "neither do all popes", kept as Wyclif orders it; Loserth's side-note reads it "nor has every pope". B in the margin (103.1): ***Potestatem Christus habuit humanitus quantam nullus habuit apostolus***, "Christ had power in his humanity such as no apostle had". ***humanitus***: as man, in his human nature.
2. ***primogenitura***: Christ as firstborn (Colossians 1:15, 18); the power of the firstborn belongs to him as man but cannot pass to a vicar without making the vicar God and man.
3. John 10:18, DR "I have power to lay it down: and I have power to take it up again"; DR's "it" is the life (***anima***); "soul" is kept because the next sentence argues from body and soul. Augustine, ***In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*** 47.11 (Loserth: ***Opp.*** tom. III, 610; PL 35, 1739: ***nemo habet potestatem sumere quod posuerit: Christus autem ... quando voluit, sumpsit***).
4. ***naturam terciam*** (103.14): Loserth notes "sic in codd." and suggests ***separatam***, "separate"; translated as printed. ***corpus vero***: continuative, "and".
5. ***principiare graciam***: to be the principle (source) of grace for another. ***sed***: the minor premiss, closed by ***ergo***.

6. John 1:14 and 1:16, joined. Wyclif departs from the Vulgate (*vidimus gloriam eius gloriam quasi unigeniti ... et de plenitudine eius nos omnes accepimus et gratiam pro gratia*; DR "and we saw his glory, the glory as it were of the only begotten of the Father ... And of his fulness we all have received: and grace for grace"); his Latin is translated. Loserth: *accipimus* is the manuscripts' reading (103.27), and the print has it too (plate).
7. *potencia*: "power" (glossary: *potencia*, CONTEXTUAL), the same as *potestas* in this argument, not Aristotle's potency.
8. *idemptificari personaliter*: "made identical in person". The period lacks a link between *licet ... distinguantur* and *quodammodo necesse est*; translated as it stands, with a semicolon. B reads *et personaliter* (104.2). *influere*: "flow in" (glossary: *influxus / influere*).
9. *obiectus*: the objections (glossary: *objectum*). *infinite divine potencie* (104.12): the manuscripts read *infiniti*; translated as printed. A in the margin numbers the three arguments *1*, *2*, *3* (104.9, 14, 19).
10. *Stat ... augere*: "it stands", it is consistent, that God increase. *per se ponere*: to place a quality by itself, without a subject; the third argument rests on the separable accident, which Wyclif rejects below.
11. Loserth: cf. *De benedicta incarnacione* cap. XI, p. 189 (his query; confirmed at p. 189.14–15: *Christus non potest aliam naturam assumere*). *non potuit ... verumtamen potuit facillime si voluisset*: Christ could not as things stand (he did not will it), yet could have done so with ease had he willed; the conditional, not the absolute, impossibility. The qualification is Wyclif's here: *De benedicta incarnacione* says only that it *est impossibile*.
12. *universitatem creatam*: the created universe; *individua ... universalia*: the incarnation adds new individuals and new species (Christ's grace and power are of another species).
13. *substanciam accidentaliter esse qualem*: a quality is nothing but the substance's being qualified. The quality "that can exist by itself" is the accident without subject of the eucharistic doctrine Wyclif rejects (the next sentence; Loserth's side-note at 105.27).
14. *tubam novissimam*: 1 Corinthians 15:52, DR "at the last trumpet". *rima*: "a chink", a crack through which to ground it. *quatuor sancti doctores*: the four doctors of the Latin church (Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory).
15. *tres predictas argucias*: the three confirmations; the first argument and the fourth (*Sed et istud arguunt*) are counted with them.
16. *auctonzandi*: the print's *autorizandi*, misread; the glossary *autorizare*. AB in the margin (106.11): *Secunda pars*.
17. 1 Timothy 5:23, DR "use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thy frequent infirmities". A reads *utere inquam*; B in the margin *inquit* (106.24). *prepositis*: "superiors" (glossary: *prepositi*), here the bishops.
18. Acts 28:8–9: Paul heals the father of Publius and the other sick of Malta.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 102: *CAPITULUM SEXTUM.*
  - 102: *Christus*
  - 104: *idemptificari*
  - 104: *parificata* [NW]
  - 104: *illa*
  - 105: *parificari* [NW]
  - 106: *prima Thim* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 106: *V*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 24. I. Tim. V, 23. (106.33).

Part 2: The apostles' powers and the authority of scripture

Loserth pp. 106.29–110.19

¶1 106.29–107.16
107.4 *The apostles had power to cast out devils and to deliver offenders to Satan.*
107.18 *All are not alike in grace or power,.*

[106]Item, si nostri episcopi habent tantam potestatem faciendi miracula eciam primitiva ut olim, cum sepe foret necessarium uti huiusmodi potestate, culpandi sunt ex ocio potestatis et discredendi tamquam fictores pompatici, cum nesciunt [107]racione vel facto ostendere huiusmodi potestatem. Apostoli enim sicut habuerunt potestatem vexatos a sathana liberandi, sic eciam habuerunt potestatem tradendi Sathane peccatores inficientes ecclesiam. Nam Mar. ultimo dicit Christus: Signa autem eos qui crediderint, hec sequentur: In nomine meo demonia eiicient, linguis loquentur novis,

Again, if our bishops have so great a power of working miracles, even the miracles of the beginning, as of old, then, since it would often be necessary to use such power, they are to be blamed for the idleness of their power and disbelieved as pompous pretenders, since they cannot [107]show such power by reason or by deed. For the apostles, just as they had power to free those vexed by Satan, so also had power to deliver to Satan sinners who infected the church. For in the last [chapter] of Mark Christ says: "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name they shall

serpentes tollent, et si mortiferum quid biberint non eis nocebit. Et patet in cronicis quod apostoli habuerunt huiusmodi potestates, ut patet de Paulo Act. ultimo; et quod apostoli habuerunt potestatem tradendi perversos sathane, patet Act. V de Anania et Saphira, et prima Cor. V de fornicario, qui cognovit uxorem patris et prima Thim. primo de Ymeneo et Alexandro, quos Apostolus tradidit sathane propter blasphemiam.

cast out devils. They shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents: and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them."[1] And it is clear in the chronicles that the apostles had such powers, as is clear of Paul in the last [chapter] of Acts;[2] and that the apostles had the power to deliver the perverse to Satan is clear in Acts 5 of Ananias and Sapphira, and in 1 Corinthians 5 of the fornicator who knew his father's wife, and in 1 Timothy 1 of Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom the Apostle delivered to Satan on account of blasphemy.[3]

¶2 107.18–108.24
108.1 *Even in the ministrations of sacraments the Apostles had greater power.*
108.18 *It our prelates have these great powers they should use them.*
108.25 *Our priests cannot rule books to be canonical,*

[107]Item, secundum Apostolum prima Cor. XII, 4 divisiones graciarum sunt, quas Dominus dividit singulis prout vult; et ille gracie vel sunt potestates vel ad potestates consequentes, igitur sicut non omnes parificantur in graciis, sic nec in potestate. Nec valet dicere quod nostri prelati in potestate precipua sunt pares apostolis, quia summa potestas concessa christiano stat in hoc, quod sit Dei filius adoptivus, cum aliis inde sequentibus, ut puta quod constituatur super omnia bona Dei. Sed ex dubio cuiquam prelato nostro simplex ydiota sibi subiectus in hoc ipsum exuperat, igitur non in hoc debet pompare de preeminencia potestatis, ymo si parificatur apostolis in potestate ministrandi sacramenta et aliunde apostoli ipsum excesserant, videtur quod [108]tota aggregata potestas in apostolis fuit maior, ymo cum apostoli mediate eadem potestate suffecerunt instituere sacramenta et tam miraculose ac tam efficaciter ministrare eadem sacramenta, videtur quod apostoli habuerunt ampliorem et efficaciorem potestatem ad dispensandum ecclesie sacramenta. Nec ostendunt in signis efficacibus, quod habeant vel absconditam potestatem; cum igitur posset esse error in institucione et error in potestatis abusione, racione cuius Deus non conferat sed auferat huiusmodi potestatem, videtur signum luciferinum gloriari sine efficacia operis de huiusmodi potestate. Opus inquam meritorium de celo ecclesie instanter tractum in preteritum gigneret consolacionem et gaudium potentatus et daret fidem subditis quod Deus sibi communicat potestatem. Status autem et potestas magna viancium incuteret eis ex altitudine casus formidinem. Et patet ex secundo capitulo per multa media quomodo in qualibet potestatum novem patres in primitiva ecclesia excesserunt. Aliter enim prelati nostri nimis illuderent subtrahendo usum huiusmodi potestatum.

Again, according to the Apostle, 1 Corinthians 12:4, "there are diversities of graces", which the Lord divides "to every one according as he will";[4] and those graces either are powers or are consequent upon powers; therefore, just as not all are made equal in graces, so neither in power. Nor does it avail to say that our prelates are equal to the apostles in the principal power, because the highest power granted to a Christian consists in this, that he be an adopted son of God, with the other things that follow from it, for instance that he be set "over all the goods" of God.[5] Now, for all anyone knows, a simple unlettered man subject to any prelate of ours surpasses him in this very thing;[6] therefore he ought not to vaunt himself on preeminence of power in this; indeed, if he is made equal to the apostles in the power of ministering the sacraments, and the apostles had exceeded him in other respects, it seems that [108]the whole aggregated power in the apostles was greater; indeed, since by means of the same power the apostles sufficed to institute sacraments and to minister those same sacraments so miraculously and so effectively, it seems that the apostles had an ampler and more effective power for dispensing the sacraments to the church. Nor do they show by effective signs that they have even a hidden power; since, therefore, there could be error in the institution and error in the abuse of the power, by reason of which God would not confer but take away such power, it seems a Luciferian sign to glory in such power without the effect of the work. A meritorious work, I say, drawn down from heaven for the church at urgent asking, as in time past, would beget consolation and joy for the potentate, and would give faith to his subjects that God communicates power to him.[7] But the great state and power of wayfarers would strike fear into them from the height of the fall.[8] And it is clear from the second chapter, by many middle terms, how in each of the nine powers the fathers in the primitive church excelled.[9] For otherwise our prelates would mock [us] exceedingly by withholding the use of such powers.

¶3 108.25–110.19
109.3 *nor have their writings any claim to such authority as belongs to Scripture.*
110.11 *If they had such power theological study and canon law would be useless,*

[108]Quantum ad auctorizacionem scripture sacre patet ex modo loquendi beati Augustini IV De Doctrina Christiana VI cap.; quod apostoli et evangeliste qui scripserunt libros canonicos erant eorum autores, licet solus Deus fuerit autor summus. Aliter enim nulla creatura haberet auctoritatem ad aliquid faciendum. Quod autem sacerdotes nostri temporis non habent tantam auctoritatem vel potestatem canonizandi libros sicut sunt libri de biblia, videtur ex universali sermone dicto [109]de veritate et auctoritate scripture. Et patet ex hoc; quod idem esset parificare eorum dicta auctoritati scripture, et asserere quod Spiritus Sanctus et Jhesus noster hec in ipsis loquitur. Sed vite eorum elongacio, sentencie contrariacio et propria confessio contradicunt; vivunt enim voluptuose et sermo eorum sapit avariciam. Sed Sapiencie I, 5 dicitur, quod Spiritus Sanctus discipline effugiet fictum, ideo perit illis evidencia auctoritatis, quod Spiritus Sanctus dicit in illis suas sentencias et cum in Christo non fuerunt Est et Non, ut patet II Cor. I, 17, 18; ipsi autem sepe contrariantur evangelio ac eciam sibi ipsis; ideo perit illis quantum ad illa in quibus extraneant, Christi auctoritas: sepe enim contradicit posterior precedenti. Et quantum ad conformacionem propriam, sunt multa dicta sanctorum paparum eminenciam scripture concorditer confitencium, sicut faciunt sancti doctores, in quibus fundant suam sentenciam, ymo in V Decretalium de sentencia excommunicacionis cap A nobis confitetur papa de sua ecclesia, quod sepe fallit et fallitur, eciam de excommunicacione et absolucione in quibus magis attenderet. Ideo non possent patencius accusare se ipsos de supina blasfemia quam parificare dicta sua extranea evangelio, specialiter cum deficiunt in potestate minori, ut puta interpretacione sermonum facta in loquendo omnia linguarum genera, ut fecerunt apostoli et sui conversi, ymo in exercendo gracias sanitatum. Et ista sunt modicum in comparacione ad [110]superiora carismata. Ostendant igitur istas potestates, conversiones infidelium vel sanaciones infirmorum per suas epistolas, ut factum est cum scripturis apostolorum; et est evidencia quod Christus in eis loquitur, ymo ut dictum est superius, generaliter potestas subtrahitur pro mortali. Sed multi eorum ex ingratitudine incidunt in mortale, ideo necesse est quod potestas si quam in principio habuerunt ex ingratitudine sit subtracta. Item, si sint paris auctoritatis cum nostris auctoribus, cum continue multiplicant leges suas addiscere sicut legem fidei scripturarum, quod est contra leges multas ecclesie, que preferunt theologiam et privilegiant eius discipulos, similiter tunc destruerentur iura canonica, quia tota illa facultas foret pura

As to the authorizing of holy scripture, it is clear from the manner of speaking of blessed Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* book 4, chapter 6, that the apostles and evangelists who wrote the canonical books were their authors, although God alone was the highest author.[10] For otherwise no creature would have authority to do anything. And that the priests of our time do not have so great authority or power of canonizing books such as are the books of the Bible appears from the general discourse given [109]*On the Truth and Authority of Scripture*.[11] And it is clear from this: that to make their sayings equal to the authority of scripture would be the same as to assert that the Holy Spirit and our Jesus speaks these things in them. But the distance of their life [from Christ's], the contrariety of their teaching and their own confession contradict [this]; for they live voluptuously and their speech savours of avarice. Now in Wisdom 1:5 it is said that "the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful"; therefore the evidence of authority perishes for them, [the evidence] that the Holy Spirit speaks his teachings in them. And since in Christ there was not "It is and It is not", as is clear in 2 Corinthians 1:17–18,[12] now they often contradict the gospel and even themselves; therefore Christ's authority perishes for them as to those things in which they stray from it: for often the later contradicts the earlier. And as to their own conformity, there are many sayings of holy popes who with one accord confess the eminence of scripture, as the holy doctors do, on whom they ground their teaching;[13] indeed, in book 5 of the Decretals, title *On the Sentence of Excommunication*, chapter *A nobis*, the pope confesses of his church that it often deceives and is deceived, even concerning excommunication and absolution, in which it should take the more heed.[14] Therefore they could not more openly accuse themselves of supine blasphemy than by making their sayings, foreign as they are, equal to the gospel,[15] especially since they fall short in a lesser power, for instance "interpretation of speeches" made in speaking all "kinds of tongues", as the apostles and their converts did, indeed in exercising "the graces of healing".[16] And these are slight in comparison with [110] the higher charisms. Let them therefore show these powers, conversions of unbelievers or healings of the sick, through their epistles, as was done with the writings of the apostles; and that is evidence that Christ speaks in them; indeed, as was said above, power is in general withdrawn for mortal [sin]. Now many of them fall into mortal [sin] through ingratitude; therefore it is necessary that the power, if they had any in

theologia, quia sermo quem Deus in eis loquitur eque evidenter sicut locutus est olim in scribis fidei scripturarum.

the beginning, has been withdrawn for ingratitude. Again, if they are of equal authority with our authors, then, since they continually multiply their laws, [we should have] to learn [them] like the law of the faith of the scriptures, which is against many laws of the church, which prefer theology and privilege its students;[17] likewise the canon laws would then be destroyed, because that whole faculty would be pure theology, because [it would be] the word that God speaks in them as evidently as he spoke of old in the scribes of the faith of the scriptures.

Notes

1. Mark 16:17–18, Douay–Rheims. The print has the Vulgate's futures *sequentur*, *loquentur*; the manuscripts read the presents *sequuntur*, *loquuntur* (apparatus 107.6–7), which do not change the sense. The print's *Unguis* is the Vulgate's *linguis*, "tongues".
2. Acts 28:3–6, the viper at Malta, which did Paul no harm (the "serpents" of Mark 16:18).
3. Acts 5:1–11; 1 Cor. 5:1–5; 1 Tim. 1:20 ("whom I have delivered up to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme").
4. 1 Cor. 12:4, Douay–Rheims; the relative clause is 12:11, where the Vulgate's subject is the Spirit (*dividens singulis prout vult*). Wyclif makes *Dominus*, "the Lord", the subject.
5. Matt. 24:47, "he shall place him over all his goods", turned from the master's goods to God's.
6. *Ex dubio*, literally "out of doubt": taken here as "it is possible that" (no one knows who is predestinate). If it stands for *sine dubio*, "without doubt", the sentence asserts that some unlettered subject does surpass his prelate.
7. *De celo ecclesie instanter tractum in preteritum* is hard to construe: literally "urgently drawn from heaven of the church into the past". Taken as a miracle won from heaven by the church's urgent prayer, as in the primitive church. *Potentatus* is the person who holds power, here the prelate (*sibi*).
8. *Formido* here is plainly the emotion, so "fear", not the scholastic "misgiving". *Viancium*, "wayfarers", is Wyclif's word for those still on the way.
9. The nine powers are set out in ch. 2 of this treatise; *media*, the middle terms of the arguments there.
10. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 4.6.9 (Loserth: *Opp.* tom. III, 1, 67), where the scriptural writers are called "our authors" (PL 34, 93: *auctores nostri, quorum scripta divinitus inspirata canonem nobis … fecerunt*).
11. Wyclif's *De veritate sacre scripture* (Loserth's identification: Buddensieg's edition, 1904).
12. 2 Cor. 1:17–19, Douay–Rheims; the phrase is 1:17 and 1:19 (Loserth cites 17, 18).
13. *Conformacionem propriam* answers the third item of the list above, *propria confessio*, "their own confession": the popes' own words confirm scripture's preeminence. The word may stand for *confirmacionem* or *confessionem*; we translate the print.
14. *Liber extra* 5.39.28 (*A nobis*, Innocent III), where the church's judgement "sometimes follows opinion, which it often happens both deceives and is deceived" (Loserth, 109.21; Friedberg II, 899–900: *iudicium autem ecclesiae nonnunquam opinionem sequitur, quam et fallere saepe contingit et falli*; modern form ours). *Sentencia* here is the judicial sentence of excommunication, so "sentence".
15. *Extranea* agrees with *dicta*: "their sayings, foreign [to it]". The dative *evangelio* could also hang on *extranea* alone ("sayings foreign to the gospel"), with the object of *parificare* understood as scripture; the sense is the same.
16. 1 Cor. 12:10 and 12:28 (Douay–Rheims "interpretation of speeches", "kinds of tongues", "the graces of healings"); the "higher charisms" that follow recall 1 Cor. 12:31.
17. *Multiplicant leges suas addiscere*: so all the manuscripts (Loserth, apparatus 110.12–13). The infinitive has no governing verb; we supply "[we should have] to learn". At 110.14 the manuscripts read *prefuerunt*; Loserth prints *preferunt*, which we translate.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 107: *sathana* [NW]
  - 107: *Signa*
  - 107: *sequentur*
  - 107: *nomine*
  - 107: *tollent*
  - 107: *Dominus*
  - 107: *parificantur* [NW]
  - 107: *parificatur* [NW]
  - 109: *parificare* [NW]

- **109: *fictum***
- **109: *illa***
- **109: *parificare* [NW]**
- **110: ∅ (English side-note word)**
- **110: *illa***
- **107: *Christus:* (Chnstus: -> Christus: (scans: chnstus | christus | chnstus | chnstus))**

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 24. I. Tim. V, 23. (106.33).**

Part 3: The decretals are not scripture; the apostles' equal authority

Loserth pp. 110.20–114.29

¶1 110.20–111.2

110.29 *It would imply that God gave an imperfect law to the apostles.*
111.3 *We are not bound to believe that the pope is head of the Church. What if rival popes are elected?*

[110]Similiter, tunc difficultaretur christiana religio ultra patres veteris testamenti vel infideles de secta Machometi, qui de paucioribus legibus sunt contenti; multo magis in secta Christi; qui Mat. XI, 30 promisit onus suum esse leve, et ille qui Mat. V, 17 dicit, quod non venit solvere legem sed implere, facit verbum abbreviatum Mat. XXII, 40 dicens, quod in dileccione Dei et proximi lex pendet et prophete. Similiter, Deus foret insufficiens et improvidus, si incomplete dedisset legem suam per eius cariores apostolos, relinquens ingracioribus eius presbiteris ex declinacione ab eius vita et verbis legis tam necessarie complementum. Sic enim fuissent patres primitive ecclesie frustrati a fructu [111]finali legis dominice, cum nescierunt decretales epistolas.

Likewise, the Christian religion would then be made more difficult than [that of] the fathers of the old testament, or of the unbelievers of the sect of Mahomet, who are content with fewer laws; much more [should it be otherwise] in the sect of Christ, who in Matthew 11:30 promised that his "burden" is "light"; and he who in Matthew 5:17 says that he came not "to destroy" the law "but to fulfil" makes an abridged word in Matthew 22:40, saying that on the love of God and of neighbour "dependeth the whole law and the prophets".[1] Likewise, God would be insufficient and improvident if he had given his law incompletely through his dearer apostles, leaving the completion of so necessary a law to his presbyters, who are more displeasing to him through declining from his life and words. For so the fathers of the primitive church would have been cheated of the final fruit [111]of the Lord's law, since they did not know the decretal epistles.

¶2 111.3–113.5

112.12 *One pope revokes the decrees of another.*
112.24 *I would rather rely on the four great doctors.*
113.6 *If the pope's claims are allowed, the decretals would be of more authority than the gospels.*
113.20 *All the Scripture is of equal authority, as were all the apostles.*

[111]Similiter, non plus tenemur credere illis epistolis quam tenemur credere quod auctor eorum sit caput ecclesie militantis, sed hoc non tenemur credere absque formidine, non solum quia nescimus si moritur, verum quia nescimus si prescitus fuerit vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie. Sic enim electis duobus papis de primatu contendentibus christianismus foret perplexus et non sufficeret in Christum credere; non enim teneor plus credere dicto hominis quam teneor de illo credere sanctitatem vel quod Deus in ipso loquitur, sed non teneor pariter credere sanctitatem vite in nostris prepositis, sicut in sanctis apostolis igitur non tantum teneor credere suis scriptis; tunc enim tenerer credere quod sunt confirmati gracia predestinacionis. Similiter, ista sentencia inficeret totam scripturam sacram, cum Apostolus Gal. I, 8 audacter asserit quod si illis vel angelus de celo evangelizaret preterquam quod evangelizatum est, anathema sit. Modo autem multe gentes transferuntur cum

Likewise, we are no more bound to believe those epistles than we are bound to believe that their author is head of the church militant; now we are not bound to believe this without misgiving, not only because we do not know whether he is dead, but because we do not know whether he has been foreknown or a member of holy mother church.[2] For so, when two popes have been elected contending over the primacy, Christendom would be perplexed, and it would not suffice to believe in Christ;[3] for I am not bound to believe a man's saying more than I am bound to believe holiness of him, or that God speaks in him; now I am not bound to believe holiness of life in our superiors equally as in the holy apostles; therefore I am not bound to believe their writings so much; for then I would be bound to believe that they are confirmed in the grace of predestination. Likewise, this teaching would infect the whole of holy scripture, since the Apostle, Galatians 1:8, boldly asserts that if even "an angel from heaven"

Gal. doctrina Apostoli per epistolas decretales. Cum igitur per falsigraphum oportet tantum illis credere sicut apostolo, relinquitur quod oportet apostolo in isto discredere, cum licet eis ut referunt contra apostolum dispensare, eo quod ipsi auctorizant scripta apostoli. Item, Apoc. ultimo propter auctoritatem libri propheta sic loquitur: Si quis apposuerit ad hec, apponet Deus super illum plagas scriptas in libro [112]isto, et si quis diminuerit de verbis libri prophecie huius, auferet Deus partem eius de libro vite et de civitate sancta. In veteri vero testamento est aliud duplex testimonium: primo Deutero. IV, 2 per sanctum Moysen Deus precipit Israeli: Non addetis ad verbum quod vobis loquor neque auferetis ex eo. Et Proverb. XXX dixit vir cum quo Deus est ne addas quicquam verbis illius et arguaris et inveniaris mendax. Cum igitur nostri non doceant quod hec dicit Dominus, illud videretur nimis magna presumcio parificare dicta illa legi scripture. In cuius confirmacionem unus Papa revocat, suspendit vel abrogat epistolas et bullas alterius, sed facta sua falsificat. Ideo vel oportet falsificare totam fidem scripture vel omnes satrapas sequentes in auctoritate postponere. Hoc tamen papa habet pre aliis, quod sibi ut pape plus credi debet propter vite sanctitatem, cum debet ut sic conformius sequi Christum, quod si manifeste declinat ab hac semita, nullus est simulacior, mendacior et quidquid tunc locutus fuerit de mendacio plus suspectus. Ideo absit michi plus credere cuicumque Romano pontifici, quam quatuor sanctis doctoribus vel eis similibus, primo quia facta et scripta multorum paparum plus discordant a lege Dei; secundo quia non debemus credere verbis hominis nisi de quanto debemus credere quod prima veritas in ipso loquitur. Fides inquam est, si quid sit veritas, verbum Domini ipsam loquitur, libencius autem loquitur sapiencia in iusto sibi benivolo, quam in mendace sibi contrario. Tercio quia criminosus mentitur quicquid dixerit, non auctoritate [113]vel racione sui, sed racione sermonis primi dicentis, credenda est veritas quam ipse balbuciet menciendo. Revera qui convictus est mendax in opere vel sermone, antequam purificetur quicquid dixerit est suspectum.

should preach to them "besides that which" has been preached, "let him be anathema".[4] Now many nations are "removed", with the Galatians, from the doctrine of the Apostle through the decretal epistles.[5] Since, therefore, according to the false writer one must believe them as much as the apostle, it remains that one must disbelieve the apostle in this, since it is lawful for them, as they report, to dispense against the apostle, because they themselves authorize the writings of the apostle.[6] Again, in the last [chapter] of the Apocalypse, for the sake of the authority of the book, the prophet speaks thus: "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in [112]this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city."[7] And in the old testament there is another, twofold, testimony: first, Deuteronomy 4:2, through holy Moses God commands Israel: "You shall not add to the word that I speak to you, neither shall you take away from it." And in Proverbs 30 "the man" said, "with whom God is": "Add not any thing to his words, lest thou be reproved and found a liar."[8] Since, therefore, our [prelates] do not teach that "thus saith the Lord", it would seem exceedingly great presumption to make those sayings equal to the law of scripture. In confirmation of this, one pope revokes, suspends or abrogates the epistles and bulls of another, but [so] falsifies his acts.[9] Therefore either one must falsify the whole faith of scripture, or put all the satraps who follow after [it] in authority.[10] Yet the pope has this before others: that he, as pope, ought to be believed more on account of holiness of life, since as such he ought to follow Christ more conformably; but if he manifestly declines from this path, no one is more dissembling, more lying, and whatever he has then said is the more suspect of lying. Therefore far be it from me to believe any Roman pontiff more than the four holy doctors or those like them: first, because the deeds and writings of many popes are more at odds with God's law; second, because we ought not to believe the words of a man except in so far as we ought to believe that the first truth speaks in him. It is of faith, I say, that if anything is truth, the word of the Lord speaks it; and wisdom speaks more willingly in a just man well-disposed to her than in a liar contrary to her. Third, because a criminous man lies whatever he says; not by the authority [113]or by reason of him, but by reason of the word of the first speaker, is the truth to be believed which he stammers out while lying. Truly, he who has been convicted a liar in deed or word, whatever he says before he is purified is suspect.

¶3 113.6–114.12

114.5 *So should it be with priests now, who should speak in the name of the Lord,*

114.13 *Objection: 1. This would confuse all law and order in the Church.*

114.22 *2. There must be degrees of authority, even if it rests on holiness.*

[113]**Item, si quilibet papa haberet tantam potestatem edificandi ecclesiam et quicquid aliud faciendi cum sanctis apostolis et cum non excederet Mattheum, Johannem et ceteros citra Petrum, videtur quod, sicut omnes alii apostoli, ut fingitur, erant minoris auctoritatis quam Petrus, sic et quilibet papa ipsum succedens. Si igitur papa habet auctoritatem canonizandi epistolas Pauli, quod ipse non habuit, quia tunc foret per se autenticus, videtur quod quilibet papa sequens omnem apostolum citra Petrum auctoritate excesserat, et sic decretales essent maioris autoritatis quam quatuor evangelia et paris auctoritatis cum Petri epistolis. Sed deliramenta sunt ista, cum tota scriptura capit parilitatem auctoritatis a Spiritu Sancto, quem credimus eius autorem. Nec credo beatum Petrum fuisse maioris auctoritatis quam ceteros, quia ore, digito et auctoritate Domini locuti sunt et fecerant facta sua. Ideo auctoritas Dei non cepit magis vel minus in ipsis. Nec aliquis apostolus in quantum illa privata persona sed in quantum homo divinus; ut loquitur Augustinus IV De Doctrina christiana cap. VI; vel in quantum Christus participative, ut loquuntur multi sancti, ut sic (inquam) sunt omnes paris auctoritatis, unus ad unum et alius ad aliud, secundum quod Deus eis diviserat dona sua, et quicquid aliquis apostolus ut talis dixerit est paris auctoritatis cum** [114]**quolibet. Et hinc Petrus ut solidum membrum sancte matris ecclesie gaudebat de Pauli iusta correpcione; non enim spectat ad membra corporis usurpare vel remurmurare contra aliena officia. Et sic videtur michi quod quilibet sacerdos debet esse sub non gradu potestatis et auctoritatis secularis, et pure in nomine Domini precipere sic vel sic facere; quod si sit antichristus, membrum dyaboli vel aliter Scarioth, non habet aliquam huiusmodi potestatem. Unde ut sepe repecii, pure de tanto debet christianus implere quod precipit.**

Again, if every pope had as great a power of building the church, and of doing whatever else, as the holy apostles had, and since he would not exceed Matthew, John and the others short of Peter, it seems that, just as all the other apostles, as is feigned, were of less authority than Peter, so also is every pope who succeeds him.[11] If then the pope has authority to canonize the epistles of Paul, which [Paul] himself did not have, because then he would be authentic of himself, it seems that every following pope had exceeded in authority every apostle short of Peter, and so the decretals would be of greater authority than the four gospels and of equal authority with Peter's epistles. But these are ravings, since the whole of scripture takes equality of authority from the Holy Spirit, whom we believe to be its author. Nor do I believe that blessed Peter was of greater authority than the rest, because they spoke and did their deeds by the mouth, the finger and the authority of the Lord. Therefore God's authority did not admit of more or less in them. Nor [does] any apostle [speak] as that private person, but as a divine man, as Augustine says, *On Christian Doctrine* book 4, chapter 6; or as Christ [does], participatively, as many saints say;[12] as such, I say, they are all of equal authority, one for one thing and another for another, according as God had divided his gifts to them; and whatever any apostle as such has said is of equal authority with [114]**[that of] any other. And hence Peter, as a solid member of holy mother church, rejoiced at Paul's just rebuke; for it does not belong to the members of the body to usurp or murmur against the offices of others.[13] And so it seems to me that every priest ought to be under no degree of secular power and authority, and to command purely in the name of the Lord that this or that be done;[14] but if he is an antichrist, a member of the devil, or otherwise a Scarioth, he has no such power at all. Hence, as I have often repeated, a Christian ought to fulfil what he commands purely to that extent.**

¶4 114.13–114.29

[114]**Sed contra illud arguitur per hoc quod iuxta dicta nullus apostolus vel predestinatus citra Christum est maioris auctoritatis quam quilibet, quod confunderet gradus ecclesie et iura papalia, cum sicut Petrus et ceteri apostoli fuerunt paris auctoritatis, sic debet esse papa et quilibet sanctus episcopus, ymo quilibet predestinatus. Ubi igitur foret papalis sentencia de maioritate et obediencia? Similiter, iuxta dicta de sanctitate debet capi auctoritas, sed unus est reliquo sanccior, igitur maioris auctoritatis quam evangelium. Nec valet referre omnem auctoritatem pure ad Deum, quia sunt gradus**

But against this it is argued by appeal to the fact that, according to what has been said, no apostle or predestinate [person] short of Christ is of greater authority than any other, which would confound the grades of the church and the papal laws, since, as Peter and the other apostles were of equal authority, so must the pope and every holy bishop be, indeed every predestinate [person]. Where, then, would the papal teaching on greatness and obedience be?[15] Likewise, according to what has been said, authority must be taken from holiness; now one is holier than another;

auctoritatum, cum unus constitutus est sub alterius potestate, aliter enim periret regula obediencie humane et maioritas auctoritatis ecclesie.

therefore of greater authority than the gospel.[16] Nor does it avail to refer all authority purely to God, because there are grades of authorities, since one is set under the power of another; for otherwise the rule of human obedience and the greatness of the church's authority would perish.

Notes

1. Matt. 11:30 ("my burden light"), 5:17 ("I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil"), 22:40 ("On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets"), Douay–Rheims. "Abridged word" (*verbum abbreviatum*) is Rom. 9:28 (Douay "a short word shall the Lord make").
2. *Si moritur*, literally "whether he dies": whether the author of the epistles is still living.
3. The double papal election of 1378 (Urban VI and Clement VII), current when Wyclif wrote.
4. Gal. 1:8; Wyclif's Latin departs from the Vulgate (*licet nos aut angelus de caelo evangelizet vobis praeterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis*), so we translate his words, quoting the Douay where they agree. The print has *illis*, "to them"; the manuscripts read *illi* (apparatus 111.21), which would give "if they or an angel from heaven should preach".
5. Gal. 1:6, "I wonder that you are so soon removed". *Cum Gal.* is "with the Galatians"; *doctrina* is an ablative of separation without a preposition, or an *a* has been lost before it.
6. *Per falsigraphum*: "by [the reckoning of] the false writer", the one who sets the decretals level with scripture.
7. Apoc. 22:18–19, Douay–Rheims (Wyclif stops before "and from these things that are written in this book").
8. Deut. 4:2; Prov. 30:1, 6 (Loserth), Douay–Rheims.
9. *Sed facta sua falsificat*: by revoking, one pope declares false what the other did. The *sed* is odd; *et* would be smoother.
10. *Postponere*, "put after", against the faith of scripture just named.
11. The protasis runs on with *et cum*: "if every pope had ... and since he would not exceed ...". *Citra Petrum*, "short of Peter", as *citra Christum*.
12. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 4.6.9 (PL 34, 93: the scriptural authors are *viros summa auctoritate dignissimos planeque divinos*). The sentence has no verb; we supply "[does] ... [speak]" from the context of speaking with God's authority.
13. Gal. 2:11–14, Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch; that Peter rejoiced at it is not in the text of Galatians; the nearest is Augustine, Ep. 82.22 (PL 33, 286), Peter accepting the correction *sanctae ac benignae pietate humilitatis*.
14. *Sub non gradu*, literally "under a non-degree": taken as "under no degree". It may stand for *sub nullo gradu* or *sine gradu*.
15. The print has *papalis sentencia*; the manuscripts read *papali* (apparatus 114.20). *Majoritas*, "greatness", as with *prioritas*, "priority".
16. *Quam evangelium*: the objection draws an absurd consequence: if authority follows holiness, a holier man would have greater authority than the gospel. *Alius*, "than the other", would be the expected comparison.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 110: *religio* (20 is the line number after it)
  - 110: *suum*
  - 110: *pendet*
  - 111: ∅ (30 is the line number)
  - 111: *ad* (italic d with broken bowl, zoomed leaf)
  - 111: *illum*
  - 111: *libro*
  - 112: *diminuerit*
  - 112: *verbis* (print has v)
  - 112: *huius*
  - 112: *eius*
  - 112: *Non* (5 after it is the line number)
  - 112: *parificare* [NW]
  - 112: *legi*
  - 113: *illa*
  - 114: *Sed*
  - 114: *dicta*
  - 114: *quia* (25 is the line number)
  - 111: *apostolis* (comma not carried)

Part 4: The power of order and the gentile name of authority

Loserth pp. 114.30–118.5

¶1 114.30–115.10
114.30 *3, In receiving orders a man receives authority and rule,*
115.11 *I reply: 1. The clergy should rely only on divine authority, having nothing to do with civil power.*
115.28 *All authority belongs to God; man's part in it is only promulgation,*

[114]**Similiter, suscipiendo potestatem ordinis, quis suscipit adeo potestatem et auctoritatem quia potestatem pascendi ecclesiam, quod est optimum regimen et iurisdiccio summa, quam Christus umquam instituit, cum plus sit differencie** [115]**ius Dei quam ius cesaris. Nec dependet potestas regiminis a loco vel populo, quia distinguitur ab actu potestatis, data indistincte a Deo ante locum vel populum, ideo cum non variatur correspondenter ad tale obiectum, manifestum est quod quiescit ante tale iurisdicionis obiectum. Sic enim habuerunt apostoli quiescentes in Jerusalem datam a Spiritu Sancto potestatem regiminis, et tamen nondum fuit ad eorum noticiam distinctus populus limitatus.**

Likewise, in receiving the power of order, one receives power and authority to this degree, because [one receives] the power of feeding the church, which is the best rule and the highest jurisdiction that Christ ever instituted, since God's right is of more difference [115]**than Caesar's right.[1] Nor does the power of rule depend on place or people, because it is distinguished from the act of the power, being given by God indistinctly, before place or people; therefore, since it does not vary in correspondence with such an object, it is manifest that it is at rest before such an object of jurisdiction [is given it]. For so the apostles, resting in Jerusalem, had the power of rule given by the Holy Spirit, and yet no distinct people had yet been assigned to their knowledge.[2]**

¶2 115.11–117.15
116.6 *We do not know what grace or power God has given to any man, and we try to make up for our ignorance by ordaining degrees in the clergy.*
116.32
2. Holiness is a sign but not a measure of authority.
117.1 *Balaam and others prophesied though wicked.*
117.16
3. The power of orders is also a power to rule,
117.23 *but a curate does not receive it by a bishop's appointment unless he is a faithful herald of God, from whom the gift comes.*

[115]**Ad primum videtur michi, ut sepe tetigi, quod omnis clericus debet pure inniti auctoritati divine, dimittendo auctoritatem gentilem adinventam regibus gencium; qui infideliter blasfemaverant quod sunt Deus, ut patet de Nabugodonosor Danielis IV; et hinc sumpserunt sibi nomen auctoritatis et capitalis dominii, Christus autem docet suos apostolos gentilitatem istam aufugere, ut patet Luce XXII et Matth. XX. Unde quia aliquid licencie remansit in ista gentilitate, ideo remansit cum civilitate verbum auctoritatis, per quod ego intelligo superioritatem potestatis civilis. Sed postquam dotata est ecclesia, introducta sunt irreligiose nomen iurisdicionis et auctoritatis cum similibus, que civilitatem sapiunt. Et sic conceditur quod unus episcopus est reliquo maioris potestatis quam quidam vocant auctoritatem. Referendo autem auctoritatem ad Deum et negando auctoritatem sed promulgacionem inesse formaliter creature neganda foret in apostolis auctoritatis maioritas. Secundo vero intelligendo auctoritatem in quantum dicit Dei preconem habere potestatem ad promulgandum eius sentenciam, sic omnes apostoli vel evangeliste** [116]**sunt paris auctoritatis, cum ipsa non potest maius aut minus suscipere. Ad quem sensum scriptura sacra est paris auctoritatis utrobique. Sed tercio michi infundabiliter loquuntur quidam de auctoritate, ut dicit maioritatem sanctitatis vel carismatum multitudinis, et quia illud est nobis incognitum, transferunt auctoritatem gentiliter ad ordinacionem humanam, ut quotlibet gradus ponunt in papa, archiepiscopo, rectore et simplici sacerdote, cum quotlibet intercisionibus, que quia auctoritate divina**

To the first it seems to me, as I have often touched on, that every cleric ought to rely purely on divine authority, leaving aside the gentile authority devised for the kings of the gentiles, who unbelievingly blasphemed that they are God, as is clear of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4;[3] and hence they took to themselves the name of authority and of chief lordship. But Christ teaches his apostles to flee that paganism, as is clear in Luke 22 and Matthew 20.[4] Hence, because something of licence remained in that paganism, therefore the word "authority" remained with civil standing, by which I understand the superiority of civil power. But after the church was endowed, the names of jurisdiction and of authority, with others like them that savour of civil standing, were irreligiously brought in. And so it is granted that one bishop is of greater power than another, which some call authority. But, referring authority to God, and denying that authority is formally in a creature, but [only] promulgation, greatness of authority would have to be denied in the apostles.[5] And secondly, understanding authority as it signifies that God's herald has power to promulgate his teaching, in this way all the apostles or evangelists [116]**are of equal authority, since it cannot admit of greater or less. In this sense holy scripture is of equal authority on both sides.[6] But thirdly some speak of authority, groundlessly in my view, as it signifies greatness of holiness or a multitude of charisms; and because that is unknown to us, they transfer authority in gentile fashion to human ordinance, so that they posit any number of grades in pope,**

bene possunt fieri secundum divisiones graduum, discrecionis et potestatis quam ipse distribuit, ideo sollempnizantur instituciones humane, quamvis ordinacioni divine contrarie, et observantur amplius quam lex Dei. Sed loquatur sic de auctoritate, qui in scriptura sacra sciverit hoc fundare. Leges autem papales de maioritate et obediencia possunt intelligi, quando institucio humana de preposituris hominum correspondet divino iudicio, sic videtur quod proporcionaliter ut quis ponitur in maiori preeminencia quoad homines, sic ponatur realiter in maiori preeminencia virtutum et gracie quoad Deum; quod quia nunquam vel raro contingit, nec superest (ut credo) ad illud fundandum scripture auctoritas, ideo taceo quoad leges et facta, dicens quod illud bene potest fieri de Dei potencia absoluta, sciens quod sic non fuit inter Christi sacerdotes in ecclesia primitiva. Et patet in parte quomodo dicendum est ad primum obiectum. Ad secundum patet ex dictis, quomodo ex sanctitate ut signo remoto debet capi duplex auctoritas, et non ut de equata mensura, quia tunc diminueretur vel extingueretur ut sanctitas [117] promulgantis, quod est falsum, cum infideles ut Balaam, Cayfas et ceteri dampnabiles prophetarunt. Sanctitas tamen est signum auctoritatis divine et firmitatis inaugmentabilis auctoritatis humane, et sic gradus prepositure et auctoritatis civilis nuncupate surrepserunt cum dotacione et temporalium cupiditate non solum in seculares clericos sed in fratres, cum ipsi constituunt tribunos, centuriones, decanos et alios sicut Judei, qui servarunt cerimonias veteris testamenti, ut notatum est Exod. XVIII. Sed servata vera humilitate octuplici, de qua superius, omnia ista superfluerent sicut superfluissent in sanctis apostolis, et sic defectus instruccionis virtutis est causa, quare ista sunt modo utilia.

archbishop, rector and simple priest, with any number of subdivisions; and because these can well be made by divine authority according to the divisions of the grades of discernment and of power which he distributes, therefore human institutions are solemnized, although contrary to divine ordinance, and are observed more than God's law.[7] But let him speak so of authority who knows how to ground it in holy scripture. And the papal laws on greatness and obedience can be understood [to hold] when the human institution of men's offices of superior corresponds to the divine judgement; [then] it seems that, in proportion as someone is set in greater preeminence as regards men, so he should really be set in greater preeminence of virtues and of grace as regards God.[8] And because this never or rarely happens, and there is not, as I believe, any authority of scripture left to ground it, therefore I am silent as to the laws and the deeds, saying that this can well be done by God's absolute power, knowing that it was not so among Christ's priests in the primitive church. And so it is clear in part how one must answer the first objection. To the second it is clear from what has been said how a twofold authority must be taken from holiness as from a remote sign, and not as from an equal measure; because then [authority] would be diminished or extinguished as the holiness [117] of the one who promulgates [is], which is false, since unbelievers such as Balaam, Caiaphas and other damnable men prophesied.[9] Yet holiness is a sign of divine authority and of the firmness, which cannot be increased, of human authority;[10] and so the grades of the office of superior and of what is called civil authority crept in, with the endowment and the cupidity for temporal goods, not only among secular clerics but among the friars, since they appoint tribunes, centurions, deans and others, like the Jews who kept the ceremonies of the old testament, as is noted in Exodus 18.[11] But if the true eightfold humility, of which [I spoke] above, were kept, all these things would be superfluous, as they would have been superfluous in the holy apostles; and so the lack of instruction in virtue is the cause why these things are now useful.[12]

¶3 117.16–118.5

[117] Ad tercium patet quod potestas ordinis est potestas regiminis, quam quilibet habet in quantum presbiter; quam solum cognoscunt qui noverunt universalia, et illa distinguitur a potestate ordinis sive regiminis excedente gradum remississimum potestatis. Et sic idem episcopus habet multas potestates ordinis sive regiminis, ut patet superius. Nec prelatus dat curato novam potestatem regiminis nisi

To the third it is clear that the power of order is a power of rule, which each has inasmuch as he is a presbyter; which only those recognize who have known universals; and that power is distinguished from the power of order or of rule that exceeds the most remiss degree of power.[13] And so the same bishop has many powers of order or of rule, as is clear above. Nor does a prelate give a curate a new power of rule unless he is a

sit fidelis preco Dei prius dantis; ymo videtur michi quod sacerdos prius fuit debitor eidem populo, cui per episcopum suum preponitur, cum apostolus Rom. I, 14 confitetur se esse Grecis Latinis et barbaris debitorem, verumtamen ex novo voto et munere recepto est amplius obligatus. Ritus autem gentilis ecclesie in hac parte videtur dare licenciam ad congregandum commodum temporale et inhabili quoad Deum, et talis iurisdicio non frenata per scripturam maxime induceret sectam Antichristi. Si igitur nostri habent potestates episcopales pares [118] cum apostolis, ostendunt se dampnabiles, quod ociando tantum illis potestatibus abutuntur. Si autem potestates terrenas habuerint supra apostolos, hoc false et antichristiane habent a principe mundi huius.

faithful herald of God, who gave [it] before; indeed, it seems to me that the priest was already a debtor to the same people over whom he is set by his bishop, since the apostle, Romans 1:14, confesses himself a debtor to Greeks, Latins and barbarians;[14] nevertheless, by the new vow and the charge received, he is the more bound. But the rite of the gentile church in this matter seems to give licence for gathering temporal advantage even to one unqualified as regards God; and such jurisdiction, not bridled by scripture, would bring in the sect of Antichrist above all.[15] If, therefore, our [bishops] have episcopal powers equal [118] with the apostles, they show themselves damnable, in that by idling they so far abuse those powers. But if they have had earthly powers above the apostles, they have this falsely and antichristianly from "the prince of this world".[16]

Notes

1. The third objection (A in the margin: "3"), answered at 117.16. *Adeo ... quia*, "to this degree ... because", is loose; the sense is that receiving orders confers the highest jurisdiction. *Cum plus sit differencie ius Dei quam ius cesaris* does not construe cleanly: the sense is that God's right stands further above Caesar's. A word may be lost at the page turn (114.33–115.1).
2. Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:4, the apostles staying in Jerusalem until the Spirit came; *limitatus*, "assigned", as a people assigned to a bishop.
3. Dan. 4 (Vulgate 4:27, "Is not this the great Babylon, which I have built ... by the strength of my power"). The boast that the king is God is closer to Judith 3:13 (DR "that he only might be called God") and 6:2 ("there is no God, but Nabuchodonosor").
4. Luke 22:25–26 ("The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them ... But you not so"); Matt. 20:25–26.
5. The first of three senses of *auctoritas* (the second and third follow at 115.31 and 116.3): if authority belongs to God alone and a creature has only promulgation, no apostle had more authority than another.
6. *Utrobique*, "on both sides": in both testaments, or in every part of scripture alike.
7. At 116.3 Loserth's apparatus reads "tercio; adde: videtur", proposing *videtur* after *tercio*; the print does not have it and construes without it. *Ordinacio* here is the arrangement of grades, so "ordinance".
8. The manuscripts read *correspondent* and *sic videt* (apparatus 116.19–20); Loserth prints *correspondet* and *sic videtur*, which we translate.
9. Num. 22–24 (Balaam); John 11:51 (Caiaphas "prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation").
10. *Firmitatis inaugmentabilis auctoritatis humane*: holiness signals the firmness of human authority, a firmness that does not grow with holiness. We take *inaugmentabilis* with *firmitatis*; it could also agree with *auctoritatis*.
11. Exod. 18:21, the "rulers of thousands, and of hundreds, ... and of tens" (Vulgate *tribunos, et centuriones, et quinquagenarios, et decanos*).
12. The eightfold humility is treated earlier in this treatise, ch. 3, 59.8 ff.: the eight conditions of the truly humble from Grosseteste's sermon on humility (see 03-e n4).
13. *Gradus remississimus*, "the most remiss degree", the lowest degree in the scholastic intension and remission of qualities: the bare priestly power, which higher powers of order exceed.
14. Rom. 1:14, Vulgate *Graecis ac barbaris, sapientibus et insipientibus debitor sum* (Douay "To the Greeks and to the barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor"). Wyclif adds "Latins".
15. *Gentilis* may agree with *ritus* ("the gentile rite of the church") or with *ecclesie* ("the rite of the gentile church"); we follow the word order.
16. John 12:31, Douay–Rheims.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 117: *qui* (10 is the line number)
  - 117: *illa*
  - 117: *Grecis*
  - 117: *Latinis*

Part 5: The eighth teaching: antichrist, and the first six conditions of the pseudo-pope

Loserth pp. 118.6–122.29

¶1 118.6–119.6
118.6 *A pontiff who claims to be Christ's Vicar while leaving his way is the worst of Antichrists.*
118.29 *The whole body of the reprobate are Antichrist; so is each of its members.*
119.7 *Antichrist must originate from the clergy.*
119.31 *The special sin of Antichrist is hypocrisy.*

[118]**Octava sentencia est: Romano pontifice vel quocumque alio fingente se gerere primatum vicarie potestatis Christi in terris, ab eius semita declinante secundum sensum scripture nullus plenius vel periculosius gerit de facto nomen et opera Antichristi. Pro declaracione istius sentencie notandum est primo secundum modum loquendi scripture: Quod quicumque est Christo vel legi sue contrarius, dicitur Antichristus, et concordat literalis composicio, cum Antichristus dicitur ab anti, quod est contra, et Christus quasi contra Christum. Et isto modo loquitur Evangelista in prima epistola sua canonica II cap. 18: Et sicut audistis, inquit, quia Antichristus venit, nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt. Et illos vocat Christus Matth. XXIV cap. Pseudochristos a pseudo quod latine dicitur falsus vel decipiens, et sic quilibet dyabolus vel membrum eius est realiter antichristus. Unde videtur michi illos esse culpandos qui preter auctoritatem scripture sompniant quod de tribu Dan in illo loco cum equis et curru igneis et ceteris ficticiis dominabitur Antichristus. Doctores autem qui sic loquuntur vel ad modum loquendi propheticum loquuntur mistice vel videntur ad modum concionatoris fingere. Certum est itaque quod persona prescitorum aggregata, est unus Antichristus, sicut quotlibet membrum eius, et illius erit unus capitalis in malicia plus** [119]**accensus; ymo videtur predestinatum, dum crimine fuerit Christo contrarius, dici posse realiter Antichristum, modo quo ille qui dixit et facta sunt Mat. XVI propter adversacionem nominat Petrum sathanam. Est igitur christiano necessarium cognoscere Antichristum.**

The eighth teaching is this: when the Roman pontiff, or anyone else who feigns that he bears the primacy of the vicarial power of Christ on earth, turns aside from his path, then, according to the sense of scripture, no one bears more fully or more dangerously, in fact, the name and the works of Antichrist.[1] To make this teaching plain it is to be noted, first, according to scripture's manner of speaking, that whoever is contrary to Christ or to his law is called Antichrist; and the literal composition of the word agrees, since Antichrist is named from *anti*, which means "against", and *Christus*, as if "against Christ". And in this way the Evangelist speaks in his first canonical epistle, chapter 2:18: "And as you have heard," he says, "that Antichrist cometh, now there are become many Antichrists."[2] And Christ in Matthew 24 calls them "false christs" (Matt. 24:24), from *pseudo*, which in Latin is said "false" or "deceiving"; and so every devil, or member of the devil, is really antichrist. Hence it seems to me that those are to be blamed who, beyond the authority of scripture, dream that Antichrist, of the tribe of Dan, will lord it in that place with fiery horses and chariot and the other fictions.[3] But the doctors who speak so either speak mystically, after the prophetic manner of speaking, or seem to invent after the manner of a preacher. It is certain, then, that the aggregate person of the foreknown is one Antichrist, as is any member of it; and of that [Antichrist] there will be one chief, more [119]**inflamed in malice;[4] indeed it seems that a predestinate [person], while by crime he is contrary to Christ, can really be called Antichrist, in the way in which he who "spoke, and they were made" calls Peter Satan for his opposition, Matthew 16 (16:23).[5] It is therefore necessary for a Christian to know Antichrist.**

¶2 119.7–119.30

[119]**Secundo notandum, quod de clero necesse est Antichristum trahere suam originem; cum enim non omnes sacerdotes confirmati sunt, necesse est quod aliqui propter status excellenciam cadant profundius. Sic magnus Antichristus fuit Lucifer cum suis complicibus, sic magnus Antichristus fuit Scarioth cum avaris suis sequentibus, et ita de generacione nequam, que processit Cayn usque ad novissimum reprobandum, unde beatus Evangelista II epistola canonica concedit, quod multi seductores exierunt in mundum, qui non confitentur Jhesum Christum venisse in carne; hic est seductor et antichristus, unde prima epistola IV, cap.: Multi pseudoprophete exierunt in mundum; et sequitur eorum descripcio Omnis spiritus qui solverit Jhesum ex Deo non est, et hic est Antichristus de quo audistis**

Second, it is to be noted that Antichrist must draw his origin from the clergy; for since not all priests are confirmed [in grace], it must be that some, because of the excellence of their state, fall the more deeply.[6] So Lucifer with his accomplices was a great Antichrist; so Iscariot with his avaricious followers was a great Antichrist; and so of the wicked generation that has proceeded [from] Cain down to the last who is to be reprobated.[7] Hence the blessed Evangelist in his second canonical epistle grants that "many seducers are gone out into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a seducer and an antichrist" (2 John 7); hence the first epistle, chapter 4: "Many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1); and their definition

quoniam venit, et declarat quod ille Antichristus sit mundo deditus et de clero prodiit. Cui conformiter loquitur Christus Matth. XXIV, 5: Multi, inquit, venient in nomine meo, dicentes quia ego sum Christus, et multos seducent, et illos nominat posterius Pseudochristos. Ex quibus videtur quod surgent de clero.

follows: "Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh" (1 John 4:3); and he makes plain that that Antichrist is given to the world and has come forth from the clergy.[8] In agreement with this Christ speaks in Matthew 24:5: "Many," he says, "will come in my name saying, I am Christ. And they will seduce many"; and later he names them "false christs" (24:24). From which it seems that they will rise from the clergy.

¶3 119.31–121.9

120.13 *A man may be a pope in name, yet have the conditions of Antichrist.*

120.21

1. *He says he is a follower of Christ, yet goes and leads others astray.*

120.27

2. *He does not imitate Christ in his poverty,*

121.1 *but claims rule over the whole world.*

121.10

3. *Against Christ's prohibition he makes new laws not founded in Scripture.*

121.29 *Christ chose poor simple men for his disciples; the pope chooses such as are illustrious or astute.*

[119]Et concordat racio cum antichristus peccato gravissimo et magis subdolo erit Christo contrarius. Sed illud peccatum oportet esse traditoriam [120]ypocrisim, quia illam scit dyabolus magis efficere, et simplices propter velamentum eam minus percipere. Et ad istum sensum vadunt verba Apostoli II epistola ad Thym., II Petri epistola, et epistola Jude cum aliis dictis propheticis, quia indubie talis est apcius instrumentum dyaboli ad simplices seducendum. Quando enim dyabolus videt constantem dileccionem Christi in laycis et cum pietate ceca ignoranciam legis Christi, ex alioque latere avariciam Scariothis in clero, non est sibi placencius crimen propter ingratitudinis et duplicitatis gravedinem, quam seducere christianos in propriis instrumentis; sic enim victus est a Christo. Unde sine assercione ymaginor tercio quod sit unus nominetenus papa pseudonomine, cui iste XI condiciones insint ex instinctu patris mendacii. Primo quod ubi est Christus veritas Joh. XIV, Pseudo ubique innititur mendacio, quod notum est esse contrarium veritati, innititur, inquam, mendacio in verbis, in scriptis et vita, dicendo se propinquissime sequi Christum tamquam eius fidelem vicarium, dum tamen sit ab eo in moribus maxime elongatus, aliter enim non palliaret seducendo populum, quomodo veniret in nomine crucifixi, ut Christus prophetavit Matth. XXIV et Joh. XV. Secundo, ubi Christus regularissime tenuit summam pauperiem, iste Pseudo irregulariter summe seculo innititur; aliter enim non esset de mundo, sed ex Deo, qui per pauperiem vicit mundum, ut prophetatum est I Joh. II et Joh. [121]XVII, cum enim sibi desunt miracula et vite sanctitas; aliter valde pauci suo disciplinatui iungerentur. Modo autem ex instinctu dyaboli totus mundus est mundo deditus, sic ubi Christus renuit oblacione dyaboli omnia regna mundi, ut dicitur Matth. IV, iste Pseudo dicit maniace quod dominetur capitaliter super tota habitabili et per eius licenciam et pacienciam singuli reges regnant.

And reason agrees, since antichrist will be contrary to Christ by the gravest and more crafty sin. Now that sin must be treacherous [120]hypocrisy, for the devil knows it to be the more effective, and the simple, because of its veil, perceive it the less.[9] And to this sense go the words of the Apostle in the second epistle to Timothy, of the second epistle of Peter and of the epistle of Jude, with other prophetic sayings; for without doubt such a one is the apter instrument of the devil for seducing the simple.[10] For when the devil sees in the laity a constant love of Christ, and with blind piety an ignorance of Christ's law, and on the other side the avarice of Iscariot in the clergy, no crime is more pleasing to him, for the gravity of its ingratitude and duplicity, than to seduce Christians by their own instruments; for so he was conquered by Christ.[11] Hence, third, I imagine, without asserting it, that there is one pope in name only, by a false name, in whom these eleven conditions are present by the prompting of the father of lies (cf. John 8:44). First: whereas Christ is the truth (John 14:6), the Pseudo everywhere leans on a lie, which is known to be contrary to truth; he leans, I say, on a lie in words, in writings and in life, saying that he follows Christ most nearly as his faithful vicar, while yet he is in his manners most far removed from him. For otherwise he would not cloak [himself] in seducing the people: how [else] would he come in the name of the Crucified, as Christ prophesied in Matthew 24 and John 15?[12] Second: whereas Christ most regularly kept the highest poverty, this Pseudo irregularly leans in the highest degree on the world; for otherwise he would not be of the world but of God, who conquered the world through poverty, as is prophesied in 1 John 2 and John [121]17; for since miracles and holiness of life are lacking to him, otherwise very few would be joined to his discipleship.[13] But as it is, by the prompting of the devil the whole world is given over to the world: so, whereas Christ refused all the kingdoms of the world at the devil's offer, as is said in Matthew 4 (4:8–10), this Pseudo says like a madman that he lords it as head over

¶4 121.10–121.28

[121] **Tercio, ubi Christus anathemate gravi prohibuit quod non adderetur aliquid impertinens legi sue, ut patet Gal. primo et sepe alibi, iste Pseudo fabricat leges novas, que nusquam reperiuntur in scriptura sacra; in qua secundum Augustinum est omnis veritas, sed sunt legi Christi latenter contrarie. Nec mirum quia sacerdos et propheta paulative declinantes a lege Domini preposituram talis legiferi meruerunt, ut prophetatum est Psalmo IX, 21. Ubi propheta de Antichristo loquens secundum exposicionem sanctorum: Constitue, inquit, legislatorem super eos. Et istam legis translacionem oportet sequi extraneum sacerdotem, quia Heb. VII, 12 dicit Apostolus, quod translato sacerdocio necesse est ut legis translacio fiat. Et iste triplex funiculus, scilicet commentum mendacii, commentum favoris seculi et commentum tradicionis inique sunt basis tocius retis dyaboli.**

the whole inhabited earth, and that by his licence and sufferance each king reigns.[14]

Third: whereas Christ, under a grave anathema, forbade that anything not pertaining to his law be added to it, as is clear in Galatians 1 (1:8–9) and often elsewhere, this Pseudo fabricates new laws, which are nowhere found in holy scripture (in which, according to Augustine, is all truth), but are secretly contrary to the law of Christ.[15] **Nor is it a wonder, for priest and prophet, turning aside little by little from the law of the Lord, have deserved such a lawgiver in the office of superior [over them], as is prophesied in Psalm 9:21, where the prophet, speaking of Antichrist according to the exposition of the saints, says: "Appoint a lawgiver over them."**[16] **And this translation of the law must follow a foreign priest, for in Hebrews 7:12 the Apostle says that "the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation be made of the law".**[17] **And this threefold cord, namely the fabrication of falsehood, the fabrication of the world's favour and the fabrication of wicked tradition, are the base of the devil's whole net.**[18]

¶5 121.29–122.3

122.4
5. Christ bade his disciples to go out through the world preaching; the false pope dwells in a rich palace and does not preach.
122.18
6. Christ taught his disciples to submit to persecution; the pope teaches his to fight for dominion.

[121] **Quarto, ubi Christus elegit discipulos simplices idiotas, mundo pauperes et introitu ad suam religionem fecit plus pauperes, ut patet Matth. XIX; iste Pseudo eligit sibi plus inclitos, callidos et astutos, et prius mundo abiectos elevat in falsos dominos urbis et orbis. Aliter enim foret discipulus magistro nimis dissimilis et ex contrarietate** [122] **foret societas desoluta, quia Ecclesiastici XIII, 3 scribitur: Quid communicabit cacabus ad ollam? quando enim se colliserint confringetur.**

Fourth: whereas Christ chose as disciples simple unlearned men, poor to the world, and on their entry into his religion made them poorer, as is clear in Matthew 19 (19:21, 27), this Pseudo chooses for himself the more renowned, the crafty and the astute, and raises those before cast off by the world into false lords of the city and of the world. For otherwise the disciple would be exceedingly unlike his master, and from the contrariety [122] **the fellowship would be dissolved; for it is written in Ecclesiasticus 13:3: "What agreement shall the earthen pot have with the kettle? for if they knock one against the other, it shall be broken."**[19]

¶6 122.4–122.16

[122] **Quinto, ubi Christus precepit suis discipulis ire in mundum universum et predicare indifferenter evangelium docereque omnes gentes servare quecumque eis mandaverat, ut patet Matth. ultimo, iste Pseudo docet et care conducit suos discipulos modo contrario servare oppositum, cum ipse residens in sumptuoso palacio constructo de bonis pauperum, ut alter Cosdroe, nulli predicat et discipulos tales optat, qui in castris conquestis mutescendo resideant nisi forte superbe, blasfeme, eciam scandalose in verba de potestate sua proruperint. Et istarum scolarum promulgata contrarietas confundit seculum.**

Fifth: whereas Christ commanded his disciples to go into the whole world and preach the gospel without distinction, and to teach all nations to observe whatsoever he had commanded them, as is clear in the last [chapter] of Matthew, this Pseudo teaches his disciples, and hires them dearly, to observe the opposite in the contrary way; since he himself, residing in a sumptuous palace built from the goods of the poor, like another Chosroes, preaches to no one, and wants such disciples as sit in conquered castles keeping silent, unless perhaps they break out, proudly,

blasphemously, even scandalously, into words about his power.[2021] And the published contrariety of these schools confounds the world.

¶7 122.18–122.29

[122]Sexto, ubi docuit Christus suos discipulos possidere et servare vitas suas quietas atque perpetuas in paciendo tribulaciones atque iniurias, ut patet Matth. V et Luce XXI, iste Pseudo docet verbo et opere suos discipulos ex immensitate sue dignitatis quoscumque eis contrarios debellare, quia aliter paulative periret ab eis dominium; et sic sunt in capitulo impiorum, de quibus Sapiencie II, 1 scribitur: Dixerunt impii cogitantes apud se non recte: Exiguum et cum tedio est tempus vite nostre, non est refrigerium in fine hominis, et cetera que sequuntur.

Sixth: whereas Christ taught his disciples to possess and keep their lives quiet and perpetual in suffering tribulations and injuries, as is clear in Matthew 5 and Luke 21 (21:19), this Pseudo teaches his disciples by word and deed, out of the immensity of his dignity, to war down whoever is contrary to them, because otherwise lordship would little by little perish from them; and so they are in the chapter of the wicked, of whom it is written in Wisdom 2:1: "The wicked have said, reasoning with themselves, but not right: The time of our life is short and tedious, in the end of a man there is no remedy", and the rest that follows.[22]

Notes

1. ***Romano pontifice ... declinante*** is an ablative absolute: the sentence states a condition ("when, or if, the Roman pontiff ... turns aside") and then denies that anyone bears Antichrist's name more fully. The ablatives may instead be of comparison after ***plenius ... periculosius***: "no one ... bears more fully or more dangerously the name and work of Antichrist than the Roman pontiff ... turning aside from his path". ***Eius semita*** is Christ's path. AB in marg.: ***Antichristus quis est secundum scripturam. Sentencia*** (CONTEXTUAL; teaching / sentence): here the position taught, "teaching".
2. 1 John 2:18. Wyclif omits the Vulgate's ***et*** before ***nunc*** (DR "even now"); the English follows his Latin. B in marg. at 118.16: ***Anti valet contra***.
3. The legend of Antichrist's birth from the tribe of Dan is patristic (Irenaeus, ***Adv. haer.*** 5.30.2, on Jer. 8:16). ***In illo loco*** names no place (perhaps Jerusalem or its temple). The fiery horses and chariot recall Elijah's (4 Kings 2:11). ***Dominabitur***: "lord it", the pejorative sense (glossary: ***dominari***).
4. ***Persona ... aggregata***: the foreknown taken together as one person, the body whose head is the devil. ***Quotlibet*** is read as ***quodlibet***. Loserth's side-note renders ***prescitorum*** "the reprobate"; the the glossary's "the foreknown" is kept. AB in marg. at 118.27: ***De Antichristo***.
5. "He spoke, and they were made": Ps. 148:5 (also 32:9), naming Christ as the creator Word. Matt. 16:23, "Go behind me, Satan". A in marg. at 119.1: ***Nota contradicit sibi de ecclesia***, a reader's charge that calling a predestinate man Antichrist contradicts Wyclif's doctrine of the church.
6. ***Confirmati***: confirmed in grace, i.e. made unable to fall; "[in grace]" is supplied. Loserth compares Wyclif, ***De Antichristo*** = ***Opus evangelicum*** III, 6 (editor). A in marg.: ***Antichristus ex clero***.
7. ***Que processit Cayn*** will not construe as printed, and the plate shows no lost word: a preposition (***a*** or ***de***) is wanting before ***Cayn***. "[from]" is supplied (our emendation); no variant is recorded.
8. ***Declarat***: Wyclif takes the Evangelist to show that Antichrist is "given to the world" (1 John 4:3, "he is now already in the world") and came "from the clergy" (cf. 1 John 2:19, "they went out from us"). The second identification is ours.
9. ***Illam scit dyabolus magis efficere*** is read "the devil knows it [hypocrisy] to accomplish more"; it may also mean "the devil knows how to work it the better". ***Sed*** brings the next premiss, hence "now".
10. The texts meant are probably 2 Tim. 3:1–5 (those "having an appearance indeed of godliness"), 2 Pet. 2:1–3 and Jude 4; the identification is ours.
11. ***In propriis instrumentis*** is ambiguous: the Christians' own instruments (their clergy), or Christ's own instruments turned against him. ***Sic enim victus est a Christo*** then gives the devil's motive: he repays Christ in kind for his own defeat. ***Dileccio*** is "love", kept apart from ***caritas*** "charity" (glossary: ***dileccio***).
12. ***Pseudo***, the Greek prefix used as a noun, is kept as "the Pseudo" throughout the eleven conditions. The ***quomodo*** clause is read as a question ("how else"). Matt. 24:5; "John 15" as printed; the nearest text is John 5:43, "if another shall come in his own name" (our suggestion). Apparatus 120.18, 20: codd. ***innitatur*** for ***innititur***; A ***tantum*** for ***tamen***. Loserth compares Wyclif's other lists of Antichrist's conditions, ***Opus evangelicum*** III–IV and ***De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*** cap. 11 (***Pol. Works*** II, 680), which has twelve (editor).
13. ***Regularissime ... irregulariter*** plays on ***regula***, the rule of a religious life. ***De mundo ... ex Deo***: 1 John 2:15–16 and John 17:14–16 (our identification). The ***cum ... aliter*** clause is loose: since he lacks miracles and holiness, only worldliness draws followers. ***Disciplinatus***, "discipleship", the body of his disciples.
14. Codd. ***dicat*** (apparatus 121.6); the print's ***dicit*** is translated. ***Totus mundus est mundo deditus*** plays on ***mundus*** as the whole race and as the world opposed to God. ***Dominetur capitaliter***: "lords it as head", the pejorative sense of ***dominari***. ***Tota habitabili***: the inhabited earth (***oikoumene***).
15. Gal. 1:8–9. Augustine: probably ***De doctrina christiana*** 2.42.63 (PL 34, 65): ***quidquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi damnatur; si utile est, ibi invenitur***.
16. Ps. 9:21; Wyclif omits the Vulgate's ***Domine*** (DR "Appoint, O Lord, a lawgiver over them"). The reading of the verse as Antichrist is Augustine's, ***Enarr. in Ps.*** 9.20 (PL 36, 125: ***Videtur mihi Antichristum significare***). ***Preposituram talis legiferi***: literally "the superiorship of such a lawgiver".

17. Heb. 7:12; Wyclif omits *enim* and *et* (DR "For ... a translation also"). *Istam legis translacionem oportet sequi extraneum sacerdotem* may also be construed "a foreign priest must follow this translation of the law"; Hebrews sets the priesthood first and the law after it, which supports the rendering.
18. The threefold cord is Eccles. 4:12 ("a threefold cord is not easily broken"). The three fabrications answer to the first three conditions: the lie, the world, the new laws. *Commentum* is "fabrication" (the glossary).
19. Matt. 19:21, 27. Ecclus. 13:3 agrees with the Vulgate; DR is quoted as it stands. Apparatus 122.3: codd. *colliderint*; B *refringentur*, A *confringentur*; the print is translated.
20. *Sua* is taken of the Pseudo (the indirect reflexive after *optat*); it may refer to the disciples, "their own power".
21. Matt. 28:19–20 combined with Mark 16:15 ("Go ye into the whole world"). Chosroes II of Persia, who in the legend of the Exaltation of the Cross sat enthroned as a god in a costly tower (Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea* cap. 137, *De exaltatione sanctae crucis*, 14 September, ed. Graesse p. 606). B *Cosdree*. *Castra conquesta* are castles taken by conquest; not the friars' "Caim's castles" (*castra caynitica*).
22. Luke 21:19, "In your patience you shall possess your souls". Wis. 2:1: Wyclif adds *impii* and omits *enim* and the second *et* (DR "For they have said ... and in the end of a man"); the English follows his Latin. *Capitulum* is both an assembly (a chapter) and a chapter of the book: the wicked of Wisdom 2.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 118: *literalis* [NW]
  - 118: *18*
  - 119: *carne*
  - 119: *traditoriam* (hyphenated tradi-toriam; main token covers whole word)
  - 120: *placencius* [NW]
  - 120: *vicarium* (print has v; 190d is the folio mark)
  - 120: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 121: *21*
  - 121: *12* (print has Heb. VII, 12 before dicit)
  - 121: *iste Pseudo* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 121: *eligit*
  - 121: *discipulus* (35 is the line number)
  - 122: *cacabus* [NW]
  - 122: *de* (25 is the line number)
  - 122: *1* (old-style 1, x-height)
  - 122: *recte*
  - 122: *vite* (print has v)
  - 122: *refrigerium*
  - 120: *nominetenus* (nommetenus -> nominetenus (scans: nommetenus | nommetenus | nominetenus | nommetenus))

Part 6: The seventh to eleventh conditions of the pseudo-pope

Loserth pp. 122.30–125.31

¶1 122.30–123.8
122.30 *7. Christ forbade his disciples to take the sword;*
123.1 *the pope uses the spoils of the poor to hire soldiers,*
123.9 *Christ would not call down fire on the Samaritans; the pope curses all who do not obey him.*
123.21 *9. Christ refused to be a judge; the pope is*

[122]Septimo, ubi Christus prohibet suis ferire cum gladio sed pati ut ipse, cum potuit hostes suos faciliter superare; ut patet Joh. XVIII, iste Pseudo docet et conducit milites de bonis pauperum [123] ad cumulandum sibi superfluitates stercorum et discipulos suos, qui severius exequuntur illud officium, plus commendat et promovet ad seculi dignitatem, sic quod Christo conversante nobiscum non foret suis cum illis societas vel amicicia nisi inter homines prope pares, Et secundum Apostolum II Cor. VI, 15 non est communicacio Christi ad Belial, ut tangebam superius.

Seventh: whereas Christ forbids his own to strike with the sword, but [bids them] suffer as he did, although he could easily have overcome his enemies, as is clear in John 18 (18:11), this Pseudo teaches and hires soldiers from the goods of the poor [123]to heap up for himself superfluities of dung; and those of his disciples who carry out that office the more severely he commends the more and promotes to the world's dignity; so that, were Christ living among us, his own would have no fellowship or friendship with them, [for there is none] except between men nearly equal.[1] And according to the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 6:15, there is no communion of Christ with Belial, as I touched on above.[2]

always grasping at jurisdiction.

¶2 123.9–123.20

[123] **Octavo, ubi Christus prohibuit cariores eius discipulos Jacobum et Johannem inprecari ignem de celo descendere instar Helye, IV Reg primo ad vindicandum de Samaritanis negantibus eis necessaria, cibum et tegumina, ut patet Luce IX, 56, iste Pseudo deficiente materiali gladio fingit fulmen anathematis in eos, qui nolunt sue tyrannidi obedire, sic quod ubi Christus dicit suos discipulos esse spirituales nulli obnoxios, cum ipse non venit animas perdere sed salvare, ut ibi dicitur, iste Pseudo pro nichilo perdit utramque vitam multiplicium animarum.**

Eighth: whereas Christ forbade his dearer disciples, James and John, to call down fire from heaven after the manner of Elijah (4 Kings 1) to take vengeance on the Samaritans who denied them necessaries, food and shelter, as is clear in Luke 9:56, this Pseudo, when the material sword fails him, forges the thunderbolt of anathema against those who will not obey his tyranny; so that, whereas Christ says that his disciples are spiritual, hurtful to no one, since he "came not to destroy souls, but to save", as is said there, this Pseudo for nothing destroys both lives of many souls.[3]

¶3 123.21–124.7

124.8 *10. Christ humbly hid his deity under cover of his manhood; the pope claims to be God in earth,*

124.28 *and fulfils St. Paul's prophecy of the man of sin.*

[123] **Nono, ubi Christus dicit in suo Apostolo prima Cor. VI, 7 quod omnino est delictum in gentibus, quod iudicia secularia sic exercent, cum ipse renuit tale iudicium, ut patet Luce XII, iste Pseudo hortatur viis et modis scolares suos contendere, dicens quod condidit multiplices leges sacras ecclesie et ordinavit satrapas ad complementum talis iusticie; ideo sicut excomunicantur qui impediunt pugiles ecclesie, qui volunt exequi eius iura, sic excomunicantur iniuriati in paciendo iniurias, cum ob torporem eorum leges et possessiones ecclesie sunt extincte. Unde Apostolus dicens: Quare non magis iniuriam patimini? per** [124] **antiphrasim locutus est yronice, sicut quando dicit quod talia debent per contemptibiles ecclesie iudicari, et sic ubi Christus cum sua familia suspensus fuit a talibus intendens pure saluti anime, iste Pseudo cum sua familia trahit sibi omnia secularia negocia, gracia congregandi pecunie.**

Ninth: whereas Christ says in his Apostle, 1 Corinthians 6:7, that "there is altogether a fault" among the gentiles in that they so "exercise secular judgments", since he himself refused such judgment, as is clear in Luke 12 (12:14), this Pseudo exhorts his scholars by all ways and means to go to law, saying that he has made many sacred laws of the church and ordained satraps for the fulfilment of such justice; therefore, as those are excommunicated who hinder the champions of the church who wish to execute its rights, so those are excommunicated who, being wronged, [persist] in suffering the wrongs, since through their sluggishness the laws and possessions of the church are extinguished.[4] Hence the Apostle, in saying "Why do you not rather suffer wrong?", spoke ironically, [124] **by antiphrasis, as when he says that such matters ought to be judged by the contemptible of the church.[5] And so, whereas Christ with his household was suspended from such things, attending purely to the salvation of the soul, this Pseudo with his household draws to himself all secular business, for the sake of gathering money.[6]**

¶4 124.8–124.34

[124] **Decimo, ubi Christus ostendit humiliter suam inferioritatem celans sub testa humanitatis suam divinitatem, ut patet Joh. XIV et alibi sepe in evangelio, iste Pseudo proclamat pompatice et blasfeme quod est Deus mixtus vel Deus in terris, quem nemo debet corripere, cum habens omnes leges in scrinio pectoris, debet ad votum scripturam autorizare, exponere vel quantum libuerit abrogare, et sic propter iniustam pene gravedinem periculosius est in mandatum suum quam in mandatum Christi offendere, cum potest declarare quoscumque sibi contradicentes, licet pure asserentes fidem scripture, esse hereticos, cum pure ex bullis suis ad votum habilitat et inhabilitat quemcumque voluerit, ymo eo ipso quo pretendit se quovis modo**

Tenth: whereas Christ humbly showed his inferiority, hiding his divinity under the shell of his humanity, as is clear in John 14 (14:28) and often elsewhere in the gospel, this Pseudo proclaims pompously and blasphemously that he is a mixed God, or God on earth, whom no one ought to rebuke, since, having all laws in the shrine of his breast, he is at will to authorize scripture, to expound it, or to abrogate it as far as he pleases;[7] and so, because of the unjust gravity of the penalty, it is more dangerous to offend against his command than against the command of Christ, since he can declare any who contradict him, though they purely assert the faith of scripture, to be heretics, since purely by his bulls he

solvere vel ligare, eo ipso sic solvit vel ligat. Et ipse supra Christum habet plenam potestatem civiliter dominandi, et sic de infinitis blasfemiis, ex quibus infertur prophecia Apostoli II. Tess. II, 3 de Antichristo dicta quem hominem peccati nominant, ita ut in templo Dei sedeat, ostendens se tamquam sit Deus, ymo ut dicit Apostolus, extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus. Deus enim non potest taliter dominari nec nude per bullas sine interiori illapsu quemquam habilitare, nec potestatem preter Dei licenciam ab imperatore capere.

qualifies and disqualifies at will whomever he will; indeed, by the very fact that he claims in any way to loose or bind, by that very fact he so looses or binds. And he has, above Christ, full power of exercising civil lordship; and so of infinite blasphemies, from which the Apostle's prophecy is drawn, 2 Thessalonians 2:3, spoken of Antichrist, whom they name "the man of sin": "so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God"; indeed, as the Apostle says, he "is lifted up above all that is called God" (2:4).[8] For God cannot exercise lordship in that way, nor qualify anyone barely by bulls without an inward inflowing, nor take power from the emperor apart from God's licence.[9]

¶5 125.1–125.31

125.1 *Christ's disciples made no money by prelacies, the pope makes all appointments a matter of gain.*

[125] Undecimo et ultimo patet quod Christus abnuit omnem sentenciam, in qua necesse foret facere alicui iniuriam, ideo Luce XII, 14 dicit cuidam petenti eius iudicium: Quis me constituit iudicem aut diuisorem super vos? Unde et eius apostoli abalienati sunt a divisione cuiuscumque prepositure, que lucrum temporale sapiunt, quia didicerant a magistro Matth. X, 8: Gratis accepistis gratis date. Iste autem Pseudo cum discipulis suis palliat, quod ad eum solum spectat in solidum, omnes preposituras sapientes pinguedinem temporalem tribuere; nec potest propter plenitudinem potestatis symoniam committere, sed propter plenitudinem dominii oportet quemcumque secundum pinguedinem sui beneficii de thesauro Pseudo afferre; et de plenitudine potestatis facit reservaciones mentales absconditas, et virtute earum plus offerens preponetur, cum potest anteriorare vel posteriorare tempus ad libitum, ymo non obstante quod Christus sit cum suis apostolis omnibus diebus usque ad consumacionem seculi, ut dicit Matth. ultimo, iste tamen Pseudo potest dispensando tempus redimere et mutare, sic quod quando est maxime necessarium Christo et sue ecclesie consilia Christi servare, liceat sibi consilia ipsa suspendere, privilegia quecumque propter questum concedere, et quantumcumque Christo inhabiles tamquam habiles approbare, et quicquid fecerit debet tota militans ecclesia, quam oportet esse sub dicione ut legem Christi ratum credere.

Eleventh and last: it is clear that Christ refused every sentence in which it would be necessary to do wrong to anyone; therefore, Luke 12:14, he says to one who asked for his judgment: "Who hath appointed me judge or divider over you?"[10] Hence his apostles too were estranged from the distribution of any office of superior that savours of temporal gain, for they had learned from the master, Matthew 10:8: "Freely have you received, freely give." But this Pseudo with his disciples cloaks [the matter, saying] that it belongs to him alone, in full, to bestow all offices of superior that savour of temporal fatness; and that he cannot commit simony, because of the plenitude of power, but because of the plenitude of lordship everyone must bring [payment] out of his treasure to the Pseudo, according to the fatness of his benefice;[11] and out of the plenitude of power he makes hidden mental reservations, and by virtue of them the one who offers more will be preferred, since he can put the time earlier or later at pleasure.[12] Indeed, notwithstanding that Christ is with his apostles "all days, even to the consummation of the world", as he says in the last [chapter] of Matthew (28:20), yet this Pseudo can by dispensing redeem and change the time, so that, when it is most necessary for Christ and his church to keep the counsels of Christ, it is lawful for him to suspend those very counsels, to grant any privileges whatever for gain, and to approve as qualified men however unqualified for Christ; and whatever he has done, the whole church militant, which must be under [his] sway, ought to believe ratified, as [it believes] the law of Christ.[13]

Notes

1. Apparatus 123.5: codd. ***sui***; the print's ***suis*** (Loserth's) is translated: "there would be for his own no fellowship". ***Milites*** hired for pay are "soldiers" (glossary: ***milicia; milites***, the estate is "knights"). The last clause gives the reason: fellowship needs near-equals. John 18:11, "Put up thy sword"; cf. 18:36. A in marg. at 122.30: *7*.

2. 2 Cor. 6:15, where the Vulgate asks *quae autem conventio Christi ad Belial?* (DR "And what concord hath Christ with Belial?"); Wyclif states it, with *communicacio*, and the English follows his Latin. "Above": perhaps 06-e, the fourth condition, on the pot and the kettle (our suggestion).
3. Luke 9:54–56, with 4 Kings 1:10–12. "His disciples are spiritual" answers Luke 9:55, "you know not of what spirit you are". *Nulli obnoxios* may also be read "liable to no one". "Both lives" are the bodily and the eternal. The print's *patetLuce* is *patet Luce*. AB in marg. at 123.9: *8*.
4. 1 Cor. 6:7, paraphrased: the Vulgate has *in vobis* and *quod iudicia habetis inter vos*; Wyclif's *in gentibus* and *iudicia secularia* (from 6:4) are his, and the quotation marks follow Loserth's italics. Luke 12:14. *Contendere*: to contend at law. *Iniuriati in paciendo iniurias*: the wronged who go on bearing their wrongs, "[persist]" supplied. *Ius* is subjective here, "rights". AB in marg. at 123.21: *9*.
5. 1 Cor. 6:7 again; Wyclif's *patimini* (Vulgate *accipitis*, DR "take wrong") is translated "suffer". "The contemptible of the church": 1 Cor. 6:4 (DR "who are the most despised in the church"). This reading of Paul as ironic is the Pseudo's, reported in Wyclif's voice; the *unde* continues the Pseudo's case.
6. *Suspensus fuit a talibus*: held aloof from such business; the glossary "suspend" is kept, with no pun on hanging here.
7. *Deus mixtus* is unexplained (perhaps God mingled with man, a mock of the two natures). *Omnes leges in scrinio pectoris* is the canonists' maxim (Boniface VIII, *Sext* 1.2.1, *Licet Romanus pontifex*: *qui iura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere*; Wyclif has *omnes leges*). *Debet ... autorizare* is read as the Pseudo's claimed right ("is to authorize"), not a duty.
8. 2 Thess. 2:3–4, quoted in DR; *nominant*, "they name", has the doctors as subject. *Infertur*: the prophecy is brought in, i.e. it applies.
9. *Illapsus*: God's inflowing into the soul, without which no bull qualifies anyone. The last clause (*nec potestatem preter Dei licenciam ... capere*) cannot have God as subject in sense; Wyclif seems to slip back to the Pseudo, who takes power from the emperor (the Donation) apart from God's licence. Translated as printed.
10. *Sentenciam* here is the judicial sentence, not a teaching (glossary: *sentencia*, CONTEXTUAL). AB in marg. at 125.1: *11*.
11. *Palliat quod* is read "pleads, as a cloak, that". *De thesauro Pseudo afferre*: *Pseudo* is taken as dative, "to the Pseudo"; it may also be genitive, "into the Pseudo's treasury". The plenitude of power is set against the plenitude of lordship: the first clears him of simony, the second obliges every beneficed man to pay (the annates and services, our gloss).
12. *Reservaciones mentales*: papal reservations of benefices, kept unpublished (in the pope's mind) so that the date of reservation can be moved, *anteriorare vel posteriorare*, to suit the higher bidder.
13. Matt. 28:20 in DR. *Tempus redimere* turns Eph. 5:16 ("redeeming the time") to the sale of dispensations. *Ut legem Christi ratum credere* is read "believe ratified, as the law of Christ"; it may also mean "believe it ratified as [being] the law of Christ".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 124: *inferioritatem*
  - 124: *celans*
  - 124: *Joh*
  - 124: *pene*
  - 125: ∅ (box is the folio bar before nec (192a))
  - 125: *ecclesia* (30 is the line number)
  - 123: *inter homines* (interhomines -> inter homines (two words run together))
  - 125: *spectat in* (spectatin -> spectat in (two words run together))
  - 123: *fulmen* (LEFT-nw: 15 is the line number)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 33.1. Cor. VI, 7. (123.33); reference 28. II. Thess. II, 4. (124.34); reference 22. Matth. V, 20. (125.34).

Part 7: The pseudo-pope's sophistries: what a state is

Loserth pp. 125.32–129.31

¶1 125.32–127.31

126.21 *The pope says that the clerical state is more perfect than the lay and that the laity have no right to judge the clergy. He says too that the man and his state are one.*
126.28 *A man may and must judge of deeds open and visible.*
127.5 *If the man and his state are one every cleric is*

[125] Multe sunt versucie velate sub istis XI, in quibus falluntur simplices versuciis Pseudochristi, et indubie quicumque fuerit talis Pseudo vel ei [126] consenciens est secundum quod plus vel minus istis condicionibus participat Antichristus. Ideo docet beatus Evangelista epistola sua canonica; postquam Antichristum descripserit: Nolite, inquit, eum recipere in domum vestram, nec ave ei dixeritis; quod oportet intelligi nec in persona sua propria nec in membris, qui, inquit; dixerit illi ave, communicabit operibus eius malignis, et iste si est talis est heresiarcha solvens Christum infideliter in naturis

Many are the wiles veiled under these eleven, in which the simple are deceived by the wiles of the false christ; and without doubt whoever is such a Pseudo, or [126] consents to him, is Antichrist according as he shares more or less in these conditions.[1] Therefore the blessed Evangelist teaches in his canonical epistle, after he has described Antichrist: "Receive him not," he says, "into your house, nor say to him: God speed you" (which must be understood neither in his own person nor in his members); "he who shall say to him: God speed you," he says, "shall communicate

infinitely more perfect than any layman. Moreover the state of every man and angel would be unchangeable.

persone, in Christi legibus et in membris, cuius scolam oportet cordatos theologos affeccione donorum suorum et timore suorum supplicacionum postpositis animose detegere. Et ipsum describunt omnes libri sapienciales vel prophetici alterius testamenti; et propter nostrorum vecordiam et membrorum suorum crescenciam in brevi tempore magis invaluit. Nec dubium quin sit infidelis Christo, qui aliquo quinque modorum consentit homini contra Christum. Sunt autem multa sophistica quibus homo iste illudit simplicibus christianis; dicitur enim primo quod status cleri sui est infinitum perfeccior quam status aliquis laycalis, ideo non pertinet ipsos de statu cleri cognoscere. Dicit secundo palpatus in metaphisica quod omnis status hominis est realiter ipse homo. Contra utrumque istorum invexi sepius: contra primum est decretum Crysostomi Imperfecto Omelia 26; ubi docet; quod homo debet iudicare de operibus manifestis, quia aliter precluderet lex Christi naturale iudicium et foret sibi ipsi contraria, [127]cum ipsemet docet Matth. VII, 15 attendere a falsis prophetis ex fructibus cognoscendis, aliter enim necessario cecaret laycos ad elemosinas suas Antichristi discipulis improvide parciendum. Contra secundum patet quod repugnat priori, cum tunc omnis clericus foret infinitum perfeccior quam laycus; quod soli Christo potest competere; iterum omnis homo vel angelus maneret continue in eodem statu, sicut manet constanter in eadem humanitate, et sic nullus status posset maius aut minus suscipere. Et iterum periret status et christianorum distinccio, ymo propter casum Luciferi non foret status angelorum deterior, nisi forte dicatur quod status sit qualitas anime vel peccatum. Ideo certum est quod status iuxta methaphisicam scripture verissimam est denominacio, qua natura racionalis dicitur formaliter stare respectu finis ultimi, et sic in homine aliquis est status corporis, aliquis status anime et aliquis mixtum; aliquis eciam est status quoad mores et aliquis quoad ritus vel religionem, aliquis totalis et aliquis parcialis. Unde de statu corporali et statu mentali racionali vel integra individua potest intelligi illud Yob. XIII quod homo miserabilior lapsus nunquam in eodem statu permanet continue, nam secundum statum integrum variatur, ut patet de etate, de morum varietate et de circumstanciis statum integrantibus, que communiter variantur; manet tamen idem status communis et individuis successivis intercisus vel continuus.

with his wicked works."[2] And this man, if he is such, is a heresiarch, faithlessly dissolving Christ in the natures of his person, in Christ's laws and in his members; and stout-hearted theologians must courageously expose his school, setting aside affection for his gifts and fear for their supplications.[3] And all the sapiential or prophetic books of the other testament describe him; and through the faint-heartedness of our men and the growth of his members he has in a short time grown the stronger. Nor is there doubt that he is faithless to Christ who in any of the five ways consents to a man against Christ.[4] And there are many sophistries by which this man mocks simple Christians. For it is said, first, that the state of his clergy is infinitely more perfect than any lay state, and therefore it does not pertain to [the laity] to take cognizance of the state of the clergy. He says, second, having groped about in metaphysics, that every state of a man is really the man himself.[5] Against both of these I have often inveighed. Against the first is the decree of Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum*, homily 26, where he teaches "that a man ought to judge of manifest works, since otherwise the law of Christ would shut out natural judgment and would be contrary to itself",[6] [127]since he himself teaches, Matthew 7:15, to "beware of false prophets", who are to be known "by their fruits"; for otherwise it would of necessity blind lay people into sharing out their alms improvidently to the disciples of Antichrist.[7] Against the second, it is clear that it is incompatible with the former, since then every cleric would be infinitely more perfect than a layman, which can belong to Christ alone. Again, every man or angel would remain continually in the same state, as he remains constantly in the same humanity; and so no state could admit more or less. And again the distinction of states and of Christians would perish; indeed, through Lucifer's fall the state of the angels would not be worse, unless perhaps it be said that a state is a quality of the soul, or sin.[8] Therefore it is certain that a state, according to the most true metaphysics of scripture, is a naming by which a rational nature is said formally to stand in relation to its last end; and so in man there is some state of the body, some state of the soul, and some mixed; there is also some state as to manners and some as to rites or religion, some total and some partial.[9] Hence of the bodily state, and of the mental, rational or integral individual state, can be understood that [saying] of Job 13, that man, fallen [and] more wretched, "never continueth in the same state"; for he varies according to his integral state, as is clear of age, of the variety of manners and of the circumstances that

make up the state, which commonly vary; yet the same common state remains, broken off or continuous in successive individuals.[10]

¶2 127.32–129.3
129.4 *The state of being without property is, as a State, better than that of a civil owner.*

[127]Ex istis logici sollicitant se quod continuum componitur ex non quantis, cum status continuus sicut etas per indivisibile vel duo aut quotlibet [128]indivisibilia excedit aliud, nam P. superstes, qui incepit cum Paulo nunc desinente est per instans antiquior quam fuit Paulus vel ipse; nec est possibile unum continuum per indivisibile excedere aliud nisi indivisibile faciens ad maioritatem eius sit pars talis maioris, ut est in numeris. Et sic potest argui de statu sanitatis vel infirmitatis, de quo quis meritorie continue elicit actum caritatis, gaudendo et laudando Deum de statu; et patet quod actus terminatur exclusive ad instans ut sanitas vel infirmitas, et (ut videtur) est continue novus actus, sicut continue novum obiectum, ad quod actus essencialiter terminatur. Et ita videtur quod captis duobus predestinatis, quorum primi meritum terminetur exclusive ad septimum gradum, et secundi totale meritum terminetur inclusive ad eundem gradum, status primum in patria correspondenter se habebunt; nec negabitur antecedens, cum stat de duobus predestinatis unum exclusive et alium inclusive incipere mereri ab eodem instanti. Postquam originaliter peccando continue antefuerant in mortali et continue equaliter merendo pro eodem instanti decedant. Constat quidem quod actuum merendi aliquis est successivus, cuius incepcio est per remocionem de presenti, et aliquis per posicionem de presenti. Sic enim Christus potuit incipere purgasse Baptistam ab originali pro primo instanti sui esse, et alium communem sibi et aliunde undique parem creasse in gracia et beatificasse eos correspondenter ad merita, et sic de mille casibus possibilibus et de facto in quibus implicatur unum quantum excedere aliud per indivisibile. Ex quibus oportet concedere aliquam esse maximam partem quantitativam, [129]eius parem excesso, et adiectum cum facit quantitative totum maius, oportet esse partem quantitativam maiorati per ipsum.

From these things the logicians busy themselves [to show] that a continuum is composed of non-quantities, since a continuous state, like age, exceeds another by an indivisible, or by two or any number of [128]indivisibles: for P., the survivor, who began with Paul, who now ceases, is older by an instant than Paul was, or than he himself [was]; nor is it possible for one continuum to exceed another by an indivisible unless the indivisible that makes for its greatness is a part of the greater, as it is in numbers.[11] And so it can be argued of a state of health or sickness about which someone meritoriously and continually elicits an act of charity, rejoicing in the state and praising God for it: it is clear that the act is terminated exclusively at an instant, as the health or the sickness is, and (as it seems) there is continually a new act, as there is continually a new object, at which the act is essentially terminated.[12] And so it seems that, taking two predestinate, of whom the merit of the first is terminated exclusively at the seventh degree, and the whole merit of the second inclusively at the same degree, their states in the homeland will first stand correspondingly; nor will the antecedent be denied, since it is consistent that, of two predestinate, one should begin to merit exclusively and the other inclusively from the same instant, after they had previously been continually in mortal [sin] through original sinning, and, continually meriting equally, they die at the same instant.[13] It is evident indeed that among acts of meriting some one is successive, whose beginning is by removal of the present, and some one by positing of the present.[14] For so Christ could have begun to have cleansed the Baptist from original [sin] at the first instant of his being, and to have created another, common with him and otherwise equal in every respect, in grace, and to have beatified them correspondingly to their merits; and so of a thousand cases, possible and actual, in which it is implied that one quantity exceeds another by an indivisible.[15] From which it must be granted that there is some greatest quantitative part [129]of it, equal to the [quantity] exceeded, and that what is added, since it makes the whole quantitatively greater, must be a quantitative part of what is made greater by it.[16]

¶3 129.4–129.31

[129]Istam materiam diffuse prosecutus sum alibi cum aliis dubiis annexis, ideo transeo dictum repetens superius, quod status exproprietarie vivendi est quocumque statu civili perfeccior, sicut

This matter I have pursued at length elsewhere, with other doubts annexed to it; therefore I pass on, repeating what was said above: that the state of living without property is more perfect than any civil state,

status virginitatis est quocumque statu coniugati perfeccior, natura angelica est naturaliter natura humana superior, vita contemplativa est vita activa perfeccior et sexus femineus est sexu masculino fragilior; et tamen constat quod multi coniugati sunt multis virginibus meliores, multi homines superiores dyabolis gracia non natura, multi activi sunt multis contemplativis sancciores, et multe femine virgines in iuvenili etate multis viris eciam decrepitis plus constantes, ut sepe meminit Augustinus in scriptis istius materie. Ideo necesse est volentem istam materiam intelligere considerare perfeccionem quam habet homo in quantum exproprietarie vivit, et perfeccionem quam habet in quantum civilis proprietarius, et illarum perfeccionum quas voco perfecciones simpliciter supra perfecciones individuas, primam inveniet plus perfectam. Ille autem perfecciones more universalium non possunt augmentari vel minui, sed perfecciones vel status individui secundum quod illis alia commoda sunt adiecta, et sic, ut sepe repecii, status exproprietarie vivendi propter excellenciam perfeccionis, congruit clero Christi.

as the state of virginity is more perfect than any state of the married, angelic nature is by nature superior to human nature, the contemplative life is more perfect than the active life, and the female sex is frailer than the male sex.[17] And yet it is evident that many married people are better than many virgins, many men superior to devils by grace, not by nature, many active people holier than many contemplatives, and many women, virgins of youthful age, more constant than many men, even decrepit ones, as Augustine often recalls in his writings on this matter.[18] Therefore whoever wishes to understand this matter must consider the perfection that a man has inasmuch as he lives without property, and the perfection that he has inasmuch as he is a civil proprietary [owner]; and of those perfections, which I call perfections without qualification, over and above individual perfections, he will find the first more perfect. Now those perfections, after the manner of universals, cannot be increased or diminished; but individual perfections or states [can], according as other advantages are added to them.[19] And so, as I have often repeated, the state of living without property, because of the excellence of its perfection, befits the clergy of Christ.

Notes

1. Apparatus 125.32: codd. *materie*; the print's *Multe* (Loserth's) is translated. With the manuscripts the sentence would open "There are wiles of the matter veiled ...".
2. 2 John 10–11, which Loserth cites (2 Joh. 10). Wyclif departs from the Vulgate (*nolite recipere eum in domum ... qui enim dicit illi ave, communicat*): he adds *vestram* and puts *dixerit ... communicabit* in the future; the English follows his Latin, in DR's words where they agree. The parenthesis is Wyclif's gloss inside the quotation. Apparatus 126.8: codd. *ille* for the print's *iste* (no change of sense).
3. *Solvens Christum* echoes 1 John 4:3 (*qui solvit Iesum*). *Supplicaciones*: the petitions (rolls) for provision to benefices that the schools sent to the pope; *suorum* is read as the theologians' own, "fear for their supplications" (it may be the Pseudo's: fear of his response to them). *Cordatos*, "stout-hearted", is the opposite of *vecors*.
4. B *infideles* (apparatus 126.18). The five ways of consenting are not listed here; Wyclif's list elsewhere is the canonists' verse *Consentit operans, defendens, consilium dans, / Ac auctorisans, non iuvans, nec reprehendens* (*De simonia* cap. 8, p. 98; *De officio regis* p. 68, where he counts six; *quinque modorum consensuum* also at *De officio regis* p. 117). *Infidelis* with a dative is "faithless" (the glossary).
5. *Ipsos* is the laity, from *laycalis*: "[the laity]" supplied. *Palpatus in metaphisica*: literally "having felt his way", a sneer at a dabbler. AB in marg. at 126.25: *Iudicare de prelatis*.
6. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, homily 26 as printed; Loserth gives "Opp. tom. VI, 743 (?)" and compares the genuine *In Matth. hom.* 23 (Opp. VII, 307) (editor, with his query). The quotation bounds are Loserth's italics; whether the words are Chrysostom's own is to be checked with the source.
7. Matt. 7:15–16; *ex fructibus cognoscendis* is Wyclif's compression of 7:16 (DR "By their fruits you shall know them"). *Ipsemet* is taken as Christ, the lawgiver; *cecaret* has the law (or Christ) as subject. *Parciendum* is read as *partiendum*.
8. Apparatus 127.5: codd. *tercium* for *secundum*; 127.11: codd. *status christianorum* without *et* ("the distinction of the state of Christians"). The print is translated in both places.
9. *Denominacio* "naming" (the glossary): a state is not a thing in the man but a name taken from his standing toward his last end. AB in marg. at 127.15: *Status hominis quid est*.
10. "Job 13" as printed; the words are Job 14:2 (DR "and never continueth in the same state"), the verse after 14:1 *homo natus de muliere*. *Homo miserabilior lapsus* is read "man, fallen and more wretched [than before]". *Integra individua* does not agree with *statu*; it is translated as "integral individual [state]" and flagged. *Intercisus* is Loserth's emendation of codd. *intricisus* (apparatus 127.30).
11. The thesis that a continuum is composed of indivisibles is Wyclif's own (*De logica* III, tr. 3 cap. 9, ed. Dziewicki III, 30 ff.); *sollicitant se quod* is read "busy themselves [to show] that". *P.* is a sample name. Apparatus 128.1: codd. *II* for *duo*; 128.6: one codex *m'us* for *numeris*. B in marg. at 128.7: *Casus notabilis*.
12. *Terminatur exclusive ad instans*: the act has no last instant, as the state of health has none, so each instant brings a new object and a new act.
13. *Status primum ... se habebunt* does not construe smoothly: *primum* may be corrupt (for *eorum*?). Translated as printed, "first". The next printed sentence (*Postquam ... decedant*) has no main verb and is read as continuing the case; the full stop before it is the print's.

14. The two modes of beginning in the schools' *de incipit et desinit*: by "removal of the present" (it is not now, and immediately after this it will be) and by "positing of the present" (it is now, and immediately before this it was not).
15. *Alium communem sibi* is read "another sharing [that first instant] with him". The Baptist's sanctification in the womb rests on Luke 1:15 ("he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb"; our identification). *Beatificasse*: "beatified", from *beatificacio* (the glossary).
16. *Maximam partem quantitativam eius, parem excesso*: the greatest quantitative part of the greater, equal to the lesser that it exceeds; the added indivisible is then a quantitative part too.
17. "Elsewhere": probably *De logica* III, tr. 3 cap. 9 (ed. Dziewicki III, 30 ff.), where whether the continuum is composed *ex non quantis* is one of three annexed *dubia*. "Above": the eighth teaching's earlier conclusions in this chapter. AB in marg. at 129.4: *Status diversi secundum gradus*. The print's *alus* is *aliis*.
18. Augustine, *De bono coniugali* and *De sancta virginitate* (e.g. *De bono coniug.* 23.28, PL 40, 392: *possunt conjugati esse continentibus meliores*; the young virgins' constancy is not traced). B *et tantum* for *et tamen* (apparatus 129.12); the print is translated.
19. B in marg. at 129.26: *Perfecciones in universali non augentur sed in singulari*, an early reader's summary. AB in marg. at 129.32 (the next paragraph): *Status exproprietarius approbatur a tota Trinitate*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 126: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 127: *VII*
  - 127: *attendere*
  - 127: *cum* (English side-note glued)
  - 127: *in*
  - 127: *minus*
  - 127: *Et*
  - 127: *corporali*
  - 128: *incepcio* (25 is the line number)
  - 127: *methaphisicam* (LEFT-nw: metha- | phisicam across lines; whole word per main-scan token)
  - 129: *exproprietarie* (one word, no split)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 22. Matth. V, 20. (125.34).

Part 8: States: whether a man's state is changed by sin

Loserth pp. 129.32–133.25

¶1 129.32–131.34
130.19 *A man may be in several states at once.*
130.24 *The higher a man's state, the worse his sin.*
131.17 *A man's state is not changed by his sin.*

[129]Et istam sentenciam approbat tota Trinitas cum tota ecclesia triumphante, tota natura bestiarum [130]cum condicione status innocencie et saniores monachi, qui propter perfeccionem decreverunt statum illum eligere. Et patet probabilitas cronice, quam narrat Cestrensis libro IV, cap. LXXXVI quomodo tempore dotacionis ecclesie audita est angelica vox in aere, dicens quod hodie effusum est venenum in ecclesia sancta Dei. Nam quomodocumque hoc fuerit, hoc est verum, cum clerus a statu perfecciori decidit sine equivalente recompensa, ut eventus patulus rei probat. Unde manifestum signum foret Pseudochristi dampnantis ut hereticum quod genus illorum qui sic maculaverunt matrem nostram possunt eam purgare de macula quam ex eorum stulticia sic contraxit. Unde capitalis defendens pertinaciter istam sentenciam contra perfeccionem membrorum Christi et sancte matris ecclesie, heresiarcha racionaliter potest dici. Sed dubitatur si homo sit simul in multis statibus. Et videtur planum quod sic de statibus tam corporis quam anime compossibilibus, sicut homo habet simul

And this teaching the whole Trinity approves, with the whole church triumphant, the whole nature of beasts [130]together with the condition of the state of innocence, and the sounder monks, who for the sake of perfection decided to choose that state.[1] And the probability of the chronicle is clear which Cestrensis tells in book 4, chapter 86: how at the time of the endowment of the church an angelic voice was heard in the air, saying that "today poison has been poured out into the holy church of God".[2] For however this may have been, this is true, since the clergy fell from a more perfect state without equivalent recompense, as the open outcome of the matter proves. Hence it would be a manifest sign of a false christ, condemning as heretical [the teaching] that the kind of those who so stained our mother can cleanse her of the stain which she thus contracted from their folly. Hence the chief man who defends this teaching pertinaciously against the perfection of the members of Christ and of holy mother church can reasonably be called a heresiarch.[3] But it

denominaciones multorum actuum, ut puta qualitatum. Similiter differendum est utrique preposito peccanti propter dignitatem status, ut patet LXXXII distinccione cap. Presbiter et sepe alibi; et cum hoc valet efficaciter testimonium Augustini in multis locis, ut ubi docet quod in Pharaone, in Nabuchodonosor propter statum et dignitatem regalem ad regimen populi subiecti Deus inspiraverat propheciam, et propter sacerdotalem [131]dignitatem Deus dedit Cayphe propheciam, ut dicit Augustinus in de Questionibus veteris et nove legis XXXV, et hinc David rite pepercit Sauli, ut patet I Reg. XXIV. Similiter, aliter nullius status celsitudo gravaret peccatum, quod est contra illud Sapiencie VI, 6 Durissimum iudicium hiis qui presunt, fiet, ymo aliter cuiuscumque prepositi status extingueretur, antequam quicquam boni vel mali faceret, que contradicunt scripture, cum ecclesie legibus, communi modo loquendi et sanctis doctoribus. Supposita igitur constancia statuum et facta limitacione ad statum quem preter nudos ritus humanos Deus ordinat, est dubium quomodo status variatur propter actus statui dissonos vel peccatum. Videtur enim quod status cum sit accidens tam parve constancie quod sit inalterabilis et per idem immobilis, cum manet eius dignitas cum peccato; aliter enim status sacerdotalis posset per alteracionem subiecti equiparari statui laycali et quilibet status cuilibet. Similiter, cum dignitas status hominis sit impertinens suis moribus, videtur quod stat eundem esse simul quantumcumque dignum et indignum et propter multiplicitatem statuum foret impertinens discernere per statum de hominis dignitate, nec sufficit homo cognoscere statum totalem aggregatum, tum quia infinitus est statuum numerus, tum quia aliquem statum proximi oportet viatorem quomodolibet ignorare. Similiter, cum status denigrari et debilitari poterit et alias serenari, videtur quod omne mortale statum quem invenit inficit, cum secundum Augustinum facit hominem esse nichil.

is asked whether a man may be in many states at once. And it seems plain that he may, as to states of body as well as of soul that are compossible, just as a man has at once the namings of many acts, for instance of qualities. Likewise, deference is to be shown to each superior who sins, on account of the dignity of his state, as is clear in distinction 82, chapter *Presbiter*, and often elsewhere;[4] and with this the testimony of Augustine holds good effectively in many places, as where he teaches that in Pharaoh and in Nebuchadnezzar God had inspired prophecy on account of the royal state and dignity, for the rule of the subject people, and on account of the priestly [131]dignity God gave Caiaphas prophecy, as Augustine says in *On Questions of the Old and New Law* 35; and hence David rightly spared Saul, as is clear in 1 Kings 24.[5] Likewise, otherwise no loftiness of state would aggravate sin, which is against that word of Wisdom 6:6, "a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule"; indeed, otherwise the state of any superior whatever would be extinguished before he did anything good or bad; and these things contradict scripture, together with the laws of the church, the common way of speaking, and the holy doctors.[6] Supposing, therefore, the constancy of states, and the limitation being made to the state which God ordains beyond bare human rites, there is a question how a state is varied on account of acts discordant with the state, or of sin. For it seems that a state, although it is an accident of such slight constancy, is unalterable and by the same token immovable, since its dignity remains along with sin; for otherwise the priestly state could, through alteration of the subject, be made equal to the lay state, and any state to any other.[7] Likewise, since the dignity of a man's state is irrelevant to his morals, it seems that it is consistent for the same man to be at once however worthy and unworthy; and on account of the multiplicity of states it would be irrelevant to judge of a man's dignity by his state; nor is a man able to know the total aggregate state, both because the number of states is infinite, and because a wayfarer must in some way be ignorant of some state of his neighbour. Likewise, since a state can be blackened and weakened and at another time made bright, it seems that every mortal [sin] infects the state it finds, since according to Augustine it makes a man to be nothing.[8]

¶2 132.1–133.25
132.1 *We cannot judge of the spiritual state of others.*

[132]Ex quo videtur quod sicut homo dubitat de proximo si sit in mortali vel prescitus, sic dubitaret de excellencia cuiuscumque status viantis. Sic enim fuit status exproprietarie vivendi Scariothis vilissimus, ymo cum status sit successivus et dubitatur de fine

From which it seems that, just as a man is in doubt about his neighbour whether he is in mortal [sin] or foreknown, so he would be in doubt about the excellence of any state of one on the road. For so the state of living without property was most vile in Iscariot;[9] indeed, since a

132.11 *Change may be in substance or in concomitant good or evil.* 132.24 *It is in the latter way that state is altered,* 133.1 *As doctors treat of the state of the body, so priests should of the soul.*

qui est status beatitudinis secundum Boecium III de Consolatione philosophie videtur, quod quilibet foret de totali statu fratris sui ambiguus. Hic oportet supponere descripcionem et distinccionem supradictas de statibus. Et secundo oportet notare quomodo dupliciter aliquid dicitur transmutari, vel subiective vel gracia concomitancie. Subiective ut sola substancia transmutatur; gracia concomitante omnis status vel res alia inexistens homini melioratur vel peioratur propter concomitanciam virtutis aut vicii. Et sic res in natura sua continue nunc est melior et nunc peior, et sic fides et spes possunt nunc formari caritate et nunc remanere informes, cum ipsa non permittit secum crimen ut suprema virtus et simplex. Et patet, quod triplex primum argumentum roborat veritatem. Quantum ad primum trium argumentorum sequencium patet ex distinccione iam posita, quomodo status non alteratur subiective sed con- comitative. Et quandoque per peccatum extinguitur, quod pertinet ad eum cognoscere, qui nobis incomprehensibiliter ordinat cunctos status; quamvis autem materia de statibus sit valde ampli ambitus, ut medicus tractat de statu corporis, ut precedit ad felicitatem vie sive miseriam, politicus [133]autem considerat de statu partis populi, secundum quem respicit pacem reipublice, tamen theologus et curatus, qui debet esse animarum medicus, considerat de statu hominis secundum virtutes vel vicia, ut respicit statum beatitudinis; et de tali statu est nobis sermo. Ipse autem infinitum excedit status alios, eciam status vivendi sive officii, qui dicuntur racione concomitancie virtutis vel vicii alterari; et patet ad primum obiectum. Ad secundum dicitur quod status temporalis est impertinens moribus quantum ad naturam status pertinet, vel in se simpliciter quod solum considerantes naturas universalium et reduplicativas concipiunt, verumtamen quantum ad denominacionem respectivam concomitancie status, tales valde pertinenter respiciunt virtutes et vicia; et hinc voco eos status disposicionis et alios virtutis; et sic concedo quod stat eundem esse dignum et indignum equivoce quoad dignitates morum et status, ideo pertinet specificare de qua hominis dignitate loquimur, quando ex statu dignitatem hominis arbitramur, et ultra conceditur quod non sufficimus hic cognoscere nisi imperfecte de statu totali hominis, quia ignoramus de exitu.

state is successive and there is doubt about the end, which is the state of blessedness according to Boethius, *On the Consolation of Philosophy* III, it seems that each would be uncertain of the total state of his brother.[10] Here one must suppose the definition and distinction of states given above. And secondly one must note how something is said to be changed in two ways: either subjectively or by reason of concomitance. Subjectively, as the substance alone is changed; by reason of concomitance, every state or other thing existing in a man is bettered or worsened on account of the concomitance of virtue or vice.[11] And so a thing in its nature is continually at one time better and at another worse; and so faith and hope can at one time be formed by charity and at another remain unformed, since charity, as the supreme and simple virtue, does not allow crime alongside it.[12] And it is clear that the threefold first argument strengthens the truth. As to the first of the three following arguments, it is clear from the distinction now set down how a state is altered not subjectively but concomitatively. And sometimes it is extinguished through sin, which it belongs to him to know who, incomprehensibly to us, ordains all states. And although the matter of states is of very wide compass (as the physician treats of the state of the body as it leads on to the felicity or misery of the way, and the politician [133]considers the state of a part of the people according as it regards the peace of the commonwealth), yet the theologian and the curate, who ought to be the physician of souls, considers the state of a man according to virtues or vices, as it regards the state of blessedness; and of such a state is our discourse.[13] And this state infinitely exceeds the other states, even the states of living or of office, which are said to be altered by reason of the concomitance of virtue or vice; and the answer to the first objection is clear. To the second the answer is that a temporal state is irrelevant to morals so far as concerns the nature of the state, or in itself without qualification, which only those conceive who consider the natures of universals and reduplicative [natures]; nevertheless, as to the relational naming of the concomitance of the state, such states bear very relevantly on virtues and vices; and hence I call these states of disposition, and the others states of virtue. And so I grant that it is consistent for the same man to be worthy and unworthy equivocally, as regards the dignities of morals and of state; therefore it is pertinent to specify of which dignity of a man we speak when we judge a man's dignity from his state. And further it is granted that here we are not able to know the total state of a man except imperfectly, because we are ignorant of the outcome.[14]

Notes

1. ***Monachi*** is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read ***monses*** (130.2). "This teaching" is the one restated at 129.4 ff., that the state of living without property is more perfect than any civil state; AB in marg.: ***Status exproprietarius approbatur a tota Trinitate*** (129.32). Beasts and man in the state of innocence are cited, it seems, as holding nothing as property.
2. Cestrensis, "the man of Chester", is Ranulf Higden, ***Polychronicon***; Loserth corrects the chapter: not 86 but 26, "tom. V, 130" (130.4; Rolls Series V, 130, where the cry ***Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei*** is the devil's, ***hostis antiquus***, not an angel's). The voice is the legend attached to Constantine's endowment of the church. AB in marg.: ***Vox hodie effusum est venenum*** (130.7).
3. ***Dampnantis ut hereticum quod ...***: the participle agrees with ***Pseudochristi***, and the ***quod***-clause is what he condemns: that the descendants (***genus***) of the endowers can cleanse the church of the stain, i.e. take the endowment back. ***Possunt*** is plural with the collective ***genus***. ***Capitalis defendens***: "the chief man who defends", the leader of that party; ***istam sentenciam*** here is the condemning teaching just named, not the teaching of 129.32.
4. ***Differendum ... utrique***: ***differendum*** read as ***deferendum***, "deference is to be shown"; ***utrique***, strictly "to each of two", is rendered "to each" (a doubt: the two may be the man and his state). Decretum D.82 c.5 ***Presbiter*** (Loserth 130.26; the modern form is ours). AB in marg.: ***Status multos si tenet homo*** (130.19).
5. Pharaoh's dreams, Gen. 41; Nebuchadnezzar's vision in the furnace, Dan. 3:92 (so q. 35; Wyclif's ***propheciam*** may also recall Dan. 2); Caiaphas, John 11:51 (DR "being the high priest of that year, he prophesied"). The ***Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti*** (Wyclif: ***legis***), q. 35, now given to Ambrosiaster; Loserth refers to Augustine, ***Opera*** III, Appendix, p. 53 (131.3); q. 35 (PL 35, 2234) gives David's honouring of Saul, Pharaoh's dream and Nebuchadnezzar's vision as owed to the royal order; Caiaphas comes from q. 101 (PL 35, 2302), not q. 35. 1 Kings 24 (1 Sam. 24): David spares Saul as "the Lord's anointed" (24:7).
6. Wis. 6:6 (DR; Wyclif puts ***Durissimum*** first). ***Hiis*** and ***fiet*** were read on the plate.
7. ***Cum sit accidens tam parve constancie quod sit inalterabilis***: ***cum*** is taken as concessive and the ***quod***-clause as the content of ***videtur*** ("it seems that a state, although ..., is unalterable"). Taken as ***tam ... quod*** ("of so slight constancy that it is unalterable") the clause contradicts itself. This is the first of the three arguments answered at 132.21 ff.
8. Augustine: sin is nothing, and men become nothing when they sin (***In Iohannis evangelium*** tr. 1.13, PL 35, 1385: ***peccatum nihil est, et nihil fiunt homines cum peccant***). Loserth gives no reference. This is the third argument, answered at 133.26.
9. ***Sic enim***: Judas lived without property among the apostles, yet his state was the vilest, so the excellence of a state cannot be read from its kind. B reads ***vilissimis*** (132.5). A in marg.: ***Nota optime*** (132.4).
10. ***De Consolatione*** is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read ***de questione*** (132.7). Boethius, ***Consolatio*** III pr. 2, beatitude as "a state made perfect by the gathering of all goods" (***beatitudinem statum bonorum omnium congregatione perfectum***, PL 63, 724; Loserth gives 720).
11. The print has ***gracia concomitante*** (132.14, so the plate) where the line before has ***gracia concomitancie***; we read ***concomitancie*** (our emendation) and render it as the same phrase, "by reason of concomitance" (***gracia*** with a genitive, "for the sake of"). As an ablative absolute it would be "concomitant grace" (a glossary term, ***gracia concomitans***), which cannot be "bettered or worsened ... on account of vice". AB in marg.: ***Mutari dicitur aliquid dupliciter*** (132.11).
12. ***Caritate*** is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read ***caritatem*** (132.19). ***Ipsa*** is taken as charity. "Formed ... unformed": formed faith and unformed faith, faith formed by charity.
13. ***Triplex primum argumentum***: the three-part argument first stated (130.19–131.12: many states at once, deference to the sinning superior, the gravity of a lofty sinner's sin), set against the "three following arguments" (131.12 ff.) now answered in turn. ***Quamvis autem ... tamen***: the ***autem*** only continues the period. B reads ***policitus*** (132.31). B in marg.: ***Ad primum*** (132.23).
14. ***Naturas universalium et reduplicativas***: ***reduplicativas*** agrees with ***naturas***: natures taken reduplicatively, the state "as a state". ***Status disposicionis*** and ***status virtutis*** are Wyclif's names. ***Exitus***: the end of life. AB in marg.: ***Ad 2*** (133.10); and at 132.30, ***Diversitas statuum. Dignum et indignum stat eundem esse hominem***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 130: ***illum***
  - 130: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 131: ***hiis***
  - 131: ***fiet***
  - 132: ***non***
  - 132: ***con-*** (hyphenated con-comitative; main token holds first half, 25 is the line number)

Part 9: The duty of reproving superiors

Loserth pp. 133.26–135.11

¶1 133.26–135.11
133.26 *Duty of reproving superiors.*

[133] **Ad tercium patet quod status denigratur vel serenatur solummodo concomitanter, et hoc quoad Deum, quomodo omne**

To the third it is clear that a state is blackened or made bright only concomitantly, and this as regards God, in the way that every mortal

134.15 *Our attack on the pseudopope is not personal except to any who feels that it fits him.*

mortale denigrat, et super isto currunt multe leges hominum propter quas pusillanimes timent sibi nedum corripere sed peccata publice predicare, ut V decretalium De Hereticis cap. Cum ex iniuncto in fine prohibetur quod inferior publice corripiat patrem suum; et [134] multe sunt leges huiusmodi, que omnes intelliguntur quod nemo debet illegitime fratrem suum corripere; non enim subiacet ordinacioni humane correpcionem fraternam quam Christus precipit Matth. XVIII cap. prohibere. Nec debet quis attemptare corripere suum prepositum, nisi propter defectum notorium, quem dicere debet ecclesie, quando prepositus notorie excidit a racione patris et pastoris. Quando scilicet nec gignit nec fovet subditum verbo Dei, tunc enim est tam expers racionis patris quam expers est quilibet a quocumque patris opere alienus; unde peccant qui mendaciter tales patres nominant vel pastores. Sed ut procedam minus intricabiliter et remocius a verbis scandali, securius servo me in verbis generalibus et condicionalibus, que ad auditorium et personam rei debent faciliter applicari efficaciter ad errantem, ut nullus papa nisi forte sibi conscius imponeret sibi raciones declaratas superius convenire autonomatice pseudopape. Unde non evidencius posset quis scandalizare se ipsum, quam sibi applicare sine pluri data evidencia verbum huiusmodi generale. Sic enim exierunt incipiendo a senioribus adulteram accusantes Joh. VIII. Sic et sacerdotes et Pharisei cognoverunt quod Christus de ipsis diceret in suis parabolis, Matth. XXI. Quod si probabiliter cognovero, quod predicans applicat ad me verbum huiusmodi generale, examinabo primo veritatem sentencie, secundo utrum in hoc sum conscius michi ipsi. Et tercio festinanter instar me ipsum corrigere et reddendo Deo gracias verba generalia nitar equaliter tollerare, quia nimis ostendunt suam stulticiam, qui ex talibus verbis communibus [135] convincunt illegitimam correpcionem vel scandalum, verumtamen sciens peccatum quantumcumque alti prepositi esse notorium et periculosum ecclesie, debet ex fervore spiritus peccatorem quem credit aliunde non corrigi publice arguere cum Johanne, ut patet Mar. VI de Herode; oportet tamen in talibus quod homo a se ipso correpcionem incipiat et pura intencione procedat et utrobique sensui legis Domini innitatur, pro cuius exposicione nullus fidelium offendetur, ut patet de Paulo.

[sin] blackens. And on this point run many laws of men, on account of which the faint-hearted fear for themselves not only to reprove but to preach sins publicly; as in book 5 of the Decretals, *On Heretics*, chapter *Cum ex iniuncto*, at the end, it is forbidden that an inferior should publicly reprove his father.[1] And [134] there are many laws of this kind, which are all understood [to mean] that no one ought to reprove his brother unlawfully; for it is not subject to human ordinance to forbid the fraternal correction which Christ commands in Matthew 18. Nor ought anyone to attempt to reprove his superior except for a notorious fault, which he ought to tell to the church, when the superior notoriously falls away from the character of father and shepherd: namely, when he neither begets nor nourishes his subject with the word of God; for then he is as devoid of the character of a father as anyone is who is a stranger to every work of a father. Hence those sin who lyingly name such men fathers or shepherds.[2] But that I may proceed less intricately and further from words of scandal, I keep myself, more safely, to general and conditional words, which should be applied easily to the audience and the person concerned, and effectively to the one who errs, so that no pope, unless perhaps one conscious [of it] in himself, would take upon himself that the reasons declared above fit the pseudopope by antonomasia.[3] Hence no one could scandalize himself more evidently than by applying to himself, without more evidence given, a general word of this kind. For so those who accused the adulteress went out, beginning at the eldest (John 8). So too the priests and Pharisees knew that Christ was speaking of them in his parables (Matthew 21).[4] And if I shall know with probability that the preacher applies to me a general word of this kind, I will examine first the truth of the teaching, second whether in this I am conscious [of it] in myself; and third I will press on speedily to correct myself, and, giving thanks to God, I will strive to bear general words with an even mind;[5] for those show their folly exceedingly who from such common words [135] make out unlawful reproof or scandal. Nevertheless one who knows that the sin of a superior, however high, is notorious and dangerous to the church ought, out of fervour of spirit, publicly to rebuke the sinner whom he believes will not otherwise be corrected, as John did, as is clear in Mark 6 concerning Herod. Yet in such cases a man must begin the correction from himself, and proceed with pure intention, and on both sides rely on the sense of the law of the Lord, at the exposition of which none of the faithful will be offended, as is clear of Paul.[6]

Notes

1. "The third" is the third argument (131.30 ff.). ***Solummodo*** is Loserth's reading; the manuscript has ***sodo*** (133.27). ***Cum ex iniuncto*** is Innocent III's decretal in ***Decretales Gregorii IX*** 5.7.12, under ***De haereticis***, whose close forbids ***patrem suum etiam delinquentem reprehendere manifeste***; Loserth's reference reads "Decr. Greg. IX, Lib. V, tit. XXXII, cap. 2" (133.32), which is the homonymous X 5.32.2 (***De novi operis nunciatione***, also ***Quum ex iniuncto***), not the decretal meant. AB in marg.: ***Ad tercium*** (133.26); ***Corripere potest subditus prepositum*** (133.30).
2. Matt. 18:15–17 (DR "tell the church", 18:17). B omits ***patres*** (134.13). ***Racio patris***: what makes a man a father, here "the character of father".
3. ***Ad*** (***ad auditorium***) is supplied by Loserth; the manuscripts omit it (134.16). B omits ***et*** (134.16) and reads ***et rei*** (134.17). The construal of ***debent faciliter applicari efficaciter ad errantem*** is doubtful: taken as two applications, easy to the hearers and effective to the one who errs; alternatively "should be applied easily and effectively to the one who errs". ***Raciones declaratas superius***: presumably the marks of the false christ set out at 125.32 ff.
4. John 8:9 (DR "went out one by one, beginning at the eldest"); Matt. 21:45 (DR "the chief priests and Pharisees ... knew that he spoke of them"; Wyclif has ***sacerdotes***, "priests").
5. ***Instar*** is read as the deponent future of ***instare***, "I will press on", matching ***nitar*** beside it; the plate shows ***instar***. ***Equaliter***, "equally", is rendered "with an even mind".
6. ***Pro cuius*** is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read ***procius*** (135.10). Mark 6:18 (DR "For John said to Herod: It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife"). "As is clear of Paul": no reference is given; perhaps Gal. 2:11–14, Paul withstanding Peter to the face (our suggestion).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 133: ***concomitanter*** [NW]
  - 134: ***corripere***
  - 134: ***condicionalibus*** [NW]
  - 134: ***efficaciter*** (efncaciter -> efficaciter (scans: efncaciter | eincaciter | efficaciter | efncaciter))
  - 134: ***instar*** (134.31; checked on the plate during translation: the print reads ***instar***)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Causes ot Peter's primacy. (135.13).

Chapter 7

Part 1: Peter's preeminence lies in service, not lordship

Loserth pp. 135.13–138.31

¶1 135.13–135.21
135.13 *Causes of Peter's primacy.*
135.22 *Humility.*
135.25 *Mildness.*

[135]**Sed ulterius transcurrendum est per argumenta capta ex fide evangelii, ut sciatur quam sentenciam reportant in testimonium veritatis. Ex primo itaque argumento capto a diffinicione Christi Luce XXII elicitur, quod preeminencia Petri in alios non stat in honore, in dominatu vel gloria seculari sed in omnino oppositis. Patet primo ex hoc quod stat in fidei sinceritate et humilitate et in servitute, ut patet ex dictis.**

But further we must run through the arguments drawn from the faith of the gospel, so that it may be known what teaching they bring back in testimony of the truth. From the first argument, then, taken from Christ's definition in Luke 22, it is drawn out that the preeminence of Peter over others does not consist in honour, in lordly rule or secular glory, but in the wholly opposite things. This is clear, first, from this: that it consists in sincerity of faith and in humility and in servitude, as is clear from what has been said.[1]

¶2 135.22–135.24

[135]**Similiter primatus Petri stat in preeminencia sequendi Christum in moribus; Christus autem omnia predicta abnuit et condiciones oppositas acceptavit.**

Likewise, the primacy of Peter consists in preeminence in following Christ in conduct; now Christ refused all the aforesaid things and accepted the opposite conditions.[2]

¶3 135.25–136.14

[135]**Similiter, Luce XXII; 26 sic loquitur: Qui maior est vestrum, fiat ut minor. Constat autem ex doctrina prima Petri II quod maiores in ecclesia debent esse quasi modo geniti infantes, qui magis alienati sunt ab honore, a dominatu vel gloria seculari; debet autem primas post Christum esse minor, ad serviendum flexibilior, ut dicitur** [136]**Matth. XX. Sic enim Christus fuit omnium hominum servus necessarior ac mitior, ut docet Ambrosius epistola, et Augustinus De Verbis Domini sermone VIII: hominem coaptatum unam fecit Deus cum servo personam. Voluit inquam regnum suum conquirere per humilem pacienciam iniurie, et cetera arma virtutum et non per gentilem dominatum, quem apostolis suis prohibuit, sed reverti voluit ad iudicium in celesti Dominio glorioso. Unde infidelior, horribilior et stulcior non posset fieri argucia quam ex vicaria primatus Petri et Christi eius magistri, arguere vel fundare in eorum vicariis triplicitatem predictam mundanam, cum omnino contrarium inferatur.**

Likewise, Luke 22:26 speaks thus: "He that is the greater of you, let him become as the younger."[3] **Now it is evident from the teaching of 1 Peter 2 that the greater in the church ought to be as newborn babes, who are more estranged from honour, from lordly rule or secular glory; and the primate after Christ ought to be the lesser, more pliant to serve, as is said in** [136]**Matthew 20.**[4] **For so Christ was the servant of all men, more needful and milder [than any], as Ambrose teaches in an epistle; and Augustine, *On the Words of the Lord*, sermon 8: having fitted the man [to himself], God made one person with the servant.**[5] **He willed, I say, to conquer his kingdom by humble patience under injury and the other arms of the virtues, and not by gentile lordly rule, which he forbade to his apostles; but he willed to return to judgement in glorious heavenly lordship.**[6] **Hence no more faithless, more horrible or more foolish quibble could be made than, from the vicarship of the primacy of Peter and of Christ his master, to argue or ground in their vicars the aforesaid worldly threefold [honour, lordly rule and glory], since altogether the contrary is inferred.**

¶4 136.16–137.31

[136] **Pro declaracione vero istius materie adduxi alia multa testimonia de Christo et unum de beato Bernhardo oportet repetere. Nam libro secundo ad Eugenium ita scribit: Quid dimisit tibi sanctus apostolus, quod habeo, hoc tibi do. Quid illud? Unum scio: non est aurum neque argentum, cum ipse dicat: argentum et aurum non est michi. Si habere contingat, utere non pro libitu sed pro tempore. Sic eris utens illis quasi non utens. Ipsa quidem ad animi bonum non spectant, cuiusmodi sunt divicie, nec sunt per se bona nec mala, usus autem horum bonus, abusio mala, sollicitudo peior, questus turpior. Esto ut alia racione hec tibi vendices sed non apostolico iure. Nec enim ille tibi dare potuit quod non habuit; quod habuit hoc dedit, sollicitudinem ut dixi super ecclesias. Numquid dominacionem?** [137] **Audi ipsum: non dominantes, ait, in clero, sed forma facti gregis. Et ne dictum sola humilitate putes non eciam veritate, vox Domini est in evangelio: Reges gencium dominantur eorum etc. Et infert: vos autem non sic. Planum est, apostolis interdicitur dominatus. Et igitur tu tibi usurpare audes aut dominans apostolatum aut apostolicus dominatum. Planum est, ab utroque prohiberis. Si utrumque simul habere voles, perdes utrumque. Alioquin non te exceptum de illorum numero putes, de quibus Deus sic conqueritur: Ipsi regnaverunt et non ex me, principes extiterunt et non cognovi eos. Iam si regnare sine Deo iuvat, habes gloriam sed non apud Deum, at si interdictum tenemus audiamus edictum, id est qui maior est vestrum, fiat sicut minor et qui precessor est sicut qui ministrat, forma apostolica hec est, dominacio interdicitur, indicitur ministracio, que et commendatur exemplo ipsius legislatoris, qui secutus adiungit, ego autem in medio vestrum sum tamquam qui ministrat. Ecce quam breviter iste sanctus et quam plane dilucidat sentenciam sepedictam tamquam sequentem formaliter ex scriptura, et revera dampnare, hereticare vel impugnare sentenciam tam sancti, tam devoti, tam profundi atque subtilis theologi sicut fuit beatus Bernhardus ab ecclesia canonizatus et in celo cum angelis gloriosus propter istam sentenciam quam verbo docuit et exemplo, videretur nimis ceca presumpcio et specialiter in materia fidei quam dictavit tam lex Christi quam lex naturalis.**

And for the declaration of this matter I have adduced many other testimonies about Christ, and one from blessed Bernard I must repeat. For in the second book *To Eugenius* he writes thus: "What did the holy apostle leave you? 'What I have, this I give you.' What is that? One thing I know: it is not gold or silver, since he himself says: 'Silver and gold I have none.' If it happens that you have it, use it not at your pleasure but as the time requires. So you will be using them as though not using them. These things, indeed, of which kind are riches, do not bear on the good of the soul; they are neither good nor bad in themselves, but the use of them is good, the abuse bad, anxiety over them worse, gain from them more shameful. Grant that you claim these for yourself on some other ground, but not by apostolic right. For he could not give you what he did not have; what he had, that he gave: anxiety, as I have said, over the churches. Was it the exercise of lordship?[7] [137] **Hear him: 'Neither as lording it over the clergy,' he says, 'but being made a pattern of the flock.' And lest you think this said only from humility and not also in truth, the voice of the Lord is in the gospel: 'The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them,' etc. And he adds: 'But you not so.' It is plain: lordly rule is forbidden to the apostles. And so you dare to usurp for yourself either the apostolate as one who lords it, or lordly rule as an apostolic man. Plainly you are forbidden either. If you wish to have both at once, you will lose both.**[8] **Otherwise do not think yourself excepted from the number of those of whom God thus complains: 'They have reigned, but not by me: they have been princes, and I knew them not.' If it now delights you to reign without God, you have glory, but not with God. But if we hold to the prohibition, let us hear the edict, that is: 'He that is the greater of you, let him become as the younger, and he that is the leader, as he that serveth.' This is the apostolic form: the exercise of lordship is forbidden, ministry is enjoined; and it is also commended by the example of the lawgiver himself, who, following on, adds: 'But I am in the midst of you, as he that serveth.'"**[9] **Behold how briefly this saint, and how plainly, sets out the oft-mentioned teaching as following formally from scripture. And in truth to condemn, to pronounce heretical, or to impugn the teaching of so holy, so devout, so profound and subtle a theologian as was blessed Bernard, canonized by the church and glorious in heaven with the angels, on account of this teaching which he taught by word and example, would seem an exceedingly blind presumption, and especially in a matter of faith which both the law of Christ and the natural law dictated.**[10]

¶5 137.32–138.22
138.3 *He taught that the Pope should not exercise secular rule.*

[137] Constat quidem ex dictis sanctorum et testatur canon XXIV q. III cap. Heresis, quod qui aliter [138] intelligit scripturam sacram, quam Spiritus Sanctus flagitat, adiuncta pertinacia, est expresse hereticus. Iste autem sanctus intellexit et expressit tam opere quam sermone quod non licet sacerdoti Christi, specialiter Romano pontifici, seculariter vel civiliter dominari, in tantum quod papatus et vera secularis dominacio qualis est licita in laycis formaliter contradicunt. Et virtute huius precepti vixerunt apostoli, sancti monachi et mendicantes exproprietarie, usque hodie dicentes tam vita quam verbo quod Dominus suis sacerdotibus hoc precipit; aliquos tamen voluit habere usum temporalium largius et alios striccius ex titulo elemosine secularium dominorum subducto seculari dominio. Unde credo beatum Bernhardum habuisse noticiam de toxico dominandi in Romano pontifice; et ideo dicit libro III ad Eugenium: Nullum tibi venenum, nullum gladium plus formido, quam libidinem dominandi; non enim sequitur ex primo testimonio scripture Luce XX, quo docetur Petrum super alios preeminere sed eius oppositum.

It is evident, indeed, from the sayings of the saints, and the canon attests it, 24, question 3, chapter *Heresis*, that whoever "understands [138] holy scripture otherwise than the Holy Spirit demands", with pertinacity added, is expressly a heretic.[11] Now this saint understood and expressed, by deed as much as by word, that it is not lawful for a priest of Christ, especially the Roman pontiff, to exercise lordship secularly or civilly, so much so that the papacy and true secular exercise of lordship, such as is lawful in lay people, formally contradict each other. And by virtue of this precept the apostles lived, and holy monks and mendicants, without property, saying down to this day by life as well as by word that the Lord commands this to his priests; yet he willed some to have the use of temporal goods more largely and others more strictly, by title of the alms of secular lords, secular lordship being withdrawn.[12] Hence I believe that blessed Bernard had knowledge of the poison of lording it in the Roman pontiff; and therefore he says in book 3 *To Eugenius*: "No poison, no sword do I fear more for you than the lust of lordship."[13] For from the first testimony of scripture, Luke 20, by which it is taught that Peter is preeminent over others, [lordship] does not follow, but its opposite.[14]

¶6 138.23–138.31

[138] Et ideo libro II declarans pape officium: Si hec facis, inquit, honorificas ministerium tuum, non mediocris est iste principatus. Hoc enim est extirpare malas bestias a terminis tuis, quo greges tui securi in pascua educantur. Domabis lupos sed ovibus non dominaberis. Pascendas utique non premendas suscepisti. Timebat enim iste sanctus ex dominacione illius sedis subversionem vocate ecclesie.

And therefore in book 2, declaring the pope's office, he says: "If you do these things, you honour your ministry; not mean is this principate. For this is to root out evil beasts from your borders, so that your flocks may be led out safe to pasture. You will tame the wolves, but you will not lord it over the sheep. You took them up to be fed, not to be oppressed." For this saint feared, from the exercise of lordship of that see, the subversion of the so-called church.[15]

Notes

1. Luke 22:24–27, Christ's ruling on which of the disciples is the greater. *Argumenta capta ex fide evangelii*: a participle governs *ex*, so "drawn from the faith of the gospel", not the formula "as faith teaches".
2. *Autem* brings the second premiss; the conclusion (Peter's primacy lies in the opposite of honour, lordly rule and glory) is left to the reader. A in marg.: *2* (135.22), *3* (135.26). *Acceptavit* was read on the plate.
3. Luke 22:26 (DR "he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger"); Wyclif has *vestrum* for *in vobis* and *ut* for *sicut*, translated. *Minor* is DR's "younger"; in Wyclif's own sentence that follows it is "the lesser".
4. B omits *infantes qui magis* (135.29). 1 Pet. 2:2 (DR "As newborn babes"). Matt. 20:26–27 (DR "whosoever is the greater among you, let him be your minister"). *Primas*: the holder of the primacy.
5. Ambrose, "in an epistle": not identified. Augustine, *De verbis Domini* sermon 8 (Loserth, *Opera* V, 373; 136.3): the words are *Sermo* 67.7 (PL 38, 436), *suscepit plenum hominem: coaptat sibi, unam facit Dominus cum servo personam. Hominem coaptatum unam fecit Deus cum servo personam* is construed with *Deus* as subject: the man fitted to the Word, and one person with the "form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7); alternatively "God made the man he fitted [to himself] one person with the servant". *Necessarior ac mitior* are comparatives without a stated term.
6. *Virtutum*: the manuscripts read *veritatum* (136.7); Loserth's correction is translated. Gentile lordly rule: Luke 22:25.

7. Bernard, *De consideratione* II.6.10 (PL 182, 748, as Loserth: ch. 6, *Opera* (Migne) I, 748; 136.19; the quotation runs into II.6.11). Acts 3:6 (DR "Silver and gold I have none; but what I have, I give thee"); 1 Cor. 7:31 (DR "as if they used it not"). *Utere* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *vere* (136.23); at 136.24 they read *malicia temporis*, apparently for *pro tempore*. A in marg.: *Nota. Nota beatum Bernardum contra dominacionem cleri sed non contra temporalium possessionem et appropriacionem evangelicam*; B in marg.: *Quid dimisit Petrus suis successoribus* (136.18).
8. 1 Pet. 5:3 (DR, without "from the heart"); Luke 22:25–26 (DR). *Et igitur tu tibi usurpare audes* is translated as printed; Bernard's text (II.6.11, PL 182, 748) has *I ergo tu, et tibi usurpare aude* ("Go then, and dare ...", ironic). The manuscripts read *aut dominus ... aut apostolatus dominium* (137.7–8); Loserth prints Bernard's *aut dominans apostolatum aut apostolicus dominatum*.
9. Hos. 8:4 (DR "They have reigned, but not by me: they have been princes, and I knew not"; Bernard adds *eos*, "them"). Luke 22:26 (DR "he that is the leader, as he that serveth"; Bernard has *vestrum*); Luke 22:27 (DR; *tamquam* for *sicut*). *Que et commendatur* is wanting in the manuscripts and supplied by Loserth (137.18); they read *adiungi* for *adiungit* (137.19).
10. *Sententiam sepedictam*: the teaching that Peter's preeminence lies in service, not in lordship (135.15 ff.). *Dictavit* is singular with the two laws as subject.
11. Decretum C.24 q.3 c.27 *Heresis* (Jerome, on Gal. 5); Loserth gives no reference. The canon reads *quam sensus Spiritus sancti flagitat*; Wyclif drops *sensus*, and *adiuncta pertinacia* is his own; his wording is translated. *Scripturam* and *quam* were read on the plate.
12. *Autem* brings the second premiss: whoever understands scripture otherwise than the Spirit demands, pertinaciously, is a heretic; now Bernard understood it so; the conclusion, that those who condemn him on this point fall under the canon, is left implicit. *Ex titulo elemosine ... subducto seculari dominio*: the clergy hold temporal goods as alms of the lords, lordship being withdrawn from the clergy.
13. Bernard, *De consideratione* III.1.2 (PL 182, 759; Loserth prints "p. 769"; 138.18). *Formido* is the verb, "I fear", not the noun "misgiving".
14. "Luke 20" as printed; the first testimony was Luke 22 (135.15), and *XX* may be a slip for *XXII*. The subject of *non sequitur* is unexpressed: "lordship" is supplied from the context; alternatively "it does not follow ... that Peter is preeminent, but its opposite", which sits ill with *quo docetur*.
15. Bernard, *De consideratione* II.6.13 (PL 182, 749, as Loserth: ch. 6, p. 749; 138.24). Loserth notes that Bernard reads *ministerium tuum et ministerium te* (you honour your ministry, and your ministry you); the print is translated. *Vocata ecclesia*: the church so called, not the true church.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 135: *CAPITULUM SEPTIMUM.*
  - 135: *acceptavit* (print has line 25 acceptavit, missing from main scan; print has v)
  - 135: *26*
  - 135: *sic loquitur* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 135: *Qui maior* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 136: *habeo*
  - 136: *illis*
  - 136: *divicie* (print has v)
  - 137: *Deus*
  - 137: *audiamus* (15 is the line number)
  - 137: *hereticare* [NW]
  - 138: *scripturam*
  - 138: *quam*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Causes ot Peter's primacy. (135.13).

Part 2: The keys are power and knowledge, given to every priest

Loserth pp. 138.32–142.12

¶1 138.32–141.15
139.1 *Peter was not to maintain his primacy by force,*
140.10 *The gift of the keys was to Peter as attorney for the Church.*
140.22 *Paul held the keys (knowledge and power) even better than Peter.*

[138] Quantum ad secundum argumentum de illo Matth. X, ubi recitatis nominibus apostolorum Petrus preponitur, indubie notatur primatus Petri, [139] quem Christus intenderat, ut scilicet Petrus sit capitaneus et pugil precipuus ad ducendum Christi exercitum sibi similius, scilicet fide, humilitate et passione, ideo Petrus querendo de vita evangeliste signantis vitam contemplativam recepit responsum a Deo: Quid ad te, tu me sequere Joh. ultimo, 19. Istum igitur

As to the second argument, from that [text] of Matthew 10, where in the listing of the names of the apostles Peter is put first, the primacy of Peter is without doubt marked, [139] which Christ had intended: namely, that Peter should be captain and chief champion, to lead Christ's army more closely like himself, that is, in faith, humility and suffering. So Peter, asking about the life of the evangelist, who signifies the contemplative life, received an answer from God: "What is it to thee? Follow thou

141.16 *John XXII an others forged keys which subjected simple men to their tyranny.*
141.29 *It is false that the keys mean excommunication and absolution.*

sensum comportant argumenta duo facta, ut sepe repecii, et non dominacionem vel honorem secularem, aut, ut dicit Bernhardus, potestatem seculariter castigandi; sicut caput verbis et intuitu, non autem corporali invasione vel instrumentali defensione, pascit et regit residuum corporis, quod si pape deficiunt visus, auditus et omnis sensus ad regendum capitaliter corpus Christi, quid sibi et pape vel capiti Christi ecclesie? Revera nulla eleccio vel approbacio humana potest facere quod talis fit caput vel articulus Christi ecclesie, sed mendaciter presumendo sic nomen fit caput ecclesie malignancium et synagoge sathane. Homo enim habet ex se potenciam vadendi et esse membrum dyaboli, sed non habet nisi a Deo esse membrum ecclesie; oportet enim proximum Christi vicarium esse instar sui spiritualem, ut docet Luce IX, 55, 56 de tribus apostolis appetentibus humanam vindictam: Nescitis, inquit Christus, cuius spiritus estis, filius hominis non venit animas perdere sed salvare. Miticia namque et non guerra possidebunt terram vivencium, ut docet Veritas Matth. V. Et hinc notat Crysostomus super primam epistolam Thym. Omelie V: Non, inquit, ait apostolus auctorabiliter neque dominative neque cum potestate, sed fili, ait, Thymothee, et ideo [140]dicit Bernhardus, quod pascendas non premendas suscepit Eugenius oves Christi; debet enim pugnare tamquam spiritualis miles cum gladio spiritus, ad spiritualem Dei iniuriam vindicandam. Sed postquam mixta est cum religione sacerdotum civilitas, surrepsit in clero superbia, civilis exaccio et monstruosum dominium, ita quod illud Psalmi IX de Antichristo loquentis verificatur hodie: Dum superbit impius, incenditur pauper. Et quantum ad illud tactum de clavibus singulariter datis Petro, ut dictum est, nulli fideli licet ambigere; quin Petrus tamquam generalis attornatus gerebat personam ecclesie, ubi recepit potestatem non singulariter pro se et quocumque Romano pontifice sed generaliter et supereminenter pro quocumque sacerdote similius sequenti, cui est quicumque locus vel eleccio humana impertinens, quia donacio istarum clavium est divinum misterium. Sunt enim dicte claves potestas et sciencia ad edificandum ecclesiam, que signanter debent esse in quolibet sacerdote, et (ut credo) erant in Paulo excellencius quam in Petro. Cum enim impium videtur sine racione ponere in Petro ocium et potestatis abusum, Paulus autem ex fide scripture prima Cor. XV, 10 plus omnibus laboravit, videtur quod habuit amplius potestatis; laboravit, inquam, evangelizando, scribendo et persecuciones amplius paciendo, et clavis potestatis regiminis quam dicimus auctoritatem singulariter Petro competere non fundatur. Potestas enim ad regendum ecclesiam [141]datur unicuique episcopo, quantum potest

me" (John 21 [the last chapter], 19).[1] This sense, therefore, the two arguments put forward carry, as I have often repeated, and not exercise of lordship or secular honour, or, as Bernard says, a power of chastising in secular fashion. Just as the head feeds and rules the rest of the body by words and by its gaze, but not by bodily assault or defence with weapons, so if the pope lacks sight, hearing and every sense for ruling the body of Christ as head, what has he to do with "pope" or "head of Christ's church"?[2] In truth no human election or approval can make such a man become head or joint of Christ's church; but by lyingly presuming the name in this way he becomes head of "the assembly of the malignant" and of "the synagogue of Satan".[3] For a man has of himself the power of going off and of being a member of the devil, but he has it only from God to be a member of the church; for the nearest vicar of Christ must be spiritual after his likeness, as Luke 9:55–56 teaches about the three apostles who desired human vengeance: "You know not," says Christ, "of what spirit you are. The Son of man came not to destroy souls, but to save." For meekness, and not war, shall possess the land of the living, as the Truth teaches in Matthew 5.[4] And hence Chrysostom notes on the First Epistle to Timothy, homily 5: "The apostle does not speak," he says, "authoritatively, nor in lordly fashion, nor with power, but says 'son Timothy'"; and therefore [140]Bernard says that Eugenius received the sheep of Christ "to be fed, not to be oppressed".[5] For he ought to fight as a spiritual soldier with the sword of the spirit, to avenge the spiritual injury done to God. But after civil standing was mingled with the religion of priests, pride crept into the clergy, civil exaction and monstrous lordship, so that that [verse] of Psalm 9, which speaks of Antichrist, is verified today: "Whilst the wicked man is proud, the poor is set on fire."[6] And as to the point touched on about the keys given singly to Peter, as has been said, it is not lawful for any of the faithful to doubt that Peter, as general attorney, bore the person of the church, where he received the power not singly for himself and any Roman pontiff whatever, but generally and preeminently for any priest whatever who follows [Christ] more closely, to whom any place or human election whatever is irrelevant, because the giving of these keys is a divine mystery.[7] For the said keys are power and knowledge for building up the church, which, significantly, ought to be in every priest, and (as I believe) were in Paul more excellently than in Peter. For since it seems impious to posit in Peter, without reason, idleness and abuse of power, but Paul, from the faith of scripture (1 Corinthians 15:10), "laboured more than all", it seems that he had more

matri sue proficere, sive evangelizando sive sacramenta ministrando sive oracione, contemplacione, exemplacione edificando. Unde propter excellenciam, quam debemus habere, claves iste dicuntur singulariter sacerdotibus Christi competere, sic quod potestas sit materiale spiritualis clavis presbiteri, et formale est sciencia Dei; non sciencia mathematica, non logica vel disputacio scolastica, sed sciencia scripture, quam episcopus debet excellenter cognoscere et docere. Unde sicut materia prima non potest esse sine forma materiali nec econtra, sic videtur michi quod potestas clavium sacerdotalium non potest esse sine predicta sciencia nec econtra.

of power: he laboured, I say, by preaching the gospel, by writing, and by suffering persecutions more abundantly. And that the key of the power of rule, which we call authority, belongs singly to Peter has no foundation.[8] For power to rule the church [141] is given to each bishop, as far as he can profit his mother, whether by preaching the gospel, or by ministering the sacraments, or by building up through prayer, contemplation and example. Hence, because of the excellence which we ought to have, these keys are said to belong singly to the priests of Christ, so that power is the material [element] of the presbyter's spiritual key, and the formal [element] is the knowledge of God: not mathematical knowledge, not logic or scholastic disputation, but the knowledge of scripture, which a bishop ought to know and teach excellently. Hence, just as prime matter cannot be without a material form, nor the converse, so it seems to me that the power of the priestly keys cannot be without the aforesaid knowledge, nor the converse.[9]

¶2 141.16–142.12

[141] Unde Johannes XXII et alii seculum sapientes, quia non excesserant in istis clavibus et earum officiis, finxerunt claves potestatis et auctoritatis, quas congregando pecunias simplices sue tyrannidi et ypocrisi subiecerunt. Sicut enim sunt due vie, una descendendi in viciis ad infernum et alia ascendendi in virtutibus ad ecclesiam triumphantem, sic sunt due porte sive introitus. Sacerdos autem debet habere claves ad serandum portas inferi a simplicibus sibi subditis et ad aperiendum simplicibus portas celi, et sic debet aperire pascendis ovibus thesaurum virtutum, et ipse primo virtuosis operibus sequelam ovium exemplantibus et excitantibus introire. Unde quotquot potestates vel sciencias tales prelatus habuit, tot claves habet, que omnes solum duas constituunt. Quod autem claves iste specificantur ad excomunicaciones et absoluciones, Deus huius seculi per fastum et avariciam cecando simplices introduxit. [142] Et sic intelligo decretum XXIV, q. I, Quodcumque cum eis similibus, que omnia oportet intelligi potestate militantis ecclesie non errante; quod solum est verum quando iudicio triumphantis ecclesie est conformis; non enim potest aliter aperire ianuam regni celorum eciam sibi ipsi. Si autem claves iste quoad materiam sint verse in affeccionem terrenam et quoad formam declinant monstruose a sciencia apostolorum ad artem luciferi, necesse est quod tales suis clavibus aperiant portas suas et dogmatizent discipulorum suorum precipicium ad infernum.

Hence John XXII and others who savour the world, because they had not excelled in these keys and their offices, invented keys of power and authority, by which, in gathering money, they subjected the simple to their tyranny and hypocrisy.[10] For just as there are two ways, one of descending by vices to hell and the other of ascending by virtues to the church triumphant, so there are two gates or entrances. And the priest ought to have keys to lock the gates of hell against the simple who are subject to him and to open the gates of heaven to the simple; and so he ought to open the treasure of virtues to the sheep that are to be fed, and himself to enter first, by virtuous works that give example to and stir up the following of the sheep.[11] Hence as many such powers or kinds of knowledge as a prelate has had, so many keys he has, and all of them make up only two. But that these keys are narrowed to excommunications and absolutions, the god of this world brought in, blinding the simple through pomp and avarice. [142] And so I understand the decree 24, q. 1, *Quodcumque*, with those like it: all of them must be understood [to hold] when the power of the church militant does not err, which is the case only when it is conformed to the judgement of the church triumphant; for otherwise it cannot open the door of the kingdom of heaven even to itself.[12] But if these keys, as to their matter, have been turned into earthly affection and, as to their form, swerve monstrously from the knowledge of the apostles to the art of Lucifer, it must be that such men with their

keys open their own gates and teach as dogma the headlong fall of their disciples into hell.[13]

Notes

1. Matthew 10:2 (DR "The first, Simon who is called Peter"). The words are John 21:22 (DR "what is it to thee? Follow thou me"); the printed verse 19 is where Christ first says "Follow me". The evangelist is John, the figure of the contemplative life. ***Sibi similius***: "more like himself", that is, like Christ. ***Capitaneus***: captain, kept apart from ***caput***.
2. Bernard's ***potestatem seculariter castigandi*** has no reference from Loserth here and is not in ***De consideratione***; cf. the sense of IV.3.7 (PL 182, 776: ***Quid tu denuo usurpare gladium tentes ...?***). ***Quid sibi et pape vel capiti ...***: the idiom of ***quid mihi et tibi***, "what has he to do with" the titles "pope" or "head". ***Sicut ... quod si***: the comparison is completed by the conditional, construed "so if".
3. Psalm 25:5 (DR "the assembly of the malignant"); Apocalypse 2:9 (DR "the synagogue of Satan"). ***Articulus***: a joint or limb of the body. ***Presumendo sic nomen***: construed "presuming the name in this way" (of head).
4. ***Potencia*** here is ordinary power, a man's ability to go astray, not Aristotle's potency. Luke 9:55–56 (DR); Luke 9:54 names two apostles, James and John, where Wyclif says three. ***Miticia ... possidebunt terram vivencium***: a paraphrase of Matthew 5:4 (DR "Blessed are the meek: for they shall possess the land") with the "land of the living" of Psalm 26:13; left unquoted.
5. Chrysostom, homily 5 on 1 Timothy: Loserth, ***Opera*** XI, 527 (139.31); Chrysostom on 1 Tim. 1:18: Paul charges him "not so much with arbitrary or despotic authority as like a father" (NPNF, read in English only). ***Fili Thymothee***: 1 Timothy 1:18 (DR "O son Timothy"). Bernard, ***De consideratione*** II.6.13 (PL 182, 749: ***Pascendas utique, non premendas suscepisti***), Loserth's ***ubi supra*** (140.1), quoted already at 138.24.
6. ***Miles***: the Pauline figure, "soldier" (Ephesians 6:17, DR "the sword of the Spirit"). Psalm 9:23 in the Vulgate (DR), which Loserth gives by the Hebrew numbering as Psalm 10:2 (140.9).
7. The editor's semicolon after ***ambigere*** parts the verb from its ***quin*** clause; the two are construed together. Matthew 16:19. ***Generalis attornatus***: the legal proctor who acts in another's person. A in marg. (139.30, again 140.19): "Peter received the keys not singly [139.30 ***simpliciter***] for himself but generally for the church"; A in marg. 140.7 ***Ad 2***, B "To the second in the second argument", A 140.10 "To 2 in the second argument": both readers mark the answer to the second argument.
8. 1 Corinthians 15:10: Wyclif's ***plus omnibus laboravit*** for the Vulgate's ***abundantius illis omnibus laboravi*** (DR "I have laboured more abundantly than all they"). ***Autem*** here sets Paul against Peter inside the ***cum*** clause ("but"). ***Clavis ... quam dicimus auctoritatem singulariter Petro competere non fundatur*** is construed with ***competere*** as what is unfounded; alternatively "the key ..., which we say belongs as authority singly to Peter, is not founded". AB in marg. 140.19: "The keys [are] power and knowledge for building up the church"; 140.25: "Paul had more of power".
9. ***Materiale / formale***: the pair of matter and form: power is the matter of the key, knowledge its form. ***Forma materialis***: the form that exists in matter. ***Matri sue***: the church as mother.
10. ***Quia non excesserant***: Loserth suggests adding ***parum*** (141.17: "because they had gone not a little too far"); the print construes and is translated. ***Seculum sapientes***: ***sapere*** "to savour". AB in marg. 141.17: "How the abuse of the keys comes about".
11. ***Sacerdos autem***: ***autem*** continues the figure of the gates ("and"). ***Sequela*** is the flock's following of Christ, not "what follows".
12. 2 Corinthians 4:4 (DR "the god of this world hath blinded"). Gratian, Decretum C. 24 q. 1 c. 6 ***Quodcumque*** (form ours; Loserth, foot: "Cap. VI"; Augustine, ***In Ioh.*** tr. 50, PL 187, 1267); B reads ***Quicunque*** (142.1–2). ***Potestate ... non errante*** is an ablative absolute, rendered "when the power ... does not err".
13. ***Portas suas***: the gates of hell, the second of the "two gates" above. ***Quoad materiam ... quoad formam*** takes up the matter (power) and form (knowledge) of the key.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 139: ***a Deo*** (one token covers two printed words)
  - 139: ***Quid***
  - 139: ***tu***
  - 139: ***sed fili*** (one token covers two printed words)
  - 140: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 140: ***supereminenter*** (hyphenated superemi-nenter; main token covers whole word)
  - 140: ∅ (second half of superemi-nenter, main scan already holds whole word)
  - 142: ***aliter*** (one word; print = aliter (no s); margin figure after it is a line number)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter's (142.13).

Part 3: Peter on the waters: the dragon, the ship and the propertyless way

Loserth pp. 142.13–146.33

¶1 142.13–144.30
142.13 *Peter's boldness in walking on the sea gives no authority to his vicar.*
142.32 *His courage should be an example,*
143.1 *teaching us not to fear worldly trouble,*
143.14 *In the Apocalypse the woman is the Church and the changing moon beneath her feet a symbol of things temporal.*
144.6 *The dragon signifies the chief Antichrist.*

[142] **Quantum ad tercium argumentum de adventu Petri ad dominum super aquas cum aliis exemplis audaciam Petri signantibus, patet quod docent ad sensum expositum vicarium Petri obligari diversissime ad faciendum similiter. Unde non video quomodo patencius, turpius aut convincibilius posset papa mendax allegare pro sua preeminencia quam afferre dictas autoritates ad confirmacionem sue preeminencie, faciendo ad sensum misticum eis contrarium; quia hoc esset afferre dampnacionem suam ex verbis propriis. Cum igitur ambulacio Petri super aquas signat suppeditacionem temporalium sub affeccione per quam viam vicarius Petri ut talis duceret ecclesiam plus vel minus, que maior confusio quam allegare illud iudicium ex lege Domini et cum hoc vivendo sub aquis mundi profundius in fastu et questu seculi, perplexius profundari? Deus enim ex ore proprio iudicat huiusmodi servum nequam. Si igitur sequimur Petrum moraliter in dictis audaciis, debemus postponere vecordiam omnium omissionum temporalium, omnium tribulacionum** [143] **corporalium et omnium amissionum favorum mundialium, ut similius sequamur Christum et Petrum et induemus formalius corpus suum, cum secundum doctrinam prima Petri V, 3 debemus esse forma facti gregis non coacte sed ex animo. Quomodo igitur non proficit sed officit ad hoc seculare dominium; unde beatus Evangelista prenuncius Antichristi, qui statum tocius ecclesie previdit prophetice Apoc. XII, 3— 4 sic effatur: Ecce, inquit, draco magnus rufus habens capita septem et cornua decem et in capitibus eius septem dyademata, eciam cauda eius trahebat terciam partem stellarum celi, et misit eas in terram, et draco stetit ante mulierem, que erat paritura, ut cum peperisset, filium devoraret. Mulier ista amicta sole habens lunam sub pedibus est mater ecclesia, sponsa Christi, habens ipsum qui est sol iusticia amplexantem, cum de sponso Cantic. II, 5 dicit sponsa Christi: Leva eius sub capite meo, et dextra illius amplexabatur me. Ista mulier habet lunam sub pedibus, quando omnia temporalia, que sunt ut luna mutabilia, appetitui ecclesie substernuntur iuxta illud Apostoli Philipp. III. Omnia detrimentum esse et arbitror ut stercora, ut Christum lucrifaciam. Hec mulier habet capitaliter duodecim apostolos et eorum veros vicarios; hec mulier, ut dicit Johannes, parturiens cruciatur ut pariat, quia Christi vicarii signando Christum in animabus fidelium, utrimque sicut oportet varie tribulantur, cum Act. XIV, 21 dicitur per multas tribulaciones oportet nos intrare in regnum celorum et prima Cor. IV, 15 post multas tribulaciones expressas dicit Apostolus in Christo Jesu per evangelium,** [144] **ego vos genui Et Gal. IV, 19 signanter dicit Apostolus: filioli mei quos iterum**

As to the third argument, from Peter's coming to the Lord over the waters, with other examples that signify Peter's boldness, it is clear that, in the sense expounded, they teach that the vicar of Peter is bound in the most diverse ways to do likewise.[1] Hence I do not see how a lying pope could allege for his preeminence more openly, more shamefully or more to his own conviction than by bringing the said authorities to confirm his preeminence while acting, in their mystical sense, contrary to them; for this would be to bring his own condemnation out of his own words. Since, therefore, Peter's walking on the waters signifies the treading underfoot of temporal goods in affection, by which way the vicar of Peter as such would lead the church more or less, what greater shame is there than to allege that judgement from the law of the Lord and, with this, living under the waters of the world more deeply in the pomp and gain of the world, to be sunk the more perplexedly? For God judges such a "wicked servant" out of his own mouth.[2] If, therefore, we follow Peter morally in the said acts of boldness, we must put behind us faint-heartedness at all the giving up of temporal goods, at all bodily [143] **tribulations and at all losses of worldly favours, so that we may follow Christ and Peter more closely and put on his body more formally, since according to the doctrine of 1 Peter 5:3 we must be "made a pattern of the flock", "not by constraint" but "from the heart".[3] How, therefore, secular lordship does not further this but hinders it [is clear]; hence the blessed Evangelist, who foretold Antichrist and prophetically foresaw the state of the whole church, speaks thus in Apocalypse 12:3–4: "Behold," he says, "a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns: and on his heads seven diadems. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered: that, when she should be delivered, he might devour her son."[4] This woman clothed with the sun, having the moon under her feet, is mother church, the bride of Christ, who has him that is the sun of justice embracing her, since the bride of Christ says of the bridegroom in the Canticle 2:5: "His left hand is under my head, and his right hand embraced me." This woman has the moon under her feet when all temporal goods, which are changeable like the moon, are laid beneath the appetite of the church, according to that [word] of the Apostle, Philippians 3: "I count all things to be but loss, and count them but as dung, that I may gain Christ."[5] This woman has at her head the twelve apostles and their true vicars; this woman, as John**

parturio, donec formetur Christus in vobis. Ideo dicitur quod mulier peperit filium masculum, qui redempturus est omnes gentes. Draco autem est quicumque capitalis in ecclesia Antichristi, draco propter venenum ypocrisis et voracitatem populi simplicis. Magnus autem propter pretensionem potencie, rufus propter effusionem sanguinis, quem consilio, auxilio et specialiter omissione causat in ecclesia ex consensu; necesse quidem est ut veniant bella inter gentes et regna pro inordinato amore temporalium, quando sacerdotes Christi, qui debent mundum relinquere, sunt maxime mundiales. Septem capita sunt universitas peccatorum vel evidenciarum, quibus suadet se esse caput ecclesie. Et decem cornua universitas potentatuum, qui militant sub vexillo huius principis Antichristi. Cauda eius est cleri communitas, que exemplo suo trahit stellas in terram, quando viros contemplativos inducit, ut deserentes splendorem virtutum et situm altum in firmamento ecclesie mundialiter conversantur. Oportet igitur quod Christi vicarius sit minime mundialis, ut patet Joh. XVII, et I. Joh. V, quia aliter submergit se in mari non cum Petro ambulans fideliter super aquas. Et iste sentencia evangelica movebat beatum Bernhardum libro III ad Eugenium, quando dixit: Nullum tibi venenum, nullum gladium tibi formido, quam libidinem dominandi.

says, travailing, is in pain to be delivered, because the vicars of Christ, in imprinting Christ in the souls of the faithful, are troubled on every side in various ways, as they must be, since in Acts 14:21 it is said, "through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of heaven", and in 1 Corinthians 4:15, after many tribulations set out, the Apostle says, "in Christ Jesus, by the gospel, [144]I have begotten you". And in Galatians 4:19 the Apostle says significantly: "My little children, of whom I am in labour again, until Christ be formed in you."[6] Therefore it is said that the woman "brought forth a man child", who is to redeem all nations.[7] And the dragon is whoever is chief in the church of Antichrist: a dragon because of the venom of hypocrisy and his devouring of the simple people. And great because of the pretension of power; red because of the shedding of blood which he causes in the church by counsel, by aid and especially by omission, through consent; for indeed it must be that wars come between nations and kingdoms for inordinate love of temporal goods when the priests of Christ, who ought to leave the world, are most worldly. The seven heads are the whole sum of the sins or evidences by which he persuades [men] that he is head of the church. And the ten horns are the whole sum of the potentates who serve as soldiers under the banner of this prince, Antichrist.[8] His tail is the commonalty of the clergy, which by its example draws the stars to the earth when it induces contemplative men to forsake the splendour of the virtues and their high station in the firmament of the church and to live in worldly fashion. Therefore the vicar of Christ must be least worldly of all, as is clear from John 17 and 1 John 5, for otherwise he plunges himself into the sea, not walking faithfully with Peter upon the waters. And this gospel teaching moved blessed Bernard, in book 3 to Eugenius, when he said: "I fear no poison for you, no sword, [more] than the lust of lordship."[9]

¶2 144.31–146.22
145.1 *How the ship of the Church is to be navigated.*
145.15 *The navigator must follow Christ in humility and poverty.*
146.5 *The rich man may be saved by Christ's power, but the way of poverty is safer.*

[144]Unde Augustinus sermone XIV De Verbis Domini notans navicellam Petri signare ecclesiam et mare seculum, cuius fluctus sunt persecuciones tyrannorum inflicte fidelibus, docet quomodo [145]nauta huius navicelle debet artemonem arbori crucis infigere et ipsum lignum cum Christo suspenso ut velum erigere et sic eum efficaciter respiciens erit securus a turbine. Et hinc dicit Petrus nauta huius navicelle: Christus passus est pro nobis, nobis relinquens exemplum, ut sequamur vestigia eius. Et beatus Johannes: Sicut Christus pro nobis animam suam posuit et nos debemus pro fratribus animam ponere. Huic igitur velo simplex conversacio et vera confessio religentur et tuti esse possumus, quantumlibet mare seviat aut

Hence Augustine, in sermon 14 *On the Words of the Lord*, noting that "the little ship of Peter signifies the church, and the sea the world", whose waves are the persecutions of tyrants inflicted on the faithful, teaches how [145]the sailor of this little ship must fix the sail to the mast of the cross and raise that wood, with Christ hanging on it, as a sail, and so, looking to him effectually, he will be safe from the storm.[10] And hence Peter, the sailor of this little ship, says: "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we may follow his steps." And blessed John: "As Christ laid down his life for us, we also ought to lay down [our] life for the brethren." "To this sail, therefore, let a simple manner of life and true

ventus incuciat, quod nostra navicella non mergetur; quantumlibet inter flatus et fluctus seculi conturbetur. Sed notet fidelis quod in ista nave non navigat nisi qui in humilitate et paupertate odit seculum, sequendo Christi vestigia. Ideo dicat fidelis prepositus: Si tu est Christus, non miror si solidam carnem super liquantes aquas suspenderis, sed fac quod mirer, iube me ex potestate divina venire ad te super aquas, quod non facit fidelis ad sensum misticum nisi calcata affeccione cunctorum temporalium imitetur Christum in moribus, et sic papa prepollens in talibus est verus Christi vicarius, ut tangitur in quarto argumento, quo Petrus Joh. ultimo misit se in mare ex calore fidei satis salvum. In quo, ut reor, datur intelligi quod stat christianum meritorie sequi Christi vestigia et sic esse in corpore Christi mistico, quod est Petri navicula, licet videatur in facie errantis ecclesie esse foris. Decet enim scripturam sacram esse gravidatam multiformi [146] sentencia, ut preter literam factum illud signat iuxta quod martyrio cicius venitur ad Christum stantem in eternitatis littore, quam contemplacione vel officio confessorum. Et preter hec tercio signatur quod sicut apud Deum est possibile quod quis intromittat se cum mundo et adiutorio ac miraculo suo evadat periculum, ut dicit Christus Luce XVIII, 24 27 quam difficile qui pecunias habent regnum Dei introibunt; facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire, quam divitem in regnum Dei. Et dixerunt, qui hec audiebant, et quis potest salvus fieri? Et ait illis: que impossibilia sunt apud homines possibilia sunt apud Deum. Et videtur michi quod illam difficultatem signavit Petrus Matth. XIV, 30, quando veniens super aquas ad Dominum propter ventum validum cepit mergi; quamvis enim multi divites proni ad pompam, quos oportet finaliter mundum deserere, innitentes Christi adiutorio salvabuntur, via tamen veniendi navigio est clero securior, quia lignum salutis supponitur, ut medium impulsivum periculorum, que ex aquis mundi contigerint.

confession be bound, and we can be secure, however the sea may rage or the wind strike, that our little ship will not sink, however much it is tossed among the blasts and waves of the world."[11] But let the faithful man note that in this ship no one sails except one who in humility and poverty hates the world, following Christ's footsteps. Therefore let the faithful superior say: "If thou art Christ, I do not wonder that thou holdest solid flesh up over the flowing waters; but do what I may wonder at: bid me, by divine power, come to thee upon the waters." The faithful man does not do this in the mystical sense unless, having trampled on his affection for all temporal goods, he imitates Christ in conduct; and so a pope who excels in such things is a true vicar of Christ, as is touched on in the fourth argument, in which Peter (John 21 [the last chapter]) "cast himself into the sea" out of the warmth of his faith, safe enough.[12] In this, as I think, we are given to understand that a Christian can meritoriously follow Christ's footsteps and so be in the mystical body of Christ, which is Peter's little ship, although to the face of the erring church he seems to be outside. For it befits holy scripture to be pregnant with manifold [146] teaching, so that, besides the letter, that deed signifies that one comes more quickly by martyrdom than by contemplation or the office of confessors to Christ, who stands on the shore of eternity.[13] And besides these, thirdly, it is signified that, just as it is possible with God that someone should involve himself with the world and by his help and miracle escape the danger, as Christ says in Luke 18:24–27: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they that heard it said: Who then can be saved? He said to them: The things that are impossible with men are possible with God." And it seems to me that Peter signified that difficulty in Matthew 14:30, when, coming over the waters to the Lord, he began to sink because of the strong wind. For although many rich men prone to pomp, who must finally forsake the world, will be saved by leaning on Christ's help, yet the way of coming by ship is safer for the clergy, because the wood of salvation is set beneath, as a means that drives off the dangers which may befall from the waters of the world.[14]

¶3 146.23–146.33

[146] Ex quo videtur quod clerus sed papa precipue debet viare per illam semitam, in qua posset securius et expedicius sequi Christum; securius, quia status exproprietarius est elongacior a periculo temptatorum, et expedicius, quia minus intricatur cum mundo et

From which it seems that the clergy, but the pope above all, ought to go as a wayfarer along that path in which he could follow Christ more safely and more readily: more safely, because the propertyless state is further removed from the danger of tempters; and more readily, because it is less

hostibus, qui a legis Dei observancia retardarent. Unde propulsa vecordia ex temporalium pinguedine talis exproprietarius est ad martyrium pro Christo paracior; in cuius signum cronicantes notant quod post dotacionem fuerunt pauci vel nulli pape martyres.

entangled with the world and with enemies who would hold [him] back from the observance of God's law. Hence, with the faint-heartedness that comes of the fatness of temporal goods driven off, such a propertyless man is readier for martyrdom for Christ; in sign of which the chroniclers note that after the endowment there were few or no martyr popes.[15]

Notes

1. Matthew 14:28–29. *Vicarius Petri*: vicar of Peter, kept apart from vicar of Christ. *Diversissime* is construed "in the most diverse ways"; it may instead mean "very differently" (from what the pope claims these texts give him).
2. *Convincibilius*: in a way that more plainly convicts him. *Dampnacio* is the judgement passed on him: "condemnation". *Suppeditacio temporalium sub affeccione* is construed "treading temporal goods underfoot in affection". *Confusio*: shame, the Vulgate sense. Luke 19:22 (DR "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee, thou wicked servant").
3. Loserth prints *induemus* (sic) (143.3, with a manuscript reading his apparatus gives as *minemus*); construed with *sequamur* as part of the purpose clause. The manuscripts cite 1 Peter 4; Loserth corrects to 5 (143.4). Wyclif joins 5:2 (DR "not by constraint but willingly") and 5:3 (DR "being made a pattern of the flock from the heart").
4. *Quomodo igitur ... dominium* is an indicative clause with nothing to govern it (so the plate, 143.6: no word lost): "[is clear]" is supplied. It may instead be an exclamation: "How, therefore, secular lordship does not further this but hinders it!" Apocalypse 12:3–4 (DR); Wyclif has *eciam* for *et*, *eius* for *suis*, and no *eius* after *filium*: none changes the sense. B in marg. 143.10: "The woman [is] holy church, whose son the dragon sought to devour".
5. Apocalypse 12:1; "the Sun of justice", Malachi 4:2. The print has *sol iusticia* (143.18, so the plate); we read *iusticie* (our emendation). The Canticle verse is 2:6 (DR "His left hand is under my head, and his right hand shall embrace me"); Wyclif has the past *amplexabatur* for the Vulgate's future *amplexabitur*, translated. Philippians 3:8, abridged; the manuscripts read *feci* where Loserth prints *esse* (143.24), and *omnia detrimentum feci* stands in the verse's second clause (DR "for whom I have suffered the loss of all things").
6. *Capitaliter*, here "at her head": the crown of twelve stars on the woman's head (Apocalypse 12:1). *Parturiens cruciatur ut pariat*: Apocalypse 12:2 (DR "travailing in birth: and was in pain to be delivered"), paraphrased, so left unquoted. *Signando*: imprinting, as a seal. Acts 14:21: Wyclif has *regnum celorum* for the Vulgate's *regnum Dei* (DR "kingdom of God"). 1 Corinthians 4:15 and Galatians 4:19 (DR).
7. Apocalypse 12:5: the Vulgate has *recturus* (DR "who was to rule all nations with an iron rod"); Wyclif's *redempturus* is translated. B in marg. 144.8: "The great red dragon".
8. *Potencia* here is ordinary power or might. *Ex consensu*: the blood is shed with his consent, though by others' hands. *Universitas*: the whole number taken together. *Huius principis Antichristi* is construed "this prince, Antichrist"; "this prince of Antichrist" is possible.
9. Bernard, *De consideratione* III.1.2 (PL 182, 759; Loserth *ubi supra*, 144.28; cf. 138.18). In the same quotation at 138.18 Wyclif has *plus formido*; here *plus* is missing and *quam* has no comparative, so "[more]" is supplied. *Iste sentencia*: *iste* for *ista*. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): the teaching, not a judicial sentence.
10. Augustine, *De verbis Domini* sermon 14: Loserth, *Opera* V, Appendix, p. 132 (144.31), that is, among the sermons the Maurists judged not Augustine's: ps.-Augustine, *Sermo* 72.2 among the *Sermones suppositii* (PL 39, 1884–85), on Matt. 14:23–32: *erigatur antenna, ut suspensa arbori crucem Christi figuret* and *simplex conversatio et pura confessio ... religentur*; *Si tu es ... non miror ... fac quod mirer* (145.15) is §4 of the same sermon (PL 39, 1886). Loserth calls the quotation loose (145.9). *Artemonem*: B in marg. *anlempnam* (for *antennam*, the yard), as Augustine reads (*erigatur antenna*). AB in marg. 145.5: "Peter's little ship".
11. 1 Peter 2:21 (DR "Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow his steps"): Wyclif has *nobis* for *vobis* and the first person *sequamur* (the manuscripts *sequimur*, Loserth *sequamur*, 145.6). 1 John 3:16 (DR "he hath laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren"), Wyclif's wording translated. The last sentence is Augustine's again, in Loserth's italics.
12. The print has *Si tu est Christus* (145.18, so the plate); "thou art" follows *es* (our emendation). Matthew 14:28 (DR "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to thee upon the waters"), in Augustine's words. *Prepositus*: a superior, one set over others. John 21:7 (DR "cast himself into the sea"; Loserth, 145.26). *Satis salvum* agrees with *se*: Peter himself was safe.
13. *Stat christianum ...*: the scholastic *stat*, "it can be that". *Sentencia* is the teaching, here the sense, that scripture carries. Christ "stood on the shore" in John 21:4.
14. Luke 18:24–27 (DR); Wyclif's small departures (*introibunt*, no *intrare*) do not change the sense. *Sicut* opens a comparison whose second limb is never stated. Matthew 14:30 (DR "seeing the wind strong ... when he began to sink"). *Medium impulsivum*: a means that drives away.
15. *Viare*: the verb of *viator*. *Temptatorum*: of tempters. *Dotacio*: the endowment of the church, Constantine's. The chroniclers' claim has no reference from Loserth; Wyclif makes it again, also unsourced, at *De civili dominio* III, 217.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 142: *ad*
  - 142: *ad*
  - 142: *iudicium*
  - 143: *animabus* [NW]

- **144: *genui***
- **144: *pretensionem* [NW]**
- **144: *Et decem* (one token covers two printed words)**
- **145: *velo* (print has v)**
- **145: *tu***
- **145: *mistico* (30 is the line number)**
- **146: *Luce***
- **146: *XVIII***
- **146: *24***
- **146: *27***
- **142: *audaciis,* (audacns, -> audaciis, (scans: audacns | audacus | audaciis | audacns))**
- **143: *Christi,* (Chnsti, -> Christi, (scans: christi | chnsti | cnnsti | chnsti))**
- **143: *Christum* (print = Christum (OCR chnstum is noise))**

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter's (142.13).**

Part 4: A fourth sense: riches make the mind giddy

Loserth pp. 146.34–147.26

¶1 146.34–147.26
147.4 *A man engaged in worldly pursuits sees spiritual things confusedly.*

[146]**Nec obest talis sensus varietas, cum aqua nunc signat divicias, nunc tribulaciones et nunc populum** [147]**in scriptura. Posset et quartus sensus moralis elici ex isto opere secundum doctrinam Crysost, super secundo capitulo, II. Thym, morali V, scilicet quod vadentes in mundi diviciis tamquam vertiginosi habent de spiritualibus incertum iudicium. Constat quidem naturalibus quomodo in vertiginosis spiritus, qui sunt vehicula interiorum sensuum, circumducti faciunt apparenciam eciam quieti corporis, ac si corrotaretur homine stante fixo. Sic cogitacione et fantasia fixis in temporalibus detecto timore Dei inmobilis, diviciis se sperificantibus ad corrupcionem sensibilium instar aque, necesse est fantasiam et affeccionem vertiginosi proporcionaliter circumduci; et talis non foret bonus dux itineris ad sequendum. Unde erivatis multis malis avaricie imaginatur iste sanctus animam talis extrahi et peccata sua in qualitates sensibiles commutari. Videres tunc, inquit, animam pallidam trementem, verecundantem, velatam, agoniam habentem, se ipsam miserabiliter contempnentem. Et hec racio quare Christus voluit duces sue ecclesie instar sui a mundialibus elongari, ne fantasia corrupta contempnant veras divicias, et talis indubie licet reputacione humana, tamen non auctoritate Domini foret papa.**

Nor does such variety of sense stand in the way, since in scripture water signifies at one time riches, at another tribulations, and at another a people. [147]**A fourth, moral sense could also be drawn from this deed, according to the doctrine of Chrysostom on the second chapter of 2 Timothy, the moral part of homily 5: namely, that those who walk in the world's riches have, like men with vertigo, an uncertain judgement about spiritual things.**[1] **For it is evident to natural philosophers how in men with vertigo the spirits, which are the vehicles of the inner senses, being whirled round, produce the appearance, even in a body at rest, that it is turning round with them while the man stands fixed. So, with thought and imagination fixed on temporal goods, the fear of the immovable God stripped away, and riches spinning themselves round like a sphere to the corruption of perceptible things, like water, the imagination and affection of the giddy man must be whirled round in proportion; and such a man would not be a good leader of the journey for others to follow.**[2] **Hence, having traced many evils to avarice,**[3] **this saint imagines the soul of such a man drawn out and its sins changed into perceptible qualities. "You would see then," he says, "the soul pale, trembling, ashamed, veiled, in agony, miserably despising itself."**[4] **And this is the reason why Christ willed that the leaders of his church, after his likeness, be removed far from worldly things: lest, with a corrupted imagination, they despise the true riches. And such a man without doubt, though by human reputation, would yet not be pope by the Lord's authority.**[5]

Notes

1. ***Nunc … nunc***: "at one time … at another". ***Opere***: Peter's walking on the water. Chrysostom, homily 5 on 2 Timothy, ch. 2: Loserth, *Opera* XI, 628 (147.3). ***Morali V*** is construed as the moral exhortation that closes the homily. The manuscripts read ***vadantes***, Loserth ***vadentes*** (147.4).
2. ***Naturalibus***: the natural philosophers. ***Spiritus***: the bodily spirits of medieval physiology. ***Detecto timore Dei inmobilis***: construed as an ablative absolute, "the fear … stripped away", with ***inmobilis*** agreeing with ***Dei***; the participle is doubtful. ***Sperificantibus*** (Loserth, 147.12): B reads ***ad modum spere se rotantibus*** ("rotating themselves like a sphere"), added also in A's margin; the sense is the same. ***Ad corrupcionem sensibilium***: the corruption of the things the senses perceive.
3. The print has ***erivatis*** (147.16, so the plate); we read ***derivatis***, "traced" (our emendation).
4. The quotation is Chrysostom's, same homily (Loserth p. 628, 147.19; NPNF: "you would see it pale and trembling, ashamed, hiding its head, anxiously fearful, and self-condemned", which Wyclif's six terms follow; read in English only). ***Commutari*** is "changed into", not the exchange of trade.
5. ***Tamen***: A reads ***tantum*** ("would be pope only by human reputation, not by the Lord's authority", 147.25); the print construes and is followed. ***Licet … tamen*** pairs "though … yet".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 147: ***morali*** (hyphenated mo-rali; main token covers whole word)
  - 147: ***spiritualibus*** [NW]
  - 147: ***incertum*** (hyphenated in-certum; main token covers whole word) [NW]

Part 5: The fifth argument: the watchful vicar and the two who say they are popes

Loserth pp. 147.27–152.9

¶1 147.27–152.9

147.27 *The vicar of Peter must be a watchful guardian of the flock.*
148.5 *If not, the faithful should not follow him.*
148.29 *Christ's prophecy of Antichrist.*
149.10 *It may refer to those who now claim to be popes.*
149.28 *They should wait patiently for a decision and meanwhile serve the Church as true priests.*
150.9 *They have no authority to claim tribute and the nations should not allow their lordship.*
150.28 *Wyclif will recant if taught better.*

[147] Ad quintum patet ex illo Mar. XIV quod P. et quilibet eius vicarius debet cum Christo vigilare attencius in custodia gregis sui, quia Psalmo CXX, 4 dicitur quod non dormitabit neque dormiet, qui custodit Ysrahel, quod si nominetenus [148] papa dormierit sompno spirituali letifero, nullus dampnabilius se ipsum condempnat et ad officium illud inhabilitat, cum sibi ipsi in vita et nomine contradicit. Nec debet communitas fidelium sequi talem; habet enim ex mendacio signum potissimum Antichristi, ut declarat Crysostomus Omelia VIII, exponens illud II. Thim. III, 1 In novissimis diebus instabunt tempora periculosa, ubi declarat processisse hereticos a mundi principio, dyabolo contra plantacionem Dei mendacium seminante. Et correspondenter de membris istorum causatum ut Caym contra Abel, filii Dei contra filios hominum, Abraham et Pharao, Yacob et Esau, Moyses et magi, prophete et pseudoprophete, apostoli et pseudoapostoli, Christus et Antichristus continue repugnarunt et continue opponebatur mendacium veritati. Dyabolus, inquit, et membra sua operibus nichil monstrant, sed verbis magna false promittunt, ut patet Genes. III, 5 ubi dicit dyabolus: Nequaquam moriemini, sed eritis sicut dii. Quod si de maioritate potestatis pompose contendimus et in vita ac sanctis operibus sumus steriles, absolucionem a pena et a culpa pro pecunia promittentes et tamen in vivendo Christo conformiter subditos non iuvantes, sumus indubie Antichristi. Quod si torpemus in declaracione talium, Spiritus Sanctus necessario dissipabit consilium Achitofel, dividens membra

To the fifth [argument]: it is clear from that [passage] of Mark 14 that Peter and every vicar of his must keep watch with Christ more attentively in guarding his flock, because in Psalm 120:4 it is said that "he shall neither slumber nor sleep, that keepeth Israel". So if one who is pope in name only [148] sleeps the deadly sleep of the spirit, no one condemns himself more damnably or makes himself more unqualified for that office, since he contradicts himself in life and in name.[1] Nor must the community of the faithful follow such a one; for from his lie he has the chief sign of Antichrist, as Chrysostom declares in Homily 8, expounding that [text] of 2 Tim. 3:1, "in the last days shall come dangerous times", where he declares that heretics have come forth from the beginning of the world, the devil sowing a lie against God's planting.[2] And correspondingly it has been brought about among the members of these [two] that Cain against Abel, the sons of God against the sons of men, Abraham and Pharaoh, Jacob and Esau, Moses and the magicians, prophets and false prophets, apostles and false apostles, Christ and Antichrist have continually been incompatible, and lie has continually been set against truth.[3] "The devil," he says, "and his members show nothing in works, but in words falsely promise great things, as is clear in Genesis 3:5, where the devil says: By no means shall you die, but you shall be as gods."[4] So if we contend pompously about greatness of power, and are barren in life and in holy works, promising absolution from penalty

Antichristi ab invicem fidelibus precipiens ne sequantur. Nam Matth. XXIV, 5 dicitur: Multi venient in nomine meo, dicentes quia ego sum Christus et multos seducent, quod cum necesse sit esse verum ad literam, patet quod oportet hoc verificari de pretendentibus se esse Christi [149] vicarios, unde quia sofisticacione dyaboli nimis seducitur populus, non credens signo abhominacionis stanti in loco sancto Dan. IX cap. prophetato, abbreviabit Deus dies propter electos faciendo divisionem inter apostatas, ut vel sic noscatur veritas. Et statim de cavendo periculo divisionis subiungit, tunc si quis dixerit vobis: Ecce hic est Christus aut illic, nolite credere. Surgent enim pseudochristi et pseudoprophete, et dabunt signa magna. Ecce, inquit, predixi vobis. Istam propheciam Christi omnis catholicus tenetur credere. Et videtur michi ipsam posse exponi de istis dicentibus hodie se esse papas; uterque enim dicit se esse Christum Deum, et maioris vel pluris potestatis quam Ihesus noster; in cuius nomine tamquam eius summos vicarios referunt se venire; et certum est quod ista divisio est ad instruccionem ecclesie. Ideo videtur salubris doctrina Christi, quod neque nudis verbis dicencium, quod nunc papa sit Rome, nunc quod papa sit Avinione, debemus credere, sed ipsis operibus Christo conformibus, ut docet Joh. X, 38 de seipso; quia certum est, quod nuda verborum promulgacio nec fallax et subdola satraparum eleccio facit fidem de Christi vicario, sed ut dicit beatus Crysostomus: Nudis foliis verborum ut signis generacionis adultere innititur Antichristus, quia hoc est magis contrarium verbo Dei. Unde uterque istorum, ut michi videtur, debet contentari de isto regnorum responso: ex quo non claret eis ex eleccione vel opere quis est papa, quiescunt in fide filii Dei, quousque ecclesia plene doceatur, quis eorum fuerit verus papa, et supponentes [150] utrumque eorum esse bonum sacerdotem atque catholicum, parati sunt obedire utrique secundum formam, qua Apostolus obedivit debite beato Petro. Et quicumque extorserit maiorem obedienciam est suspectus. Petrus enim non peciit obedienciam maiorem a populo nisi quod credatur fides Christi et efficaciter opere compleatur. Non enim peciit dominacionem seculi, pecuniam vel vectigal. Nec subest alteri eorum auctoritas plus querendi, et specialiter de regnis, populis vel personis exigendo pecunias vel pinguium beneficiorum collaciones, nisi fundare sciverit ex racione vel scriptura quod Christus vel Petrus obedienciam huiusmodi vendicavit vel debuit vendicare. Si autem alter eorum regno vel populo fidem Christi predicare voluerit vel fidem susceptam instar Petri confirmare miraculis; videtur michi quod populus gratanter debeat obedire, dominacionem autem ut venenum debet expellere, gracias agens Deo, qui abbreviavit et detexit

and from guilt for money, and yet not helping our subjects to live in conformity with Christ, we are without doubt Antichrist's.[5] And if we grow sluggish in declaring such things, the Holy Spirit will of necessity defeat the counsel of Achitophel, dividing the members of Antichrist from one another and commanding the faithful not to follow them.[6] For in Matthew 24:5 it is said: "Many will come in my name saying, I am Christ. And they will seduce many"; and since this must be true to the letter, it is clear that it must be verified of those who claim to be [149] vicars of Christ. Hence, because the people is exceedingly seduced by the devil's sophistry, not believing the sign of the abomination standing in the holy place, prophesied in Daniel ch. 9, God will shorten the days for the sake of the elect by making a division among the apostates, so that even in this way the truth may be known.[7] And at once, on guarding against the danger of the division, he adds: "Then if any man shall say to you, Lo here is Christ, or there: do not believe him. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall shew great signs." "Behold," he says, "I have told it to you, beforehand."[8] Every catholic is bound to believe this prophecy of Christ. And it seems to me that it can be expounded of those who today say they are popes; for each of them says that he is Christ God, and of greater or more power than our Jesus, in whose name, as his highest vicars, they report that they come; and it is certain that this division is for the instruction of the church.[9] Therefore Christ's doctrine seems wholesome, that we must believe neither the bare words of those who say at one time that the pope is at Rome, at another that the pope is at Avignon, but the works themselves that are conformed to Christ, as he teaches of himself in John 10:38; for it is certain that neither a bare promulgation of words nor a deceitful and crafty election by satraps produces faith concerning the vicar of Christ; but, as blessed Chrysostom says, "Antichrist leans on the bare leaves of words, as on the signs of an adulterous generation", because this is more contrary to the word of God.[10] Hence each of these two, as it seems to me, ought to be content with this answer of the kingdoms: since it is not clear to them from election or from works which is pope, they rest in the faith of the Son of God until the church is fully taught which of them was the true pope; and, supposing [150] each of them to be a good and catholic priest, they are ready to obey each according to the form in which the Apostle duly obeyed blessed Peter.[11] And whoever extorts a greater obedience is suspect. For Peter did not seek a greater obedience from the people than that the faith of Christ be believed and effectually fulfilled in deed. For

venenosam tyrannidem Antichristi. Nec moveat quod tempora ista sunt prospera, Christus autem dicit; quod est tribulacio magna, qualis nunquam fuit. Loquitur autem de miserabili tribulacione anime maxima que iam instat, quia dormicio Symonis et Yude vigilia in cautelis faciunt litargire quod multi sompno letifero insensibiliter moriantur. Paratus sum autem revocare istam sentenciam, docto quod sit contraria fidei christiane. Sed videtur michi indubie quod non amplius quam ostensum est; debet catholicus talem ducem sequi vel ei ut Christi vicario obedire; et nichil [151]infidelius quam quod oportet de necessitate salutis christianum exercitum tali capite regulari. Et patet quod in isto quinto argumento facto pro papa debet ipse diligenter attendere quod non sit ad instar Petri reprobati fumo fastus vel avaricie soporatus; de quo sompno dictum est alibi. Nam habere solum nomen Petri vicarii vel pastoris est ex mendaci ypocrisi magis dampnabile quam si foret homo huius prepositure, cum Gregorius beatus primo libro De cura Pastorali II cap. exponendo illud Matth. XVIII, 6 Qui scandalizaverit unum de pusillis istis minimis, qui in me credunt, expedit ei ut suspendatur mola asinaria circa collum eius et demergatur in profundum maris: Pastores, inquit, perversi in moribus quod verbis predicant, moribus impugnant; unde fit, ut cum pastor per abrupta graditur, ad precipicium grex sequatur; quia cum layci dicta prelatorum cognoverint, per opera pervertuntur. Hinc scribitur per prophetam: Causa sunt ruine populi sacerdotes mali, de quibus dicit Dominus per prophetam: Facti sunt domui Ysrahel in offendiculum iniquitatis. Nemo quippe amplius in ecclesia nocet, quam qui perverse agens habet nomen vel ordinem sanctitatis, delinquentem autem hunc redarguere nullus audet; et in exemplum culpa vehementer extenditur, quando peccator pro reverencia ordinis honoratur. Indigni namque, tanti ponderis pericula fugerent, si Veritatis sentenciam sollicite cogitarent, qui scandalizaverit etc. Per molam quippe asinariam secularis vite circuitus [152]ac labor exprimitur et per profundum maris extrema dampnacio designatur. Qui igitur ad sanctitatis speciem deductus vel verbo ceteros destruit vel exemplo, melius profecto fuerat, ut hunc ad mortem sub seculari habitu terrena acta constringerent, quam quod sacra officia in culpa ceteris imitabilem demonstrarent, quia nimirum si solus caderet hunc utrumque pena inferni tollerabilior cruciaret.

he did not seek exercise of lordship in the world, money or tribute. Nor does either of them have authority to seek more, and especially by exacting money or conferrals of fat benefices from kingdoms, peoples or persons, unless he knows how to ground from reason or scripture that Christ or Peter claimed such obedience or ought to have claimed it. But if either of them is willing to preach the faith of Christ to a kingdom or a people, or to confirm with miracles the faith received, after Peter's pattern, it seems to me that the people should gladly obey; but the exercise of lordship it must expel like poison, giving thanks to God, who has shortened and uncovered the poisonous tyranny of Antichrist. Nor let it trouble [anyone] that these times are prosperous, whereas Christ says that "there is great tribulation, such as never was".[12] And he speaks of the wretched tribulation of the soul, the greatest, which is now at hand; for the sleeping of Simon and the watching of Judas in wiles make men so lethargic that many die imperceptibly in deadly sleep.[13] And I am ready to revoke this teaching, once it is shown that it is contrary to the Christian faith.[14] But it seems to me without doubt that a catholic ought not to follow such a leader, or to obey him as vicar of Christ, any further than has been shown; and nothing [151]is more unbelieving than [to say] that the Christian army must, of necessity of salvation, be ruled by such a head.[15] And it is clear that in this fifth argument made for the pope he himself must take diligent heed that he not be, like Peter when he was rebuked, lulled to sleep by the smoke of pride or of avarice; of which sleep it has been spoken elsewhere. For to have only the name of vicar of Peter or of shepherd is, by lying hypocrisy, more damnable than if he were a man of this office of superior,[16] since blessed Gregory, in the first book of the *Pastoral Care*, ch. 2, expounding that [text] of Matthew 18:6, "he that shall scandalize one of these least little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea", [says]:[17] "Shepherds perverse in their morals attack by their morals what they preach in words; hence it comes about that, when the shepherd walks over steep places, the flock follows to the precipice; for when lay people have learned the sayings of prelates, they are perverted by their works. Hence it is written by the prophet: Evil priests are the cause of the people's ruin; of whom the Lord says by the prophet: They were a stumblingblock of iniquity to the house of Israel.[18] For no one does more harm in the church than one who, acting perversely, has the name or the order of holiness; and no one dares to refute him when he transgresses, and the fault spreads

violently as an example when the sinner is honoured out of reverence for his order. For the unworthy would flee the dangers of so great a burden if they pondered carefully the sentence of the Truth, he that shall scandalize etc.[19] For by the millstone the round and toil [152]of secular life is expressed, and by the depth of the sea the uttermost damnation is signified. Whoever, therefore, brought to the outward form of holiness, destroys others either by word or by example, it would surely have been better for him that earthly deeds should bind him unto death in a secular habit, than that sacred offices should show him to others as imitable in his fault; for doubtless, if he fell alone, a more tolerable pain of hell would torment him in both [respects]."[20]

Notes

1. Mark 14:37, Christ to Peter asleep in Gethsemane: "Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one hour?" *Nomine tenus* (printed across the page turn) is *nominetenus*, "in name only", as in "clerics in name only". A and B note in the margin at 147.31 *Papa non est verus vicarius Christi, dum Christum non imitatur* ("the pope is not the true vicar of Christ while he does not imitate Christ").
2. Chrysostom, *Homilies on 2 Timothy*, hom. 8, on 2 Tim. 3:1; Loserth: Opp. tom. XI, p. 643.
3. *causatum* is Loserth's emendation; the manuscripts read *catum*. The clause has no finite verb: we take *causatum* [*est*] with an *ut*-clause of result ("it has been brought about that"); *ut* could also be "as", making the pairs examples. *Repugnarunt* keeps the glossary's "be incompatible", here of persons set against each other. The sons of God and of men: Gen. 6:2; Moses and the magicians: Exod. 7.
4. Loserth: "loosely quoted" (Chrysostom, same homily). His italic runs from *et membra sua* to *sicut dii*. The devil's words are Gen. 3:4–5 in a short form (Vulgate *Nequaquam morte moriemini ... et eritis sicut dii*; DR "No, you shall not die the death ... and you shall be as Gods").
5. *sumus ... Antichristi*: genitive, "Antichrist's", i.e. his members, as just said; the form could also be nominative plural, "we are antichrists". A and B note in the margin at 148.21 *Antichristi qui sunt*. "Absolution from penalty and from guilt" (*a pena et a culpa*) is the formula of plenary indulgences.
6. 2 Kings 15:31 and 17:14 (DR; 2 Sam. in modern Bibles): David's prayer against the counsel of Achitophel, and its defeat.
7. The abomination: Dan. 9:27, as cited at Matt. 24:15; the shortened days: Matt. 24:22, here applied to the division among the claimants.
8. Matt. 24:23–25 (Loserth's foot reference). Wyclif stops 24:24 at *signa magna* (Vulgate *et prodigia ...*, DR "and wonders, insomuch as to deceive (if possible) even the elect"); "he says" (*inquit*) is his insertion in 24:25.
9. The two who "today say they are popes": Urban VI at Rome and Clement VII at Avignon, rival claimants since 1378 (so Loserth's introduction, on this passage). *Christum Deum*: each claims to be "Christ" in the sense of Matt. 24:5. The manuscripts read *se hodie esse* and *summos vicarius*; Loserth prints *hodie se esse* and *vicarios*.
10. John 10:38 ("believe the works"). The Chrysostom quotation has no reference at the foot and is not traced; it is not in hom. 8 on 2 Timothy, cited just above; the adulterous generation that seeks a sign is Matt. 12:39. *facit fidem*: "produces faith", i.e. makes the claim credible.
11. Loserth glosses *de isto regnorum responso* as *que regna eis respondere debeant*, how the kingdoms ought to answer them: the answer is the kingdoms', and "they" who rest in faith are the kingdoms. "Duly" (*debite*): Paul obeyed Peter only so far as was due (Gal. 2:11; cf. 157 below). A and B note in the margin at 150.5 *Obedire pape*.
12. Matt. 24:21 in Wyclif's form (*est ... qualis nunquam fuit*); Vulgate *erit enim tunc tribulatio magna, qualis non fuit ab initio mundi*, DR "For there shall be then great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world".
13. Simon is Peter asleep in Gethsemane (Mark 14:37), as in note 1, while Judas kept watch to betray; Peter "when he was rebuked" (151) is the same scene. *faciunt litargire quod*: literally "make [men] fall into lethargy, so that".
14. Wyclif's declaration, an offer to retract. Loserth notes that it is missing from the *Protestationes* of Wyclif printed by Höfler (*Anna von Luxemburg*, Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie 1870/71, p. 147).
15. The print sets a semicolon after *ostensum est*; we construe *non amplius quam ostensum est* with *debet ... sequi ... obedire*. B reads *regulare*. "Of necessity of salvation" echoes the bull *Unam sanctam* (1302), *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1, *omnino esse de necessitate salutis* (Friedberg II, 1246).
16. Doubtful: as printed the comparison is weak, and a word may be lost (perhaps *non* before *foret*, "than if he were not a man of this office"). The manuscripts read *foret si homo*; Loserth prints *si foret homo*. Translated as printed.

17. The manuscripts are corrupt here (A *prepositure tam Gregorius beatus, Gregorius primo libro De Cura …*; B *tam Gregorius beatus quam Gregorius primo libro …*); Loserth prints *cum Gregorius beatus primo libro*, and the clause has no main verb, so "[says]" is supplied. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* I.2 (Loserth: *De cura pastor.*). Matt. 18:6 in Wyclif's form adds *minimis* ("least") and reads *circa collum* for the Vulgate's *in collo*; *mola asinaria* is the millstone turned by an ass, which Gregory reads below as the round of secular life.
18. "Evil priests are the cause of the people's ruin" is not a text of scripture in this form: Gregory here reads *Laqueus ruinae populi mei, sacerdotes mali* (Hos. 5:1; 9:8; *Reg. past.* I.2, PL 77, 16), and Wyclif's form is Gregory's own phrase in his letters (*causa sunt ruinae populi sacerdotes mali*, PL 77, 1031, 1209). "They were a stumblingblock …": Ezek. 44:12.
19. *Veritatis sentenciam*: the judgement of the Truth (Christ) in Matt. 18:6, a threatened penalty, so "sentence", not "teaching" (the CONTEXTUAL row). A and B note in the margin at 151.10 *Nocent in ecclesia maxime mali sacerdotes*; B at 151.30 *Mola asinaria quid signet*. Loserth: Hus reuses the passage (*De ecclesia*, fol. 224b).
20. The manuscripts read *suaverat ut hunc*; Loserth prints *fuerat*. B reads *constringerentur. hunc utrumque* does not construe well; Gregory's text reads *utcunque*, "at any rate" (*Reg. past.* I.2, PL 77, 16: *si solus caderet, utcunque hunc tolerabilior inferni poena cruciaret*). Translated as printed.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 148: *sequi talem* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 148: *ſ* (old-style 1, x-height)
  - 148: *sed* (20 is the line number)
  - 149: *responso*
  - 150: *tempora*
  - 151: *fit*
  - 152: *labor*
  - 152: *exprimitur*
  - 152: *verbo* (print has v)
  - 152: *terrena*
  - 148: *Antichriſti,* (Antichnsti, -> Antichristi, (scans: antichristi | antichnsti | antichnsti | antichnsti))
  - 148: *instabunt* (LEFT-nw: print = instabunt)

Part 6: The sixth argument: Peter's second fishing and the 153 fishes

Loserth pp. 152.10–156.25

¶1 152.10–154.15
152.14 *Danger of accepting the office of Pope from wrong motives.*
153.16 *Prevalence of simony.*
154.16 *The mystical meaning of the 153 fishes.*

[152]Iste sanctus papa novit condiciones et pericula adiacencia perverso preposito et specialiter Romano pontifici, cum peccatum commissionis vel omissionis in ipso foret scandalum toti gregi. Per hoc patet responsio ad sextam racionem, in qua ex secunda piscacione Petri notatur in ipso preeminencia sepedicta. Ex quo notaret papa ex preeminencia dignitatis periculum, sciens quod vocatus ad tale officium ex corpore vel negligencia gravius est dampnandus, ymo acceptans illud officium plus propter piscacionem fastus aut questus, quam propter piscacionem animarum trahendarum ad litus soliditatis perpetue in retibus regis Christi, ut sic peccat mortaliter, ut patet XXIII cap. quinti libri, et per consequens quamdiu duraverit talis declinans intencio in occupacione vocati beneficii ecclesiastici vel dignitatis crimen amplius continue invalescit, dicente Lyncolniensi in quadam epistola: Dispensacione beneficiorum quisquis abutitur, qui ad alium finem quam ad fidei et caritatis augmentacionem eadem utitur. Quomodo igitur excusatur distribuens bona ecclesie propter carnem vel favorem [153]mundi lucrificacione Christi postposita. Recole quomodo Petro dabatur titulus beatitudinis, quia caro et

This holy pope knew the conditions and dangers that attend a perverse superior, and especially the Roman pontiff, since a sin of commission or omission in him would be a scandal to the whole flock. By this the reply to the sixth reason is clear, in which the often-mentioned preeminence is noted in Peter from his second fishing.[1] From this the pope should note the danger that comes from the preeminence of dignity, knowing that one called to such an office is to be damned more heavily for [a fault of] the body or for negligence;[2] indeed one who accepts that office more for a fishing of pride or of gain than for the fishing of souls, to be drawn to the shore of everlasting firmness in the nets of Christ the king, sins mortally as such, as is clear in ch. 23 of the fifth book;[3] and consequently, as long as such a swerving intention lasts in the occupation of the so-called ecclesiastical benefice or dignity, the crime grows continually stronger, as Lincoln says in a certain letter: "Whoever uses benefices for any other end than the increase of faith and charity abuses their dispensation."[4] How then is he excused who distributes the goods of the church for the sake of flesh or of the world's [153]favour, the winning [of souls] for Christ set

sanguis non revelavit sibi, et per consequens ex equo opposito acquirit titulum dampnacionis qui propter carnem vel sanguinem sic accipit vel distribuit bona Dei. Consule, inquit, conscienciam tuam, utrum plura ecclesiastica queris beneficia, ut caritas augeatur in ovibus aut tu augearis ex ovium operibus, ut tu pascas oves verbo, exemplo et oracione aut tu pascaris ex ovium lacte, vide utrum Deo dicere possis cum Augustino in De Verbis Domini Sermone XLIX: Domine, tu scis quia dixi scis quia non tacui scis quo animo dixi, scis quia flevi, cum dicerem et non audirer; ipsa puto integra racio est nostra. In ista materia convincere potest pius theologus, attendens ad conversacionem pontificum ydolorum, quod peccatum Symonis est tam publice induratum, ut nisi pastor summus trahat clerum ad vitam pauperem per subtraccionem elemosinarum secularium tam grex quam pastores vadent in precipicium. Stupor enim huius veneni mortiferi ex diutina consuetudine ad tantum invaluit, quod verba quantumlibet acuta et ex fide desiderabilia non movent clerum possessionibus soporatum. Ideo non restat nisi denudare stertentem litargicum, subtrahendo velamentum sompniferum; olim enim verificatum est illud Apostoli Hebre. V, 4: Nemo sibi sumit honorem, sed qui vocatur a Deo, ymo hodie debet esse, si non essemus peccatis cecati occultatis periculis, quod nemo sumeret sibi dignitatem huiusmodi per procuratoria media sumptuosa, subdola et laboriosa, quin pocius necessitatus apostolo, propter vite sanctitatem [154]coactus susciperet onus tam arduum cum intencione faciendi opus evangeliste, subducta affeccione prosperitatis terrene et per consequens cum timore. Inde distinccione XL sub auctoritate Jeronimi dicit canon: Non est facile stare in loco Petri et Petri tenere cathedram, quia non sanctorum filii sunt qui tenent loca sanctorum sed qui exercent opera eorum. Attendamus igitur ad opera pastorum primitive ecclesie et non ad temporalia preter ordinacionem primevam ex pia ignorancia conglobata, et videbimus ex decreto (ut sepe repecii) quod nimis multi mendaciter sunt prelati. Ideo dicit Spiritus Apoc. III, 9 quomodo illi de synagoga sathane dicunt se esse Iudeos et non sunt sed menciuntur.

aside? Recall how Peter was given the title of blessedness because "flesh and blood hath not revealed it" to him; and consequently, by the equal opposite, he acquires the title of damnation who for the sake of flesh or blood so receives or distributes the goods of God.[5] "Consult," he says, "your conscience, whether you seek several ecclesiastical benefices so that charity may be increased in the sheep, or so that you may be increased from the works of the sheep; whether to feed the sheep by word, example and prayer, or to be fed from the milk of the sheep. See whether you can say to God with Augustine in *On the Words of the Lord*, Sermon 49: Lord, thou knowest that I spoke, thou knowest that I did not keep silent, thou knowest with what mind I spoke, thou knowest that I wept when I spoke and was not heard; that, I think, is the whole of our account."[6] In this matter a pious theologian, attending to the manner of life of the idol-pontiffs, can prove that the sin of Simon is so publicly hardened that, unless the chief shepherd draws the clergy to a poor life by withdrawing secular alms, both flock and shepherds will go over the precipice.[7] For the stupor of this deadly poison has grown so strong from long custom that words however sharp, and desirable as faith teaches, do not move a clergy lulled to sleep by possessions. Therefore nothing remains but to uncover the snoring lethargic by withdrawing the sleep-bringing covering; for once that [saying] of the Apostle in Heb. 5:4 was verified, "No man taketh the honour to himself, but he that is called by God"; indeed today it ought to be so, if we were not blinded by sins to hidden dangers, that no one would take to himself a dignity of this kind by costly, crafty and laborious proctorial means, but rather, under necessity like the apostle, [154]constrained on account of holiness of life, would take up so heavy a burden with the intention of doing the work of an evangelist, the affection for earthly prosperity withdrawn, and consequently with fear.[8] Hence in distinction 40, under the authority of Jerome, the canon says: "It is not easy to stand in Peter's place and to hold Peter's chair, for they are not the sons of the saints who hold the places of the saints, but they who do their works."[9] Let us attend, then, to the works of the shepherds of the primitive church, and not to the temporal goods heaped up out of pious ignorance beyond the first ordinance, and we shall see from the decree (as I have often repeated) that exceedingly many are prelates falsely. Therefore the Spirit says in Apoc. 3:9 how those "of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews and are not, but do lie".

¶2 154.16–156.25
155.2 *Various significations to be drawn from the number 153.*
155.29 *The fishes are the elect.*
156.3 *The vicar of St. Peter should preach to bring men to Christ, should help the fallen and confirm the sickly.*

[154] Redeundo igitur ad exposicionem scripture videamus secundum mellifluum sub cortice verborum centum qninquaginta trium magnorum piscium. Nam, ut inquit Augustinus, De Verbis Domini Sermone XIV: Quando possumus de divinis operibus, que leguntur, intellectum alicuius mistice significacionis exculpere quasi de abstrusis favorum cellis mella producimus. Vel Christi discipulos imitantes spicas manibus confricamus, ut ad grana vitalia in eis latencia contingamus. Exponit autem Augustinus LXXXIII questionum questione LVII illum numerum seriose notans, primo quatuor gradus status ecclesie; primo enim a quaternario resultat denarius sub quo ecclesia ymo tota universitas continetur. Dicit enim Apostolus prima Cor. XI, 3 quod mulieris caput est vir sed viri caput est Christus, caput autem Christi est Deus, in quo gradu quadruplici patet quod [155] Deo correspondet unitas, Christo binarius propter duplicitatem naturarum, cum humanitas in potencia fuit sibi semper adaptata, trinarius vero correspondet homini, cum sit memoria, racio et voluntas, quaternarius autem correspondet carni vel corpori quod dicitur ex quatuor principiis scilicet punctali, lineari, superficiali et profundali vel quatuor electis, colligendo autem unum duo tria quatuor constituunt decem. Sed natura humana egrediens denarium ex prevaricacione decalogi (ut dicitur cap. XXIII, V huius) indiguit reformante, ideo mediator Dei et hominum, sponsus et formator ecclesie, corpus suum quod est quaternarius duxit in dictum denarium et passione sua redemit ecclesiam. Et hec racio quare ieiunavit quadraginta diebus. Sed quia quadragenarius resultans ex ductu quaternarii in denarium habet septem partes aliquotas, ut XX, X; VIII, V, IV, II, I, que integrant quinquaginta, iam post resureccionem quadraginta diebus exspectavit ascensionem et post decem dies reformatam ecclesiam confirmavit, mittendo consolantem Spiritum dono septemplici. Sed quarto dictus cesar semper augustus augmentando semper progrediens dictam ecclesiam, consumavit, quando dictum quinquagenarium triplicavit, quod constituit centum quinquaginta et in eternitate extra illum numerum beatificavit; quod fit, cum fides, spes et caritas tocius ecclesie quoad miliciam consumatur. Pisces igitur captos a spiritu predestinante ministerio hortancium ad bona gracie Petrus trahit in terram vivencium, quando usque ad [156] finem oves diligens corroborat verbo et opere finalem docens perseveranciam in virtute. Qui igitur voluerit esse Christi vel Petri vicarius; oportet ut ad instar eorum ex animo faciat similiter cum vita imitatoria et non nudum nomen vel eleccio in facie ecclesie facit papam. Predicet igitur cum apostolo, ubi nominatus

Returning, then, to the exposition of scripture, let us look, according to the honey-flowing [sense], beneath the rind of the words about the hundred and fifty-three great fishes.[10] For, as Augustine says in *On the Words of the Lord*, Sermon 14: "When we can carve out of the divine works which are read the understanding of some mystical signification, we bring forth honey as from the hidden cells of the combs. Or, imitating Christ's disciples, we rub the ears of corn in our hands so as to reach the life-giving grains hidden in them."[11] And Augustine, in the *Eighty-three Questions*, question 57, expounds that number, marking in order, first, the four grades of the state of the church; for first from the four results the ten, under which the church, indeed the whole universe, is contained.[12] For the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 11:3 that "the head of the woman is the man", but "the head of the man is Christ", "and the head of Christ is God"; in which fourfold grade it is clear that [155] unity corresponds to God; the two to Christ, because of the doubleness of natures, since the humanity was always fitted to him in potency;[13] the three corresponds to man, since he is memory, reason and will; and the four corresponds to the flesh or body, which is said [to be] of four principles, namely of point, line, surface and depth, or of four elements; and, adding up, one, two, three, four make ten.[14] Now human nature, going out of the ten through transgression of the decalogue (as is said in ch. 23 of [book] 5 of this [work]), needed one to reform it; therefore the mediator of God and men, the bridegroom and former of the church, multiplied his body, which is the four, into the said ten, and by his passion redeemed the church. And this is the reason why he fasted forty days.[15] Now since the forty, which results from multiplying the four into the ten, has seven aliquot parts, namely 20, 10, 8, 5, 4, 2, 1, which together make fifty, after the resurrection he waited forty days for the ascension, and after ten days confirmed the reformed church, sending the comforting Spirit with the sevenfold gift.[16] Now fourthly, the said Caesar ever august, ever going forward in augmenting the said church, consummated [it] when he tripled the said fifty, which makes a hundred and fifty, and in eternity, beyond that number, beatified [it]; which comes about when the faith, hope and charity of the whole church is consummated as regards its soldiery.[17] The fishes, then, caught by the predestinating Spirit through the ministry of those who exhort to the goods of grace, Peter draws into the land of the living, when, loving the sheep, he strengthens them to the [156] end by word and work, teaching final perseverance in virtue.

est Christus, donec in vasis capacibus formetur Christus et tunc ex quaternario evangeliorum format ecclesiam. Secundo lapsis conversis suis det animam complens quadragesimam penitencie pro ovibus reformandis, tercio implorando eis Spiritum Sanctum imponat eis manus operatrices, oves morbidas confirmando, recolens illud Luce XXII cap. 32 dictum Petro: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos. Unde Act. VIII, 17 legitur quod Petrus confirmando imposuit eis manus. Et quarto reducat oves ad stabilimentum cubi supra petram firmam quomodolibet proiecti, stantis sine vituperio anguli. Quod si quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus tamquam quatuor equis superficialibus lateralibus substrata sit equa operacio et supposita virtutum continuacio secundum similitudinem captam ex operibus presidentis, tunc enim vendicare potest ex debito locum Petri.

Whoever, therefore, wishes to be vicar of Christ or of Peter must, after their pattern, do likewise from the heart, with a life that imitates [them]; and it is not the bare name or an election in the face of the church that makes a pope. Let him therefore preach with the Apostle where Christ has been named, until Christ be formed in capable vessels; and then from the four of the gospels he forms the church.[18] Secondly, to those of his converts who have fallen let him give his soul, completing the forty [days] of penance for the sheep to be reformed; thirdly, imploring the Holy Spirit for them, let him lay working hands on them, confirming the sickly sheep, remembering that [word] in Luke 22:32 said to Peter: "and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren". Hence in Acts 8:17 it is read that Peter, confirming, "laid hands upon them".[19] And fourthly let him bring the sheep back to the stability of the cube upon the firm rock, which, however it is thrown, stands without reproach of corner.[20] And if, beneath the four cardinal virtues as four equal lateral surfaces, an equal working be laid, and a continuity of the virtues set under it, after the likeness drawn from the works of the one presiding, [it is well;] for then he can claim Peter's place as his due.[21]

Notes

1. "This holy pope" is Gregory the Great, whose *Pastoral Care* has just been quoted. The second fishing: John 21:1–11 (the first, Luke 5:4–11). A notes in the margin at 152.14 *Ad 6*, "to the sixth".
2. *ex corpore* is doubtful; *ex torpore*, "from sluggishness", would pair with *negligencia* (a conjecture, not adopted). Translated as printed.
3. "The fifth book" is the fifth book of Wyclif's *Summa*, *De civili dominio* III; Loserth: *De civili dominio* III, 485 ff.. *ut sic*: "as such", in so far as he accepts it for that end.
4. Robert Grosseteste, letter to Hugh of Pateshull, ed. Luard, p. 99 (Loserth); the manuscripts read *Linconiense*. *vocati beneficii*: "so-called", as the glossary fixes *vocatus*; it could also be "the benefice [to which he was] called", taking up *vocatus ad tale officium* above.
5. Matt. 16:17. *ex equo opposito*: the argument from contraries. *dampnacio* is CONTEXTUAL: here the title to damnation, not a judicial condemnation.
6. The speaker of "he says" is not named; it is Lincoln still: the letter goes on *Consule igitur conscientiam tuam ...*, with the Augustine inside it (Luard p. 99). Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, sermon 49 in Wyclif's numbering, now *Sermo* 137.12.15 (PL 38, 762–63); Grosseteste's quotation lacks *scis quo animo dixi* and *Ipsa puto ... integra ratio nostra est*, which Wyclif restores from Augustine. Loserth's italic runs from *conscienciam tuam* to *racio est nostra*. *integra racio*: "account", the reckoning a steward renders.
7. "Idol-pontiffs" (*pontificum ydolorum*): cf. Zach. 11:17 (*o pastor et idolum*). The "chief shepherd" (*pastor summus*) is the pope, who could withdraw the alms; Christ (1 Pet. 5:4) is the other possible referent. The "sin of Simon" is simony (Acts 8:18–20). A and B note in the margin at 153.17 *Prelatus verus* (B *bonus*) *non est qui vita bona caret*, and at 153.29 *Dignitates ecclesiasticas quomodo usurpant*.
8. Heb. 5:4 in Wyclif's form (*Nemo sibi sumit*; Vulgate *Nec quisquam sumit sibi ... tamquam Aaron*, DR "Neither doth any man take ... as Aaron was"). *necessitatus apostolo*: the dative is hard; we take it "under necessity like the apostle" (1 Cor. 9:16). "Proctorial" (*procuratoria*): as in "proctorial power". "The work of an evangelist": 2 Tim. 4:5.
9. Decretum D.40 c.2 (Loserth: "Cap. II"; the modern form is ours), under Jerome's name (*ad Heliodorum*; PL 187, 214: *Non est facile stare loco Pauli et tenere gradum Petri*, where Wyclif has *in loco Petri et Petri tenere cathedram*). "The decree" below is this canon.
10. *secundum mellifluum*: "according to the honey-flowing [sense]", the honey of the Augustine figure that follows; it may instead mean "according to the mellifluous [doctor]", or *secundum* may stand for *sensum* ("let us look at the honey-flowing sense"). The 153 fishes: John 21:11. A and B note in the margin at 154.25 *Pisces 153 quid signant*.
11. Loserth: Augustine, Opp. tom. V, App., p. 131/32, i.e. among the sermons printed as spurious: ps.-Augustine, *Sermo* 72.1 (PL 39, 1884), the sermon of 144.31. The disciples and the ears of corn: Luke 6:1.
12. Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, q. 57, "De centum quinquaginta tribus piscibus" (PL 40, 39–40; Loserth: tom. VI, p. 25). *seriose*: "in order". *quaternarius*, *denarius*: the numbers four and ten.

13. 1 Cor. 11:3 with the clauses in another order than the Vulgate's (DR "the head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man: and the head of Christ is God"). *in potencia*: "in potency" in Aristotle's sense, the humanity always apt to be united to him. B notes *vel anime* ("or of souls") in the margin at *naturarum*.
14. *punctali* is Loserth's emendation (the manuscripts read *peccali*), from Augustine's progression from point to length to breadth. *electis*, so printed (read on the plate), does not construe; we read *elementis*, "elements" (our emendation).
15. "Ch. 23 of [book] 5 of this [work]": *De civili dominio* III (Loserth: III, 485). The mediator: 1 Tim. 2:5; the forty days' fast: Matt. 4:2. *duxit in* is the arithmetic of multiplication. *prevaricacio* takes the "transgression" of the *prevaricator / prevaricancia* row.
16. The aliquot parts of forty (20, 10, 8, 5, 4, 2, 1) sum to fifty. B omits *quadraginta ... ascensionem* (155.20–21). Forty days to the ascension: Acts 1:3; the Spirit at Pentecost: Acts 2:1; the sevenfold gift: Isa. 11:2.
17. *cesar semper augustus*: the imperial style "ever august", glossed by *augmentando*, the play on *augustus* and *augere*. The three "beyond that number" make up 153. *milicia*: the church's soldiery, i.e. the church militant (the Pauline-figure sense of the row).
18. "Where Christ has been named": Rom. 15:20 says the opposite, "not where Christ was named" (*non ubi nominatus est Christus*); a *non* may have been lost here. Loserth's margin reference "Cf. Rom. XV, 20" is not in the established Latin. "Until Christ be formed": Gal. 4:19. A and B note in the margin at 156.2 *Vicarius Christi verus qualis est*.
19. *det animam*: "give his soul", the good shepherd's *animam suam dat* (John 10:11). The forty of penance: Lent, as the forty of 155. Luke 22:32. Acts 8:17 in the Vulgate is plural, of Peter and John (*imponebant manus super illos*, DR "they laid their hands upon them"); Wyclif's *imposuit eis manus* makes Peter the subject.
20. The cube stands on whichever face it falls. *stantis sine vituperio anguli* is hard: we take *anguli* with *sine vituperio* ("without reproach of corner", whatever corner it falls on); it may instead depend on *cubi* ("the cube of the corner"), Christ the cornerstone. The rock: Matt. 16:18.
21. *equis* is *aequis*, "equal" (the four side faces of the cube), not "horses". The *si*-clause has no main clause before *tunc enim*; "[it is well]" is supplied. "The one presiding" (*presidentis*) is Christ, or Peter.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 152: ∅ (English side-note word)
  - 153: *opposito*
  - 153: *ut*
  - 153: *ut*
  - 153: *tacui*
  - 154: *qninquaginta* (misprint: second letter has arched top = n (turned u), zoomed leaf 215) [NW]
  - 154: *illum*
  - 154: ∅ (folio bar (199c) read as i; not text)
  - 155: *carni*
  - 155: *punctali* [NW]
  - 155: *illum*
  - 156: *animo*
  - 156: *tu*
  - 156: *17* (print has 17; main token holds the 1 only)
  - 156: *quatuor* (20 is the line number)
  - 153: *dixi* (one word, italic; comma not carried)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 6.-7. Cf. Rom. XV, 20. (156.33).

Part 7: The seventh argument: Peter at the council and how a vicar should correct

Loserth pp. 156.26–160.4

¶1 156.26–160.4
156.26 *Peter's behaviour at the council of Jerusalem.*
158.19 *Our prelates preach another gospel than Christ's.*
159.1 *A scandalous reason is given why the Pope should not preach.*

[156]Per hec patet responsio ad septimum, in quo probatur preeminencia Petri per illud Act. XV, quod Petrus humiliter se pretulit ad laborem. Non fuit tunc inter apostolos de prepositura contencio, sed octuplex vera humilitas necessitavit Petrum respondere pre aliis. Et utinam papa modernus vellet exercere illam clavem sciencie fidei instar Petri, tunc enim non temptaret imponere [157] fidelibus graves cerimonias eciam ultra ritus iudaycos, sed sine illis

By these things the reply to the seventh is clear, in which Peter's preeminence is proved by that [passage] of Acts 15, that Peter humbly put himself forward for the labour.[1] There was not then among the apostles any contention about the office of superior; but an eightfold true humility compelled Peter to answer before the others.[2] And would that the modern pope were willing to exercise that key of the knowledge of the

159.21 *How Christ's vicar should correct others.*
159.25
1. *He should keep himself clear of fault. 2. He must correct wisely.*
159.31
3. *He must remember that he is a servant of the Church.*
160.1
4. *That the Church is greater than he.*

vel obediencia exacta a Petro diffiniret libertatem eorum stare in isto, quod eis et gentibus suffecit ad salutem gracia domini Ihesu Christi. Et post hec Jacobus socialiter et domestice alloquitur populum in hec verba: Viri fratres, audite me, Symon narravit quomodo Deus visitavit sumere ex gentibus populum nomini suo; propter quod ego iudico non inquietari eos, qui ex gentibus convertuntur. Ubi notum est quod Spiritus Sanctus non scribit eum beatissimum papam Petrum, sed vocat eum Symonem ex humilitate socium, et Jacobum non ex auctoritate Petri, sed Domini sic locutum, et ideo singulariter dixisse, ego iudico, quod verbum foret hodie graviter ut rusticum et inconsonum reprobatum. Nec valet allegare contra modernos episcopos Jacobi sanctitatem, quia tantum distat papa a sanctitate Petri, qui nec in hoc reprobavit Jacobum nec vendicavit quod ex sua auctoritate Jacobus sic loquatur. Sicut igitur episcopi longe sunt a sanctitate Jacobi, sic pape nimis distant a sanctitate Petri. Unde igitur pape auctoritas ad vendicandum de episcopis quod non est exemplatum in iurisdicione Petri super alios sanctos apostolos vel conversos? Petrus autem nullam dominacionem vendicavit super alios fratres suos, sed apostolo reprehendenti ipsum humiliter obedivit. Recolat igitur papa quomodo nemo debet sibi obedire, nisi de quanto ut Dei organum dixerit legem suam, nec tenetur sibi credere, nisi de quanto tenetur credere quod Deus in ipso loquitur; et hoc movebit eum ad allegandam legem Domini, in qua est omnis [158] veritas et ad innitendum preeminencie sanctitatis, quia aliter est ut Antichristus maxime discredendus et a comitiva fidelium precipue fugiendus. Et tercio recolat quod Roboam ex dominacione pompatica, quam didicit ex consilio iuvenum dixit false, quod minimus digitus suus fuit potencior dorso patris, et per hoc divisum est regnum, ut patet III. Reg. XII, 10 et notat Crysostomus Omelia prima Operis Imperfecti. Et applicet ad hoc verba sua et opera, si implicat se extollere super omne quod dicitur Deus, exigens dominacionem quam Christus non potest exigere, et videbit quod racione huius precipue christianismus dividitur, nam fideles ab eo recesserant propter fetens eius dominium, et hinc impeditur utrimque conversio infidelium ad legem Domini; tam extranea, inquam, videtur conversacio eius a Christo quod longe plus variatur ab eo quam conversacio sacerdotum veteris legis a Moyse, qui sensu, verbis et doctrina remanserant, sed vita et opere recesserunt. Iste autem papa videtur extraneus a Christo, qui tam vita quam doctrina ab eo discordat, nam Matth. XXIV, 11 Christus dicit quod predicabitur hoc evangelium de pseudochristo in universo mundo in testimonium omnibus gentibus, pseudo autem nedum est interpositus, ut sit testis Christo in terris,

faith after Peter's pattern; for then he would not try to impose [157] heavy ceremonies on the faithful, even beyond the Jewish rites, but, without them and without obedience exacted by Peter, would define their liberty to stand in this: that the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ sufficed them and the Gentiles for salvation.[3] And after this James, as a companion and familiarly, addresses the people in these words: "Men, brethren, hear me. Simon hath related how God visited to take of the Gentiles a people to his name. For which cause I judge that they are not to be disquieted, who from among the Gentiles are converted."[4] Here it is noteworthy that the Holy Spirit does not write him "the most blessed pope Peter", but calls him Simon, a companion, out of humility; and [writes] that James spoke thus not by Peter's authority but by the Lord's, and therefore said in the singular "I judge", a word that today would be severely condemned as boorish and discordant. Nor is it valid to allege James's holiness against modern bishops, for the pope is just as far from the holiness of Peter, who neither reproved James in this nor claimed that James spoke so by his authority. As, then, the bishops are far from the holiness of James, so the popes are exceedingly far from the holiness of Peter. Whence, then, does the pope have authority to claim from bishops what is not exemplified in Peter's jurisdiction over the other holy apostles or converts? Now Peter claimed no exercise of lordship over his other brethren, but humbly obeyed the apostle who rebuked him.[5] Let the pope therefore recall that no one ought to obey him except in so far as he has spoken God's law as God's instrument, nor is [anyone] bound to believe him except in so far as he is bound to believe that God speaks in him; and this will move him to allege the law of the Lord, in which is all [158] truth, and to rely on the preeminence of holiness; for otherwise he is, as Antichrist, most of all to be disbelieved, and above all to be fled by the company of the faithful. And thirdly let him recall that Rehoboam, out of the pompous exercise of lordship which he learned from the counsel of the young men, said falsely that his "little finger" was mightier "than the back of" his "father", and through this the kingdom was divided, as is clear in 3 Kings 12:10, and as Chrysostom notes in the first homily of the *Unfinished Work*.[6] And let him apply his words and works to this, [to see] whether it implies that he exalts himself "above all that is called God", demanding an exercise of lordship which Christ cannot demand; and he will see that it is above all by reason of this that Christendom is divided, for the faithful had withdrawn from him because of his stinking lordship, and hence on both sides the conversion of unbelievers to the law of the Lord is hindered.[7] So

sed persequitur illos, qui hoc evangelium attestantur; unde videtur quod non de illis Christus tantum confidit, ut de sacerdotibus legis veteris, cum Matth. XXIII, 3 suis precipit: Omnia quecumque dixerint vobis facite, secundum opera eorum nolite facere, dicunt enim et non faciunt. Dicitur autem quod nostri prelati ex maiori elongacione a Christo per superinductam dotacionem cesaream nec dicunt nec faciunt. [159]Nam ubi beatus Gregorius ex animo iter arripuit ad Anglicos convertendum, papa modernus ut legem sibi limitat quod non predicet ne cadat in heresim, propter quam est solummodo deponendus, ut videtur ex XL distinccione: Si papa. Sed scandalosa sunt ista, primo quia papa sciret cavere sibi de heresi antequam acciperet huiusmodi dignitatem, secundo quia papa, qui dicitur habere tantam potestatis plenitudinem, diffiniret quod non foret heresis quicquid dixerit, vel saltem protestaretur, quod non habet animum a lege Domini declinandi. Tercio heresis periculosior est in vite discordia, ymo per idem nullus prepositus predicaret, cum pro heresi et specialiter reali sit dignus deponi, et papa propter causam multiplicem cicius aufugeret illud periculum. Ideo non est nisi antichristiana et accusatoria excusacio in peccatis. Accusatoria dico, quia ut sic patenter iudicat, quod sit alienus a vicario Christi, et in aliis dicitur comuniter quod peccare non poterit. Et sic notaret Petri vicarius illud septimo replicatum, quomodo Matth. XVIII propter primatum fuit dictum singulariter Petro, quod fratrem suum corriperet, ubi sunt tria Petri vicario annotanda, primo cum debet fratrem suum corripere, debet primo omnium irreprehensibilem se servare, nam caritas debet incipere a se ipsa. Secundo notandum est quod Petri vicarius debet esse in modo corripiendi prudens, assiduus et intentus, quod non excomunicet ante finem correpcionis tercie in quo viderit fratrem suum non esse apcius corrigendum. Tercio debet notare, quod sit socius et minister ecclesie; aliter enim [160]non adhiberet sibi multitudinis testimonio, et quarto diceret ecclesie ut maiori, sic enim missus est a parva apostolorum ecclesia, ut patet Act. VIII.

foreign, I say, does his manner of life seem from Christ, that it varies from him far more than the manner of life of the priests of the old law [varied] from Moses, who had remained [with him] in sense, words and doctrine, but withdrew in life and work. But this pope seems foreign to Christ, since he disagrees with him both in life and in doctrine; for in Matt. 24:11 Christ says that "this gospel" about the false christ "shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations";[8] but the Pseudo, far from being set there to be a witness to Christ on earth, persecutes those who bear witness to this gospel. Hence it seems that Christ does not trust these as much as the priests of the old law, since in Matt. 23:3 he commands his own: "All things whatsoever they shall say to you, do: but according to their works do ye not. For they say, and do not."[9] And it is said that our prelates, from their greater distance from Christ through the caesarean endowment brought in upon [them], neither say nor do. [159]For whereas blessed Gregory set out with all his heart on the journey to convert the English, the modern pope assigns himself as a law that he is not to preach, lest he fall into heresy, for which alone he is to be deposed, as appears from distinction 40, *Si papa*.[10] But these things are scandalous: first, because the pope would know how to guard himself against heresy before he accepted such a dignity; second, because the pope, who is said to have so great a plenitude of power, could define that whatever he said would not be heresy, or at least could declare solemnly that he has no mind to turn aside from the law of the Lord.[11] Third, heresy is more dangerous in discord of life; indeed, by the same token no superior would preach, since for heresy, and especially real heresy, he deserves to be deposed; and the pope, for a manifold cause, would sooner flee that danger. Therefore it is nothing but an antichristian and self-accusing "excuse in sins".[12] Self-accusing, I say, because as such he openly judges that he is a stranger to [being] vicar of Christ; and in other matters it is commonly said that he cannot sin. And so the vicar of Peter should note what was repeated in the seventh, how in Matt. 18, because of the primacy, it was said to Peter singly that he should correct his brother;[13] where three things are to be noted by the vicar of Peter: first, since he must correct his brother, he must first of all keep himself irreprehensible, for charity must begin from itself. Second, it is to be noted that the vicar of Peter must be prudent, assiduous and attentive in the manner of correcting, so as not to excommunicate before the end of the third correction, at which he sees that his brother is not to be corrected more fitly [otherwise].[14] Third, he must note that he is a companion and minister of the church;

for otherwise [160] he would not bring in for himself the testimony of the many, and, fourth, tell it to the church as the greater; for so he was sent by the small church of the apostles, as is clear in Acts 8.[15]

Notes

1. Acts 15:7–11. A has a marginal note at 156.26 whose text is cut off in the scan of the apparatus (presumably *Ad 7*).
2. *octuplex*, "eightfold", is unexplained and doubtful; translated as printed. The contention about greatness: Luke 22:24.
3. Acts 15:10–11, Peter against laying the yoke of the law on the Gentile converts. "The key of knowledge": Luke 11:52; *diffiniret libertatem eorum stare in isto*: "define their liberty to consist in this".
4. Acts 15:13–14, 19 in Wyclif's form: he omits *primum* ("first") in 15:14 and *ad Deum* ("to God") in 15:19.
5. Gal. 2:11–14. *notum est* above: "it is noteworthy"; "the most blessed pope" is the style of papal address.
6. 3 Kings 12:10 (DR; 1 Kings in modern Bibles) in Wyclif's indirect form, *potencior* for the Vulgate's *grossior* (DR "My little finger is thicker than the back of my father"). Chrysostom: the pseudo-Chrysostom *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 1; Loserth, foot to 158.9: "Opp. tom. VI (Ed. Migne) p. 622".
7. 2 Thess. 2:4. *si implicat se extollere*: we take *implicat* as "implies"; it could be "whether he involves himself in exalting himself". "On both sides": of the divided Christendom.
8. The words are Matt. 24:14, printed "XXIV, 11". Wyclif reads *hoc evangelium de pseudochristo* where the Vulgate has *hoc Evangelium regni* ("this gospel of the kingdom"), and *in universo mundo* for *in universo orbe*: "about the false christ" is his gloss, taking the gospel to be the warning of Matt. 24:23–24. *pseudo* is the Pseudo, his name in ch. 6 for the false pope.
9. Matt. 23:3 without the Vulgate's *ergo* and *servate et* (DR "All things therefore whatsoever ... observe and do").
10. Gregory the Great set out to convert the English before he was pope: Bede, *Hist. eccl.* II.1, has his request and offer but says the Romans would not let him go; the journey itself (three days out, then recalled) is John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii* I.22–24 (PL 75, 72). Decretum D.40 c.6 *Si papa*: the pope is judged by none "unless he is found to deviate from the faith" (Loserth, foot: "Cap. VI"; the modern form is ours; PL 187, 215, under Boniface's name: *a nemine est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius*). *limitat* takes the glossary's "assign"; the sense is "prescribes". A and B note in the margin at 159.5 *Papa quare non predicat*.
11. *sciret*, *diffiniret*, *protestaretur* are potential subjunctives ("would know", "could define", "could declare"): the argument is ironic, since a pope who claims plenitude of power could remove the danger by a definition.
12. "Excuse in sins": Ps. 140:4 (*ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis*, DR "to make excuses in sins"). *heresis realis*: heresy in deed, as against heresy in words; cf. *in vite discordia* just before.
13. Matt. 18:15–17 is addressed to the disciples; Wyclif reads it as said to Peter (cf. Peter's question at 18:21). *septimo replicatum*: "repeated in the seventh", i.e. the seventh argument. B reads *ut* for *ubi* (159.24). The print says "three things" but four follow (Loserth's side-notes number them 1–4). A and B note in the margin at 159.21 *Vicarius Petri debet notare dicta Petro*.
14. *apcius*: "more fitly"; the third correction is the telling to the church (Matt. 18:17). "Charity must begin from itself": ordered charity begins with oneself.
15. Matt. 18:16–17 (the witnesses; "tell the church"). Acts 8:14: the apostles at Jerusalem sent Peter and John to Samaria. *multitudinis testimonio* is dative or ablative where *testimonium* is expected; translated by sense.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 158: *10* (old-style 10)
  - 158: *universo* (print has v)
  - 159: *et* (20 is the line number)
  - 160: *adhiberet*
  - 160: ∅ (page-opening slip repeating end of p. 159; main scan already holds it)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 6.-7. Cf. Rom. XV, 20. (156.33).

Part 8: The eighth confirmation: the propertyless state of the clergy

Loserth pp. 160.5–164.32

¶1 160.5–161.31
160.7 *It was for his great love that Peter was chosen to feed Christ's sheep,*
161.9 *How the Church gradually fell away from the life of true poverty.*

[160] Ad octavam confirmacionem Johannis ultimo ubi Petrus singulariter recepit pastum ovium propter prerogativam amoris quo Christum et corpus suum dilexerat, vere concluditur primatus Petri predictus; quod si papa fuerit expers predicti amoris, quid sibi et papatui? Nunquid credimus Christum acceptare personam Romani

To the eighth confirmation, from the last chapter of John, where Peter alone received the feeding of the sheep because of the prerogative of the love with which he had loved Christ and his body:[1] the aforesaid primacy of Peter is truly inferred; but if the pope should be without the aforesaid

pontificis propter elecciones aut invenciones humanas, cum hoc quod sit in vita et moribus Christo contrarius? Deliramentum blasfemum foret sic credere. Unde videtur quod papa timens mentiri Domino, servaret se in limitibus paupertatis et apostolice a mundo alienacionis, in quibus Petrum Christus constituit; certum quidem est, quod si mentitur de Christo et Petro, dicens quod virtute successionis vicarie Petri habet ex ordinacione divina tantam excellenciam mundanam super ecclesiam, oportet quod finaliter super verecundo mendacio sit convictus, quia cum peccatum sit mentiri super discolum in materia impertinente fidei; quanto maius peccatum est mentiri super beatos et caput ecclesie in materia fidei, in qua tota ecclesia est seducta? Si igitur papa sit Petri vicarius procuret pro ecclesia instar Petri. Petrus autem procuravit assidue quod clerus Christi poneretur in statu exproprietario plus perfecto, quod si papa viis et modis nitatur degradare se et clerum ab illo statu evangelico ad statum secularem proprietarium, quis dubitat, quin sit infidelissimus proditor, preparans viam dyabolo? Quomodo superabit [161] ecclesiam Christi cum mammona? Ille, inquam, vivit exproprietarie qui ob amorem Dei et securitatem a seculi seduccione relinquit omnem titulum humane securitatis de dotacione vel elemosina perpetua, spe suspensus in Deo, cui in superiori ecclesie officio inturpate et assidue famuletur; qualiter vixerunt prophete legis veteris. Christus cum suis apostolis et multi posteriores docti ab illis. Unde paulative recepit iste status gradus et sophisticabatur mille versuciis; nam tempore apostolorum dividebantur exproprietarii, alii ministrando mensis et alii pure intendentes evangelizacioni et aliis spiritualibus operibus sacerdotis, ut patet Act. VI. Secundo recepit clerus glebam et paulative dotaciones ulteriores ex titulo elemosine sine affeccione vel securitate humana, ymo rapinam et oblacionem talium cum gaudio susceperunt. Et sic fuit tempore Augustini et aliorum sanctorum, qui leviter peccaverunt. Sed cum istis surrepsit venenum dyaboli, quo cum expropriacione de facto propriacionem immiscuit in affectum, ut patet de Scarioth et multis sequentibus; secundo vero subintroducte sunt lacius cautele dyaboli, quibus elemosine occupate a notorie indignis sunt ut hereditas avidissime vendicata. Et ad defendendum istam cleri avariciam sunt multe leges condite; in tantum quod oblito tali officio summe pro lucro temporali contenditur, et illud venenum est periculosius et extensius: ideo ve illis, qui fovent ipsum propter animum dominandi.

love, what has he to do with the papacy?[2] Do we believe that Christ accepts the person of the Roman pontiff because of human elections or devisings, when all the while he is contrary to Christ in life and manners? It would be blasphemous raving to believe so. Hence it seems that the pope, fearing to lie to the Lord, would keep himself within the limits of poverty and of the apostolic estrangement from the world in which Christ established Peter; and it is certain that if he lies about Christ and Peter, saying that by virtue of succession to the vicarship of Peter[3] he has by divine ordinance so great a worldly excellence over the church, he must finally be convicted of a shameful lie; for if it is a sin to lie about a froward man in a matter that does not pertain to faith, how much greater a sin is it to lie about the blessed and the head of the church in a matter of faith, in which the whole church is led astray? If therefore the pope is the vicar of Peter, let him provide for the church after the manner of Peter. Now Peter assiduously provided that the clergy of Christ should be placed in the more perfect propertyless state; but if the pope by ways and means strives to degrade himself and the clergy from that evangelical state to the secular proprietary state, who doubts that he is a most faithless traitor, preparing the way for the devil? How [else] will [the devil] overcome [161] the church of Christ [but] with mammon?[4] That man, I say, lives without property who, for the love of God and for security from the seduction of the world, leaves every title of human security from endowment or perpetual alms, hanging in hope upon God, whom he is to serve unstainedly and assiduously in the higher office of the church: as the prophets of the old law lived, Christ with his apostles, and many later men taught by them. Hence this state gradually passed through stages[5] and was counterfeited with a thousand tricks; for in the time of the apostles the propertyless were divided, some serving tables and others attending purely to preaching the gospel and to the other spiritual works of a priest, as is clear in Acts 6. Secondly, the clergy received the glebe and gradually further endowments by title of alms, without affection for them or human security; indeed, they took with joy the being stripped of such things and the offering of them.[6] And so it was in the time of Augustine and the other saints, who sinned lightly. But with these the devil's poison crept in, by which, together with renunciation of property in fact, he mixed owning into the affection,[7] as is clear of Iscariot and many who followed; and secondly the devil's wiles were brought in more widely, by which alms occupied by the notoriously unworthy are claimed most greedily as an inheritance. And to defend this avarice of the clergy

¶2 161.32–163.8

162.1 *Antichrist's disciples say there is no distinction between the States of poverty and possession.*
162.14 *Endowments make the difference, since they are maintained by secular authority.*
163.9 *The Pope should protect the privilege of the clergy, which is, to live the higher life.*
163.22 *Christ has given authority to no one to make the church worse.*

[161]**Sunt autem multi fuci, quibus discipuli Antichristi perturbant ecclesiam: querunt enim descripcionem vite exproprietarie et arguunt quod** [162]**omnis homo vivit tam proprietarie quam exproprietarie, et sic inponunt magnam stulticiam pape Nicolao III. et sanctis doctoribus, ymo nostris religiosis, cum dicunt quod non sit statuum istorum distinccio. Notum est, inquam, ex modo vivendi tam preterito quam presenti quod in alio statu est clerus postquam recepit dotacionem cesaream et in alio antequam fuerit sic dotatus, sicut in alio statu vivunt religiosi possessionati, eciam in alio fratres et alii, quibus non sunt elemosine perpetue humanitus sic affixe. Status igitur exproprietarius cleri est status cleri conversandi sine dotacione et elemosinacione perpetua secularium dominorum. Et status cleri proprietarius est status cleri conversando ex dotacione vel elemosinacione perpetua secularium dominorum, ut contingit personis vel ecclesiis cleri quibus appropriatur ecclesia vel annuus redditus ex pacto elemosinacionis perpetue; que omnia oportet originari ex auctoritate dominorum secularium, licet alii de clero ad hoc adiuverint et autorizare false finxerint. Et patet quod talis appropriacio sapit ingratam diffidenciam de Christo et suis legibus, qua homo superflue exponit se spinis et temptacionibus huius mundi. Status igitur exproprietarius non est non habere temporalia, sed habere ex puro titulo Dei sine autorizacione humana vel sollicitudine preter necessaria ad cleri officium. Nec obest perfeccioni illius status quod sint in illo statu pessimi, quia distinguitur a statu morum. Supposito igitur quod status ille sit alcior atque perfeccior, patet quod ille papa ingrate et infideliter ducit ecclesiam,** [163]**quia nititur statum illum deprimere et alium exaltare. Non enim licet degradare clerum Christi a statu quem ipse instituit, sed status proprietarius in quo per papam confirmatur ecclesia est inferior statui quem Christus instituit, igitur non licet pape sine auctoritate divina a statu illo deicere clerum Christi. Petrus enim vel Paulus non habuit huiusmodi potestatem.**

many laws have been made, so much so that, that office being forgotten, men contend to the utmost for temporal gain;[8] **and that poison is the more dangerous and the more widespread: therefore woe to those who foster it out of a will to lord it.**

And there are many disguises with which the disciples of Antichrist trouble the church: for they ask for a definition of the propertyless life, and argue that [162]**every man lives both proprietarily and without property; and so they impute great folly to Pope Nicholas III**[9] **and to the holy doctors, indeed to our religious, when they say that there is no distinction between these states. It is known, I say, from the manner of living both past and present, that the clergy is in one state after it received the caesarean endowment and in another before it was so endowed, just as the possessioned religious live in one state, and in another the friars and others to whom perpetual alms are not thus humanly fixed. Therefore the propertyless state of the clergy is the state of the clergy living without endowment and perpetual almsgiving from secular lords. And the proprietary state of the clergy is the state of the clergy living from endowment or perpetual almsgiving from secular lords, as happens to persons or churches of the clergy to which a church or an annual revenue is appropriated by a compact of perpetual almsgiving; all of which must originate from the authority of secular lords, although others of the clergy have helped toward it and have falsely feigned to authorize it. And it is clear that such appropriation savours of an ungrateful distrust of Christ and his laws, by which a man needlessly exposes himself to the thorns and temptations of this world.**[10] **Therefore the propertyless state is not to have no temporal goods, but to have them by the pure title of God, without human authorization or anxiety beyond what is necessary for the office of the clergy. Nor does it hurt the perfection of that state that there are very bad men in that state, because it is distinguished from the state of morals.**[11] **Supposing therefore that that state is higher and more perfect, it is clear that that pope leads the church ungratefully and faithlessly,** [163]**since he strives to depress that state and exalt the other. For it is not lawful to degrade the clergy of Christ from the state which he himself instituted; now the proprietary state in which the church is confirmed by the pope is inferior to the state which Christ instituted; therefore it is not lawful for the pope, without divine authority, to cast the clergy of Christ down from that state. For Peter or Paul had no such power.**

¶3 163.9–163.21

[163]Item, papa tenetur specialiter stare pro privilegiis cleri sui, sed precipuum privilegium per quod distinguuntur cleri a laycis stat in hoc quod cleri serventur in statu exproprietario alciori, igitur hoc privilegium debet papa in se et subditis observare. Sic enim fecit Apostolus in quo locutus est Christus Heb. XIII, 5, 6 quando sic docuit: Sint mores sine avaricia, contenti presentibus; ipse enim dixit: Non te deseram neque derelinquam Ita ut confidenter dicamus: Dominus michi adiutor, et non timebo quid faciat michi homo. Que doctrina videtur expresse facere pro expropriacione contra propriacionem.

Again, the pope is bound especially to stand for the privileges of his clergy; now the chief privilege by which clerics are distinguished from laymen consists in this, that clerics be kept in the higher propertyless state; therefore the pope ought to observe this privilege in himself and in his subjects. For so did the Apostle, in whom Christ spoke,[12] Heb. 13:5–6, when he taught thus: "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: and I will not fear what man shall do to me."[13] Which doctrine seems expressly to make for renunciation of property against owning.

¶4 163.22–164.32

164.11 *God knows our weakness and enjoins the safer state.*

[163]Item, papa non habet potestatem a Deo ad deteriorandum sed meliorandum ecclesiam, ut dicit Apostolus de se ipso II. Cor. X, 8: Si aliquid amplius gloriatus fuero de potestate nostra, quam nobis dedit Dominus in edificacionem et non in destruccionem. Et patet de racione; nam bonus dominus cesar semper Augustus non dat potestatem homini, ut dampnificet sponsam suam, magna autem dampnificacio foret statum tam altum et securum perdere sine equivalencia recompense; omnis enim mundana ditacio non potest attingere illum statum, cum maior ditacio plus abducit. Quomodo igitur autorizabit Christi vicarius [164]ex fastu vel avaricia sic ducere gregem Domini per abrupta; cum posset securius in pascuis quas Christus instituit ducere oves suas? Securius dico propter dietam a morbis putridis preservantem, propter facilitatem tenendi ad pascua semper virencia preparantem, et propter securitatem insultus latronis et male bestie excludentem. Sic enim prudens paterfamilias seminat semen bonum non inter spinas, ne ex earum cremento frugum contrario suffocetur. Scit enim Deus infirmum statum sue familie quomodo prona est ad omnia morborum genera; ideo ut summus medicus iniungit dietam, que licet videatur antichristo Romano contraria, est tamen statui nostro fragili summe consona. Nam iniungit nobis quoad statum exproprietarium relinquere omnia; quod debemus nos curati facere; viventes pure de decimis, oblacionibus et privatis elemosinis laycorum. Et quia cum illo statu exproprietario stat elemosinarum abusio, ideo secundum beatum Jeronimum Petrus adiungit, quod perfectum est scilicet statum morum; dum dicit: Et secuti sumus te, sine hoc enim non potest esse salus fidelium. Sed illius; qui reliquit omnia, est status perfeccior quam remanentis in seculo, quia statui summo propinquior. Istam autem materiam decet

Again, the pope does not have power from God to make the church worse but to make it better, as the Apostle says of himself, 2 Cor. 10:8: "If I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification and not for destruction."[14] And it is clear by reason; for the good Lord, Caesar ever Augustus, does not give a man power to harm his bride;[15] now it would be a great harm to lose a state so high and secure without an equivalent recompense; for no worldly enriching can reach that state, since greater enriching leads further away. How then will the vicar of Christ authorize [himself], [164]out of pride or avarice, thus to lead the Lord's flock over precipices, when he could more securely lead his sheep in the pastures which Christ instituted? More securely, I say, because of the diet that preserves from putrid diseases, because of the ease of keeping to ever-green pastures that it provides, and because of the security that shuts out the assault of the robber and of the evil beast.[16] For so a prudent householder sows good seed not among thorns, lest it be choked by their growth, which is contrary to the crops.[17] For God knows the infirm state of his household, how prone it is to all kinds of disease; therefore, as the supreme physician, he enjoins a diet which, although it seems contrary to the Roman antichrist,[18] is yet supremely consonant with our fragile state. For he enjoins us, as to the propertyless state, to leave all things; which we curates ought to do, living purely from tithes, offerings and the private alms of laymen.[19] And because an abuse of alms can stand together with that propertyless state, therefore, according to blessed Jerome, Peter adds what is perfect, namely the state of morals, when he says: "and have followed thee" (Matt. 19:27); for without this there can be no salvation of the faithful.[20] But the state of him who has

cunctos fideles cognoscere, quia caucius cavebunt a lupis qui veniunt in vestimentis ovium; securius sequentur Christi vestigia dimissis viis Antichristi, et prudencius preparabitur ad discredendum suis blasfemiis et ab adhibendo sibi cultus indebitos et consensum.

left all things is more perfect than that of one who remains in the world, because it is nearer the highest state. And it befits all the faithful to know this matter, because they will more warily beware of the wolves who come in the clothing of sheep;[21] they will more securely follow the footsteps of Christ, leaving the ways of Antichrist;[22] and [the way] will be more prudently prepared for disbelieving his blasphemies and for withholding from him undue worship and consent.

Notes

1. John 21:15–17, the threefold "Feed my sheep" after "lovest thou me more than these?". A marks the place in the margin "Ad 8." (the eighth confirmation of the chapter's thesis).
2. *Quid sibi et papatui?*, the idiom of *quid mihi et tibi* (John 2:4): "what is there between him and the papacy?" The print's "?," after *amoris* is kept in the Latin and not rendered.
3. *Successionis vicarie Petri*: *vicarie* read as the genitive of *vicaria*, "vicarship"; it could also be the adjective, "the vicarial succession of Peter". The sense is the same.
4. The subject of *superabit* is unexpressed: taken as the devil, for whom the pope prepares the way; it may be the pope himself (*superare*, "surpass": "How will he surpass the church of Christ with mammon?").
5. *Recepit iste status gradus*, literally "this state received degrees": it came down step by step, as the stages that follow (*nam ... Secundo ... secundo vero*) set out.
6. *Rapinam ... cum gaudio susceperunt* echoes Heb. 10:34, "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods"; the DR phrase is kept and *oblacionem* ("offering") added. C. The early clergy took gifts and losses alike without affection.
7. *Propriacio* here and at 163.21 is the opposite of *expropriacio* "renunciation of property": "owning", making a thing one's own. It is not *appropriacio* (the annexing of a church, 162.21). C. *In affectum*: into the will, while the renunciation stood "in fact".
8. *Summe* may go with *oblito* ("that office being utterly forgotten") rather than with *contenditur*; we take it with the verb.
9. Nicholas III's decretal *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), which defined the Franciscans' use of goods without lordship (*Sext.* 5.12.3, Friedberg II; the form is ours).
10. A reads *spernis* for *spinis* (Loserth). S. The thorns of the parable, Matt. 13:7, 22. G. *Ingratus*: ungrateful toward Christ, who provides (the glossary: "ungrateful" where a person is ungrateful to someone).
11. The *status morum* is a man's moral condition; the propertyless state is a state of life and can hold bad men. The same pair returns at 164.24.
12. *In quo locutus est Christus* echoes 2 Cor. 13:3, "of Christ that speaketh in me".
13. The print has *contenti presentibus*, with the Vulgate; Loserth reports that the manuscripts read *contemptis presentibus* ("the present things despised"). S. Wyclif adds *et* before *non timebo*, rendered "and".
14. Wyclif's citation omits the Vulgate's *Nam*, *vestram* ("your") and the close *non erubescam*; DR is adjusted to his Latin. T. Loserth reports that in the manuscripts the quotation (*Si aliquid ... destruccionem*) stands in the margin, and that B lacks *et* before *patet*.
15. Christ, given the imperial style *semper Augustus*; the bride is the church.
16. The three participles agree with their nouns: the diet preserves, the ease is "providing" (*preparantem*), the security shuts out. An alternative takes all three with *dietam*.
17. Loserth notes that the subject of *suffocetur* is *semen*, the seed. *Frugum contrario*: the thorns' growth is contrary to the crops. S. Matt. 13:7, 22.
18. The print reads *antichristo Romano*; Loserth reports *Romani* in the manuscripts ("the antichrist of the Roman").
19. *Nos curati*: Wyclif counts himself among the curates (the Crown presented him to the rectory of Lutterworth on 7 April 1374).
20. Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew* 3, on Matt. 19:27: leaving is not enough, so Peter adds what is perfect, "and have followed thee" (PL 26, 138: *Et quia non sufficit tantum relinquere, jungit quod perfectum est: et secuti sumus te*). Loserth places the reference to Matt. 19:27 in the margin.
21. Matt. 7:15, "who come to you in the clothing of sheep".
22. The print reads *viis*; Loserth reports that the manuscripts read *aviis* ("the trackless ways"). For *preparabitur* he proposes supplying *via*, which we give in brackets.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 160: *amoris*
  - 160: *papatui* [NW]
  - 160: *ex* (20 is the line number)
  - 161: *elemosina* (hyphenated ele-mosina; main token covers whole word (5 line number glued))
  - 162: *omnis*
  - 162: *inponunt* [NW]
  - 162: *preterito*
  - 162: *presenti*

- **163: *illum***
- **163: *Ita***
- **163: *quam***
- **163: *recompense* (hyphenated re-compense; main token covers whole word) [NW]**
- **163: *illum***
- **164: *pascua semper* (hyphenated pas-cua; main token covers it and the next word)**
- **161: *expropriacione* (LEFT-nw: print = expropriacione)**

- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 22. Matth. XIX, 27. (164.32).**
- **Apparatus not otherwise noted: 160.5 Loserth prints *sic credere* for the manuscripts' *si credere*; 162.26 B lacks the first *non* of *non est non habere*; 163.29 B abbreviates *suam* to *s.* The print is translated in each case.**

Chapter 8

Part 1: The name "pope", and the reason from Rome as capital

Loserth pp. 165.2–169.31

¶1 165.2–166.25
165.2 *„Pope."*
165.13 *Formerly used of other bishops.*
166.12 *It has come to mean the bishop who is nearest to Christ in life and work.*
166.19 *How came it to be assigned to the Roman pontiff:*
166.26 *Armachanus says: Because Rome was the chief city of Christendom.*

[165]Iam restat videre si oporteat regulariter Romanum pontificem esse papam et inmediatum ac proximum vicarium Christi in terris. Sed pro nomine pape, notandum, quod in scriptura sacra, si bene habeo, non exprimitur, sed est ab interieccione pape, quod admiracionem signat, derivatum. Unde eis convenit proprie qui in conversacione sunt admirabiles sanctitate; ad quem sensum Ihesus noster est summus papa possibilis, cum de eo scribitur Ysaias IX, 6: Et vocabitur nomen eius admirabilis, consiliarius, Deus fortis, princeps pacis. Olim autem vocati sunt quicumque sancti episcopi sancti pape. Unde epistola VIII jeronimi ad Augustinum sic loquitur: Domino vere sancto et beatissimo pape Augustino Jeronimus salutem. Item, Augustinus epistola XVIII ad Paulinum sic loquitur: Libros beatissimi pape Ambrosii credo habere sanctitatem tuam, eos autem multum desidero quos adversus nonnullos imperitissimos et superbissimos, qui de Platonis libris dominum profecisse contendunt, diligentissime ac copiosissime scripsit. Item, epistola X ad Aurelium scribunt Alpius et Augustinus: Domino beatissimo pape Aurelio; nec fuit iste Aurelius papa episcopus Romanus, ut patet epistola CXXXIX ad Generosum, in qua enumerat omnes episcopos a beato Petro usque ad Anastasium, qui tunc eandem [166]cathedram rexit, et olim communiter vocabantur episcopi pape. Unde Bonifacius comes epistola CII scribit Augustino: Tue sanctitatis epistolam admonitu me terrificantem suscepi; etenim venerabilis papa: Si thorus ille legitimus pavidos habet accessus quo debet puniri supplicio qui divinas temerat raciones? Et epistola III sic in fine alloquitur idem Bonifacius Augustinum: Ora igitur, venerabilis papa, ut talis de inimicis sepe ulcio procedat, ymo ut recitat Archidiaconus: Greci vocant cunctos presbiteros papas; unde ra- cione dotacionis atque dominii baptizatus fuit terminus ut approprietur Romano pontifici. Sed quia non est vis in servacione termini, suppono quod specialiter significet illum episcopum, qui gerit altissime, simillime et propinquissime vicem Christi, sicut fecit Petrus post ascensionem, et regulariter dicimus quod faciunt Romani pontifices. Sed quia videtur mirabilis saltus et infundabilis a Christo ad totum genus Romanorum pontificum regulariter sic saltare, ideo multi adinveniunt vias varias

It now remains to see whether the Roman pontiff must as a rule be pope and the immediate and nearest vicar of Christ on earth. But as for the name "pope", note that it is not expressed in holy scripture, if I am right, but is derived from the interjection *papae*, which signifies wonder.[1] Hence it properly befits those who are wonderful for holiness in their manner of life; in which sense our Jesus is the highest pope possible, since it is written of him, Isaiah 9:6: "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Prince of Peace."[2] And formerly all holy bishops whatever were called holy popes. Hence Jerome's eighth letter to Augustine speaks thus: "To the lord truly holy and most blessed pope Augustine, Jerome [sends] greeting." Again, Augustine in letter 18 to Paulinus speaks thus: "I believe your holiness has the books of the most blessed pope Ambrose; and I greatly desire those which he wrote most diligently and copiously against certain most unskilled and most proud men, who contend that the Lord profited from the books of Plato." Again, in letter 10 to Aurelius, Alypius and Augustine write: "To the most blessed lord pope Aurelius"; and this pope Aurelius was not the Roman bishop, as is clear from letter 139 to Generosus, in which he enumerates all the bishops from blessed Peter down to Anastasius, who then ruled the same [166]see;[3] and formerly bishops were commonly called popes. Hence Count Boniface, in letter 102, writes to Augustine: "I have received your holiness's letter, terrifying me by its admonition; for, venerable pope, if that lawful bed has fearful approaches, with what punishment must he be punished who violates the divine reasons?"[4] And in letter 3 the same Boniface addresses Augustine thus at the end: "Pray therefore, venerable pope, that such vengeance may often go forth upon enemies." Indeed, as the Archdeacon relates: "The Greeks call all presbyters popes";[5] hence by reason of endowment and lordship the term was baptized so that it should be appropriated to the Roman pontiff. But since no weight lies in keeping to a term,[6] I suppose that it signifies specially that bishop who bears the place of Christ most highly, most like him and most nearly, as Peter did after the ascension, and as we

ad istam ficticiam colorandum. Quidam autem dicunt hoc procedere per viam racionis, quidam per viam Petri successionis, et quidam per viam eleccionis.

say the Roman pontiffs do as a rule. But since it seems a wonderful and groundless leap to leap thus as a rule from Christ to the whole line of Roman pontiffs, therefore many devise various ways to give colour to this fiction. And some say that this proceeds by way of reason, some by way of the succession of Peter, and some by way of election.

¶2 166.26–166.30

[166]Quantum ad primum fingit dominus Ardmacanus libro VII De Questionibus Armenorum racionem multiplicem, prima quia Roma est capitalis civitas christianismi, ideo decet quod capitalis episcopus ibi regat.

As to the first, the lord of Armagh, in book 7 of the *Questions of the Armenians*, feigns a manifold reason:[7] first, because Rome is the capital city of Christendom, therefore it is fitting that the capital bishop should rule there.

¶3 166.31–167.12
167.14 *If so, what of the popes who fatten at Avignon.*
167.20 *Their first duty is to Rome where they claim dominion.*
167.32 *Capitals may be changed.*

[166]Sed quantum ad istam evidenciam videtur, quod accusat summum pontificem dominum Ihesum Christum, qui elegit Jerusalem passioni, et hoc [167]videtur racionabile, quod ille qui venerat totum genus humanum redimere; in medio terre habitabilis ostenderet medicinam iuxta illud Psalmi LXXIII, 12: Deus autem rex noster ante secula operatus est salutem in medio terre. Secundum cosmimetras Jerusalem ponitur in medio habitabilis, locus autem ille foret convencior summo pontifici quam angulus Europe Roma, quia aliter Christus indubie non taliter elegisset; potissime cum tempore Christi et Augusti Cesaris fuit Roma in medio florum sui dominii; et imperator minus impius quam sequentes tempore apostolorum.

But as to this evidence, it seems that it accuses the highest pontiff, the Lord Jesus Christ, who chose Jerusalem for his passion; and this [167] seems reasonable, that he who had come to redeem the whole human race should show the medicine in the middle of the habitable earth, according to that of Psalm 73:12: "But God is our king before ages: he hath wrought salvation in the midst of the earth." According to the cosmographers, Jerusalem is placed in the middle of the habitable [world]; and that place would be more fitting for the highest pontiff than Rome, a corner of Europe,[8] because otherwise Christ undoubtedly would not have chosen as he did; above all since in the time of Christ and of Augustus Caesar Rome was in the full flower of its lordship, and the emperor less impious than those who followed in the time of the apostles.

¶4 167.14–167.31

[167]Iterum videtur quod racio ista, cum stat continue, accusat papas sequentes, qui in maiori parte Romam non rexerant, sed incrassati quieverunt Avinione; et cum pocior racio nunc subesset, eo quod ille locus imperii dicitur esse de pape dominio; et sic remanet multiplex racio; primo et principaliter regendi hunc populum; cum crescentibus racionibus donorum debet secundum beatum Gregorium crescere racio humilius et promcius ministrandi. Nam secundum Apostolum prima Thym. V; Qui non providet suis et maxime domesticis fidem negat et est infideli deterior, papa igitur provideret specialiter Romanis de bonis spiritualibus; cum fit eorum dominus et curatus. Racione dominii debet eos seculariter defendere et racione patris spiritualis et peculiaris debet eos instar Pauli spiritualiter gignere et fovere.

Again, it seems that this reason, since it stands continually, accuses the popes who followed, who for the most part did not rule Rome but, grown fat, rested at Avignon,[9] and [accuses them the more] since a stronger reason would now be present, in that that place of the empire is said to be of the pope's lordship.[10] And so a manifold reason remains: first and principally, the reason for ruling this people; since, as the reasons of gifts grow, the reason for ministering more humbly and more readily ought to grow, according to blessed Gregory.[11] For according to the Apostle, 1 Tim. 5[:8]: "He that hath not care of his own and especially of those of his house hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel";[12] therefore the pope should provide especially for the Romans in spiritual goods, since he is made their lord and curate. By reason of lordship he ought to defend them in secular wise, and by reason of [being] their spiritual and particular father he ought, like Paul, to beget and cherish them spiritually.[13]

¶5 167.32–168.26
168.13 *There are empires greater than the Roman.*
168.16 *The papacy separable from the Roman pontificate.*
168.22 *With this falls the plea that in the capital the clergy had more influence for the good of the Church.*

[167]**Item; si super ista racione dependet racio papatus Romani pontificis, cum ista racio sit secundum fortunam valde mutabilis, sequitur quod oportet papatum proporcionaliter variari, nam** [168] **tempore apostolorum et diu post non fuit Roma civitas christianismi, vel plenius civitas synagoge sathane, cum imperator et maior pars populi fuerat infidelis, ymo ut declarat dominus Ardmacanus libro VII, cap. XVI De Questionibus Armenorum, ad tantum restrictum est Romanum imperium, ut non solum imperio Magni Canis de Cathay, sed modo insuper imperio Persarum, imperio Usbeck, imperio Soldani et imperio barbarorum sit minor dominio seculari, ymo secundum relacionem eorum, qui remotas visitarunt contratas, sunt multe civitates, que Romam exuperant. Ideo procul a catholico, ut dicat locum illum vel populum necessitare, ut episcopus suus sit optimus sequax Christi. Et ideo infra dicit dominus Ardmacanus cap. XVIII: Mihi, inquit, videtur quod papatus et pontificatus Romanus non sic connectuntur quin ex causa racionali poterunt separari. Et conformiter tollitur secunda racio, qua fingitur quod in capite mundi, ubi est generalior confluxus populi, reciperet ipse efficacius doctrinam Christi et exemplaretur apcius, quomodo principes Romani forent Christo subiecti, nec non tercio fons cleri assisteret fonti secularis dominii, ut milicia cleri corroboret, et clerus principibus consulat et regat secundum evangelium Ihesu Christi.**

Again, if the reason for the papacy of the Roman pontiff depends on this reason, since this reason is very changeable according to fortune, it follows that the papacy must vary proportionally. For [168] **in the time of the apostles and long after, Rome was not the city of Christendom, or, more fully, [it was] the city of the synagogue of Satan,[14] since the emperor and the greater part of the people were unbelievers; indeed, as the lord of Armagh declares in book 7, chapter 16 of the *Questions of the Armenians*, the Roman empire is restricted to such a degree that it is less in secular lordship not only than the empire of the Great Khan of Cathay, but now besides than the empire of the Persians, the empire of Uzbek, the empire of the Sultan and the empire of the barbarians;[15] indeed, according to the report of those who have visited remote countries, there are many cities which surpass Rome. Therefore it is far from catholic for a man to say that that place or people necessitates that its bishop be the best follower of Christ. And therefore the lord of Armagh says below, in chapter 18: "It seems to me," he says, "that the papacy and the Roman pontificate are not so connected that they could not be separated for a reasonable cause."[16] And in conformity with this the second reason is removed, by which it is feigned that in the head of the world, where there is a more general confluence of people, it[17] would receive the doctrine of Christ more effectually, and it would be more aptly exemplified how the Roman princes should be subject to Christ; and also, thirdly, that the fount of the clergy should stand beside the fount of secular lordship, so that the knighthood might strengthen the clergy,[18] and the clergy counsel the princes and rule according to the gospel of Jesus Christ.**

¶6 168.27–169.31
169.10 *Endowment made the clergy shirk their duty of teaching and reproof.*

[168]**Ista autem triplex ficticia non est racio, quia in toto continet oppositum. Nam Nero, Dyoclecianus et genus tyrannorum succedencium fuerunt precipua obstacula, quare non currebat in imperio evangelium et lex Christi, sicut patet ex notis cronicis, ymo Constantinus succedens venenando** [169] **magis diutine dampnificavit ecclesiam; et iterum clerus ex avaricia nimis dampnificavit imperium, et quod plus est dedit principibus perniciosum exemplum de omni genere peccatorum, et quod est infidelissimum, obmutuit incrassatus corripere vel docere. Nam ante dotacionem Petrus, Clemens, Marcellus et alii sancti Romani episcopi usque ad mortem dilexerunt cesarem et eius populum docendo et corripiendo. Sed postquam dotati sunt, laboraverunt vecordia atque blasfemia, vecordia timendo dicere principibus et populis sua vicia, quin pocius lacte adulacionis**

But this threefold fiction is not reason, because as a whole it contains the opposite. For Nero, Diocletian and the line of tyrants who succeeded them were the chief obstacles to the gospel and the law of Christ running in the empire, as is clear from well-known chronicles; indeed Constantine, succeeding, by poisoning [169] **harmed the church more lastingly;[19] and again the clergy out of avarice harmed the empire exceedingly, and, what is more, gave the princes a pernicious example of every kind of sin, and, what is most faithless, grown fat, fell dumb to rebuke or to teach. For before the endowment Peter, Clement, Marcellus and other holy Roman bishops loved Caesar and his people even to death, by teaching and rebuking. But after they were endowed they laboured under faint-heartedness and blasphemy: faint-heartedness, in fearing to**

mollificarunt et dissolverunt suos dominos, ut dando illis temporalia contra regulam Christi dampnificent se et illos. Et tercio prorumpunt in maiores ingratas blasfemias, dicentes quod non habuerunt dotacionem illam a cesare, sed iure successionis Christi et Petri, qui fuerunt summe taliter dominati. Ideo non docet eos visitare principes et eis impertiri aliquid spiritualis doctrine, sed residere ubicumque voluerint, imperatoresque et reges advocare et abiectissima mundana servicia imperialiter ab eis recipere. Non sic fecit Petrus, ideo indubie dissonat scole Christi, cum post multiplicacionem donorum temporalium satagerent visitando donatores, humilius refundere pociora. Sed quis tam ingratus Christo abbati non foret ingratus proximo? Christus enim ob amorem nostri venit summe inops et egenus, ut dicitur II. Cor. VIII ad finem, et ut nos clerici et specialiter Petri vicarii vivamus similiter.

tell princes and peoples their vices; nay rather, with the milk of flattery they softened and dissolved their lords, so that by giving them temporal goods against the rule of Christ they harm both themselves and them. And thirdly they break out into greater, ungrateful blasphemies, saying that they did not have that endowment from Caesar, but by right of succession to Christ and Peter, who [they say] exercised lordship in this way in the highest degree. Therefore it does not teach them[20] to visit princes and to impart to them something of spiritual doctrine, but to reside wherever they will, to summon emperors and kings, and to receive from them, imperially, the most abject worldly services. Peter did not do so; therefore it undoubtedly jars with the school of Christ, since after the multiplication of temporal gifts they ought to have busied themselves, by visiting the donors, in paying back more humbly better things. But who so ungrateful to Christ the abbot would not be ungrateful to his neighbour?[21] For Christ, for love of us, came supremely poor and needy, as is said in 2 Cor. 8 toward the end,[22] and so that we clerics, and especially the vicars of Peter, might live likewise.

Notes

1. Loserth compares Wyclif's English works, ed. Matthew, p. 471, and Hus (his p. 256), who reuse the etymology (Matthew p. 471, *De papa* ch. 7: the name "is newe foundun" and betokens "wundirful"; the Hus page not checked; Loserth also cites Freeman, *William Rufus* I, 292). R. A in the margin, at 165.14: *Nota Augustinus mirabiliter contra Wy[clif]*, the annotator's protest against the argument from the letters that follow.
2. Wyclif's citation omits the Vulgate's *Pater futuri saeculi*, "the Father of the world to come", and reads *Deus fortis* as one title; DR's "God the Mighty" fits it.
3. Loserth's references (Augustine, *Opera* II, Maurist numbering): Jerome to Augustine, Ep. 112 in Jerome's collection (PL 22, 916; Ep. 75 in Augustine's, PL 33, 251); Augustine to Paulinus, Ep. 31 (al. 32); Alypius and Augustine to Aurelius, *ibid.* p. 87 (Ep. 41); to Generosus, Ep. 53 (al. 165), with its list of Roman bishops down to Anastasius. Wyclif's letter numbers are those of his own collection. "Alypius" is the modern form of the print's *Alpius*.
4. The letters of Count Boniface stand in the appendix of spurious pieces in Augustine's *Opera* II (Loserth: App. p. 1; and Ep. 14, al. 194, App. p. 4; PL 33, 1095 and 1098, spurious Epp. 2 and 14). C. *Divinas ... raciones*: perhaps "the divine accounts" or "ordinances"; we keep the literal "reasons".
5. Loserth reports a gap in the manuscripts after *Archidiaconus*. S. The Archdeacon is presumably Guido de Baysio, archdeacon of Bologna, author of the *Rosarium* on the Decretum, the canonists' usual *Archidiaconus*; the passage has not been traced.
6. *Non est vis in servacione termini*: the canonists' *vis non est facienda in verbis*, "no stress is to be laid on words". Wyclif lets the word go and fixes the sense.
7. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* 7 (chapter 15, Paris 1512, fol. 48r, where Richard sets out these reasons, including the one fount for a "twofold stream of rule" and the martyrs' blood (cf. 168.22–26, 171.24)). G. *Fingit*: "feigns", the verb of *ficticia* "fiction" (166.24).
8. Loserth prints *quam* for the manuscripts' *quia* (167.8). C. *Angulus Europe Roma*: "Rome" is in apposition with "a corner of Europe".
9. The papal court had resided at Avignon from 1309 to 1377 (Clement V settled there in 1309; Gregory XI entered Rome on 17 January 1377). Loserth reports *papa* in the manuscripts for *papas* (167.15).
10. *Cum pocior racio nunc subesset*: *cum* may be concessive ("although a stronger reason would now be present"); either way the clause depends on *accusat*.
11. Gregory, *Homilies on the Gospels* 9.1: "when gifts increase, the accounts (*rationes*) for the gifts also grow" (PL 76, 1106; Gregory goes on: *tanto ergo esse humilior atque ad serviendum promptior quisque debet*, Wyclif's *humilius et promcius ministrandi*). C. Gregory's *racio* is "account", the reckoning to be rendered; Wyclif plays on it beside *racio* "reason", which we keep throughout.
12. Wyclif's *Qui non providet ... negat* departs from the Vulgate's *Si quis ... curam non habet, fidem negavit*; the English follows his Latin with DR's wording.
13. 1 Cor. 4:15, "in Christ Jesus by the gospel I have begotten you."
14. Apoc. 2:9, "the synagogue of Satan".

15. FitzRalph, *Summa* 7.16 (Paris, 1511, fol. 48; Loserth after R. L. Poole; seen in the 1512 print, fol. 48r, where the list is spoken by FitzRalph's interlocutor John). The same chapter (fol. 48r–v) gives the objector's case for Jerusalem, *in medio terre* (Ps. 73:12) and the city of the martyrs, which Wyclif turns to his own use at 167.1–8 and 172.14 ff. Loserth glosses *Canis* as Khan and *Cathay* as China; B reads *Usboth* for *Usbeck* (Özbeg, khan of the Golden Horde). FitzRalph writes only *imperio soldani*; the Mamluk sultan of Egypt is our presumption.
16. FitzRalph, *Summa* 7.18 (Paris 1512, fol. 50r: *non tamen sic michi videtur annexi quin ex rationabili causa … valeant separari*). T. Loserth prints *quin*; the manuscripts read *quando* (168.18).
17. *Ipse* most likely takes up *populus* in *confluxus populi*, "the people"; it could be the pope himself.
18. The Latin has *milicia cleri corroboret*, literally "that the knighthood of the clergy might strengthen", with no object; we take *cleri* as the object in sense. A word may have fallen out (e.g. *clerum*).
19. The legend that at Constantine's donation a voice was heard saying "today poison is poured into the church" (Higden, *Polychronicon* IV.26, Rolls Series V, 130: *Hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Dei*; cf. 130.4).
20. The subject of *docet* is not stated: most likely the endowment, or the claim just named; possibly the teaching of their school. G. *Ingratus* (169.15): "ungrateful" toward a person, here Caesar the donor (the glossary).
21. The print reads *Christo abbati*, "Christ the abbot"; Loserth reports *Christi* in the manuscripts, "Christ's abbot". G. *Ingratus* here is "ungrateful" toward a person (the glossary).
22. 2 Cor. 8:9, "being rich he became poor for your sakes". Loserth notes that the citation is rather 8:9 than the chapter's end.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 165: *CAPITULUM OCTAVUM.*
  - 165: *pontificem*
  - 165: *Et*
  - 165: *Deus*
  - 165: *sanctitatem*
  - 165: *quos*
  - 165: *Aurelio* (25 is the line number)
  - 166: *accessus* (hyphenated ac-cessus; main token covers whole word)
  - 166: *ra-* (hyphenated ra-cione; main token holds first half)
  - 166: *illum*
  - 167: *Deus*
  - 167: *deterior*
  - 167: *racio*
  - 168: *ut*
  - 168: *Canis*
  - 168: *contratas* [NW]
  - 168: *illum*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Rome waIthe (166.27).
- Apparatus not otherwise noted: 169.24 Loserth expands the manuscripts' *P.* to *Petrus*. The print is translated.

Part 2: The lie of Christ's lordship, and the holiness of the place

Loserth pp. 169.32–173.32

¶1 169.32–171.14

170.1 *It is false that Christ ruled and that it becomes his disciples, to do so.*
170.18 *If the clergy hold property, they do it by Cesar's law.*
171.16 *Worldly gifts do not aid the Church but injure it.*

[169]Econtra autem nos pro excusacionibus in peccatis fingimus de eo blasfemum mendacium [170]quod dominatus fuit et apostolos suos dominari docuit summe civiliter. Et virtute istius mendacii coloramus nostrum monstruosum dominium. Non enim decuit regem seculorum assumere sibi ad perfeccionem humanam seculare dominium, nisi hoc faceret ad summum ultra quam alicui alteri bene potest competere Quomodo igitur ipse acciperet tam parce et indigne sessivam in dominio ad quod aspirat, relinquens mendacibus ab eo degenerantibus possessionem gloriosam et plenam super omnia

But we, on the contrary, by way of excuses for our sins, feign of him a blasphemous lie, [170]that he exercised lordship and taught his apostles to exercise lordship in the highest degree civilly. And by virtue of this lie we colour our monstrous lordship. For it did not befit the king of ages to assume secular lordship to himself for human perfection unless he did it in the highest degree, beyond what can well belong to any other. How then would he take so sparingly and unworthily a seisin[1] in the lordship to which he aspires, leaving to liars who degenerate from him a glorious

171.29 *Another plea is sanctity of Rome for its many martyrs,*

regna mundi. Nonne (ut sepe repecii) leges papales convincunt, illud mendacium, primo XCVI distinccione Constantinus, incorporatur cartha Constantini et pape, testificans formam qua donavit cece partem illam imperii suo episcopo? Nonne secundo ex testimonio magni doctoris Augustini posito distinccione VIII Quo iure docetur expresse, quod clerus non habet proprietatem secularis dominii, nisi ex lege cesaris et dono secularium dominorum? Nonne tercio beatus Bernhardus libro II, III alloquitur Eugenium papam sub hiis verbis, ut recitavi diffuse superius: Quid dimiserit pape sanctus apostolus? quod habeo, inquit, hoc tibi do; quid illud? certe non est aurum neque argentum cum ipse dicat: Argentum et aurum non est michi. Si habere contingat, utere non pro libito, sed pro tempore, sic eris utens illis quasi non utens. Ipsa quidem quantum ad bonum anime spectat, nec bona sunt nec mala, usus tamen horum bonus, abusio mala, sollicitudo peior, questus turpior. Esto ut alia quacumque racione hec tibi venaices [171]sed non apostolico iure; nec enim tibi dare quod non habuit, potuit; quod habuit, hoc dedit, sollicitudinem ut dixi super ecclesias. Numquid dominacionem? Audi ipsum. Non dominantes, ait, in clero sed forma facti gregis, et ne hoc dictum sola humilitate putes, non eciam veritate, vox domini est in evangelio: Reges gencium dominantur eorum, vos autem non sic. Planum est: apostolis interdicitur dominatus. Ecce hoc triplex testimonium manifeste convincit illud mendacium, lex propria, Augustinus, Bernhardus, qui manifeste dicit, quod non iure apostolico papa habet hec temporalia. Ideo dicit libro IV: In hiis successisti non Petro sed Constantino.

and full possession over all the kingdoms of the world? Do not (as I have often repeated) the papal laws convict that lie? First, [in] Distinction 96, *Constantinus*, the charter of Constantine and the pope is incorporated, testifying the form in which he gave that part of the empire to his bishop.[2] Is it not, secondly, expressly taught by the testimony of the great doctor Augustine, placed in Distinction 8, *Quo iure*, that the clergy has no property of secular lordship except by the law of Caesar and the gift of secular lords?[3] Does not, thirdly, blessed Bernard, book 2, [chapter] 3, address Pope Eugenius in these words, as I recited at length above:[4] "What did the holy apostle leave to the pope? 'What I have,' he says, 'this I give thee.' What is that? Certainly it is not gold nor silver, since he himself says: 'Silver and gold I have none.' If you happen to have it, use it not at your pleasure but as the time requires; so you will be using them as though not using.[5] As far as concerns the good of the soul, these things are indeed neither good nor bad; yet the use of them is good, the abuse bad, the anxiety worse, the gain more shameful. Granted that you may claim[6] these for yourself on some other ground, [171]but not by apostolic right; for he could not give you what he did not have; what he had, this he gave: anxiety, as I said, over the churches.[7] Was it exercise of lordship? Hear him: 'Not lording it,' he says, 'over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock.' And lest you think this said only from humility and not also in truth, the voice of the Lord is in the gospel: 'The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; but you not so.' It is plain: lordly rule is forbidden to the apostles."[8] Behold, this threefold testimony manifestly convicts that lie: [the pope's] own law, Augustine, and Bernard, who manifestly says that the pope does not have these temporal goods by apostolic right. Therefore he says in book 4: "In these you have succeeded not Peter but Constantine."[9]

¶2 171.16–171.28

[171]Et patet quam horribile est fingere talia blasfema mendacia propter dominia temporalia pallianda, Patet eciam, quod nec seculares nec clerici iuvantur per assistenciam talium antichristianorum sed profundius peiorantur, tam quoad bona temporalia quam spiritualia. Quoad temporalia, ut prophetatum est Dan. II et exponitur inferius, hoc fecit scissionem imperii. Et quoad spiritualia, patet quod mutuo se inficiunt ex consensu. Assistencia autem cleri tenentis se in statu primevo decoraret miliciam et econtra, ut patet de beatis Sebastiano, Martino et ceteris sed apostatarum assistencia deturparet.

And it is clear how horrible it is to feign such blasphemous lies for cloaking temporal lordships. It is clear also that neither seculars nor clerics are helped by the assistance of such antichristians, but are made deeply worse, as to temporal goods as well as spiritual. As to temporal goods, as was prophesied in Dan. 2 and is expounded below, this made the division of the empire.[10] And as to spiritual goods, it is clear that they infect each other mutually by consent. But the assistance of a clergy keeping itself in the primitive state would adorn the knighthood, and conversely, as is clear of the blessed Sebastian, Martin and the rest;[11] but the assistance of apostates would befoul [it].

¶3 171.29–172.2
172.3 *Against this may be set its pollution by much wickedness.*
172.14 *Moreover Jerusalem has higher claims.*
172.31 *It is not proved that the bishop of Rome must be pope.*

[171]**Quinta causa ficta est loci sanctitas ex multiplici christianorum martyrio, ubi decet sanctissimum caput ecclesie conversari. Sed constat quod locus non sanctificat inhabitantem sed econtra, ut dicitur II. Machabeorum V. Locus enim non est de genere activorum, cum sit quantitas et** [172]**influencia celestis vel est sanctitati impertinens vel loca sunt alia magis apta.**

The fifth cause feigned is the holiness of the place, from the manifold martyrdom of Christians, where it befits the most holy head of the church to live.[12] But it is evident that the place does not sanctify the inhabitant, but conversely, as is said in 2 Maccabees 5.[13] For place is not of the genus of active things, since it is a quantity; and [172]**celestial influence either is irrelevant to holiness, or other places are more apt.[14]**

¶4 172.3–172.13

[172]**Similiter, si locus capit sanctitatem, per idem maledicionem ab incolis facinus committentibus in eodem, ut patet II. Regum primo de monte Gelboe. Sed Rome ab imperatoribus et carnificibus sibi subiectis, qui permanencius incolebant locum post et ante quam martyres, fuit multiplicius facinus perpetratum, igitur locus ille foret evidencius maledictus. Et in signum huius multi pape fugiunt illum locum, sicut Balaam propter influenciarum varietatem fecit altaria variari, ut dicitur Numeri XXIII.**

Likewise, if a place takes on holiness, by the same token [it takes on] a curse from inhabitants who commit a misdeed in it, as is clear from 2 Kings 1, of Mount Gelboe.[15] Now at Rome, by the emperors and the executioners subject to them, who inhabited the place more permanently, after and before the martyrs, misdeeds were more manifoldly perpetrated; therefore that place would be more evidently cursed. And in sign of this many popes flee that place, as Balaam, because of the variety of influences, had the altars varied, as is said in Numbers 23.[16]

¶5 172.14–172.30

[172]**Similiter, si sanctitas martyrum fugat facinus et locum sanctificat, Jerusalem foret locus sanctissimus, cum ibi predicavit et passum fuit caput martyrum, ibi occisus est uterque Jacobus et multi martyres, ymo in veteri testamento occisi sunt plurimi, ut testatur Christus Matth. XXIII, 37 Jerusalem que occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui ad te missi sunt, et IV. Regum XXIV, 4 scribitur quomodo Manasses effudit sanguinem innoxium et implevit Jerusalem cruore innocencium, et ob hanc rem noluit dominus propiciari. Difficile autem est sompniare, in qua istarum civitatum occisi sunt plures martyrio. Sed certum est quod Christus predicans, conversans et occisus in Jerusalem, infinitum excedit totum collegium martyrum Rome vel alibi occisorum, et preter hec locus est sanctitate antiquior.**

Likewise, if the holiness of martyrs puts misdeed to flight and sanctifies the place, Jerusalem would be the most holy place, since there the head of martyrs preached and suffered; there each James was slain, and many martyrs; indeed in the old testament very many were slain there, as Christ testifies, Matt. 23:37: "Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee"; and in 2 Kings 24:4 it is written how Manasses shed innocent blood and filled Jerusalem with the blood of innocents, "and therefore the Lord would not be appeased."[17] And it is difficult to dream in which of these cities more were slain in martyrdom. But it is certain that Christ, preaching, living and slain in Jerusalem, infinitely exceeds the whole college of martyrs slain at Rome or elsewhere; and besides this the place is older in holiness.

¶6 172.31–173.20
173.7 *Endowment would have hindered the apostles' journeys.*
173.21 *That Peter ordained Clement proves nothing or the papacy might be at Antioch.*

[172]**Ex istis colligitur quod nec iste quinque raciones nec alie fingende stabiliunt quod oportet realiter Romanum pontificem esse papam. Multi enim Romani pontifices sicut et imperatores erant pessimi antichristi, et civitas illa cum gente** [173]**sua modo prevalet et modo subditur, cum multe sunt hodie civitates, gentes et comunitates plus divites, inclite et amplius populose. Quomodo igitur apostoli, quibus preceptum est indiferenter omnes gentes, limitarent se ad illum populum, cum possent plus lucrifacere Christo in alio populo**

From these things it is gathered that neither these five reasons nor others yet to be feigned establish that the Roman pontiff must really be pope. For many Roman pontiffs, like emperors too, were the worst antichrists; and that city with its [173]**people at one time prevails and at another is subjected, since there are today many cities, peoples and communities richer, more renowned and more populous. How then would the apostles, who were commanded [to teach] all nations without distinction,[18] limit themselves to that people, when they could gain more for Christ in**

eciam non converso. Unde ut credo hec fuit una racio, quare apostoli non receperunt dotacionem fixam in terris, ut ubicumque terrarum spiritus eos moveret ad plus prodessendum ecclesie illuc tenderent indilate. Iuxta quem sensum scribit Apostolus Hebr. XIII, 14: Non habemus hic manentem civitatem sed futuram inquirimus, aliter enim dominium affixum retraheret affeccionem convertendi. Et hec racio, quare Christus non fuit affectus templo, ut patet Mar. XIII, sed predicavit sub divo, nunc in deserto, nunc in montibus, nunc in mari et sub verbis indifferentibus et generalibus, ut patet Matth. ultimo, precepit apostolis predicare.

another people, even one not converted? Hence, as I believe, this was one reason why the apostles did not receive a fixed endowment on earth: so that wherever on earth the Spirit moved them, to profit the church more, they might go there without delay. In which sense the Apostle writes, Heb. 13:14: "We have not here a lasting city: but we seek one that is to come";[19] for otherwise an affixed lordship would draw back the affection for converting. And this is the reason why Christ was not attached to the temple, as is clear from Mark 13,[20] but preached in the open air, at one time in the desert, at another on the mountains, at another on the sea; and in indifferent and general words, as is clear from the last [chapter] of Matthew, he commanded the apostles to preach.

¶7 173.21–173.32

[173] Quantum ad secundam ficticiam ad colorandum connexionem predictam Romani et summi pontificis per institucionem Petri; patet quod innititur foliis sine fructu; non enim plus sequitur: Petrus ordinavit Clementem episcopum Romanum, igitur ordinavit eum summum pontificem quam sequitur, ordinavit Marcum Anthiochie sibi succedere, igitur ordinavit eum sibi succedere in summum pontificem; locus autem (ut dictum est) est indifferens ad papatum et eque plenus papa fuit Petrus Anthiochie sicut Rome, et preterea Anthiochie accepit a populo insignia et non Rome.

As to the second fiction, for colouring the aforesaid connexion of the Roman and the highest pontiff through Peter's institution: it is clear that it leans on leaves without fruit;[21] for it no more follows, "Peter ordained Clement Roman bishop, therefore he ordained him highest pontiff", than it follows, "He ordained Mark to succeed him at Antioch, therefore he ordained him to succeed him as highest pontiff";[22] and the place (as has been said) is indifferent to the papacy, and Peter was pope as fully at Antioch as at Rome; and moreover at Antioch he received the insignia from the people, and not at Rome.[23]

Notes

1. ***Sessivam*** (so the manuscripts, Loserth): read as a form of ***seisina***, "seisin", the possession of a fief that perfects a feudal title; the figure answers ***possessionem*** in the next clause. R. AB in the margin: ***Possessio pape data est a Caesare, non a Christo vel Petro***.
2. ***Decretum*** D.96 c.14, ***Constantinus***, the Donation of Constantine (Loserth's reference; the form is ours; PL 187, 460). T. The print reads ***donavit cece partem illam***; ***cece*** does not construe and is left untranslated (checked on the plate, leaf n0231: the print has ***cece***). B reads ***formans*** for ***formam***.
3. ***Decretum*** D.8 c.1, ***Quo iure***, from Augustine on John, tract. 6 (Loserth's reference; the form is ours; PL 187, 44; Augustine, tract. 6.25, PL 35, 1436–37).
4. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** 2.6.10 (Loserth: "St. Bern. pag. 748"; PL 182, 748). The print has ***libro II, III***, the manuscripts ***libro III*** (170.21); Bernard's book is II. "Above": 136.17–137.10, where the same passage is quoted at length. Acts 3:6 is quoted within.
5. 1 Cor. 7:31, "they that use this world, as if they used it not".
6. The print's ***venaices*** is a misprint (plate: no ascender, so not ***vendices***); we translate ***vendices***, "claim", the reading of Bernard's text (our emendation).
7. 2 Cor. 11:28, "the solicitude for all the churches". ***Sollicitudo*** is "anxiety" in both places in Bernard's sentence.
8. 1 Pet. 5:3 and Luke 22:25–26, both as Bernard quotes them; Bernard's ***dominantes*** stands in the print as ***dominanies***. G. Bernard's ***dominatus*** is "lordly rule", kept apart from ***dominium*** "lordship" and ***dominacio*** "exercise of lordship".
9. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** 4.3.6 (Loserth: cap. 3, p. 776; PL 182, 776: ***In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino***).
10. Dan. 2:41–43, the divided kingdom of iron and clay. "Below": no exposition of Dan. 2 has been found later in the treatise; the nearest is 379 (ch. 12), ***ut patet Daniel II***, on the dissension of kingdoms.
11. Sebastian, the martyr of the Roman guard, and Martin of Tours, the soldier-bishop: holy men who stood beside the knighthood.
12. "The fifth cause": Wyclif counts on from FitzRalph's three reasons (166.29–168.26) and a fourth not set out in these pages; cf. "these five reasons", 172.32.
13. 2 Macc. 5:19, "God did not choose the people for the place's sake, but the place for the people's sake."
14. The sentence runs across the page break and is hard to construe: ***cum sit quantitas et influencia celestis vel est ....*** We begin a new clause at ***influencia***; a word may have fallen out at 171.33/172.1.

15. 2 Kings (Vulgate 2 Regum, modern 2 Sam.) 1:21, "Ye mountains of Gelboe, let neither dew nor rain come upon you".
16. Num. 23:1–3, 13–14, 27–30: Balaam has seven altars built at each of three places in turn.
17. 2 Kings (Vulgate 4 Regum) 24:4. Wyclif paraphrases the verse; only its close is quoted in DR's words. In Matt. 23:37 he gives *Jerusalem* once.
18. *Preceptum est indiferenter omnes gentes* lacks an infinitive; Matt. 28:19 (*docete omnes gentes*) supplies "to teach", which we give in brackets. A word may have been lost at 173.4.
19. Wyclif's citation omits the Vulgate's *enim*; DR's "For" is dropped.
20. Mark 13:1–2, the prophecy of the temple's destruction.
21. The fig tree with leaves and no fruit, Matt. 21:19; Mark 11:13. T. The manuscripts read *ficticium* (Loserth).
22. So the print: the common tradition makes Mark bishop of Alexandria and Evodius Peter's successor at Antioch (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.16 and 3.22).
23. Peter's chair at Antioch (22 February, assigned to Antioch in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*) and Acts 11:26, "at Antioch the disciples were first named Christians".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 170: *dominatus* (folio bar after it (203b))
  - 170: *Et*
  - 170: *mendacii*
  - 170: *parce*
  - 170: *Quo*
  - 170: *nisi ex lege* (print has nisi ex lege before cesaris) [GAP]
  - 170: *venaices* (misprint: a has no ascender, not d; zoomed leaf 231)
  - 171: *quod*
  - 171: *non*
  - 171: *hoc*
  - 171: *autem*
  - 171: *hiis*
  - 171: *blasfema* (hyphenated blas-fema; main token covers whole word) [NW]
  - 171: *dominia*
  - 172: ∅ (folio bar (203d) read as i; not text)
  - 172: *illum*
  - 172: *sanctificat*
  - 172: *istis*
  - 173: *inclite*
  - 173: *illum*
  - 170: *argentum* (italic; comma not carried; 25 is the line number)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Rome fo/its manv martvrs. (171.30).
- Apparatus not otherwise noted: 173.20 Loserth prints *apostolis* for the manuscripts' *apostoli*. The print is translated.

Part 3: No man can elect the highest pontiff

Loserth pp. 173.33–176.4

¶1 173.33–174.11
174.2 *Nor does Clement's succession to the bishopric carry the papacy.*
174.8 *Why Clement rather than James?*
174.12 *Peter would not presume to choose Christ's vicar without a revelation,*
174.24 *Was John the Evangelist subject to Clement?*
174.33 *That the pope is such*

[173] Item, quicumque superstes dat alteri potestatem solum dat sibi potestatem vicariam et non parem, [174] igitur ex hoc quod Petrus instituit Clementem Rome pontificem, non sequitur successorem suum fuisse summum pontificem sicut Petrus. Nec valet ficticia, qua dicitur quod Petrus Rome obiit, ideo successor suus ibidem debuit esse papa. Nam Christus papa summus obiit Jerusolimis et tamen Jacobus Alphei tenens ibidem episcopatum a Christo datum et ibi obiens non propterea fuit papa. Que igitur liga Petri ad Clementem pocius quam Christus ad Jacobum, ut episcopus succedens loco quo obiit foret papa?

Again, whoever, while he survives, gives power to another gives him only a vicarious power and not an equal one;[1] [174] therefore from the fact that Peter instituted Clement pontiff of Rome it does not follow that his successor was highest pontiff as Peter was. Nor does the fiction hold by which it is said that Peter died at Rome, and therefore his successor there had to be pope. For Christ, the highest pope, died at Jerusalem, and yet James of Alphaeus, holding there the bishopric given by Christ and dying there, was not on that account pope.[2] What league, then, [was

¶2 174.12–176.4
175.1 *by human election is true to fact but lacks religious sanction.*
175.15 *Man cannot choose a pope truly,*
175.21 *since it depends on grace which man cannot judge.*

[174] Item, non subiacet humane potestati sed solum divine constituere quemquam summum pontificem, igitur non debet supponi in Petro tanta presumpcio, ut eligat hominem de quo non fuit sibi ad hoc facta revelacio in summum pontificem et immediatum Christi vicarium super terram, specialiter cum super ista fatuitate, non relinquitur nobis scriptum autenticum, sed in eleccione Mathie reliquit hoc divine iudicio, ut patet Actuum primo; quanto plus in eleccione maioris. Quis, inquam, crederet quod Petrus diffiniret beatum Clementem sequi Christum similius quam Evangelistam, qui diu vixit post Petrum, vel beatum Evangelistam debere Clementi ut maiori? vel capiti necessario regulandi obedienciam et reverenciam, qualem pape iam exigunt a subiectis. vel quod Christus aut alius apostolus talem maioritatem instituit, vel policiam in sua ecclesia approbavit? Voluit enim omnes apostolos esse socios sibi invicem obedientes et servientes sine dominio vel magisterio alicuius capitanei preter Christum. Et ex istis infirmatur tercia ficticia quod per viam eleccionis et institucionis humane ponitur [175] quis Romanus et summus pontifex. Et quamvis ista sentencia sit maxime propinqua facto, tamen nimis elongatur a religione fideli et stabili fundamento. Cum enim aliquem stat esse Romanum pontificem et non papam et econtra, ut patet in Christo et Petro, patet quod oportet istas duas elecciones esse racionis disparis et nature ordine separatas. Stat enim aliquem esse Romanum pontificem et pessimum Antichristum, sicut econtra stat aliquem esse summum pontificem, cum hoc quod sit loco illi indifferens, ut patet ex dictis. Unde dominus Ardmacanus libro VII, cap. XVIII De Questionibus Armenorum dicit quod sunt duo pontificatus naturaliter differentes, et oportet quod sint eciam apud Deum due elecciones. Sed videtur michi quod eleccio qua quis eligeretur in papam vel summum pontificem non subiacet potestati vel eleccioni humane. Nam idem est hominem eligere in papam vel summum pontificem et eligere ipsum in apostolicum maxime propinque per graciam sequentem Christi vestigia; sed hoc non subiacet ordinacioni vel eleccioni humane, igitur nec aliud sive idem; sic enim eligeret quis hominem in predestinatum vel quocumque aliter graciosum. Et confirmatur ex factis et verbis apostolorum Act. I in eleccione Mathie apostoli, quod est minus quam eligere summum pontificem, ubi ipsi non eligunt sed rogant Deum; ut ostendat ipse quem elegerit. Sicut igitur electores non eligunt summum pontificem in eligendo alterum Scarioth vel Antichristum; sic casualiter eligendo eum quem Deus elegerit non [176] eligunt talem

there] of Peter to Clement rather than of Christ to James, so that the bishop succeeding in the place where he died should be pope?[3]

Again, to appoint anyone highest pontiff is subject not to human power but only to divine; therefore so great a presumption ought not to be supposed in Peter as that he should elect as highest pontiff and immediate vicar of Christ on earth a man about whom no revelation had been made to him for this, especially since on this folly no authentic writing is left to us; but in the election of Matthias he left this to the judgement of God, as is clear from Acts 1;[4] how much more in the election of a greater one. Who, I say, would believe that Peter would define blessed Clement to follow Christ in closer likeness than the Evangelist, who lived long after Peter, or that the blessed Evangelist owed to Clement, as to a greater, or as to a head necessary for ruling, obedience and reverence such as popes now exact from their subjects?[5] or that Christ or another apostle instituted such greatness, or approved such a polity in his church? For he willed all the apostles to be companions, obeying and serving one another, without the lordship or rule of any captain besides Christ. And from these things the third fiction is weakened, that by way of human election and institution someone is set up [175] as Roman and highest pontiff. And although this teaching is the closest to the fact, yet it is exceedingly far removed from faithful religion and a stable foundation.[6] For since it is possible for someone to be Roman pontiff and not pope, and conversely, as is clear in Christ and Peter, it is clear that these two elections must be of disparate character and separated in the order of nature. For it is possible for someone to be Roman pontiff and the worst Antichrist, just as, conversely, it is possible for someone to be highest pontiff while being indifferent to that place, as is clear from what has been said. Hence the lord of Armagh, in book 7, chapter 18 of the *Questions of the Armenians*, says that there are two pontificates naturally differing, and that there must also be two elections before God.[7] But it seems to me that the election by which someone would be elected pope or highest pontiff is not subject to the power or election of men. For it is the same to elect a man pope or highest pontiff and to elect him an apostolic man following most closely, through grace, the footsteps of Christ; now this is not subject to human ordinance or election; therefore neither is the other, or rather the same thing; for so one would elect a man to be predestinate, or gracious in any other way.[8] And it is confirmed from the deeds and words of the apostles, Acts 1, in the election of the apostle Matthias, which is less than

in summum pontificem, sed in fungentem tali officio, quod non dicit excellenciam gracie vel alia carismata, que sunt propria dona Dei.

electing a highest pontiff, where they do not elect but ask God that he himself may show whom he has chosen. As, then, the electors do not elect a highest pontiff in electing another Iscariot or Antichrist, so, electing by chance the one whom God has chosen, they do not [176] elect such a one as highest pontiff, but as one discharging such an office, which does not signify excellence of grace or other charisms, which are the proper gifts of God.[9]

Notes

1. ***Superstes***, "while he survives": the giver lives on and keeps his own power, so what he grants is delegated, not equal. The argument answers the second fiction, Peter's institution of Clement (173.21 above).
2. James son of Alphaeus taken as bishop of Jerusalem, that is, identified with "James the brother of the Lord" (Gal. 1:19), the first bishop there in the tradition reported by Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 2. T. The apparatus at 174.6–7 is damaged in our copy ("A -. et tantum"); it seems to report A's ***et tantum*** for ***et tamen***. The print is translated.
3. The print has ***Christus ad Jacobum***, nominative, where the parallel with ***Petri ad Clementem*** wants ***Christi***; translated as that genitive, "of Christ to James".
4. Acts 1:23–26: two are put forward, the apostles pray, and the lot falls on Matthias.
5. "The Evangelist" is John (side-note 174.24), who outlived Peter. The print's question marks after ***maiori*** and ***subiectis*** break one sentence: every clause hangs on ***crederet quod***, and ***capiti necessario regulandi*** is a second dative beside ***ut maiori***. R. A in the margin (174.22): ***Nota tempore apostolorum et evangelistarum Clemens a Petro eligitur, ergo non secundum sanctitatem***, "Note: in the time of the apostles and evangelists Clement is chosen by Peter, therefore not according to holiness."
6. "The third fiction" is the last of the three named at 168.27 (***triplex ficticia***). ***Sentencia*** is "teaching", the position held; ***propinqua facto***, "closest to the fact", means to how popes are in fact made (side-note 175.1, "true to fact"). R. AB in the margin (175.4): ***Romanum pontificem stat esse et non esse papam***, "It is possible to be Roman pontiff and not to be pope."
7. FitzRalph, ***Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum*** 7.18 (the codices ***cap. XIX***; Loserth: "loosely quoted"). Richard writes that the same man ***legittime potest eligi duplici electione in romanum et in summum: ex quo sunt due dignitates distincte quamvis annexe*** (Paris 1512, fol. 50r col. b), and holds the two annexed. "Naturally differing" is closer to the interlocutor John at the end of 7.17 (fol. 50r col. a), for whom the two pontificates ***videntur penitus dispares***.
8. ***Sequentem*** agrees with ***apostolicum*** and governs ***vestigia***, with ***per graciam*** between; read as ***per graciam sequentem***, "through subsequent grace", it would leave ***vestigia*** without a verb. ***Sive idem***, "or rather the same thing": the two elections are one. R. AB in the margin (175.12): ***Eleccio pontificis summi non subiacet eleccioni humane***, "The election of the highest pontiff is not subject to human election."
9. Acts 1:24, in Wyclif's own words; the Vulgate has ***ostende quem elegeris ex his duobus unum***, "shew whether of these two thou hast chosen". ***Scarioth*** is Iscariot: "another Judas". ***Casualiter***, "by chance", as by the lot. T. ***Dicit*** (176.2): Loserth, "Rectius: dat", "better ***dat***", "gives". The print construes and is translated. R. AB in the margin (175.29): ***Eleccio pontificis secundum reputacionem hominum***, "The election of the pontiff according to the reputation of men."

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 174: ∅ (folio bar (204c) read as i; not text)
  - 174: ***beatum***
  - 175: ***propinqua*** [NW]
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Peter would (174.12).
- Apparatus not otherwise noted: 174.6–7 (damaged: "A -. et tantum"), note 2. The print is translated throughout.

Part 4: Two elections: how the name of pope arose

Loserth pp. 176.5–180.32

¶1 176.5–178.16

176.5 *Man's election does not make a pope unless God too has chosen him.*
177.5 *An election requires acceptance by the subjects.*

[176] Unde post dotacionem sunt elecciones hominum introducte et cadunt super officio, dignitate vel dominacione humanitus instituta et non super carismata Deo propria. Ut communitas eligit hominem in pontificem cesareum vel nuncupative dictum, et sic cadit eleccio

Hence after the endowment the elections of men were brought in, and they fall upon an office, dignity or exercise of lordship humanly instituted, and not upon the charismata proper to God. So a community elects a man as caesarean pontiff, or pontiff so called in name, and in

177.21 *The true origin of the name 'Pope'.*
178.7 *The right to be sole pope was first granted by the Emperor Phocas.*
178.17 *Local claims as strong in other cities as in Rome.*

humana super episcopum, ut dicit communiter episcopum secundum reputacionem vel approbacionem humanam, quod fit sepius cum errore, vel secundum autorizacionem divinam, quod semper sit iuste, unde quando contingit quod eleccio humana concordat cum eleccione divina, tunc homo eligit verum episcopum et summum pontificem, sicut sepe contigit de Romanis pontificibus veris papis. Et quando discordat ab eleccione divina, tunc eligit false reputatum summum pontificem et non summum pontificem, licet errando illud crediderit. Unde cum iste terminus papa et summum dicunt summitatem in moribus, quam mirabilitatem solius Dei est facere, videtur quod solus Deus eligit hominem in papam vel summum pontificem, quia non videtur fundabile quod isti termini extendantur ad false nuncupatum huius, quia sic dyabolus foret summus pontifex. Episcopus autem secundum apostolum est nomen officii et sic aliud est eligere papam et aliud eligere hominem in papam, quia secunda proposicio implicat quod cadat eleccio in papatum, sed prima proposicio verificaretur de eleccione persone ad quodcumque officium vel preposituram, ut populus eligit [177] papam, quando instituit vel acceptat personam ad officium vel dignitatem humanam, quam personam Deus eligit ad preeminenciam sanctitatis, unde, cum scriptura Deutro. XXVI, 17 signanter dicit: Dominum elegisti hodie, patet quod quedam eleccio est institucio vel quedam faccio, et quedam eleccio est acceptacio; et per consequens oportet preter eleccionem instituencium esse eleccionem equivocam, que sit approbacio subditorum. Sic enim populus eligit dominum, quando effectualiter acceptat, quod ille sit dominus suus et spondet fideliter se esse sibi ut domino serviturum. Unde quando successione hereditaria vadit dominium, adhuc est alia eleccio subditorum; ad quod oportet movere vitam et mores in spirituali preposito, et aliter est intrusoris monstruosa extorsio. Et patet quod debet esse pape duplex eleccio, una humana in Romanum episcopum et alia pure divina in papam vel summum pontificem; qua deficiente Romanus pontifex non est papa sed unus alius mundo absconditus. Sed cum tres ficciones non sufficiunt, remanet dubium, quomodo dicta duo nomina sunt connexa. In qua materia credendum est cronicis. Narrat enim Cestrensis libro IV, cap. XXXVI, quomodo excellencia Romani imperii adinvenit papatum sui pontificis super alios: Nycena, inquit, synodus hoc contulit privilegium Romano pontifici, ut sicut Augustus pre ceteris regibus, ita Romanus pre ceteris pontifex haberetur episcopis et papa velut principalis pater vocaretur. Origo autem istius nominis et excellencie fuit in dotacione ecclesie, [178] ut specificat Decretum XLVI distinccione Constantinus. Ideo superfluum et labor inutilis foret fingere mendacia, quod sic

this way human election falls upon a bishop, as one commonly speaks of a bishop either according to human reputation or approval, which is often done with error, or according to divine authorization, which is always done justly;[1] hence when it happens that human election agrees with divine election, then a man elects a true bishop and highest pontiff, as has often happened with Roman pontiffs who were true popes. And when it is at odds with divine election, then he elects one falsely reputed highest pontiff and not a highest pontiff, though in erring he believed it. Hence, since the terms "pope" and "highest" signify highness in morals, a marvel which God alone can work, it seems that God alone elects a man pope or highest pontiff, since it does not seem to be groundable that these terms be extended to one falsely so named; for in that way the devil would be highest pontiff.[2] Now "bishop", according to the apostle, is the name of an office;[3] and so it is one thing to elect a pope and another to elect a man pope, since the second proposition implies that the election falls upon the papacy, but the first proposition would be verified of the election of a person to any office or office of superior whatever, as the people elect [177] a pope when they institute or accept a person for an office or human dignity, which person God elects to preeminence of holiness.[4] Hence, since scripture, Deut. 26:17, says pointedly, "Thou hast chosen the Lord this day", it is clear that one kind of election is an institution or a kind of making, and another kind of election is an acceptance; and consequently, besides the election of those who institute, there must be an equivocal election, which is the approval of the subjects. For in this way a people elects a lord, when it effectually accepts that he be its lord and pledges faithfully to serve him as its lord. Hence when lordship passes by hereditary succession, there is still another election, that of the subjects; and to this the life and morals in a spiritual superior must move [them], and otherwise it is the monstrous extortion of an intruder.[5] And it is clear that there must be a twofold election of the pope, one human, to Roman bishop, and the other purely divine, to pope or highest pontiff; and if this is lacking, the Roman pontiff is not pope, but some other man, hidden from the world, is.[6] But since three fictions do not suffice,[7] a doubt remains how the two said names are connected. In this matter the chronicles are to be believed. For the Chester [chronicler] relates in book 4, chapter 36, how the excellence of the Roman empire devised the papacy of its pontiff over others: "The synod of Nicaea," he says, "conferred this privilege on the Roman pontiff, that as Augustus [was held] before the other kings, so the Roman pontiff should be held before the other

oportuit esse ex racionibus ad hoc urgentibus vel scriptura. Unde quia ista videtur levis fundacio et ecclesia Romana tunc sibi cadere a papatu, narrat idem Cestrensis libro V cap. X, quomodo Bonifacius IV impetravit a Foca cesare, ut ecclesia beati Petri Rome Caput esset ecclesiarum, quia caput ecclesie Constantinopolitane se scripsit papam. Quotlibet tales fideles cronice et decreta testantur primatum Romani pontificis fuisse humanitus adinventum. Nam si papa fieret vagus ut olim et nulli loco affixus sed in mari mortuo vel deserto, et sic post eum papa secundus, et sic ad finem viacionis ecclesie, patet quod non obstante isto vere foret papa.

bishops, and be called pope, as being the principal father."[8] And the origin of this name and excellence was in the endowment of the church, [178]as the Decretum specifies, distinction 96, *Constantinus*.[9] Therefore it would be superfluous and useless labour to feign lies, that it had to be so from reasons urging it or from scripture. Hence, since this seems a light foundation, and the Roman church then [seemed] to be falling from the papacy, the same Chester [chronicler] relates in book 5, chapter 10, how "Boniface IV obtained from Caesar Phocas that the church of blessed Peter at Rome should be Head of the churches, since the head of the church of Constantinople wrote himself pope."[10] Any number of such faithful chronicles and decrees testify that the primacy of the Roman pontiff was humanly devised. For if the pope became a wanderer, as of old, and fixed to no place, but on the Dead Sea or in the desert, and so the second pope after him, and so to the end of the church's wayfaring, it is clear that notwithstanding this he would truly be pope.

¶2 178.17–179.7
179.8 *All these claims are groundless and wrong; the worst is a privilege begged from the Emperor.*

[178]Ideo oportet quod aliqua sit racio pape ante notacionem loci huius qualiscumque. Ideo vere dicit dominus Ardmacanus libro VII cap. XXI De Questionibus Armenorum: Quod Petrus ideo fuit Christi vicarius, quia fuit sibi similior in virtute. Et foret inanis ficticia quod, ubicumque fuerit talis electus humanis ritibus, consequitur quod sit Roma; non enim est racio, quare pocius fieret ibi Roma quam Anthiochia, Jerusalem vel Constantinopolis. Tales enim locorum illorum metropolitani dixerunt se esse papas propter disparem racionem: Anthiochia, quia ibi vocati sunt primo discipuli christiani, ut patet Act. XI, et beatus Petrus ibi resedit episcopus multis annis, et tercio quia prius recepit fidem Christi quam Roma. Episcopus autem Jerosolimitanus [179]vendicat papatum propter Christum, propter primitatem fidei, propter mortem Jacobi, qui ibi primo secutus est mortem Domini. Constantinopolis vero propter nomen cesaris, qui dotando tantum decoravit ecclesiam. Et Roma, quia ibi sancti apostoli sunt occisi et realiter, quia impetrarunt a cesare hoc privilegium.

Therefore there must be some ground of [being] pope prior to any designation of this place whatever. Therefore the lord of Armagh says truly, in book 7, chapter 21 *Of the Questions of the Armenians*: "That Peter was vicar of Christ for this reason, that he was more like him in virtue."[11] And it would be an empty fiction that wherever such a man has been elected by human rites, it follows that it is Rome; for there is no reason why Rome should come to be there rather than Antioch, Jerusalem or Constantinople. For the metropolitans of those places said that they were popes, each for a different reason:[12] Antioch, because there the disciples were first called Christians, as is clear from Acts 11, and blessed Peter sat there as bishop for many years, and third because it received the faith of Christ before Rome. And the bishop of Jerusalem [179]claims the papacy on account of Christ, on account of the firstness of the faith, on account of the death of James, who there first followed the death of the Lord.[13] And Constantinople on account of the name of Caesar, who by endowing so greatly adorned the church. And Rome, because the holy apostles were slain there, and, in reality, because they obtained this privilege from Caesar.

¶3 179.8–180.20
180.21 *It is not a matter of faith that Clement and others were popes in the modern use.*

[179]Et revera omnes et singulas istarum causarum propter impertinenciam ad papatum est turpe fingere, sed turpissimum quod papa aliquis impetrat privilegium illud concedere vel donare, quam potest concedere, quod datus episcopus vivat Christo similius. Sed

And in truth it is shameful to feign each and every one of these causes, for their irrelevance to the papacy; but most shameful [to feign] that some pope obtains [the power] to grant or bestow that privilege, [any more] than he can grant that a given bishop should live more like Christ.[14] But

sicut sophista vel maniacus concedit quod Deus regnat in angelis et tamen non sequitur propter suum concedere sive imperium plus vel minus, ita est de concessione privilegii pape vel cesaris, ut quis sequatur Christum similius in virtute. Sed cum locus sit huic dignitati impertinens, oportet rogare trinitatem obnixius, implorare suffragium ecclesie utriusque humilius et attendere devote bonis operibus, ut Deus eligat quem voluerit, et ostendat oraculis vel sanctis operibus, que precedant eleccionem humanam, quia eleccio humana est istis impertinens. Concedo igitur cum domino Ardmacano historiam de beato Petro quomodo timore cesaris proposuit sub colore Christi consilii a Roma aufugere, et quomodo obvianti Christo in porta civitatis et querenti: Domine, quo vadis, responsum est ab eo venio Romam iterum crucifigi. Per quod Petrus expectans concepit, quod dominus crucifigendus fuit ibi in ipso, quia iuxta rectam logicam Christi Matth. XXV [180]Christo faciunt vel non faciunt homines quicquid fecerint vel non fecerint membris suis, et sic nedum fuit ex divina ordinacione, quod Petrus et Paulus inibi morerentur, sed omne quod fit in mundo fit ex ordinacione divina accessoria vel directa. Accessoria in viciosis operibus, de quibus bonum ordinat, et directa in virtuosis operibus vel operibus naturalibus. Causam autem quare Christus ordinavit gloriosos apostolos ibi pati martyrium est exemplar et speculum aliis martyribus, quod ordinavit postmodum ibi pati, cum aliis bonis exemplum sequentibus. Sed credo quod nullus fidelis tantum insaniet, quod fingat dominum ordinasse ibi illorum martyrium, ut doceat fore papam quemcumque Romanum episcopum successurum, quia (ut dictum est) nomen tale inolevit ex institucione humana et sepe opinioni hominum in istis falsitas est substrata; locus enim ille est impertinens, ut eius episcopus sit precipuus sequax Christi.

as a sophist or a madman grants that God reigns in the angels, and yet nothing more or less follows on account of his granting or command, so it is with the grant of a privilege by pope or Caesar that someone should follow Christ more closely in virtue.[15] But since the place is irrelevant to this dignity, one must pray the Trinity more earnestly, implore more humbly the suffrage of the church of both [states], and attend devoutly to good works, that God may choose whom he will and show [him] by oracles or holy works which precede the human election, since human election is irrelevant to these.[16] I grant, therefore, with the lord of Armagh, the story of blessed Peter: how for fear of Caesar he proposed, under colour of Christ's counsel, to flee from Rome, and how, as he met Christ at the gate of the city and asked, "Lord, whither goest thou?", he was answered by him: "I come to Rome to be crucified again."[17] By which Peter, considering, conceived that the Lord was to be crucified there in himself; for according to Christ's right logic, Matt. 25, [180]men do or do not do to Christ whatever they have done or not done to his members.[18] And so not only was it from divine ordinance that Peter and Paul died there, but everything that is done in the world is done by divine ordinance, accessory or direct: accessory in vicious works, from which he ordains good, and direct in virtuous works or natural works.[19] And the cause why Christ ordained the glorious apostles to suffer martyrdom there is [that it is] an exemplar and mirror to other martyrs, whom he ordained afterwards to suffer there, with other good men following the example.[20] But I believe that no believer will be so mad as to feign that the Lord ordained their martyrdom there in order to teach that whatever Roman bishop should succeed would be pope; for (as has been said) such a name grew up from human institution, and falsehood often underlies men's opinion in these matters; for that place is irrelevant to its bishop's being a principal follower of Christ.[21]

¶4 180.21–180.32

[180]Unde videtur non esse de substancia fidei, quod Clemens, Linus, Cletus vel alius post Petrum Romanus episcopus fuit papa, intelligendo papam, ut dicit primitatem alienum excludentem. Intelligendo autem papam communiter, modo quo Ambrosius, Augustinus et ceteri sancti episcopi erant pape, manifestum est quod Paulus, Clemens et ceteri sancti martyres et confessores Romani episcopi erant pape simul cum aliis, quod si aliquis eorum in regimine ovium Christi omnes conversantes secum excesserat, tunc fuit iste papa ad sensum superius limitatum.

Hence it seems not to be of the substance of faith that Clement, Linus, Cletus or another Roman bishop after Peter was pope, understanding "pope" as it signifies a firstness that excludes another. But understanding "pope" commonly, in the way in which Ambrose, Augustine and the other holy bishops were popes, it is manifest that Paul, Clement and the other holy martyrs and confessors who were Roman bishops were popes together with others;[22] and if any of them had excelled all who lived with him in the rule of Christ's sheep, then he was pope in the sense limited above.[23]

Notes

1. ***ut dicit communiter episcopum***: the subject of ***dicit*** is unexpressed; taken impersonally, "as one commonly speaks of a bishop", in two ways, by human reputation or by divine authorization. T. ***quod semper sit iuste***: the print reads ***sit*** (plate checked); B reads ***fit iuste*** (apparatus 176.14), "is done justly". We follow B's ***fit*** because it answers ***quod fit sepius cum errore*** in the line before ("which happens often with error ... which happens always justly"); this is our choice of the manuscript reading. ***pontificem ... nuncupative dictum***: a pontiff "so called in name" only (cf. ***ecclesia nuncupativa***, the glossary).
2. ***false nuncupatum huius***: "one falsely named [by] this [term]". The argument: ***papa*** and ***summus*** name height in holiness, which only God confers; if the words could be stretched to one falsely so named, the devil, the highest in false reputation, would be highest pontiff.
3. The apostle: 1 Tim. 3:1, "If a man desire the office of a bishop" (***episcopatum***); Wyclif takes ***episcopus*** as the name of an office.
4. "To elect a pope" is said of the people's instituting or accepting for a human office a person whom God [has already] elected to preeminence of holiness; "to elect a man pope" implies that the election confers the papacy. R. AB in the margin (176.28): ***Aliud est eligere hominem in papam et aliud eligere papam***.
5. ***ad quod oportet movere vitam et mores***: the subjects' acceptance must be moved by the life and morals of the spiritual superior; without them the office is "extorted" by an intruder. R. AB in the margin (177.6): ***Eleccio duplex est***.
6. ***unus alius mundo absconditus***: if divine election is lacking in the Roman bishop, the true pope is some other man, unknown to the world.
7. ***Tres*** as printed (plate checked). The chapter does not number them; the three are not identified.
8. Ranulf Higden, ***Polychronicon*** ("Cestrensis", the Chester monk), ed. Rolls Series, vol. 5, p. 140: ***Postquam vero Nicena synodus hoc contulit Romano pontifici privilegium, ut sicut Augustus prae ceteris regibus, ita Romanus pontifex prae ceteris praeemineat episcopis, et papa tanquam principalis pater vocaretur***. The passage stands in book 4, chapter 26. The codices read ***cap. XIV***, which Loserth corrected to XXXVI, the reading translated; both are wrong. T. Loserth's apparatus at 177.29–30 records that words of the clause ***ita Romanus pre ceteris pontifex*** are wanting in the codices (***Romanus pontifex pre ceteris deest***); the print, his supplement, is translated. R. Loserth notes Hus's reuse, ***Opera*** fol. 220b (apparatus 177.25). AB in the margin (177.24): ***Papa illud nomen unde habet ortum***.
9. The ***Constitutum Constantini*** in Gratian is ***Decretum*** D. 96 c. 14 ***Constantinus*** (form ours); Loserth's reference at 177.33 gives "Cap. XIV". The print has ***XLVI distinccione*** (178.1, so the plate); the canon stands in distinction 96, and we read ***XCVI*** (our emendation; PL 187, 460; Wyclif writes ***XCVI distinccione Constantinus*** himself at 170.13).
10. Higden, ***Polychronicon*** 5.10; Loserth: ed. Rolls Series, vol. 5, p. 417 (the Latin is on p. 416: ***Hic impetravit ab Augusto Phoca ut ecclesia beati Petri Romae caput foret omnium ecclesiarum***); the codices read ***cap. LVII***. The quotation bounds follow Loserth's italics. T. At 178.5 Loserth proposes to add ***videbatur*** after ***tunc***; the bracketed "[seemed]" supplies it.
11. FitzRalph, ***Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum*** 7.21; no reference at the page foot. Paris 1512, fol. 51r: ***premisso ab ore dominico Christi Petro tanquam sibi similiori in virtute: Beatus es Simon Bariona ...***, after which Christ names him successor. R. AB in the margin (178.18): ***Vicarius Christi quare dicitur Petrus***.
12. ***propter disparem racionem***: each see on its own ground, as the list that follows shows. T. ***metropolitani***: the codices read ***metropoli*** (apparatus 178.27); the print is translated. A in the margin names each claimant: ***Papa Antiochie***, ***Papa Jerosolimitanus***, ***Papa Constantinopolitanus***, ***Papa Romanus***.
13. Acts 11:26, "at Antioch the disciples were first named Christians". C. ***mortem Jacobi, qui ibi primo secutus est mortem Domini***: James, the first to follow the Lord's death there; Wyclif does not say which James (cf. Acts 12:2 for the son of Zebedee; tradition gives James the bishop a martyr's death at Jerusalem).
14. ***quam potest concedere***: the feminine ***quam*** cannot be a relative to ***privilegium***; it is taken as "than", with the comparison elliptical: the pope can grant the privilege no more than he can grant that a bishop live more like Christ. The bracketed words supply the ellipse.
15. At 179.15 (***propter suum concedere***) Loserth notes ***Hic aliquot verba desunt***, "some words are missing here"; the print is translated as it stands, with "nothing more or less follows" for ***non sequitur ... plus vel minus***.
16. ***ecclesie utriusque***: probably the church triumphant and the church militant, whose intercession is sought. ***suffragium*** is taken here in the sense of the church's prayers (***suffragia***), not "aid".
17. The ***Quo vadis*** story; its common Latin source is Ambrose, ***Sermo contra Auxentium*** 13 (PL 16, 1011: ***videns sibi in porta Christum occurrere ... ait: Domine, quo vadis? Respondit Christus: Venio iterum crucifigi***). FitzRalph tells it at ***Summa*** 7.18 (Paris 1512, fol. 50r), where Peter would leave Rome under Christ's precept in Matt. 10:23, Christ answers ***Vado Romam iterum crucifigi***, and Peter understands ***seipsum tanquam alterum Christum ... ibi crucifigi debere***. C. ***sub colore***, "under colour": a plausible ground (here a pretext in all but name) Peter took from Christ's counsel to flee persecution (Matt. 10:23). ***obvianti ... et querenti***: dative participles agreeing with an understood ***ei*** (Peter), to whom ***responsum est***; ***Christo*** is the object of ***obvianti***, and ***ab eo*** is Christ. R. AB in the margin (179.25): ***Fuga Petri de Roma***.
18. Matt. 25:40, 45 (Loserth: Matt. 25:34 ff.), "as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me." C. ***expectans***: "considering", or "waiting" (for the sense of the answer).
19. AB in the margin (180.6): ***Ordinacio divina est duplex***.
20. ***Causam ... est exemplar***: the accusative ***causam*** stands for the nominative subject. ***quod ordinavit postmodum ibi pati*** is read as ***quos***, "whom he ordained afterwards to suffer there", referring to ***aliis martyribus***.
21. AB in the margin (180.12): ***Roma est impertinens ut eius episcopus sit precipuus sequax Christi***. T. ***nomen tale***: the codices read ***nomine*** (apparatus 180.16); the print is translated.
22. ***Paulus*** among the Roman bishops: Wyclif may mean Paul as joint founder of the Roman church with Peter (179.4, "the holy apostles"), or a later pope Paul; the print is translated. R. AB in the margin (180.25): ***Papa dicitur dupliciter***.
23. ***ad sensum superius limitatum***: the strict sense of "pope", the one who most closely follows Christ (175.21 ff.).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **177: *intrusoris* [NW]**
  - **177: *sicut***
  - **178: *beati Petri* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **178: *Rome* (hyphenated Ro-me; main token covers whole word)**
  - **178: *papa fieret* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **178: *vagus ut olim* (one token covers three printed words)**
  - **178: *nulli loco* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **178: *Christi***
  - **179: *impertinenciam* [NW]**
  - **179: *sit huic* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **179: *istis* (25 is the line number)**
  - **180: *et speculum* (one token covers two printed words)**
  - **180: *quod***

Part 5: Rival popes from the chronicle of Ralph de Diceto

Loserth pp. 180.33–184.33

¶1 180.33–181.15

181.11 *Such modern popedom is of man's invention.*

181.20 *The history of Boniface and Eulalius shews how great was the power of the lay ruler.*

[180]**Abusio autem termini infundabilis videtur michi vocare quemcumque pseudopapam nudo nomine** [181]**papam vel caput ecclesie. Unde gentilitas et primatus affeccio docuerunt quod quicumque Romanus pontifex censeatur papa et gerat primatum huiusmodi super singulos alios sacerdotes; unde patet quod Deus non ordinasset apostolorum martyrium Rome propter hunc finem, nisi verus papatus regulariter sequeretur. Sed frequenter post dotacionem ecclesie separatus est papatus a Romano pontifice, igitur Deus non intenderat per illud martyrium illum finem; tunc enim Deus frustratus a suo proposito improvide ordinasset et negligenter omisisset in suo testamento tam necessarium primatum ad regimen sue ecclesie. Ideo certum est quod invencio humana fabricavit institucionem istam de papa.**

And it seems to me an ungroundable abuse of the term to call any pseudo-pope, by the bare name, [181]**pope or head of the church.[1] Hence it was paganism and the affection for primacy that taught that whoever is Roman pontiff is reckoned pope and holds a primacy of this kind over every other priest;[2] hence it is clear that God would not have ordained the martyrdom of the apostles at Rome for this end unless true papacy followed as a rule. Now often, after the endowment of the church, the papacy has been separated from the Roman pontiff; therefore God had not intended that end by that martyrdom; for then God, frustrated of his purpose, would have ordained improvidently, and negligently omitted from his testament a primacy so necessary to the rule of his church. Therefore it is certain that human invention fabricated this institution of the pope.**

¶2 181.16–181.32

[181]**In cronicis autem Cestrensis narravi alias quomodo multi Romani pontifices de papatu defecerant, et repeto illa que scripta sunt in cronica aurea Radulphi de Dyceto decani sancti Pauli, cui Anglici darent fidem. Narrat enim libro I cap. II, quomodo anno domini CCCCXX presidebat in Roma Boni facius papa et contra hunc ordinato Eulalio, ac pro hoc dissidente ecclesia ambo iussu Honorii Augusti urbe egrediuntur, et sic reprobato Eulalio iussu Augusti Bonifacius, quia prior ordinatus fuerat, sedi apostolice restituitur. Nondum enim tunc tantum sopitum fuit dominium Romani imperii nec ad tantum invaluit usurpacio Romani pontificis quod fuit**

And in the chronicles of the Chester [chronicler] I have related elsewhere how many Roman pontiffs had fallen away from the papacy, and I repeat what is written in the golden chronicle of Ralph de Diceto, dean of St Paul's, to whom Englishmen would give credence.[3] For he relates in book 1, chapter 2, how "in the year of the Lord 420 Pope Boniface presided in Rome, and when Eulalius had been ordained against him, and the church was divided over this, both left the city by order of Honorius Augustus; and so, Eulalius being rejected, Boniface, by order of Augustus, because he had been ordained first, is restored to the apostolic see."[4] For not yet then had the lordship of the Roman empire been so lulled to sleep,

reputatum hereticum, quod domini temporales possunt auferre temporalia, ymo dignitates atque officia ab ecclesia delinquente.

nor had the usurpation of the Roman pontiff grown so strong, that it was reputed heretical that temporal lords can take away temporal goods, indeed dignities and offices, from a church that is delinquent.[5]

¶3 182.1–182.2
182.1 *Other instances of rival popes as related by Ralph de Diceto.*

[182]Secundo, anno domini CCCCXCIII contra Symachum papam ordinatur Laurencius per contencionem.

"Second, in the year of the Lord 493, Laurence is ordained by contention against Pope Symmachus."[6]

¶4 182.4–182.7

[182]Tercio, anno domini DCCLXVIII Constantino papa scismatico oculis privato Stephanus papa constituitur; hic synodum Rome congregat et ordinatos a Constantino scismatico reordinat.

"Third, in the year of the Lord 768, the schismatic Pope Constantine having been deprived of his eyes, Stephen is made pope; he gathers a synod at Rome and reordains those ordained by the schismatic Constantine."

¶5 182.8–182.9

[182]Quarto, anno domini DCCCLIII adversus Benedictum papam Anastasius presulatum invadit.

"Fourth, in the year of the Lord 853, Anastasius invades the bishopric against Pope Benedict."[7]

¶6 182.10–182.11

[182]Quinto, anno domini DCCCCVII presidet Leo papa, contra quem Chrystoforus surgit.

"Fifth, in the year of the Lord 907, Pope Leo presides, against whom Christopher rises."

¶7 182.12–182.30

[182]Sexto, anno domini DCCCCLXVIII collecta a tota Ytalia episcoporum synodo Johannes papa de nephariis causis infamatur, qui dum se excusaturum venire cunctatur, Leo adhuc laycus eleccione omnium et consensu imperatoris papa substituitur. Sic Leo fecit ordinaciones et alia, que erant apostolica. Nec longum Romani alterata fide apud imperatorem papam recipiunt Johannem. Ille autem synodo collecta Leonem deposuit et eius gesta cassavit. Statutumque est synodum a Leone non nominandam synodum sed prostibulum favens adulteris. Quicumque igitur eo ordinante erant dampnati iussi suam ipsorum proscripsionem presentare in cartha hec continente: Pater meus nichil sibi habuit, nichil michi dedit, et sic depositi manserunt in illis gradibus, quos habuerant nondum a Leone ordinati. Iste Johannes papa cum uxore cuiusdam oblectans a dyabolo in tempore coitus percutitur et sine viatico dominico obiit.

"Sixth, in the year of the Lord 968, a synod of bishops having been gathered from all Italy, Pope John is defamed for nefarious causes; and while he delays to come to excuse himself, Leo, still a layman, is put in his place as pope by the election of all and the consent of the emperor. So Leo made ordinations and other acts which were apostolic. Not long after, the Romans, having broken faith with the emperor, receive John as pope. And he, gathering a synod, deposed Leo and annulled his acts. And it was decreed that the synod [held] by Leo should be named not a synod but a brothel favouring adulterers. All, therefore, who stood condemned [as ordained] by him were ordered to present their own proscription in a charter containing this: 'My father had nothing for himself, gave nothing to me'; and so, deposed, they remained in those grades which they had held when not yet ordained by Leo. This Pope John, dallying with a certain man's wife, is struck by the devil in the act of intercourse, and died without the Lord's viaticum."[8]

¶8 183.1–183.7
183.20 *The emperor Henry IV (like Solomon) deposed the chief pontiff.*

[183]Septimo contigit Romanos contra iuramentum, quod imperatori fecerant, scilicet quod nunquam eligerent papam sine eius et sine filii eius Othonis consensu, Benedictum papam constituunt, sed imperator Roma obsessa adeo Romanos affflixit, ut Leonem papam se recepturos promitterent et sic Benedictus renuitur.

"Seventh, it happened that the Romans, against the oath which they had made to the emperor, namely that they would never elect a pope without his consent and that of his son Otto, make Benedict pope; but the emperor, besieging Rome, so afflicted the Romans that they promised to receive Leo as pope, and so Benedict is rejected."[9]

¶9 183.8–183.13

[183] Octavo, anno domini MXLV Benedictus, qui symoniace papatum invaserat, cum esset rudis literarum, alterum ad vices ecclesiastici officii exequendas secum papam Silvestrum consecrari fecit; quod cum multis non placeret, tercius superinducitur Gregorius, qui solus vices duorum impleret.

"Eighth, in the year of the Lord 1045, Benedict, who had invaded the papacy simoniacally, since he was unlettered, had another, Silvester, consecrated pope with him to discharge the duties of the ecclesiastical office; and since this displeased many, a third, Gregory, is brought in over them, to fill alone the duties of the two."[10]

¶10 183.14–184.4
184.7 *More instances of rival popes.*

[183] Nono, anno domini MXLVI Rome uno contra duos et duobus contra unum de papatu altercantibus rex Henricus contra eos Romam vadit et eis canonica et imperiali censura depositis, Clemens presidet, et ab eo rex Henricus in imperatorem benedicitur, iurantibus Romanis se sine eius consensu nunquam papam electuros. Tunc enim practizata fuit lex sepe tacta, que ponitur III. Reg. II, 35 quod instar Salomonis rex debet in casu deponere summum pontificem. Tunc eciam accepit rex ab eo humiliter benediccionem, quod post infidelitatem vocatum est necessarium sacramentum et confirmacio sine qua non fit aliquis imperator. Sed ista ficta mendacia extra fidem scripture ex gestis et factis preteritis cum racionibus professorum scripture relicta sunt a domino convincenda. Tercio patet quod antequam introducta est novella et infundabilis secta cardinalium; papa fuit electus a populo Romanorum, [184] Decimo, anno domini MLXVIII Rome duobus de papatu contendentibus Alexander cum suam purgasset innocenciam de symonia recipitur, Cadalus Parmensis episcopus reprobatur, unde dictum est

"Ninth, in the year of the Lord 1046, at Rome, with one disputing against two and two against one over the papacy, King Henry goes to Rome against them, and, they having been deposed by canonical and imperial censure, Clement presides, and by him King Henry is blessed as emperor, the Romans swearing that they would never elect a pope without his consent."[11] For then the law often touched on was put into practice, which is set down in 3 Kings 2:35, that after the manner of Solomon a king ought, in a [given] case, to depose the highest pontiff.[12] Then also the king humbly received the blessing from him, which after unbelief [set in] was called a necessary sacrament and a confirmation without which no one becomes emperor.[13] But these feigned lies, outside the faith of scripture, are left by the Lord to be refuted from past deeds and acts, together with the reasons of the professors of scripture. Third, it is clear that before the novel and ungroundable sect of the cardinals was introduced, the pope was elected by the people of the Romans.[14] [184] "Tenth, in the year of the Lord 1068, at Rome, two contending over the papacy, Alexander, when he had purged his innocence of simony, is received; Cadalus, bishop of Parma, is rejected; whence it was said:"[15]

¶11 184.5–184.5

[184] Cadalus in Parma Parme fuit arcus et arma.

"Cadalus at Parma was Parma's bow and arms;"

¶12 184.6–184.6

[184] Cadalus occubuit, Parma ruina fuit.

"Cadalus has fallen, Parma was [his] ruin."[16]

¶13 184.7–184.10

[184] Undecimo, anno domini MLXXXIII Henricus urbem Rome infregit et Wybertum in sede apostolica constituit, Hildebrandus vero Beneventum adiit, ubi usque ad obitum suum deguit.

"Eleventh, in the year of the Lord 1083, Henry broke into the city of Rome and set Wibert in the apostolic see; and Hildebrand went to Benevento, where he lived until his death."

¶14 184.11–184.13

[184] Duodecimo, anno domini MLXXXVII Desiderius, qui et Victor, papa contra Clementem est factus.

"Twelfth, in the year of the Lord 1087, Desiderius, also called Victor, was made pope against Clement."

¶15 184.14–184.23

[184] Decimo tercio, anno domini MXCI fertur fuisse duos, qui dicebantur Romani pontifices a se invicem discordantes et ecclesiam

"Thirteenth, in the year of the Lord 1091, there are said to have been two who were called Roman pontiffs, at odds with each other and dragging

Dei inter se divisam trahentes, Urbanus scilicet, qui primum fuerat episcopus Ostiensis, et Clemens qui Wybertus archiepiscopus Ravenensis. Que res per plures annos ecclesiam Anglie in tantum occupavit, quod ex quo Gregorius, qui et Hildebrandus, defunctus fuit, nulli loco pape usque ad hoc tempus subdi et obedire voluerit.

the church of God, divided, between them: Urban, namely, who had first been bishop of Ostia, and Clement, who [was] Wibert, archbishop of Ravenna. This matter so occupied the church of England for many years that, from the time that Gregory, also called Hildebrand, died, it would not be subject to or obey anyone in the place of pope up to this time."[17]

¶16 184.24–184.28

[184]Decimo quarto, anno domini MCXXX Innocencio papa regente intrusus est Petrus Leonis et dictus est Anacletus, qui regem Rogerum Sycilie consecravit, sed Innocencius papa transivit in Franciam, unde dicitur:

"Fourteenth, in the year of the Lord 1130, while Pope Innocent was ruling, Peter Leonis was intruded and was called Anacletus, who consecrated Roger king of Sicily; but Pope Innocent crossed into France, whence it is said:"

¶17 184.29–184.29

[184]Romam Petrus habet, totum Gregorius orbem.

"Peter holds Rome, Gregory the whole world."[18]

¶18 184.30–184.33

[184]Decimo quinto, anno domini MCLIX rexit Alexander papa, contra quem Octavianus intruditur, sed in scismate moritur, et sic Guido Cremensis sed Johannes intrusus reconciliatur.

"Fifteenth, in the year of the Lord 1159, Pope Alexander ruled, against whom Octavian is intruded, but he dies in schism, and so Guido of Crema; but John, the intruder, is reconciled."[19]

Notes

1. ***Abusio ... termini infundabilis***: ***infundabilis*** may agree with ***abusio*** ("an ungroundable abuse of the term") or with ***termini*** ("abuse of an ungroundable term"); the first is taken. G. ***pseudopapa***, "pseudo-pope", formed like ***pseudochristus***.
2. ***huiusmodi***: the codices lack ***-modi*** (apparatus 181.4), reading ***huius***; the print is translated. B reads ***gerit*** for ***gerat*** (181.3).
3. Ralph de Diceto, dean of St Paul's, London (d. 1202 or 1203), ***Abbreviationes chronicorum***; Loserth cites the edition of Stubbs, vol. 1, p. 83, where the entry stands as Wyclif gives it. Wyclif "related elsewhere" the Chester chronicle's account at ***De civili dominio*** II, cap. 11 (ed. Loserth, pp. 116–118), where, citing Higden, he lists popes deposed by emperors and disputed elections they settled (Symmachus and Laurentius, John XII and Leo VIII, Benedict IX, Gregory VI). R. Loserth notes Hus's reuse, ***Opera*** fol. 230a. AB in the margin (181.20): ***Deposicio paparum***.
4. The quotation bounds follow Loserth's italics, which run from the year to ***restituitur***. T. ***quia prior***: the codices read ***qui*** (apparatus 181.26); Loserth's ***quia*** is translated.
5. The point Wyclif draws: in 420 the emperor settled a disputed election, and no one yet called it heresy that temporal lords may take temporal goods, and even dignities and offices, from a delinquent church.
6. Diceto, ed. Stubbs, vol. 1, p. 89; the following entries at pp. 124, 137, 142 and 151 (Loserth). The list of fifteen schisms is Diceto's, quoted in turn; Loserth's italics cover all of it, so each entry is in quotation marks.
7. Loserth corrects the year to 855 (***Recte: 855***); for the fifth entry to 903, and for the sixth to 963. The years of the print are translated.
8. ***excusaturum***: Loserth notes ***Recte: excusatum***; either way "to excuse himself". ***nominandam synodum***: the codices read ***nominanda synodus*** (182.21–22), corrected by Loserth. ***meus***: the codices read ***nimis*** (182.25). ***manserunt***: Loserth gives the codices' reading as ***mansuerunt***, correct ***remanserunt***. B reads ***cessavit*** for ***cassavit***. C. ***Quicumque ... eo ordinante erant dampnati***: as printed, "whoever stood condemned through his ordaining"; the sense requires those whom Leo had ordained, and a word such as ***ordinati*** may have fallen out; "[as ordained]" supplies it. R. Hus, ***Opera*** fol. 230a (Loserth).
9. ***contigit Romanos ... constituunt***: the infinitive construction after ***contigit*** gives way to a finite verb; translated by the sense. Diceto, ed. Stubbs, vol. 1, p. 151, the page of the sixth entry (Loserth's "Ibid. p. 151", which the apparatus OCR reads "p. 1 1").
10. Diceto, ed. Stubbs, vol. 1, p. 187 (Loserth).
11. Diceto, as before, vol. 1, p. 187 (Loserth, ***Ibid.***, at 183.14).
12. 3 Kings 2:35 (DR), "Sadoc, the priest, he put in the place of Abiathar": Solomon deposed the priest Abiathar (2:27) and put Sadoc in his place. R. AB in the margin (183.14): ***Juramentum imperatoris dicitur necessarium sacramentum***, "the emperor's oath is called a necessary sacrament".
13. ***post infidelitatem***: "after unbelief [set in]", that is, once the church had fallen from the faith; the phrase may also mean "after the [king's] unbelief". The relative ***quod*** refers loosely to the blessing.
14. ***Tercio patet***: no first or second point precedes in this passage, and the sentence ends with a comma at the foot of p. 183, where Diceto's list resumes. It reads like a remark set into the list, perhaps from the margin.

15. Diceto, ed. Stubbs, vol. 1, p. 200; the entries that follow at pp. 211, 216, 246 and 303 (Loserth). R. Hus, *Opera* fol. 230b (Loserth).
16. ***Parma ruina fuit***: "Parma was ruin", or "Parma's was the ruin"; with the first line, the couplet plays on Parma as Cadalus's strength and his fall.
17. ***nulli loco pape***: "to no one in the place of pope". T. ***per plures annos***: one codex reads ***populares annos*** (apparatus 184.19); the print is translated.
18. The verse sets Peter Leonis (Anacletus II) against Innocent II, whose name before election was Gregory.
19. The entry is compressed: Octavian (Victor IV) died in schism, Guido of Crema (Paschal III) followed him, and John (Calixtus III) was later reconciled. ***et sic Guido Cremensis*** has no verb; ***intruditur*** is understood from the clause before.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 181: ***illum***
  - 181: ***illa***
  - 181: ***I*** (print has libro I, at line end before cap. II; main scan lacks it)
  - 181: ***facius*** (Boni | facius split by folio bar (206b), no hyphen)
  - 181: ***hunc***
  - 182: ***CCCCXCIII***
  - 182: ***Symachum*** (hyphenated Sy-machum; main token covers whole word)
  - 182: ***papam***
  - 182: ***ordinatur***
  - 182: ***per***
  - 182: ***contencionem*** (hyphenated con-tencionem; main token covers whole word)
  - 182: ***DCCLXVIII***
  - 182: ***meus***
  - 182: ***dominico***
  - 183: ***et***
  - 183: ***impleret***
  - 183: ***Romanorum*** (plate: main token spans pages; Decimo belongs at the head of p. 184 (restored there))
  - 184: ***papatu***
  - 184: ***occubuit***
  - 184: ***factus***
  - 183: ***filii*** (italic f (long-s-like f); print = filii)

Part 6: The rival popes and the signs of antichrist

Loserth pp. 185.1–188.17

¶1 185.1–185.18

185.1 *In every century since endowment there have been quarrels for the popedom.*
185.14 *This strife has been due to ambition or avarice.*
185.19 *It is to such that Christ's prophecy of Antichrist refers.*

[185] **Itaque infra quemcumque centenarium annorum a tempore dotacionis ecclesie facta est notanda contencio inter papas. Sed abhinc ex superhabundanti cautela dyaboli plus cecata est iniquitas Antichristi, cum autem apostoli habuerunt planiores revelaciones quam prophete veteris testamenti et maiorem zelum habeant ad profectum ecclesie, non licet discredere quin prophetaverant hos eventus precipuos ut periculum infidelitatis, ita ut tractus ad inferos caucius caveatur, quin indubie istorum antichristorum dissensio dicit patenter, si velimus attendere, quod gradus et vita eorum discordant; et displicent suis autoribus, Et causa dissensionis est honor mundanus vel globus temporalium, quia aliter non foret facile fingere, unde dissenciendo contendant pocius circa illud officium post dotacionem ecclesie quam perante.**

So within every hundred years from the time of the endowment of the church there has been notable contention among popes. But from then on, by an overabundant wile of the devil, the iniquity of Antichrist has been the more obscured;[1] and since the apostles had plainer revelations than the prophets of the old testament, and have greater zeal for the church's progress, it is not permitted to disbelieve that they prophesied these chief events as a danger of unbelief, so that the drag toward hell might be more warily guarded against.[2] Nay, undoubtedly the dissension of these antichrists says plainly, if we will attend, that their rank and their life are at odds; and they displease their authors. And the cause of the dissension is worldly honour or the mass of temporal goods,[3] for otherwise it would not be easy to imagine why, in dissenting, they

¶2 185.19–187.20
186.2 *The works of the rival popes shews they are antichrists.*
186.12 *The Church would be better without either of them.*
186.31 *We English should not accept either.*
187.1 *The signs of Antichrist as taught by Augustine.*

[185]Ex quibus ut supra colligo tamquam michi probabile, quod Christus summus propheta Matth. XXIV, 5 dicens, quod multi venient in nomine suo, dicentes se esse Christus, et multos seducent, intelligit de Romanis pontificibus blasfeme mencientibus, quod sunt eius vicarii, quos autorizat ad taliter dominandum. Et sic videtur michi probabile quod idem sit sensus Apostoli II. Tess. II, 3, 4 ubi prophetat, quod ante diem iudicii oportet, quod veniat dissensio primum et reveletur homo peccati, qui extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus. Sed tercio videtur michi probabile quod debemus quoad hoc inniti Christi consilio, quod facta tali divisione iam diebus nostris quibusdam dicentibus: Ecce hic Avinione est Christus et aliis dicentibus, nolite credere, quia indubie [186]opera fidelia oportet ostendere Christi vicarium, cui opinio vel eleccio humana est impertinens. Opera autem Christo contraria ostendunt multis quod uterque eorum sit antichristus et per consequens fugiendus, ymo credo indubie utroque clero, qui istis ambobus consensit, neuter clerus habebit contra reliquum evidenciam quod suus episcopus pro quo zelat sit papa, quia (ut alias ostendi) error eligencium non impedit, quin electus sit papa. Nec nos possumus contra illos ex operibus vel revelacione convincere, quod noster Romanus pontifex sit papa. Ideo videtur securum, cum melius foret ecclesie, quod nullus foret huiusmodi, quod vivamus ut ante dotacionem, quando ecclesia communiter regulabatur per socios, et pro neutro asseramus blasfema mendacia, cum tota vita sua debet capi relicto ambiguo, nam nichil nocius, quam quod stat utrumque istorum esse pseudopapam et per consequens Antichristum. Nec est racio vel auctoritas cogens quod alter istorum sit papa, igitur ista fides non est ecclesie imponenda; et nimis leve foret quod utraque istarum parcium imponat relique scisma vel heresim sine causa notoria, et specialiter cum persone aggregate religiosorum in ista sentencia sint divise. Stat enim quod homines inculpate eligant Antichristum, ut patet ex dictis; et stat quod homines viciosissime eligant quem Deus bene elegerit; ideo patet quod argumenta neutram partem necessitant ad credendum suum prepositum esse papam. Ideo nos Anglici debemus quiescere in antiqua religione Christi ut olym, neutri parti credendo nimis faciliter. Si enim uterque istorum est Antichristus, sine tali capite debet ecclesia regulari, sed quis scit hoc? Docet [187]enim Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone XLV ex triplici scripture testimonio signum evidentissimum Antichristi: primum est illud Apostoli Rom.

contend over that office more after the endowment of the church than before it.

From which, as above, I gather as probable to me that Christ, the highest prophet, saying in Matthew 24:5 that "many will come" in his "name", saying that they are Christ, "and they will seduce many", means it of the Roman pontiffs, who blasphemously lie that they are his vicars, whom he authorizes to lord it in this way.[4] And so it seems probable to me that the sense of the Apostle is the same in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–4, where he prophesies that before the day of judgement there must "come a" dissension "first, and the man of sin be revealed", who "is lifted up above all that is called God".[5] But thirdly it seems probable to me that in this we ought to lean on Christ's counsel, now that such a division has been made in our days, with some saying, "Lo here at Avignon is Christ", and others saying, "do not believe";[6] for undoubtedly it is faithful works [186] that must show the vicar of Christ, to which human opinion or election is irrelevant. Now works contrary to Christ show many that each of them is an antichrist and consequently to be fled. Indeed, I believe undoubtedly that, of the two clergies that have consented to these two, neither clergy will have evidence against the other that its bishop, for whom it is zealous, is pope,[7] because (as I have shown elsewhere) the error of the electors does not prevent the one elected from being pope. Nor can we prove against them, from works or from revelation, that our Roman pontiff is pope. Therefore it seems safe, since it would be better for the church that there were no one of this kind, that we live as before the endowment, when the church was commonly ruled through fellows,[8] and that we assert blasphemous lies on behalf of neither, since each one's whole life must be taken [as the evidence], the ambiguous being left aside;[9] for nothing is more harmful than this, that it can be that each of them is a pseudo-pope and consequently Antichrist. Nor is there a reason or authority compelling [us to hold] that either of them is pope; therefore this faith is not to be imposed on the church. And it would be an exceedingly light thing for each of these parties to charge the other with schism or heresy without notorious cause, and especially since the persons of the religious, taken together, are divided over this teaching.[10] For it can be that men blamelessly elect Antichrist, as is clear from what has been said; and it can be that men most viciously elect one whom God has well chosen. Therefore it is clear that arguments necessitate neither party to believe its superior to be pope. Therefore we English ought to rest in the

X, 3: Ignorantes Dei iusticiam et suam volentes constituere, iusticie Dei non sunt subiecti. Unde quia illud signum concludit infallibiliter Antichristum; exponit Augustinus idem pertinencius: Quid, inquit, est aliud ignorare Dei iusticiam et suam velle constituere nisi dicere, ego sanctifico, ego iustifico, quod ego dedero sanctum est, dimitte Deo quod Dei est, agnosce, homo, quod hominis est; ignoras Dei iusticiam et tuam vis constituere, iustificare me vis, sufficit tibi ut mecum iustificeris. Vendicant enim quidam secundum leges suas regere totum mundum et tamen nesciunt secundum leges Dei se ipsos regere vel suos domesticos, et cum illi habent pseudodiscipulos publice asserentes quod ipsi melius et universalibus regunt ecclesiam quam Christus vel eius apostoli.

ancient religion of Christ as of old, believing neither party too readily. For if each of them is Antichrist, the church must be ruled without such a head; but who knows this? For [187] Augustine teaches in *On the Words of the Lord*, Sermon 45, from a threefold testimony of scripture, the most evident sign of Antichrist.[11] The first is that of the Apostle, Romans 10:3: "Not knowing the justice of God, and willing to establish their own, they are not subject to the justice of God."[12] Hence, because that sign infers Antichrist infallibly, Augustine expounds the same more pertinently: "What else," he says, "is it to be ignorant of God's justice and to will to establish one's own, but to say, 'I sanctify, I justify; what I give is holy'? Leave to God what is God's; acknowledge, man, what is man's. You are ignorant of God's justice and will establish your own; you want to justify me; it is enough for you that you be justified with me."[13] For some claim to rule the whole world according to their own laws, and yet do not know how to rule themselves or their households according to the laws of God; and since they have false disciples publicly asserting that they rule the church better and more universally than Christ or his apostles.[14]

¶3 187.21–188.17
188.6 *There is not one sole Antichrist but many.*

[187] Secundum testimonium est illud Joh. V, 43 tactum superius: Ego veni in nomine patris mei et non accepistis me, Si alius venerit in nomine suo, illum accipietis. Super quo dicit Augustinus: De Antichristo dictum est, et omnes sic intelligunt: Ego veni in nomine patris mei et non suscepistis me, si alius venerit in nomine suo, hunc suscipietis. Sed audiamus Johannem: Audistis, quia Antichristus venit, et nunc Antichristi multi facti sunt. Quid autem expavescimus in Antichristo, nisi quia nomen suum honoraturus est et nomen domini contempturus. Quid aliud facit, qui dicit: Ego iustifico? respondet eis subditus, ego ad Christum veni [188] non pedibus sed corde; ubi evangelium audivi, ibi credidi, et ille: Non es mundus. Quare? quia non fui ibi. Hec Augustinus. Et patet, cum oppositorum est eadem disciplina, Antichristus autem et Christus sunt oppositi, oportet quod scriptura condiciones Christi detegens, indirecte condiciones detegat Antichristi. Ideo dicit capitulum predictum de Antichristo: Scrutamini scripturas, quia putatis in illis habere vitam eternam, et ille sunt que testimonium perhibent de me. Unde redarguendi sunt fingentes quod solum erit unus Antichristus, qui procreabitur ex fratre et moniali, quia certum est quod omnis dampnandus erit Antichristus, et scriptura docet nos sic loqui de illo; ideo fabule tales celant multos Antichristos et palliant eorum versucias, sic quod incaucius precaventur.

The second testimony is that of John 5:43, touched on above: "I am come in the name of my Father, and you have not received me: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive."[15] On which Augustine says: "It was said of Antichrist, and all understand it so: 'I am come in the name of my Father, and you have not received me; if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive.' But let us hear John: 'You have heard that Antichrist cometh, and now there are become many Antichrists.' And what do we dread in Antichrist, but that he will honour his own name and despise the name of the Lord? What else does he do who says, 'I justify'? The subject answers them: 'I came to Christ [188] not on foot but in heart; where I heard the gospel, there I believed.' And he: 'You are not clean.' Why? 'Because I was not there.'"[16] Thus Augustine. And it is clear: since the same discipline is of opposites, and Antichrist and Christ are opposites, scripture, in exposing the conditions of Christ, must indirectly expose the conditions of Antichrist.[17] Therefore the aforesaid chapter says of Antichrist: "Search the scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me."[18] Hence those are to be refuted who imagine that there will be only one Antichrist, who will be begotten of a friar and a nun;[19] for it is certain that everyone who is to be damned will be an antichrist, and scripture teaches us to

speak so of him. Therefore such fables hide many antichrists and cloak their cunning, so that they are guarded against less warily.

Notes

1. *Plus cecata est*: "has been the more obscured" (*caecare*, to blind, to darken). The sense wanted may be "the more hidden" (*celata*); the print is translated.
2. *Ita ut*: Loserth's text; the manuscripts read *ita et* (apparatus 185.10). The following *quin indubie* (185.10) is taken as corrective, "nay, undoubtedly"; the sentence does not hang well on what precedes, and a word may be missing.
3. *Globus temporalium*: "the mass of temporal goods", *globus* of things (the glossary). *Suis autoribus*: "their authors", most likely those who set them up; the referent is not stated.
4. Matthew 24:5, in indirect speech (Vulgate *in nomine meo ... Ego sum Christus*). The clause *quos autorizat ad taliter dominandum* is taken as part of the popes' lie (that Christ authorizes them); *dominari* is pejorative here.
5. 2 Thessalonians 2:3–4. Wyclif reads *dissensio* where the Vulgate has *discessio* (DR "a revolt"), as Loserth notes (apparatus 185.28); the English follows Wyclif's word.
6. After Matthew 24:23 ("Lo here is Christ, or there: do not believe him"), with Avignon put into the text. The "division" is the schism that began in 1378, with one claimant at Rome and one at Avignon.
7. *Utroque clero, qui istis ambobus consensit* is taken as a loose ablative of reference, "of the two clergies that have consented to these two"; it could also be read "with both clergies having consented".
8. *Per socios*: "through fellows", i.e. by companions of equal standing, with no single head over them.
9. *Cum tota vita sua debet capi relicto ambiguo*: construal doubtful. Taken as: each claimant's whole life is the evidence to be weighed, and what is ambiguous (the election) set aside.
10. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL) is "teaching" here: the position held on which claimant is pope. *Persone aggregate religiosorum*: the religious taken as bodies (the orders).
11. Augustine, *De verbis Domini* sermo 45 in Wyclif's numbering; Loserth: Sermo 129, Opp. tom. V, 633 (PL 38, 720–25).
12. Romans 10:3 in Augustine's form (Vulgate *suam quaerentes statuere*, DR "seeking to establish their own ... have not submitted themselves"). The manuscripts read "Rom. 1"; Loserth corrects to X (apparatus 187.4).
13. *Ego iustifico*: Loserth's emendation; the codex reads *ego sanctifico* twice (apparatus 187.10).
14. The clause *et cum illi habent pseudodiscipulos ...* has no main verb: a word or clause may have been lost (187.18–20). *Universalibus* does not construe with *melius*; it is translated as *universalius*, "more universally".
15. John 5:43, with Wyclif's *accepistis* (Vulgate *accipitis*, DR "you receive me not"); the English gives his perfect.
16. Augustine, Sermo 129.6 (PL 38, 723; Loserth's reference repeated at 188.3), quoting John 5:43 (with *suscepistis ... suscipietis*) and 1 John 2:18 (Loserth's reference, 187.28). *Ibi credidi*: Loserth's emendation; the codex reads *et* (apparatus 188.1). The exchange is with an opponent who denies the subject is clean because he was not baptized "there", among his own party.
17. *Oppositorum est eadem disciplina*: the scholastic maxim that the same science treats of opposites (Aristotle, *Metaph.* Γ.2, 1004a9–10: "it is the province of one science to study opposites"). A omits *eadem* (apparatus 188.4). *Autem* here brings the minor premiss.
18. John 5:39 (Loserth's reference), slightly reworded (Vulgate *quia vos putatis in ipsis vitam aeternam habere*); "the aforesaid chapter" is John 5, cited for 5:43.
19. The tale that Antichrist will be born of a friar and a nun; Loserth gives no source and it has not been traced.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **185: *ut* (print has quibus ut supra colligo tamquam michi; only ut stands here (DEL at 110 drops main's ut, michi is at pos 114))**
  - **185: *michi***
  - **185: *veniat* (print has v)**
  - **186: *cui***
  - **186: *opinio***
  - **186: *melius***
  - **187: *et***
  - **187: *suam* (5 is the line number)**
  - **187: *illum***
  - **188: *ille***
  - **188: *Antichristi***
  - **188: *et***

Part 7: Antichrist seeks glory from men; popes struck down

Loserth pp. 188.18–192.9

¶1 188.18–190.15
188.18 *Antichrist seeks the praise of man and not of God.*
189.11 *Antichrist claims that without obedience to him is no salvation,*
189.27 *He rests his claims on witness of men,*
190.1 *See how like the Roman pontiffs are to Antichrist.*
190.16 *Grosseteste and Innocent IV.*

[188] Tercium testimonium notificans Antichristi discipulos est quod sint gloriam ab invicem exspectantes et gloriam, que a solo Deo est, non querentes, ut docet Veritas Joh. V; nam in hoc sunt Christo contrarii, qui instanter fecit actus iustissimos, et correspondenter ad illos exspectavit gloriam a solo Deo. Unde in predicto capitulo Johannis de Antichristo: Amen amen dico vobis, non potest filius a se ipso facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit patrem facientem. Ex quo patet quod oportet omnia opera Christi esse iustissima, et sic intelligitur auctoritas Christi sequens: Iudicium meum iustum est, quia non quero voluntatem meam sed voluntatem eius, qui misit me, patris. Et patet veritas connexionis sequentis: Si ego [189] testimonium perhibeo de me ipso, testimonium meum non est verum, sed pater testimonium perhibet. Si eciam Baptista sine Christi exaccione testimonium perhibuit Veritati: Ego, inquit, habeo testimonium maius Johanne, opera enim que dedit michi pater ut perficiam; ipsa opera que ego facio testimonium perhibent de me. Ex istis textibus eliciunt sancti versucias antichristi, ipse enim summe sitit honorem et lucrum mundanum, cum Christus omnino fecit contrarium. Ideo docet Augustinus ubi supra quomodo Antichristus nitetur quod sine eius seculari obediencia non est salus, quod cum non habet testimonium ex scriptura, fingit in multis epistolis testimonium a se ipso: Si boni sumus, inquit Augustinus, facite quod scriptum est: Imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi. Si autem mali sumus, quod Deus magis facit, sic nec deserti estis nec sine Consilio remansistis; audite dicentem: Que dicunt facite, que autem faciunt nolite facere. Sed prelati contra hec: Nisi boni fuerimus, peristis. Sed hic est alius, qui veniet in nomine Christi. Sed hunc Antichristum alloquor, igitur vita mea ex te pendebit et salus mea ex te religabitur: Sed fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere nisi Christum, veni igitur mecum, Antichriste, si vis esse super petram, et noli velle esse michi pro petra. Et patet ex textu Johannis sequenti, quomodo Christus nititur testimonio iustorum operum et scripture, non autem solis verbis hominum, ut superius dicit Crysostomus esse consuetudinem Antichristi; hec considera et applica ad facta Romanorum pontificum et vide si consonant ritibus antichristi, [190] quod si uterque istorum dicit conformiter ad illam extravagantem decretalem Bonifacii VIII Unam Sanctam quod nisi quis obediat sibi ut capiti tocius ecclesie, non est de numero salvandorum, oportet utrumque relinquere tamquam alterum Antichristum. Multi enim erant tales de Romanis pontificibus, unde narrat predictus cronicans in libro suo de Floribus Historiarum, quomodo anno gracie DCV papa Sabinianus

The third testimony, which makes known the disciples of Antichrist, is that they expect glory from one another and do not seek the glory that is from God alone, as the Truth teaches in John 5;[1] for in this they are contrary to Christ, who earnestly did the most just acts and, in correspondence with them, expected glory from God alone. Hence in the aforesaid chapter of John on Antichrist: "Amen, amen, I say unto you, the Son cannot do any thing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing." From which it is clear that all the works of Christ must be most just; and so is understood the following authority of Christ: "My judgment is just: because I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me", the Father.[2] And the truth of the following conditional is clear: "If I [189] bear witness of myself, my witness is not true"; but the Father bears witness.[3] Even if the Baptist, without Christ's demanding it, bore witness to the Truth, "I", he says, "have a greater testimony than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to perfect, the works themselves which I do, give testimony of me." From these texts the saints draw out the cunning of antichrist; for he thirsts supremely for honour and worldly gain, whereas Christ did entirely the contrary. Therefore Augustine teaches in the place cited how Antichrist will strive [to make out] that without secular obedience to him there is no salvation; and since he has no testimony for this from scripture, he fabricates in many letters a testimony from himself:[4] "If we are good," says Augustine, "do what is written: 'Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.' But if we are evil, which God rather does, even so you are neither deserted nor left without counsel: hear him who says, 'What they say, do; but what they do, do not do.'[5] But the prelates [say] against this: 'Unless we are good, you have perished.' But this is the other who will come in the name of Christ.[6] But I address this Antichrist: so then my life will hang on you, and my salvation will be bound to you? But 'other foundation no man can lay' but Christ.[7] Come then with me, Antichrist, if you wish to be upon the rock, and do not wish to be a rock for me." And it is clear from the following text of John how Christ relies on the testimony of just works and of scripture, but not on the bare words of men, which Chrysostom said above is the custom of Antichrist.[8] Consider these things and apply them to the deeds of the Roman pontiffs, and see whether they accord with the rites of antichrist. [190] And if each of them says, in conformity with that extravagant decretal of Boniface VIII, ***Unam sanctam***, that unless someone obeys him as head of the whole church he

liberalitatem beati Gregorii predecessoris sui derogavit et sub hoc obtentu manum egenis subtraxit, Gregorius eum per visum ter pro culpa tenacie et huius derogacionis increpavit, et quarto horribiliter increpans et comminans in capite percussit, quo dolore vexatus paulo post obiit.

is not of the number of those to be saved, we must leave each of them as the other Antichrist.[9] For many of the Roman pontiffs were such. Hence the aforesaid chronicler relates in his book *Flores historiarum* how in the year of grace 605 Pope Sabinian disparaged the liberality of blessed Gregory his predecessor and, under this pretext, withdrew his hand from the needy; Gregory three times rebuked him in a vision for the fault of tight-fistedness and of this disparagement, and the fourth time, rebuking and threatening him horribly, struck him on the head; and, afflicted by that pain, he died soon after.[10]

¶2 190.16–191.5

191.6 *Repentance and martyrdom of Marcellinus.*

[190]Item, simile narrat Cestrensis libro suo VII MCCVI ad papam Innocencium misit Robertus Lynconiensis epistolam invectivam satis et tonantem, pro eo quod ecclesias Anglie indebitis exaccionibus vexare videretur; hac de causa ad curiam vocatus est, et cum ibi molestaretur, appellavit constanter a curia Innocencii ad tribunal Christi; unde contigit, quod Roberto in Anglia obeunte audita est vox in curia pape: Veni miser ad iudicium; repertusque est in crastino papa exanimis, quasi cuspide baculi in latere percussus. Qui licet perspicacius effulserit miraculis, transferri tamen in sanctorum cathalogo a curia non est permissus. Nec est putandum istos sanctos iregularitatem vel offensam Dei incurrere ex percussione letali summorum pontificum; qui viderunt quod erant precipui [191]Antichristi, persequentes ecclesiam, et receperunt mandatum a Domino sic tractare hostes ecclesie, pro cuius prosperitate secundum religionem et institucionem Christi, dum erant vivi, a Deo zelaverunt.

Again, the Chester [chronicler] relates a like thing in his seventh book: [in] 1206 Robert of Lincoln sent to Pope Innocent a letter invective enough and thundering, because he seemed to vex the churches of England with undue exactions.[11] For this reason he was summoned to the curia, and when he was harassed there, he appealed steadfastly from the court of Innocent to the tribunal of Christ. Whence it happened that, when Robert died in England, a voice was heard in the pope's curia: "Come, wretch, to judgment"; and on the morrow the pope was found lifeless, as if struck in the side with the point of a staff. And Robert, although he shone forth very conspicuously with miracles, was yet not permitted by the curia to be transferred into the catalogue of the saints. Nor is it to be thought that these saints incurred irregularity, or an offence against God, by the lethal striking of the highest pontiffs;[12] for they saw that these were chief [191]antichrists, persecuting the church, and they received a mandate from the Lord so to treat the enemies of the church, for whose prosperity, according to the religion and institution of Christ, they were zealous from God while they lived.[13]

¶3 191.6–191.28

[191]Item, notat lex ecclesie, quomodo Marcellinus episcopus urbis Rome, qui foret dux christiani exercitus thurificavit ydolis, ut patet distinccione XXI Nunc autem divina, ubi dicit glossa ordinaria quod consilio congregato Confessus quod fecerat et in se tulit sentenciam deposicionis, et post (ut reor) exutus ab illo officio veniens coram Dyocleciano, confessus est se esse christianum et martyr effectus est; considerans enim suam blasfemam vecordiam in papatu et preparans se per satisfaccionem ad martyrium, pro nichilo habuit huiusmodi dignitatem; diebus autem nostris, ut plus involverunt se seculari dominio sunt peiores, quia Christus non diceret de eis: Omnia quecumque dixerint vobis, facite. Nec illi ut sacerdotes legis veteris putant habere vitam perpetuam in scriptura,

Again, the law of the church notes how Marcellinus, bishop of the city of Rome, who should have been the leader of the Christian army, offered incense to idols, as is clear in Distinction 21, *Nunc autem divina*, where the ordinary gloss says that, a council having been gathered, he confessed what he had done and pronounced on himself the sentence of deposition;[14] and afterwards (as I think), stripped of that office, coming before Diocletian, he confessed that he was a Christian and was made a martyr. For, considering his blasphemous faint-heartedness in the papacy, and preparing himself by satisfaction for martyrdom, he held such a dignity for nothing. But in our days, the more they have involved themselves in secular lordship, the worse they are; for Christ would not

cum ex eius ignorancia multi antichristi cadunt in multas blasfemias et ex scripture contemptu multos, qui pie vivere volunt in Christo persequuntur, nituntur enim viis variis facere, ut credantur quod sint caput universalis ecclesie, et ipsa indubie est tunc cum paribus acephala quoad ipsos.

say of them: "All things whatsoever they shall say to you, do."[15] Nor do they, like the priests of the old law, think to have life everlasting in scripture, since from ignorance of it many antichrists fall into many blasphemies, and from contempt of scripture persecute many who "will live piously in Christ";[16] for they strive by various ways to bring it about that they are believed to be head of the universal church, and then that church is undoubtedly, along with its peers, acephalous as far as they are concerned.[17]

¶4 191.29–192.9

[191]Sed Augustinus in De Verbis Domini ubi supra: Quid, inquit, tibi fecit ecclesia ut eam velis quodammodo decollare? qui, inquit, sic decollare [192]vult et corpus et caput conatur occidere. Cum enim non sit communicacio Christi ad Belial, quomodo Christo tam contrarius in vita et moribus erit ex eius participio caput ecclesie? Erubescunt, inquit, negare Christum, hoc tamen maius est, cum Christum non vidimus sed credimus, verba autem illius nobiscum sunt, in quibus ipsum negamus, comparate itaque vos Iudeis, illi contempserunt pendentem in ligno, vos contempnitis sedentem in celo.

But Augustine, in *On the Words of the Lord*, in the place cited: "What," he says, "has the church done to you, that you wish in a manner to behead her? He who wishes so to behead her," he says, [192]"strives to kill both body and head."[18] For since there is no fellowship of Christ with Belial, how will one so contrary to Christ in life and morals be, by participation in him, head of the church?[19] "They blush," he says, "to deny Christ; yet this is greater, since we have not seen Christ but believe, and his words are with us, in which we deny him. Compare yourselves therefore with the Jews: they despised him hanging on the tree; you despise him sitting in heaven."

Notes

1. John 5:44 in indirect speech (DR "who receive glory one from another: and the glory which is from God alone, you do not seek"); Wyclif writes *exspectantes* for the Vulgate's *accipitis*.
2. John 5:19 and 5:30 (Loserth's references, 188.25, 188.29). Wyclif adds *patris* to 5:30; the English keeps it outside the quotation. *Auctoritas* here is an authoritative text.
3. John 5:31; *sed pater testimonium perhibet* is Wyclif's summary of 5:32 ("There is another that beareth witness of me"). *Connexio*: the conditional proposition, "if ... then". The quotation that follows is John 5:36 (Loserth's reference).
4. Augustine, Sermo 129.8 (Loserth: Opp. tom. V, 636; PL 38, 724). *Sine eius seculari obediencia*: "without secular obedience to him", i.e. obedience in temporal matters; *in multis epistolis* is Wyclif's.
5. 1 Corinthians 11:1 (DR) and Matthew 23:3 in Augustine's short form (DR "whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not"). *Quod Deus magis facit* hardly construes; Augustine's text has no such clause: *simus iniqui, et hoc magis ipse scit ... Si autem mali sumus, nec sic deserti estis* (Sermo 129.8, PL 38, 724), and Wyclif's words look like a garbling of *hoc magis ipse scit*, "[God] knows it better". The print is translated. B omits *fuerimus* in the next sentence (apparatus 189.21).
6. *In nomine Christi*: John 5:43, which Augustine is applying, has *in nomine suo*, "in his own name"; the print is translated.
7. *Igitur vita mea ... religabitur* is read as an indignant question. 1 Corinthians 3:11, shortened (Vulgate *praeter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Jesus*).
8. Chrysostom was cited above in chapter 7: on 2 Tim. 3:1 (hom. 8), the devil and his members "show nothing in works, but promise great things falsely in words" (148.6–17), and "Antichrist relies on the bare leaves of words" (149.25–27, untraced). "The following text of John" is John 5:36–39.
9. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam* (1302); Loserth: *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1 (modern form ours; Friedberg II, 1245–46). *Tamquam alterum Antichristum*: "as the other", the *alius* of John 5:43 who comes in his own name. A and B note here: *Obediencia pape nota bene*.
10. Loserth refers the story to Higden's *Polychronicon* V, 412, although Wyclif names the *Flores historiarum*. The date: Loserth prints DCV; the manuscripts read LXVII (apparatus 190.9). A and B note: "St Gregory the pope killed his successor."
11. Ranulf Higden of Chester, *Polychronicon* VIII, 240–42 (Loserth; Higden names *Innocentium quartum*). Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. Loserth: the date 1206 is so in the text, and the pope is Innocent IV, not Innocent III. A and B note: "Lincoln appealed to the tribunal of Christ."
12. *Irregularitas*: the canonical impediment incurred by shedding blood, which bars from orders and their exercise.
13. *A Deo zelaverunt*: "were zealous from God", i.e. with a zeal given by God; *pro Deo* may have been meant. The print is translated.

14. Decretum D. 21 c. 7 *Nunc autem* (Loserth "Cap. VII"; modern form ours) with the ordinary gloss, ed. Venice 1595, p. 91. *Consilio* is read as *concilio*, "council". *Sentencia* here is the judicial sentence (CONTEXTUAL). B reads *exustus* for *exutus* (apparatus 191.12).
15. Matthew 23:3 shortened. Loserth prints *seculari dominio*; the manuscripts read *in seculari* (apparatus 191.18).
16. Echoes John 5:39 ("you think in them to have life everlasting") and 2 Timothy 3:12 ("all that will live godly in Christ Jesus").
17. *Cum paribus*: "along with its peers", probably the church under the other claimant as well; possibly "other things being equal". A and B note *Caput ecclesie* here (apparatus 191.26).
18. Augustine, Sermo 129.9 (PL 38, 725), the sermon of the *ubi supra*: *Quid tibi fecit Ecclesia, ut eam velis quodam modo decollare? ... Qui decollare vult, et caput et corpus conatur occidere. Erubescunt negare Christum ... illi contempserunt pendentem in ligno, vos contemnitis sedentem in coelo*; Loserth's "Sermo 130 ... Opp. tom. V, 637" and "Sermo XLVI, Opp. tom. V, 230" do not contain it. The italics run the second quotation from *vult* to *occidere* and the last from *negare* to *celo*.
19. 2 Corinthians 6:15 (DR "what concord hath Christ with Belial?"), with *communicacio* for the Vulgate's *conventio*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 189: *antichristi* (print has lower-case a)
  - 189: *facite* (hyphenated fa-cite; main token covers whole word)
  - 189: *Antichristi*
  - 190: *Bonifacii*
  - 190: *Sanctam*
  - 190: *paulo*
  - 190: *papam*
  - 190: *iudicium* (folio bar before it (208c))
  - 191: *tulit*
  - 191: *decollare*
  - 192: *vult* (print has v)
  - 192: *conatur*
  - 192: *nobiscum*
  - 192: *illi*
  - 192: *celo*
  - 189: *Augustinus* (print = Augustinus)

Part 8: Redeeming the time

Loserth pp. 192.10–194.6

¶1 192.10–194.6
192.10 *Our prelates deny Christ in deed.*
193.12 *What it is to redeem the time.*
193.26 *It is to forego a life of self indulgence*

[192]Et ne pallietur huius negacionis negacio, que potissime consistit in facto, attendamus quomodo superiores satrape, quibus regeretur ecclesia, honorificum reputant legem Christi ignorando contempnere eos qui pie volunt vivere, et pericula eorum, sicut debent ex Ezechielis XXXIV detegere, nituntur omnimode tribulare, ut ostendit Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone LXXXIX: Quisquis, inquit, me audis, incipe in Christo vivere, et probabis quod dico, nam cetera pericula, de quibus Apostolus, possunt quiescere, pericula autem in falsis fratribus usque ad finem seculi quiescere non noverunt. Et intelligit modo Apostoli per falsos fratres generaliter quoscumque falsos nomine christianos. Redimamus itaque tempus, quantum dies mali sunt; hoc est, inquit, tempus redimere, quando aliquis infert tibi litem perdere substanciam, ut Deo vaces, non litibus. Quia, inquam, superiores ecclesie factis negant hanc legem, quam Chrisus in vase suo loquitur, ideo statim multitudine persequuntur eum, qui

And lest the denial of this denial be cloaked, a denial which consists chiefly in deed,[1] let us attend to how the higher satraps, by whom the church should be ruled, reckon it honourable, being ignorant of the law of Christ, to despise those who will live piously; and whereas they ought, from Ezekiel 34, to expose their dangers, they strive in every way to trouble them,[2] as Augustine shows in *On the Words of the Lord*, Sermon 89: "Whoever of you hears me," he says, "begin to live in Christ, and you will prove what I say; for the other perils of which the Apostle [speaks] can come to rest, but the perils from false brethren know not how to rest until the end of the world."[3] And he understands by false brethren, in the Apostle's manner, generally any who are false, Christians in name. "Let us therefore redeem the time, inasmuch as the days are evil."[4] "This is," he says, "to redeem the time: when someone brings a lawsuit against you, to lose your substance, that you may be free for God, not for lawsuits."

nititur dare fidem in populo, quod ipsi dicte legi apostoli precipue sunt astricti; et sic ipsi et multi per ipsos perdunt tempus propter lucrum [193] turpissimum, vocatum a ceteris commodum temporale. Nec sunt audiendi discoli, qui fingunt quod omnis res durans sit tempus, et sic clerus emens ecclesiastica beneficia vel secularia dominia emit tempus, quod est hodie necessarium clero, cum layci clericis oppido sunt infesti; antichristiana deliramenta sunt ista et sensus Apostoli subversiva. Intelligit enim Apostolus tempus proprie pro duracione successiva tocius mundi, que quamvis omni homini et omni corpori sit communis, tamen quando homo in illa secundum legem Dei progreditur et allocatur in die novissimo de expensione impensi temporis sibi ipsi proficit ad salutem tunc propter illum proprium et utilem modum habendi redimit sibi tempus. Redimit dico; quia Christus emit tempus toti ecclesie, cum aliter pure naturaliter numerasset tempus hominum. Sed merito Christi factum est tempus acceptabile, quia in brevi tempore homo ex accepcione divina potest beatitudinem promereri. Sed cum ille qui creavit te sine te, non iustificat te sine te, necesse habemus doctrinam Apostoli Ephes. V, 15—16 attendere: Videte, inquit, quomodo caute ambuletis, redimentes tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt. Oportet igitur preter redempcionem generalem temporis per Christum nobis tempus redimere, quod tunc secundum Augustinum facimus, quando temporalium affluenciam et vitam voluptuosam pretermittimus vel mutamus, ut Christo vivamus accepcius et nobis utilius, tunc enim novo modo habendi acquirimus nobis tempus. Et secundum Augustinum iudicium illius episcopi, ymo iudicium Christi, in ipso sufficeret finem imponere omni liti. Ideo illud iudicium debet [194] dux christiani exercitus, scilicet vicarius Christi, magis attendere, cum filii huius seculi sunt prudentes et callidi; ut ex stultis commerciis habeant hic dies prosperos quoad mundum, sed mali sunt et fatui cum ex tali negociacione dies una perditur valens mille.

Because, I say, the superiors of the church deny by their deeds this law, which Christ speaks in his vessel,[5] therefore they at once persecute in a crowd the one who strives to make the people believe that they themselves are especially bound to the said law of the Apostle; and so they, and many through them, lose time for the sake of [193] most filthy lucre, which others call temporal advantage. Nor are the froward to be heard, who imagine that every enduring thing is time, and so that the clergy, buying ecclesiastical benefices or secular lordships, buys time, which is needful to the clergy today, since the laity are exceedingly hostile to clerics. These are antichristian ravings, and subversive of the Apostle's sense.[6] For the Apostle understands time properly as the successive duration of the whole world; and although it is common to every man and every body, yet when a man advances in it according to the law of God, and is allowed on the last day for the spending of the time laid out, he profits himself to salvation; then, by reason of that proper and useful mode of having, he redeems time for himself.[7] "Redeems", I say, because Christ bought time for the whole church, since otherwise he would have numbered the time of men purely naturally. But by Christ's merit the time has been made "acceptable", for in a short time a man, by divine acceptance, can merit blessedness.[8] But since he who created you without you does not justify you without you,[9] we must needs attend to the doctrine of the Apostle, Ephesians 5:15–16: "See," he says, "how you walk circumspectly, redeeming the time, because the days are evil."[10] We must therefore, besides the general redemption of time through Christ, redeem time for ourselves; which, according to Augustine, we do when we forgo or change an affluence of temporal goods and a voluptuous life, that we may live more acceptably to Christ and more usefully to ourselves; for then by a new mode of having we acquire time for ourselves. And according to Augustine the judgement of that bishop, nay rather the judgement of Christ in him, would suffice to put an end to every lawsuit.[11] Therefore the leader [194] of the Christian army, namely the vicar of Christ, ought to attend the more to that judgement, since "the children of this world" are prudent and crafty, so as to have by foolish trading prosperous days here as regards the world;[12] but they are evil and foolish, since by such dealing one day is lost that is worth a thousand.[13]

Notes

1. ***Huius negacionis negacio***: construal doubtful. Taken as the denial of Christ just described (Augustine's *negamus*, 192.6–8), here said to lie chiefly in deed; "this denial" may be the genitive of definition, "the denial that this is".

2. Ezekiel 34, against the shepherds who do not tend the flock. *Legem Christi ignorando* is taken with *contempnere*: they despise the pious in ignorance of Christ's law. *Pericula eorum*: the dangers that beset the pious.
3. Augustine, *De verbis Domini* sermo 89 in Wyclif's numbering; Loserth: Opp. tom. V, 803/4; now Sermo 167.2–3 (PL 38, 910). The Apostle's perils: 2 Corinthians 11:26 ("in perils from false brethren"). A and B note: "the peril of false brethren".
4. Ephesians 5:16, in Wyclif's (or Augustine's) form, with *quantum* for the Vulgate's *quoniam*; taken as "inasmuch as". The quotation bounds follow the italics only from *hoc est*. A and B note: "What it is to redeem the time."
5. "His vessel": Paul, the "vessel of election" (Acts 9:15). The print has *Chrisus* (192.27, so the plate), a misprint for *Christus*.
6. The apparatus at 193.11 records a manuscript reading *sensum legem* (OCR rough); Loserth's *sensus* is translated.
7. *Allocatur*: Loserth's emendation; the codex reads *allocaciter* (apparatus 193.12). An accounting term: the man is "allowed" (credited) in his account on the last day for the time he has spent. *Sibi ipsi proficit* stands without a connective; the sentence is construed as two clauses.
8. "Acceptable time": 2 Corinthians 6:2 ("now is the acceptable time").
9. Augustine's saying, *qui creavit te sine te, non iustificat te sine te* (Sermo 169.13, PL 38, 923: *Qui ergo fecit te sine te, non te justificat sine te*; Wyclif has *creavit*).
10. Ephesians 5:15–16, shortened (DR "See therefore, brethren, how you walk circumspectly: not as unwise, But as wise: redeeming the time, because the days are evil").
11. *Iudicium illius episcopi*: the bishop's arbitration of disputes, to which Augustine's sermon points the litigant; the bishop is Augustine himself, who in Sermo 167.4 speaks of the cases that come before him for judgment (*quando ad nos judicanda veniunt … quia episcopum audivit*; PL 38, 910–11).
12. Luke 16:8 ("the children of this world are wiser … than the children of light"). *Ut ex stultis commerciis* is taken as the purpose of their craft.
13. Psalm 83:11 ("better is one day in thy courts above thousands"). *Negociacio* "dealing" keeps it beside *negociatores* "dealers" (the glossary).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 192: *ut*
  - 193: *illa*
  - 193: *allocatur* [NW]
  - 193: *illum*
  - 193: *quomodo* (hyphenated quo-modo; main token covers whole word)
  - 193: *caute*
  - 193: *Augustinum* (hyphenated Augusti-num; main token covers whole word)
  - 193: *sunt infesti;* (suntinfesti; -> sunt infesti; (two words run together))
  - 193: *15*— (box on the dash of 15—16; print has 16 after it)

Chapter 9

Part 1: Human election does not make a pope

Loserth pp. 194.8–197.27

¶1 194.8–195.6
194.8 *There must be a pope, but he must be of Christ's appointing.*
195.7 *Only God can make a pope,*
195.20 *The cardinals' election is of no effect.*
195.30 *The modern form of election is as scandal,*

[194]**Cum autem necesse est papam continue in ecclesia esse militante, nec est papa vians nobiscum nisi limites Petri servaverit, necessarium videtur de limitibus istis et potestate pape cognoscere. Arguunt autem multi per raciones naturales et alii testimoniis scriptis quod continue oportet aliquem esse papam; quod est concedendum, nam necesse est Christum, qui solus est caput universalis ecclesie esse usque ad finem seculi cum ecclesia militante, ut patet Matth. ultimo; et preter hec necesse est esse confuse aliquem predestinatum viantem, quem Deus propter excessum edificacionis ecclesie sue plus approbat; quem oportet ex eleccione Domini esse papam; et illam eleccionem non potest frustrare humana eleccio. Et sic intelligo decretum VII questione prima, ubi beatus Gregorius ita scribit: In apibus princeps unus est, grues unam sequuntur ordine limitato. Imperator unus, iudex unus provincie. Roma autem condita duos fratres reges simul habere non potuit, sed fratricidio dedicatur. In Rebecce utero Esau et Yacob bella gesserunt. Sic** [195]**singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbiteri, singuli archidiaconi et omnis ordo ecclesiasticus suis rectoribus innititur. Oportet igitur unam militantem ecclesiam habere conversantem unum prepositum, cum secundum philosophos omnis multitudo ad unitatem reducitur.**

And since it is necessary that there be a pope continually in the church militant, and no pope is one on the way with us unless he has kept the limits of Peter, it seems necessary to learn about those limits and about the power of the pope. And many argue by natural reasons, and others by written testimonies, that it is necessary that someone continually be pope; which is to be granted, for it is necessary that Christ, who alone is head of the universal church, be with the church militant until the end of the world, as is clear from the last chapter of Matthew;[1] and besides this it is necessary that there be, indistinctly, some predestinate [person] on the way whom God approves more for the surpassing edification of his church, who must be pope by the Lord's election; and human election cannot frustrate that election.[2] And so I understand the decree, [Cause] 7, question 1, where blessed Gregory writes thus: "Among bees there is one ruler; cranes follow one in a fixed order. There is one emperor, one judge of a province. And Rome, when founded, could not have two brothers as kings together, but is dedicated by fratricide. In Rebecca's womb Esau and Jacob waged war. So [195]**each bishop of the churches, each archpriest, each archdeacon, and every ecclesiastical order rests on its rulers."[3] Therefore the one church militant must have one superior living among it, since according to the philosophers every multitude is reduced to unity.[4]**

¶2 195.7–197.2
196.1 *The apostles would not elect an apostle,*
196.7 *The cardinals have been introduced without authority.*
196.14 *They do not take the place of the apostles who were all bishops.*
196.24 *They heap up benefices and devour the goods of the poor.*
196.27 *They surpass Gehazi and Simon.*

[195]**Data igitur tota ista sentencia patet ex dictis quod alienum est ex istis inferre quod talis prepositus sit Romanus pontifex vel humanis ritibus institutus. Sed sicut in brutis dux ostenditur a natura, ut patet ex decreto predicto, sic dux christiani exercitus debet ostendi revelacione divina, quia nichil falsius; quam quod humana eleccio facit papam nam solus Deus iustificat hominem. Omnis qui facit papam vel membrum sancte matris ecclesie, facit iustum, igitur solus Dominus facit papam. Maior patet per Augustinum in De Verbis Domini sermone XLV cum locis similibus, ubi reputat oppositum nimis hereticum. Et minor patet ex hoc quod papa (in quantum huiusmodi) est pater sanctissimus atque iustissimus, cum**

Granting, therefore, this whole teaching, it is clear from what has been said that it is foreign [to it] to infer from these things that such a superior is the Roman pontiff, or one instituted by human rites.[5] But as among the brute beasts the leader is shown by nature, as is clear from the aforesaid decree, so the leader of the Christian army must be shown by divine revelation; for nothing is more false than that human election makes a pope, for God alone justifies a man. Everyone who makes a pope or a member of holy mother church makes [him] just; therefore the Lord alone makes a pope.[6] The major is clear through Augustine in *On the Words of the Lord*, sermon 45, with similar passages, where he reckons

196.30 *They do not even supply the place of deacons,*
197.3 *What claim have there 'monsters' to appoint a head of the Church,*
197.21 *It is not lawful tor the Church to abandon the observances of the apostles.*

notum sit quod cardinales eligendo membrum non eligunt papam, nec proficit sed officit talem in ecclesia presidere. Ideo Act. primo legitur, quomodo dominus non apostoli Matthiam in apostolum elegerunt. Et certum est quod cardinales ex ficticia introducti non habent efficaciorem auctoritatem quam habuerunt dicti apostoli. Unde videtur multis quod ritus hodiernus eligendi papam inductus sit ecclesie scandalozus, primo quia est infundabilis ex scriptura. Christus enim cuius potestati humane non possunt equiparari apostoli, elegit sibi apostolos et unum [196]capitaneum inter illos. Petrus autem et omnes alii apostoli non presumpserunt nec audebant eligere unum apostolum, ut patet Act. primo cap. de Matthia, igitur multo magis cardinales infundabiliter introducti non habent potestatem ad eligendum caput universalis ecclesie quod excederet omnes apostolos preter Petrum. Dico autem illos infundabiliter introductos, quia in utroque testamento, si non fallor, fundari non potest eorum institucio sive nomen. Unde quidam dicit quod cardinalis dicitur a cardine, quia in illis porte inferi sunt rotate; sunt, inquit, altera filia sanguisuge, de qua Proverb. XXX, 15: Sanguisuge due sunt filie, dicentes: Affer, affer: non enim gerunt vicem apostolorum, cum omnes apostoli erant episcopi. Multi autem eorum non sunt presbiteri. Isti autem videntur inferiores illo de quo Marci IX, 3: Magister, vidimus quendam in nomine tuo eiicere demonia, qui non sequitur nos, quia ut patet ex responsione Christi, ipse fuit non Christo contrarius, ideo fuit ex evangelio minus istis cardinalibus improbatus. Non enim videntur venire in nomine Christi eos mittentis, cum tamquam alter Geysy beneficia ecclesiastica congregant et cumulant et pro eorum vendicione nummos per se vel suos acceptant et sic bona pauperum voluptuose et superbe devorant. Sed nec faciunt miracula nec predicant neque orant, sic quod notando quantitatem ypocrisis et operis, nec Geysy nec Symon dignus est dici eorum minister in servicio Antichristi, quod si est ita: ve illis, ve eorum autoribus et ve omnibus, qui facinori eorum consenciunt. Nec supplent tales vicem dyaconorum, quos constituerunt apostoli, [197] ut patet Act. VI, quia nec faciunt eorum officia nec vivunt eorum vita.

the opposite exceedingly heretical.[7] And the minor is clear from this, that the pope (as such) is a most holy and most just father, since it is known that cardinals in electing a member do not elect a pope, nor does it profit, but harms, that such a one preside in the church.[8] Therefore in Acts 1 we read how the Lord, not the apostles, chose Matthias as an apostle.[9] And it is certain that cardinals brought in by a fiction do not have more effective authority than the said apostles had. Hence it seems to many that the present-day rite of electing the pope has been brought in as a scandal to the church, first because it is without foundation in scripture. For Christ, to whose power the apostles cannot humanly be equalled, chose for himself apostles and one [196]captain among them.[10] Now Peter and all the other apostles did not presume, nor did they dare, to elect one apostle, as is clear from Acts 1, the chapter on Matthias; therefore much more the cardinals, brought in without foundation, do not have power to elect the head of the universal church, who would surpass all the apostles except Peter.[11] And I call them brought in without foundation because in neither testament, if I am not mistaken, can their institution or name be grounded. Hence someone says that "cardinal" is said from *cardo*, a hinge, because the gates of hell are turned on them; they are, he says, the other daughter of the horseleech, of which Proverbs 30:15: "The horseleech hath two daughters that say: Bring, bring";[12] for they do not act in the place of the apostles, since all the apostles were bishops. But many of them are not presbyters. And these seem inferior to the one of whom Mark 9:37 [speaks]: "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, who followeth not us"; for, as is clear from Christ's answer, he was not contrary to Christ, and therefore he was less disapproved by the gospel than these cardinals.[13] For they do not seem to come in the name of Christ who sends them, since, like another Gehazi, they gather and heap up ecclesiastical benefices, and for their sale accept money, themselves or through their own men, and so devour the goods of the poor voluptuously and proudly.[14] But they neither do miracles nor preach nor pray, so that, noting the extent of the hypocrisy and of the work, neither Gehazi nor Simon is worthy to be called their minister in the service of Antichrist; and if it is so, woe to them, woe to their authors, and woe to all who consent to their misdeed. Nor do such supply the place of the deacons whom the apostles appointed, [197]as is clear from Acts 6, for they neither do their offices nor live their life.

¶3 197.3–197.20

[197]Nec valet indagare ex ritibus veteris testamenti, quia nec subest causa neque licencia; ymo quando doctores residebant Jerusalem, ut dicitur fuisse tempore Christi, tunc maxime dissipaverant legem Dei. Ideo nisi dominus dissipaverit consilium Achitophel, possent talia monstra crescere in ecclesia, in specie, in numero et in spoliacione sine fine. Unde igitur talibus monstris innominatis in scriptura potestas ad constituendum caput ecclesie, cum non sit opus hominis facere aliquod membrum ecclesie. Principem autem super eos quantumcumque indignum possunt eligere, eum papam instar sui nominare extranee, sed non possunt constituere caput ecclesie; quod si Deus elegerit et ipsi instinctu Dei in talem consenserint, possunt illum populo intimare. Sed unde talibus ultra apostolos a Deo auctoritas ad eligendum caput ecclesie?

Nor is it of any avail to search [this] out from the rites of the old testament, for there underlies it neither cause nor licence; indeed, when the doctors resided at Jerusalem, as is said to have been the case in the time of Christ, then most of all had they dissipated the law of God.[15] Therefore, unless the Lord should dissipate the counsel of Achitophel, such monsters could grow in the church, in kind, in number and in spoliation, without end.[16] From where, then, do such monsters, unnamed in scripture, [have] power to constitute the head of the church, since it is not the work of man to make any member of the church? But a prince over them, however unworthy, they can elect, and name him pope after their own likeness, outlandishly; but they cannot constitute the head of the church; and if God has chosen [him], and they at God's prompting have consented to such a one, they can make him known to the people.[17] But from where do such men have, beyond the apostles, authority from God to elect the head of the church?

¶4 197.21–197.27

[197]Secundo principaliter arguitur ad idem per hoc, quod non licet ecclesie recedere ab observanciis apostolicis quas Christus docuit, sed ante dotacionem ecclesie sacerdotes Christi sine dominio erant socii et communi consilio secundum legem Dei rexerunt ecclesiam, ut patet ex dictis; igitur non licet a limitibus illis ad ritus gentiles recedere.

Secondly, as a principal [argument], it is argued to the same [conclusion] by appeal to this: that it is not lawful for the church to depart from the apostolic observances that Christ taught; now before the endowment of the church the priests of Christ were companions without lordship, and ruled the church by common counsel according to God's law, as is clear from what has been said; therefore it is not lawful to depart from those limits to the rites of the gentiles.[18]

Notes

1. Matt. 28:20, "behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world". R. A in the margin (194.12): *Caput ecclesie necesse est esse Christum*, with a note on Gregory's text for the pope, archbishops, archpriests and archdeacons.
2. *Confuse*: in the logicians' sense; it is necessary that some predestinate wayfarer be pope, though not which one is known. *Propter excessum edificacionis ecclesie sue*: for the surpassing [measure] in which he builds up God's church. *Vians* (194.8) and *viantem* are the participle of *viare*: the true pope is a wayfarer of the church militant.
3. Decretum C. 7 q. 1 c. 41 (*In apibus*), form ours; the canon is drawn from Jerome, Ep. 125 to Rusticus, though Wyclif names Gregory: Jerome, Ep. 125.15 (PL 22, 1080); in Friedberg's text the canon is inscribed *Idem ad Rusticum Monachum* after a canon of Gregory (c. 40), and only the Roman edition reads *Item Hieronymus*, which explains Wyclif's ascription. T. 194.26: Loserth notes that the Decretum reads *literato*, "in lettered order" (the cranes' formation); the print's *limitato* is translated.
4. *Habere conversantem unum prepositum*: one superior present and living among it, i.e. on earth. Loserth gives no source for the philosophers' maxim.
5. *Alienum est ex istis inferre*: the inference does not follow from what is granted; Gregory's text shows that there must be one superior, not that he is the Roman pontiff.
6. The syllogism: God alone justifies a man (major); whoever makes a pope or a member of the church makes him just (minor); so the Lord alone makes a pope. R. A and B in the margin (195.17): *Facere membrum ecclesie*.
7. Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, sermon 45 in the medieval numbering, now *Sermo* 129; Loserth gives no reference here, but identifies the same citation at 187.1 as *Sermo* 129. At 129.6 (PL 38, 723) Augustine treats the claim to justify as the mark of Antichrist: *Quid autem expavescimus in Antichristo, nisi quia nomen suum honoraturus est ...? Quid aliud facit qui dicit: Ego justifico?*.
8. *Cardinales eligendo membrum non eligunt papam*: *membrum* has no genitive. Read as "a member [of the church]", the clause says that even electing a member does not make him pope; read as "a member [of the devil]", which *talem ... presidere* ("that such a one preside") suits, a word may be lost. Translated as printed. *Nec proficit sed officit* plays on the two verbs.

9. ***Dominus non apostoli ... elegerunt*****: the verb is plural, agreeing with the nearer** ***apostoli*****; the sense is that the Lord chose. S. Acts 1:24–26: the apostles pray, "Thou, Lord ... shew whether of these two thou hast chosen", and cast lots.**
10. ***Cuius potestati humane*****:** ***humane*** **is taken as the adverb ("humanly"); it could be the adjective with** ***potestati*****, "to whose human power the apostles cannot be equalled".**
11. ***Quod excederet*****: the neuter relative taken with** ***caput*** **(the head, who would surpass all the apostles but Peter); it could refer to the act of electing, a power beyond the apostles'.**
12. Prov. 30:15. The author of the etymology (*quidam***) is not named and has not been traced. Wyclif develops the same figure in** ***De blasphemia*** **cap. 5 (ed. Dziewicki, p. 64):** ***filie sanguisuge sunt cardinales apostate. In illis enim, ut cardine, vertuntur valve duplicitatis late vie que ducit ad baratrum*****. T. 196.11: the manuscripts read** ***dicunt*****; Loserth prints** ***dicit*****, translated. R. A and B in the margin (196.13):** ***Cardinales quid faciunt*****.**
13. The print gives Mark "IX, 3"; the verse is 9:37 (Vulgate numbering), given here. S. Christ's answer follows in Mark 9:38–39.
14. Gehazi, Elisha's servant, who took Naaman's gifts (4 Kings 5:20–27); Simon, who offered the apostles money (Acts 8:18–24). T. 196.25: the manuscripts read ***commutant*****, "exchange"; Loserth prints** ***cumulant*****, translated.**
15. ***Doctores*****: the teachers of the law at Jerusalem.** ***Dissipaverant legem Dei*** **echoes Ps. 118:126, "they have dissipated thy law".**
16. 2 Sam. 17:14 (2 Kings in the Vulgate): "by the will of the Lord the profitable counsel of Achitophel was defeated" (* ***dissipatum est*** **).**
17. ***Eum papam instar sui nominare extranee*****:** ***instar sui*** **"after their own likeness" (a pope like themselves);** ***extranee*****, "outlandishly", in a manner foreign [to scripture].** ***Intimare*****: to announce.**
18. The second principal argument against the present form of election: its major is proved at 197.29, its minor at 199.21. ***Socii*****: fellows, of equal standing.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **194:** ***CAPITULUM NONUM.***
  - **194:** ***unus***
  - **194:** ***Roma autem*** **(one token covers two printed words)**
  - **194:** ***reges simul*** **(one token covers two printed words)**
  - **194:** ***Rebecce***
  - **195:** ***archipresbiteri***
  - **195:** ***alienum***
  - **195:** ***istis***
  - **195:** ***scan*** **(scan | dalozus split by folio bar (209d), no hyphen) [NW]**
  - **196:** ***after***
  - **197:** ***instar*** **(15 is the line number)**
  - **197:** ***illum***
  - **194:** ***duos fratres*** **(two words, italic, tightly spaced)**
  - **197:** ***observanciis*** **(LEFT-nw: print = observanciis)**

Part 2: The poison of endowment; presbyter and bishop once the same

Loserth pp. 197.29–200.29

¶1 197.29–200.12
197.29 *The Israelites sinned in wanting a king; we worse in appointing a pope.*
198.8 *The poison of endowment in the Church proclaimed by the Devil.*
198.27 *Heresy soon followed on endowment.*
199.15 *Endowment led Liberius astray.*
199.20 *Before endowment there was no distinction between elders, bishops and priests.*
200.5 *Evidence from Scripture,*

[197] **Maior patet ex hoc, quod ritus humani servantur ut evangelium, igitur longe evidencius ritus Dei. Non enim licuit sine gravi offensa filiis Ysrahel petere sibi regem, sed rege dato eis a Domino propter offensam graviter sunt puniti, ut patet I. Reg. VIII et infra; multo magis christiani sine licencia Domini, qui contra evangelium sibi constituunt plus quam regem quem papam nominant. Unde decrementum ecclesie; quod** [198] **continue plus invaluit, et cronice istius materie confirmant eandem sentenciam: Narrat enim Cestrensis libro 86 cap. quomodo ex tunc ecclesia Romana quanto plus cepit ditari, facta est magis instabilis, adepta plus sollicitudinis et subieccionis, quam spiritualia devocionis, plus exterioris assecuta pompositatis quam interioris ut creditur felicitatis. Proinde et hostis antiquus facta per Constantinum hac publica largicione ecclesiis**

The major is clear from this, that human rites are kept as the gospel; therefore far more evidently God's rites. For it was not lawful, without grave offence, for the children of Israel to ask a king for themselves; but when the king had been given them by the Lord they were gravely punished for the offence, as is clear from 1 Samuel 8 and following; much more Christians, without the Lord's licence, who against the gospel appoint for themselves more than a king, whom they name pope.[1] **Hence the decline of the church, which** [198] **has continually grown stronger; and the chronicles of this matter confirm the same teaching. For the Chester [chronicler] relates in book 86, chap., how "from then on the Roman church, the more it began to be enriched, the more unstable it became, having gained more of anxiety and subjection than of the spiritual**

legitur publice in aere proclamasse hodie infusum est venenum in ecclesia Unde Jeronimus scripsit in vitis patrum, ecclesia ex quo crevit in possessionibus: decrevit in virtutibus. Nec moveat, quod videtur dyabolum patrem mendacii sic clamasse, quia certum est quod oportet demones, qui letantur cum male fecerint, ministrare Deo et esse nuncios veritatis; et decet Deum per mamonam preconizare plebi periculum. Alia autem pericula ex hoc, quod sequuntur post correpcionem ecclesie; scimus stultissime applicare ad subtraccionem voluptatum ecclesie, sed vindictas prevaricacionem sequentes quas est evidens ex scriptura et sanctis doctoribus ex hinc sequi abnuimus inde sequi. Ex hinc enim oportet debilitari ecclesiam atque imperium, ut prophetatum est Daniel II. Ex hinc eciam debilitati sunt episcopi in virtute et populus consequenter, nam, ut patet ex cronicis predictis, tunc debilitati sunt Romani episcopi in tantum; quod instar magorum Pharaonis, qui in tercio signo defecerant, magnus hereticus fuit papa tercius post Silvestrum. Narrat [199]enim Cestrensis libro suo IV quomodo post Silvestrum successit Marcus, cui successit Julius, qui passus est exilium decennale, et post hunc successit Liberius, de quo cap. 91 lib. IV Cestrensis dicit, quod iussu Constantini exulat tribus annis, quia Arrianis favere noluit. De cuius consilio clerus Romanus ordinavit interim Felicem papam. Qui celebrato consilio duos presbiteros Arrianos condempnans eiecit. Hoc audito Liberius ab exilio revocatur, qui exilii diuturnitate devictus et papatus resuscepcione exhilaratus, ad hereticam pravitatem consensit et Felice deiecto ecclesiam Petri et Pauli et Laurencii tenuit violenter, ita ut clerici et sacerdotes Felici faventes Liberio non prohibente in ecclesia cruciarentur, Felix vero martyrizatur. Iste autem maledictus Liberius non foret plus de papatu exilaratus et cadens in heresim pocius quam pape ante dotacionem nisi propter innaturalem papatus pinguedinem. Et patet probabiliter maior secundi argumenti. Minor autem ex hoc evidet, quod ante dotacionem ecclesie non fuerunt nomina cleri taliter baptizata et per consequens nec dignitatum officia. Idem enim fuit ante dotacionem ecclesie presbiter, episcopus et sacerdos, ut dominus Ardmacanus ostendit libro XI De Questionibus Armenorum V cap. ex scriptura multiplici, primo ex illo ad Tytum I, 5, 6, Reliqui te Crete, ut ea que desunt corrigas, et constituas per civitates presbiteros, si quis sine crimine est, unius uxoris vir, filios habens fideles, non in accusacione luxurie aut non subditos. Et subdit causam condicionis presbiteri. Oportet, [200]inquit, episcopum sine crimine esse, sicut Dei dispensatorem. Ecce quod eundem quem prius vocat presbiterum, id est seniorem, vocat secundo episcopum; id est superintendentem. Item, Act. XX. 27— 28 legitur, quod

things of devotion, having attained more of outward pomp than, as is believed, of inward happiness. Accordingly the ancient enemy too, when this public largess had been made to the churches through Constantine, is read to have proclaimed publicly in the air: 'Today poison has been poured into the church.' Hence Jerome wrote in the *Lives of the Fathers*: the church, since it grew in possessions, has decreased in virtues."[2] Nor let it trouble [anyone] that the devil, the father of lies, seems to have cried out so; for it is certain that the demons, who rejoice when they have done evil, must minister to God and be messengers of the truth; and it befits God to herald the danger to the people through mammon.[3] And other dangers, because they follow after the correction of the church, we know how, most foolishly, to put down to the withdrawal of the church's pleasures; but the vengeances that follow transgression, which it is evident from scripture and the holy doctors follow from this, we deny follow from that.[4] For from this the church and the empire must be weakened, as was prophesied, Daniel 2.[5] From this, too, the bishops were weakened in virtue, and the people consequently; for, as is clear from the aforesaid chronicles, the Roman bishops were then weakened so far that, like Pharaoh's magicians, who had failed at the third sign, the third pope after Silvester was a great heretic.[6] For [199]the Chester [chronicler] relates in his book 4 how "after Silvester Mark succeeded, and Julius succeeded him, who suffered an exile of ten years, and after him Liberius succeeded", of whom the Chester [chronicler] says in chapter 91 of book 4 that by Constantine's command "he is exiled for three years, because he would not favour the Arians. On his counsel the Roman clergy meanwhile ordained Felix pope. He, having held a council, condemned and cast out two Arian presbyters. When this was heard, Liberius is recalled from exile; overcome by the length of his exile and elated by the resumption of the papacy, he consented to heretical depravity, and, Felix having been thrown out, held the church of Peter and Paul and Laurence by violence, so that clerics and priests who favoured Felix were tortured in the church, Liberius not forbidding it; and Felix is martyred."[7] And this accursed Liberius would not have been more elated over the papacy, and fallen into heresy, rather than the popes before the endowment, except for the unnatural fatness of the papacy. And so the major of the second argument is clear by probable argument.[8] And the minor is evident from this, that before the endowment of the church the names of the clergy had not been baptized in this way, and consequently neither had the offices of the dignities.[9] For before the endowment of the church presbyter, bishop

Apostolus vocans ad se maiores natu ecclesie Ephesiorum, dicit eis: Non subterfugi quominus nunciarem consilium Dei vobis. Attendite vobis et universo gregi, in quo Spiritus Sanctus posuit vos episcopos regere ecclesiam Dei, quam aquisivit sanguine suo. Ecce quod omnes maiores natu id est seniores vel presbiteros vocat episcopos.

and priest were the same, as the lord of Armagh shows in book 11 of the *Questions of the Armenians*, chapter 5, from manifold scripture:[10] first from that of Titus 1:5–6: "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest correct the things that are wanting, and shouldest ordain presbyters in every city: if any be without crime, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly." And he adds the reason for the condition of the presbyter: "A bishop," [200] he says, "must be without crime, as the steward of God."[11] Behold, the same man whom he first calls presbyter, that is elder, he calls in second place bishop, that is overseer. Again, in Acts 20:27–28 we read that the Apostle, calling to him the ancients of the church of the Ephesians, says to them: "I have not spared to declare unto you the counsel of God. Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Behold, he calls all the ancients, that is elders or presbyters, bishops.[12]

¶2 200.13–200.29

[200] Item, eidem consonat dictum Apostoli prima Thym. Ill, 1: Si quis episcopatum desiderat, bonum opus desiderat, quasi diceret episcopatus non dicit supra presbiteratum nisi opus superintendencie, unde V cap. specificat dicens: Qui bene presunt presbiteri, duplici honore digni habeantur, maxime quo laborant in verbo et doctrina Dei. Et sequitur: Adversus presbiterum accusacionem noli recipere nisi sub duobus vel tribus testibus. Presbiteros dicit episcopos; quia aliter non diceret IV cap. 14, quod gracia data est sibi cum imposicione manuum presbiteri. Cum igitur ad solos episcopos pertinet manus imponere, ut patet Act. VIII, patet quod Apostolus exprimit indifferenter sacerdotes nomine episcopi et nomine presbiteri; tunc enim non erat coactiva iurisdiccio vel temporalium dotacio que faceret diversitatem.

Again, the saying of the Apostle in 1 Timothy 3:1 agrees with this: "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth good work"; as if he were to say, the episcopate does not signify, beyond the presbyterate, anything but the work of oversight; hence in chapter 5 he specifies, saying: "Let the presbyters that rule well be esteemed worthy of double honour: especially they who labour in the word and doctrine of God." And there follows: "Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but under two or three witnesses."[13] By presbyters he means bishops; for otherwise he would not say in chapter 4:14 that grace was given him "with imposition of the hands of the presbyter".[14] Since, therefore, it belongs to bishops alone to lay on hands, as is clear from Acts 8, it is clear that the Apostle expresses priests indifferently by the name of bishop and by the name of presbyter; for then there was no coactive jurisdiction or endowment of temporal goods that would make a difference.[15]

Notes

1. ***Maior patet***: the major of the second principal argument (197.21), that the church may not depart from the apostolic observances. S. 1 Sam. 8 (1 Kings in the Vulgate): at 8:7 the Lord tells Samuel, "they have not rejected thee, but me, that I should not reign over them".
2. Ranulf Higden, monk of Chester (***Cestrensis***), ***Polychronicon***: Loserth gives the Rolls edition, V, 130, where Higden has the passage almost word for word, with the devil's cry and the saying of Jerome (book 4, ch. 26). T. 198.3: the print reads ***libro 86 cap.***, with no chapter number (so the plate); Loserth: "recte: libro IV, cap. XXVI". Translated as printed. At 198.5 Higden reads ***plus inde saecularis adepta sollicitudinis***: the codices' ***temporalia*** may hide an adjective (***temporalis***), and Loserth's ***plus*** is his supplement. 198.5: the manuscripts read ***adepta temporalia sollicitudinis***; Loserth corrects to ***adepta plus sollicitudinis***, translated; at 198.6 A reads ***contra spiritualia***. R. A and B in the margin (198.2): ***Ecclesia Romana a tempore dotacionis facta est instabilis***.

3. The saying ascribed to Jerome is the gist of *Vita Malchi* 1 (PL 23, 53): *postquam ad Christianos principes venerit, potentia quidem et divitiis major, sed virtutibus minor facta sit*. The *Vita Malchi* circulated among the *Lives of the Fathers*, and Wyclif takes both the saying and the title from Higden (Rolls V, 130: *Jeronimus scripsit in vitis patrum: Ecclesia ex quo crevit possessionibus decrevit virtutibus*). R. A and B in the margin (198.12): *Ecclesia crescens in possessionibus decrescit in virtutibus*. C. *Per mamonam*: through mammon, i.e. the devil speaking as the voice of riches; *preconizare*, "herald" (cf. *preco*).
4. Construed: men foolishly blame the dangers that follow a correction of the church (the taking away of its endowment) on the loss of its pleasures, but deny that the punishments following the transgression come from the endowment. *Ex hinc ... inde* both point to the endowment. T. 198.19–20: Loserth queries *in corrupcionem* for *correpcionem* ("the dangers that follow upon the church's corruption"); the print is translated.
5. Dan. 2:42: "the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken".
6. Exod. 8:18: the magicians "practised in like manner, to bring forth sciniphs, and they could not", the third plague. T. 198.29: the print's *magcrum* is a broken *magorum* (so the plate), translated "magicians".
7. Higden, *Polychronicon* IV: Loserth gives the Rolls edition, V, 146, 148, 158, and says the chapter is now 27. The Liberius entry is on p. 158 (*Hic tribus annis exulat quia noluit favere Arianis*), in book 4, ch. 27. T. 199.4: the print reads *cap. 91* (so the plate). 199.5: *Constantini* as printed; Liberius was exiled under Constantius II; Higden himself goes on *Constantius imperator Liberium ... de exsilio revocavit* (Rolls V, 160), and two of his manuscripts read *jussu Constantii* at the exile. C. *Celebrato consilio*: *consilium* for *concilium*, "council". R. A and B in the margin (199.2): *Depositio pape heretici*.
8. *Pinguedinem*: the fatness (wealth) of the papacy after the endowment. *Patet probabiliter*: the major is shown as probable, not demonstrated.
9. *Baptizata*: figurative, the titles of rank had not yet been "christened" in this way. *Minor autem*: the minor of the second principal argument (197.24), that before the endowment the priests ruled as companions.
10. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* XI.5 (Paris 1512, fol. 84r–v): *nec in scripturis euangelicis aut apostolicis invenitur aliqua distinctio inter episcopos et sacerdotes simplices qui presbyteri appellantur*. He proves it from Titus 1:5–7, Acts 20:17–28, 1 Tim. 3 and 5, then Gal. 1, 1 Cor. 12 and Eph. 4, the order Wyclif follows here and on p. 200. Loserth gives no reference but compares *Trialogus* p. 276. R. A and B in the margin (199.26): *Episcopus presbiter et sacerdos olim fuit idem*.
11. Titus 1:5–7. Wyclif omits the Vulgate's opening *Hujus rei gratia* ("For this cause"), *sicut et ego disposui tibi* ("as I also appointed thee"), and the *enim* of v. 7. DR has "set in order" for *corrigas* and "priests" for *presbyteros*: here "presbyters", since the argument turns on the word; DR's "steward" is kept for *dispensatorem*. T. 199.29: B lacks *per civitates*.
12. Acts 20:17 (*maiores natu*, DR "the ancients"), 20:27–28; in v. 27 Wyclif omits *enim* and *omne*, "all". C. *Seniorem*: "elder", the sense of *presbyter*; *superintendentem*: "overseer", the sense of *episcopus*.
13. 1 Tim. 3:1, without the Vulgate's *Fidelis sermo* ("A faithful saying"); 5:17, where Wyclif adds *Dei* and reads *quo* for *qui*; 5:19, *vel* for *aut*. DR has "priests" for *presbyteri*.
14. 1 Tim. 4:14: the Vulgate has *presbyterii*, DR "the priesthood"; Wyclif's *presbiteri* is translated as he reads it, a singular. C. The point: only bishops lay on hands (next sentence), so the "presbyter" who laid hands on Timothy was a bishop.
15. Acts 8:14–18: Peter and John lay on hands at Samaria. T. 200.24: the manuscripts lack *ad* (*ad solos episcopos*), supplied by Loserth; 200.28: B reads *erant* for *erat*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 197: *a* (print has dato eis a at line end before Domino)
  - 198: *magcrum* (letter after g is open on the right with no join = c (or a broken o); zoomed leaf 259, kept as printed) [NW]
  - 199: *cui*
  - 199: *lib* [NW]
  - 199: *papatus*
  - 199: *nomina* [NW]
  - 200: *sicut*
  - 200: *1* (old-style 1, x-height)
  - 200: *bonum*
  - 200: *tribus*
  - 200: *quod gracia* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 200: *27—* (box on the dash of 27—28)

Part 3: No middle order; election and the boast of the keys

Loserth pp. 200.30–204.29

¶1 200.30–202.2
200.30 *The only other order was of deacons.*
201.26 *Jerome's authority.*

[200] Item, prima Thym. Ill, 2 scribit sibi Apostolus quales condiciones debet habere episcopus: Oportet, inquit, episcopum

Again, in 1 Timothy 3:2 the Apostle writes to him what conditions a bishop must have: "It behoveth," he says, "a bishop to be blameless, the

202.3 *These elections prevent preaching, which is a priest's first duty.*
202.32 *Papal election multiplies hirelings,*

esse irreprehensibilem unius uxoris virum. Et immediate subiungit: dyaconos autem pudicos, non bilingues, non multo [201]vino deditos, non turpe lucrum sectantes. Si, inquam, inter ordinem episcopalem et ordinem dyaconatus foret ordo medius, iste magnus doctor gencium, qui complete et inmediate evangelium suum didicit a Domino Ihesu Christo, ut patet Gal. primo, distinccionem et regulas illius ordinis non pretermisisset; ymo nusquam in epistola aliqua ponit distinccionem illorum ordinum, sed concludit presbiteros, sacerdotes et episcopos sub nomine apostoli, quem gradum ecclesie inter novem nominat primum tamquam dignissimum, ut patet I. Cor. XII. Et idem dicit Ephes. IV. Unde et illud testantur alii sancti doctores, ut patet in decretis, distinccione XCIII Legimus sub auctoritate Jeronimi, ubi allegantur dicta testimonia Apostoli ad hunc sensum. Et adducitur duplex aliud testimonium, primum illud Apostoli Phil. primo: Paulus et Thymotheus, servus Jhesu Christi, omnibus Sanctis qui sunt Philippis cum episcopis et dyaconibus. Secundum exemplum est dictum Petri I. Pet. V, 1, 2: Seniores igitur, qui in vobis sunt obsecro, consenior et testis Christi passionum, pascite qui in vobis est gregem Dei. Per seniores intelligit iste sanctus cum decreto presbiteros, quibus interdicitur dominatus. Et distinccione XCV Olym sub auctoritate Jeronymi sic recitatur expressius: Olym idem presbiter qui et episcopus, et antequam instinctu dyaboli studia in religione fierent et diceretur in populis: Ego sum Pauli, ego sum Apollo, ego sum Cephe, communi consilio presbiterorum ecclesie gubernabantur. Sicut, inquit, presbiteri sciunt se esse ex ecclesie consuetudine ei, qui sibi prepositus fuerit, esse subiectos, ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam [202]dispensacionis dominice veritate presbiteris esse maiores et in communi debere ecclesiam regere.

husband of one wife." And immediately he adds: "And deacons chaste, not double tongued, not given to [201]much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre."[1] If, I say, there were a middle order between the episcopal order and the order of the diaconate, this great doctor of the gentiles, who learnt his gospel completely and immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ, as is clear from Galatians 1, would not have passed over the distinction and the rules of that order; indeed, nowhere in any epistle does he set down a distinction of those orders, but he comprehends presbyters, priests and bishops under the name of apostle, the grade of the church which he names first among nine, as the most worthy, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 12. And he says the same in Ephesians 4.[2] Hence the other holy doctors also testify to it, as is clear in the decrees, distinction 93, ***Legimus***, under the authority of Jerome, where the said testimonies of the Apostle are alleged to this sense.[3] And a twofold further testimony is adduced: first that of the Apostle, Philippians 1: "Paul and Timothy, servant of Jesus Christ, to all the saints who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." The second example is the saying of Peter, 1 Peter 5:1–2: "The ancients therefore that are among you, I beseech, who am myself also an ancient and a witness of the sufferings of Christ: feed the flock of God which is among you."[4] By the ancients this saint, with the decree, understands presbyters, to whom lordly rule is forbidden.[5] And in distinction 95, ***Olim***, under the authority of Jerome, it is recited more expressly thus: "Of old the presbyter was the same as the bishop; and before, by the devil's prompting, factions arose in religion and it was said among the peoples, 'I am of Paul, I of Apollo, I of Cephas', the churches were governed by the common counsel of the presbyters. Just as," he says, "presbyters know that by the custom of the church they are subject to him who has been set over them, so let bishops know that they are greater than presbyters more by custom than by the truth of the Lord's [202] arrangement, and that they ought to rule the church in common."[6]

¶2 202.3–202.8

[202]Tercio principaliter arguitur ad idem per hoc, quod precipuum officium pastoris suspenditur per elecciones novellas, sed suspenso tali officio non est pastor nisi equivoce, igitur expedicius foret ecclesie quod non foret ad talem dignitatem humana eleccio.

Thirdly, as a principal [argument], it is argued to the same [conclusion] by appeal to this: that the chief office of a pastor is suspended by the new elections; now when such an office is suspended there is no pastor except equivocally; therefore it would be more expedient for the church that there were no human election to such a dignity.[7]

¶3 202.9–202.31

[202]Assumptum patet de pastu populi verbo Dei, ad quam ydoneitatem non attenditur, sed omnino postponitur in eleccione

The assumption is clear from the feeding of the people with the word of God, a fitness to which no attention is paid, but which is wholly set aside

huiusmodi. Et constat quod per se ab illo pastu pastor ecclesie trahit nomen, non autem a pastu corporali, cum hoc sit officium laycale, ut pulchre declarat Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone XLIX, exponens textum Joh. X de pastore mercenario et lupo. Mercenarius, inquit, videns aliquem loqui peccata aut sentire secundum perniciem anime sue vel aliquid facere sceleratum, et tamen quia videtur habere alicuius momenti personam in ecclesia, unde si sperat commodum, obmutescit. Videt, inquit, hominem perire in peccato, videt illum sequi lupum id est dyabolum, videt illius guttur morsu trahi ad supplicium, et tamen non illi dicit: Peccas, uec illum obiurgat, ne perdat commoda sua; talis mentaliter videt lupum venientem et fugit. Sed bonus pastor usque ad mortem facit contrarium. In quo secundum Augustinum est integra racio pastoralis officii. Securos, inquit, nos fecit Spiritus Sanctus per Ezechielem XXXIII. 7, quia limitavit nobis speculatoris officium.

in an election of this kind. And it is evident that the pastor of the church takes his name essentially from that feeding, but not from bodily feeding, since this is a lay office, as Augustine finely declares in *On the Words of the Lord*, sermon 49, expounding the text of John 10 on the hireling shepherd and the wolf.[8] "The hireling," he says, "seeing someone speak sins, or think to the ruin of his soul, or do something wicked, and yet, because he seems to have a person of some weight in the church, whence, if he hopes for advantage, keeps silent.[9] He sees," he says, "a man perishing in sin, sees him following the wolf, that is the devil, sees his throat dragged by the bite to punishment, and yet does not say to him, 'You sin', nor rebukes him, lest he lose his advantages: such a one sees the wolf coming in his mind, and flees." But the good shepherd does the contrary even to death. In this, according to Augustine, lies the whole account of the pastoral office. "The Holy Ghost," he says, "has made us secure through Ezekiel 33:7, for he has assigned to us the office of watchman."[10]

¶4 202.32–204.29
203.5 *Doctors flatter the pope in hope of reward.*
203.21 *Even a true priest has not the power they claim.*
203.30 *The keys have been flourished till they are discredited.*
204.10 *The priest cannot, know what powers he has,*

[202]Et mundum in testem invoco, quod ista papalis eleccio et sua beneficiorum distribucio seminat [203]in ecclesia mercenarios nimis late, ex parte vero paparum dat occasionem nimis extollendi vicariam potestatem, nimis appreciandi seculi dignitatem et nimis affectandi fantasticam sanctitatem. Illi autem doctores, qui expectant remuneracionem temporalem a papa, dicunt quod est incomprehensibilis potestatis, quia potest omnia que Christus potuit humanitus et multa ultra, que concernunt regimen ecclesie activorum. Nec est aliqua opinio Antichristi magis heretica vel blasfema, quia certum est ex fide quod non habet aliquam potestatem nisi quam Deus dat sibi ad edificandum ecclesiam conformiter legi sue. Quod si habet tantam potestatem, adhuc reddit nimis se dampnabilem, quod non exponit scintillam eius ad regimen presentis ecclesie adeo vacillantis, ymo ut declarat Lumbardus IV sentenciarum distinccione XVIII cap. II et infra ex testimoniis sanctorum Augustini, Ambrosii. Jeronymi, divisus ab ecclesia, ut prescitus non habet potestatem huiusmodi; et quantumcumque verus sacerdos christianus non habet potestatem absolvendi, nisi ad promulgandum divinam sentenciam vel arbitrandum penitenciam aut acceptandum vel refutandum personam secundum quod digna fuerit aut indigna; quod si quis abutitur clavibus discordans ab ecclesia triumphante ostendit se expertem a clavibus sancte ecclesie; et creditur quod supercilium phariseicum ad tantum vibravit claves contra semitas immobiles ecclesie triumphantis, quod perit evidencia et surrepit diffidencia in opere clavium pretendencium se superiorem primatum gerere in

And I call the world to witness that this papal election, and its distribution of benefices, sows [203]hirelings in the church far too widely, and on the part of the popes gives occasion for exalting the vicarial power too much, for prizing the dignity of the world too much, and for desiring an imaginary sanctity too much.[11] And those doctors who expect temporal reward from the pope say that he is of incomprehensible power, since he can do all that Christ could do as man, and much beyond, which concerns the rule of the church of the active.[12] Nor is there any opinion of Antichrist more heretical or blasphemous, for it is certain, as faith teaches, that he has no power except what God gives him for building up the church in conformity with his law. And if he has so much power, he still renders himself exceedingly damnable, in that he does not put forth a spark of it for the rule of the present church, wavering as it is; indeed, as Lombard declares in [book] 4 of the *Sentences*, distinction 18, chapter 2 and following, from the testimonies of the saints Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, one divided from the church, as one foreknown, does not have power of this kind;[13] and however true a Christian priest [he be], he does not have the power of absolving except to promulgate the divine sentence, or to assign penance by his judgement, or to accept or refuse a person according as he shall be worthy or unworthy; and if anyone abuses the keys, in discord with the church triumphant, he shows himself to have no part in the keys of holy church;[14] and it is believed that pharisaic haughtiness has brandished the keys so far against the immovable paths

ecclesia militante. Sed benedictus Yerarcha tocius ecclesie, quod [204] satis est fidei in ipsum credere. Unde Jeronymus exponens illud Matth. XVI. 29: Tibi dabo claves regni celorum, hunc inquit, locum aliqui non intelligentes, sumunt aliquid de supercilio phariseorum, ut dampnare innoxios vel solvere se putent noxios, cum apud Deum non sentencia sacerdotum sed vita reorum queratur. Sed sicut Levit. XIV ostendere se sacerdotibus iubentur leprosi, quos illi mundos vel leprosos non faciunt, sed discernunt, ita et hic. Unde non video de quo prelatus sic posset pompare inanius quam de huiusmodi potestate, quia ignorat si habeat aliquam huiusmodi potestatem. Ignorat si exercens potestatem reddit se dampnabilem ex errore mendaci ab ecclesia triumphante. Ignorat tercio, si simplex subiectus suus habet eo quantumlibet amplius potestatis. Ideo indubie sacerdotalis potestatis pompacio fetet coram Deo et homine. Coram Deo, quia illi quorum potestas a Deo suspenditur per peccatum vel ex inhabilitate nunquam acceperant potestatem, inmiscent in Christum pompose blasfemias, dicentes se posse ultra hoc quod poterunt apostoli vel eciam Ihesus noster. Addunt eciam in palliacionem sue versucie horrendam heresim, quod Deus pepigit cum eis, quod ipsis assisteret quicquid pretenderent se solvere vel ligare, eo quod quicquid apostoli rite secundum claves ecclesie sic solverint vel ligaverint, Dei assistencia confirmabat.

of the church triumphant that evidence perishes and distrust creeps in, in the work of the keys of those who claim to hold a superior primacy in the church militant.[15] But blessed be the Hierarch of the whole church, that [204] it is enough for faith to believe in him. Hence Jerome, expounding that of Matthew 16:19, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven", says: "This place some, not understanding, take up something of the haughtiness of the Pharisees, so as to think they condemn the innocent or loose the guilty, since with God it is not the sentence of the priests but the life of the accused that is sought. But as in Leviticus 14 the lepers are commanded to show themselves to the priests, whom these do not make clean or leprous but discern, so here too."[16] Hence I do not see of what a prelate could boast more emptily than of power of this kind, since he is ignorant whether he has any power of this kind. He is ignorant whether, in exercising the power, he renders himself damnable by a lying error, [cut off] from the church triumphant. He is ignorant, thirdly, whether his simple subject has however much more power than he.[17] Therefore without doubt the boasting of priestly power stinks before God and man. Before God, because those whose power is suspended by God through sin, or [who] through lack of qualification never received the power, pompously mix blasphemies into Christ, saying that they can [do] beyond what the apostles could, or even our Jesus.[18] They add also, for the cloaking of their craftiness, a horrible heresy: that God made a pact with them that he would stand by them in whatever they pretended to loose or bind, because whatever the apostles rightly, according to the keys of the church, so loosed or bound, God's assistance confirmed.[19]

Notes

1. 1 Tim. 3:2, without the Vulgate's *ergo* ("therefore"), and 3:8, where Wyclif reads *autem* for *similiter* (DR "in like manner").
2. Gal. 1:12, the gospel received "by the revelation of Jesus Christ"; 1 Cor. 12:28, "first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors", the list Wyclif counts as nine grades; Eph. 4:11. C. *Concludit*: "comprehends", not the logician's "infer" (glossary: *concludere*).
3. Decretum D. 93 c. 24 (*Legimus*), from Jerome's letter to Evangelus (Ep. 146); Loserth at 201.14: "Decr. Prima pars; Dist. XCIII, cap. XXIV". The canon is Jerome, Ep. 146.1 to Evangelus (PL 22, 1192–93), and it cites Phil. 1:1 and 1 Pet. 5:1–2 as here; form ours.
4. Phil. 1:1: Wyclif reads *servus* (singular) for *servi* and omits *in Christo Jesu*. 1 Pet. 5:1–2, leaving out the end of v. 1 ("as also a partaker of that glory ...") and of v. 2.
5. 1 Pet. 5:3: "Neither as lording it over the clergy" (*neque ut dominantes in cleris*). C. *Cum decreto*: with the canon *Legimus* just cited.
6. Decretum D. 95 c. 5 (*Olim*): Loserth "Cap. V" at 201.27. The canon is taken from Jerome's commentary on Titus 1:5 (PL 26, 562–63: *Idem est ergo presbyter qui et episcopus ... ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicae veritate, presbyteris esse majores*). The party cries are 1 Cor. 1:12. C. *Studia*: factions, partisan zeal. T. 202.2: the manuscripts lack *et* before *in communi*, supplied by Loserth.
7. *Elecciones novellas*: the new elections of the present rite. T. 202.8: the manuscripts read *humanam*; Loserth prints *humana*, translated.
8. *Pastor ... a pastu*: the pastor is named from feeding (*pastus*); English loses the pun. "Pastor" for the office, "shepherd" in John 10 and Augustine's figure. S. Augustine, Sermon 137 (Loserth: *Opp.* V, 669, Serm. CXXXVII), sermon 49 *De verbis Domini* in the old numbering (*Sermo* 137.12, PL 38, 761: *unde si sperat commoda, mercenarius est ... non illi dicit, Peccas; non illum objurgat, ne perdat commoda sua*); John 10:12. R. A and B in the margin (202.9): *Pastor dicitur a pastu*.

9. The sentence has no finite verb until *obmutescit*; translated as it stands. *Unde si sperat commodum*: "from whom ... he hopes for advantage"; the *si* sits awkwardly, and the print is translated. R. A and B in the margin (202.17): *Mercenarius*.
10. Ezek. 33:7: "I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel". T. 202.30: the manuscripts read *XXXIV*; Loserth prints *XXXIII*, translated.
11. *Vicariam potestatem*: the power the pope holds as vicar. *Fantasticam*: "imaginary", of the imagination (cf. the glossary *fantasia*). R. A and B in the margin (202.26): *Beneficiorum distribucio papalis*.
12. *Humanitus*: as man, in his humanity. *Regimen ecclesie activorum*: the rule of the church of those in the active life; or "of active men". R. A and B in the margin (203.3): *Potestas pape magna*.
13. Peter Lombard, *Sentences* IV d. 18 c. 2 ff.; Loserth gives PL 192, 1106, but the distinction stands at PL 192, 885–89: c. 2 cites Ambrose (*haeresis vendicare non potest, quae veros sacerdotes non habet*), and Augustine and Jerome follow. C. *Ut prescitus*: "as one foreknown", i.e. as the foreknown are; or "like a foreknown man".
14. *Sententiam*: the judicial "sentence" God passes (glossary: *sentencia*, second sense), as *sentencia sacerdotum* at 204.6. *Quantumcumque verus sacerdos christianus*: even the truest priest.
15. *Evidencia*: the credibility of the work of the keys. T. 203.31: one manuscript (the siglum is illegible in the scan's apparatus) lacks *perit evidencia*.
16. Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew* III, on 16:19 (Loserth: PL 26, 118). Jerome has *Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisaeorum assumunt supercilio*. Wyclif's *hunc ... locum aliqui non intelligentes, sumunt aliquid de supercilio phariseorum* is nearer Lombard's quotation of it (*Sent.* IV d. 18, PL 192, 887). Lev. 14:2: "He shall be brought to the priest". T. The print gives Matthew "XVI, 29" (so the plate); the verse is 16:19, as in Loserth's note, and is given here. C. *Yerarcha*: Christ, the hierarch of the whole church.
17. *Ex errore mendaci ab ecclesia triumphante*: a lying error that sets him apart from the church triumphant (cf. *discordans ab ecclesia triumphante*, 203.26). *Simplex subiectus suus*: a simple man under him. R. A and B in the margin (204.10): *Clavium abusio et pompa*.
18. *Vel ex inhabilitate nunquam acceperant potestatem*: a second relative clause without *qui*. *Poterunt* for *potuerunt*, "could". *Inmiscent in Christum*: they mix blasphemies into [what they say of] Christ. T. 204.19: the manuscripts read *ille*; Loserth prints *illi*, translated.
19. *Eo quod*: the ground they allege, God's confirmation of what the apostles bound and loosed *rite*, "rightly", stretched to *quicquid*, whatever these pretend to bind and loose.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 201: *Paulus*
  - 201: *1* (old-style 1, x-height)
  - 201: *Seniores*
  - 201: *expressius* [NW]
  - 201: *antequam* [NW]
  - 201: *Pauli* (30 is the line number)
  - 201: *Apollo*
  - 202: *peccata* (short ascender at t-height (same as t of et), crossbar not inked = broken t; zoomed leaf 263)
  - 202: *et*
  - 202: *tamen* (short ascender at t-height (same as t of et), crossbar not inked = broken t; zoomed leaf 263)
  - 202: *videtur* (print has v)
  - 202: *uec* (misprint: first letter is u (open top), not n; zoomed leaf 263) [NW]
  - 202: *illum*
  - 202: *seminat*
  - 203: ∅ (second half of incomprehen-sibilis; main scan already holds whole word)
  - 203: *diffidencia* (hyphenated diffi-dencia; main token covers whole word) [NW]
  - 204: *intelligentes* (hyphenated in-telligentes; main token covers whole word)
  - 204: *sumunt*
  - 204: *aliquid*
  - 204: *ut* (5 is the line number)
  - 204: *discernunt*
  - 204: *ita*
  - 204: *hic*
  - 200: *bilingues,* (box on a folio bar before non; no word [the box was the junk glued to the word; the word stands])
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Jerome's authoritv. (201.26).

Part 4: The blind quibble of the keys; pride of order and the narrow way

Loserth pp. 204.30–207.22

¶1 204.30–205.26
205.6 *God does not confirm all binding and loosing of the priest.*
205.27 *Danger of pride in order or State.*

[204] **Sed ceca argucia, unde cap. IX ex auctoritate beati Augustini magister sic loquitur: Quodcumque ligaveris super terram etc, hoc est ego Deus** [205] **et omnes celestis milicie ordines et omnes sancti in gloria mea laudant vobiscum et confirmant, quos ligatis et solvitis. Non dixit, quos putatis ligare et solvere, sed in quos exercetis opus iusticie vel misericordie. Aliter autem opera vestra in peccatores non cognosco. Quis igitur non horreret, quod sacerdos cogit Deum et totam triumphantem ecclesiam consentire culpabiliter sue stulticie vel quicquid in isto fecerit ad ratam prudenciam imputare, vel quod populus sine iudicio debet credere esse confirmatum a Deo, quicquid sacerdos fecerit in hac parte. Tales blasfemias et mille permittit Deus in peccatum ecclesie, confitens vero erit optimus iudex peccati proprii, considerans si perfecte dolet de commisso in Deum, si humiliter proponit et non vult sic peccare amplius. Sacerdos autem qui apponit materiam in confitentem ignorat hoc; verumtamen multum valet apud utramque ecclesiam, quod quis humiliter confiteatur presbitero, quod ipse secundum clavem sciencie aptet sanificam medicinam, et quod oret ac supportet cum ceteris membris Christi pro scelere confitentis. Sic enim secundum Augustinum super Johanne Sermone CXXI, ecclesia sanctorum in racione meriti dimittit peccata.**

But [this is] a blind quibble; hence in chapter 9 the Master, on the authority of blessed Augustine, speaks thus:[1] "'Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth,' etc., that is, I God [205] **and all the orders of the heavenly soldiery and all the saints in my glory praise with you and confirm those whom you bind and loose. He did not say, those whom you think you bind and loose, but those upon whom you exercise the work of justice or of mercy. But otherwise I do not acknowledge your works upon sinners." Who then would not shudder [at the claim] that a priest compels God and the whole church triumphant to consent culpably to his folly, or to set down whatever he has done in this to ratified prudence, or that the people must believe without judgement that whatever the priest has done in this matter has been confirmed by God? Such blasphemies, and a thousand [more], God permits for the sin of the church;[2] but the one confessing will be the best judge of his own sin, considering whether he grieves perfectly for what he committed against God, whether he humbly purposes and wills not to sin so any more. But the priest who applies the matter to the one confessing is ignorant of this;[3] nevertheless it avails much with both churches that one humbly confess to a presbyter, that he according to the key of knowledge fit a healing medicine, and that he pray and bear [him] up with the other members of Christ for the crime of the one confessing. For thus, according to Augustine on John, Sermon 121, the church of the saints forgives sins by reason of merit.[4]**

¶2 205.27–207.22
206.6 *Need of humility.*
207.8 *The proud cannot walk in the way which is Christ*

[205] **Quantum ad secundum pomposum, quod est ordinis vel status dignitas, consideraret sic pompans dignitatem naturalem et statum dyaboli, et in quantam indignitatem incidit per peccatum, ut pulchre declarat Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone LIII: Melior est, inquit, virginalis** [206] **sanctitas quam pudicicia coniugata, sed attende superbiam et humilitatem, iungeque virginitati tue humilitatem et eris matre tua melior, quod si tu virgo admittas superbiam et mater tua servet humilitatem, ipsa est longe melior te superba. Nam sicut bonum bono adiunctum facit integrum magis bonum, sic hoc malum facit totum malum sive bono adiunctum fuerit sive malo; privat enim te racione membri humilis capitis, quod est Christus, quod si est, ut patet in lucifero, qui est melior te natura, ubi est potestas vel dignitas, de qua pompas? Nichil, inquam, foret clero utilius et specialiter Christi vicario quam sentire humiliter de seipso, quod Augustinus declarat subtiliter et devote, dicens quod genus humanum post lapsum omnino indiguit celesti medico, quod quia non suffecit**

As to the second object of boasting, which is the dignity of order or state, one who boasts so should consider the natural dignity and state of the devil, and into how great an indignity he fell through sin, as Augustine finely declares in *On the Words of the Lord*, Sermon 53: "Virginal holiness," he says, "is better [206] **than wedded chastity; but attend to pride and humility, and join humility to your virginity, and you will be better than your mother; but if you, a virgin, admit pride, and your mother keeps humility, she is far better than you in your pride."[5] For as a good joined to a good makes the whole more good, so this evil makes the whole evil, whether it has been joined to good or to evil; for it deprives you of the standing of a member of the humble head, which is Christ. And if this is so, as is clear in Lucifer, who is better than you by nature, where is the power or dignity of which you boast?[6] Nothing, I say, would be more useful to the clergy, and especially to the vicar of Christ, than to think humbly of himself; which Augustine declares subtly and devoutly, saying**

ad ipsum ascendere, Deus ineffabiliter descendit ad ipsum, docens vita, opere et sermone, quomodo oportet genus humanum si sanabitur humilitate contraria vie superbie qua adeo recesserat sanum redire ad dominum. Et hec racio, quare Christus servavit in vita et doctrina summam pauperiem et humilitatem; Antichristus autem querit mundanam gloriam Christo contrarie, ut dicitur Joh. V; et ideo licet papa sic fecerit (ut dicit Augustinus) non est de Christi ecclesia, quia si sit verus papa est homo humillimus, mundanos honores et lucrum seculi parvipendens. Et sic Christus est humanitus via, per quam oportet omnem salvandum incedere, que via cum sit arta impossibile est tumentem superbia per illam semitam penetrare. Sed de quanto collisus stante illo tumore plus illi vie facietenus innititur, de tanto comportando prohibens [207] plus offendit. Nec est talis tumorositas vera magnitudo, sed innaturalis mundana aquositas, que repugnat omnino Christi vicario, quia aliter est mendacissimus Antichristus. Et sicut dicitur Johannis XIV. 6: Viator habet, qua vult ire, cum Christus est via, quo vult ire, Christus est veritas et ubi vult manere, Christus est cursiv. Quamvis autem in via non sunt insidie, cum sit Christus, tamen iuxta illam sunt multa pericula, iuxta illud Psalmi CXXXIX, 6: Iuxta iter scandalum posuerunt michi. Vis secure incedere, tene te in via regia et omnino desere mundum ac eius gloriam, quia aliter es indubie Antichristus et non de Christi ovibus. Christus enim non potest superbum talem ad se trahere, cum oportet exaltacionem ad Deum per humilitatem procedere. Ideo quomodocumque pompaveris, exaltando te ipsum et querendo mundi gloriam, ille qui sentenciavit, quod qui se exaltat humiliabitur, et qui se humiliat exaltabitur, non potest mutare suam sentenciam, quin talis sit magis alienus a Christo et per consequens Antichristus.

that the human race after the fall wholly needed a heavenly physician; and because it was not able to ascend to him, God ineffably descended to it, teaching by life, work and word how the human race, if it is to be healed, must return whole to the Lord by a humility contrary to the way of pride by which it had gone so far away.[7] And this is the reason why Christ kept, in life and teaching, the highest poverty and humility; but Antichrist seeks worldly glory contrary to Christ, as is said in John 5; and therefore, although a pope do so (as Augustine says), he is not of Christ's church; for if he is a true pope he is a most humble man, setting little store by worldly honours and the gain of the world.[8] And so Christ in his humanity is the way by which everyone who is to be saved must walk; and since that way is narrow, it is impossible for one swollen with pride to pass through by that path. But the more one who is bruised presses outwardly upon that way while that swelling remains, the more, obstructing [it] by what he carries, does he [207] stumble.[9] Nor is such swollenness true greatness, but an unnatural worldly wateriness, which is wholly incompatible with the vicar of Christ, since otherwise he is a most lying Antichrist. And as is said, John 14:6: the wayfarer has that by which he wishes to go, since Christ is "the way"; whither he wishes to go, Christ is "the truth"; and where he wishes to abide, Christ is the life.[10] And although there are no snares in the way, since it is Christ, yet beside it there are many dangers, according to that of Psalm 139:6: "They have laid for me a stumblingblock by the wayside." Do you wish to walk safely? Keep yourself on the king's highway and wholly forsake the world and its glory, for otherwise you are without doubt Antichrist and not of Christ's sheep. For Christ cannot draw such a proud man to himself, since exaltation to God must proceed through humility. Therefore, howsoever you boast, exalting yourself and seeking the glory of the world, he who pronounced that "he that exalteth himself shall be humbled: and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" cannot change his sentence, so that such a man should not be the more estranged from Christ, and consequently Antichrist.[11]

Notes

1. The Master is Peter Lombard, *Sentences* IV d. 18; Loserth gives "l.c. pag. 887", i.e. PL 192, 887. Lombard (d. 18 c. 5, PL 192, 887) ascribes the gloss to Augustine, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*. It stands in that pseudo-Augustinian work, c. 10.25 (PL 40, 1122), on the plural *Quodcumque solveritis* (Matt. 18:18), and Lombard gives it under Matt. 16. Wyclif's "chapter 9" matches neither Lombard's chapter (5) nor the treatise's (10). The quotation runs to "upon sinners" as Loserth's italics mark it.
2. *ad ratam prudenciam imputare* depends on *cogit* like *consentire*: the priest compels God to count his act as ratified prudence. *in peccatum ecclesie*: "for the sin of the church", that is, in punishment of it; possibly "to the church's sinning".

3. ***apponit materiam***: the priest lays the matter (the penance enjoined) upon the penitent; "this" is whether the penitent's sorrow is perfect. "Both churches": militant and triumphant. "The key of knowledge": Luke 11:52. A and B in the margin (205.14): ***Confessio que fit sacerdoti***, "confession made to a priest".
4. Augustine, ***Tractatus in Iohannem*** 121 (Wyclif's "Sermon 121"); Tract. 121.4, PL 35, 1958: ***Ecclesiae charitas quae per Spiritum sanctum diffunditur in cordibus nostris, participum suorum peccata dimittit***. Lombard cites tract. 121 a few lines before he quotes the same sentence (***Sent.*** IV d. 18, PL 192, 886–87). Loserth's "Opp. tom. V, 595" points to the Maurist ***Sermo*** 121, which does not contain it.
5. Augustine, cited as ***De verbis Domini*** Sermon 53; Loserth: "St. Aug. Serm. CCCLV, Opp. tom. V, 1379. Loosely quoted." The passage is ***Sermo*** 354.9 (***Ad continentes***), PL 39, 1567: ***melior est virginalis sanctitas, quam pudicitia conjugalis ... Si enim tu tenueris superbiam, et tua mater humilitatem, melior erit mater quam filia***. Loserth's CCCLV is a slip for CCCLIV. A and B in the margin (205.32): ***Dignitas unde causatur***, "whence dignity is caused".
6. ***racione membri*** is "the standing of a member", not the technical ***racio*** "aspect". ***quod si est***: if pride so deprives even Lucifer, better than you by nature, of his dignity. B reads ***pompos*** for ***pompas*** (206.12).
7. Augustine on Christ the humble physician: Loserth gives no reference. The passage is ***Sermo*** 142.2 (PL 38, 778): ***haec res fecit ut veniret ad te tantus medicus ... Sed quia tu ire non potuisti ad eum, ille venit ad te. Venit docens humilitatem, qua redeamus: quia superbia nos redire non sinebat***. ***sanum*** agrees with ***genus humanum***: the race is to return "whole", healed.
8. "As is said in John 5": John 5:43–44 (another coming "in his own name", "receive glory one from another"). ***licet papa sic fecerit***: "although a pope do so"; possibly "though he be pope, if he has done so". The Augustine is probably ***Tract. in Ioh.*** 29.8 (PL 35, 1631–32), on John 5:43: Antichrist ***gloriam nominis sui quaesiturus est, inflatus, non solidus ... Omnes ergo pertinentes ad corpus Christi ... non quaeramus gloriam nostram***; cf. ***Sermo*** 129.6 (PL 38, 723). The manuscripts in the margin (206.23): ***Antichristus quis est. Via est Christus.***
9. A hard sentence. ***collisus*** "one who is bruised"; ***facietenus*** "outwardly" (literally "as far as the face"); ***comportando prohibens*** "obstructing [it] by what he carries": the swollen man jams the narrow way of Matt. 7:14 (DR "strait is the way"). ***aquositas***, "wateriness", continues the figure of a dropsical swelling. The image comes from Augustine, ***Sermo*** 142.5 (PL 38, 780–81): ***Tumuerat autem superbia, et ipso tumore per angustum redire non poterat ... Magnitudo enim soliditatem habet, tumor inflationem***.
10. "the life": the print reads ***cursiv*** (207.7, confirmed on the plate), which does not construe; John 14:6 (***Ego sum via, et veritas, et vita***) requires ***vita*** (our emendation). The triple ***qua ... quo ... ubi*** is Augustine, ***Sermo*** 142.1 (PL 38, 778): ***Qua vis ire? Ego sum via. Quo vis ire? Ego sum veritas. Ubi vis permanere? Ego sum vita***. Augustine goes on, as Wyclif does, to the snares beside the way (Ps. 139:6). The manuscripts in the margin (207.5): ***Viator attendat Christum***, "let the wayfarer attend to Christ".
11. Psalm 139:6 in DR. For "he that exalteth himself ..." Loserth refers to Matt. 23:12 (page foot of p. 207, keyed to line 6); Wyclif's present tenses are those of Luke 14:11 and 18:14, given in DR without "every one". ***sentenciam*** is here the judge's "sentence" (glossary: ***sentencia***, second sense). The manuscripts in the margin (207.17): ***Gloriam fugere debet prelatus***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 205: ***autem***
  - 205: ***virginalis*** (hyphenated virgi-nalis across the page; main token covers whole word)
  - 206: ***quam***
  - 206: ***humilitatem***
  - 206: ***tu***
  - 206: ***et***
  - 206: ***humilitatem***
  - 207: ***Iuxta***
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Dan8er order Pride (205.27); reference 6. Matth. XXIII, 12. (207.32).

Part 5: Holiness of life: Jude's six marks of the proud

Loserth pp. 207.23–210.14

¶1 207.23–209.16

207.23 *We must not claim praise of men for holiness.*
208.9 *Falsity of claim to distribute the merits of the Saints.*
209.3 *Those whose hospitality is for pleasure and show.*
209.31 *Those who not preaching are like waterless clouds,*

[207] **Quantum ad tercium scilicet vite sanctitatem, patet quod necesse est gloriantem sic in laudibus hominum considerare se sollicite in speculo scripturarum. Consideret igitur papa et impleat ea que exposita sunt de Petro, et tunc non delectabitur in laude hominum nec in mundana gloria, sed in spe premii absconditi in Christo, et sic non video, quin affectans humanas laudes et gloriam propter vite sanctitatem sit detestandus ypocrita et mendaciter contrarius sibi ipsi, nam** [208] **si talis prius est sanctus, luciferina affeccio laudis hominum extinguit sanctitatem quam reperit. Si sit semper**

As to the third, namely holiness of life, it is clear that one who glories thus in the praises of men must consider himself carefully in the mirror of the scriptures. Let the pope therefore consider and fulfil the things that have been set out concerning Peter, and then he will not delight in the praise of men nor in worldly glory, but in the hope of the reward hidden in Christ;[1] **and so I do not see how one who desires human praises and glory on account of holiness of life is not a detestable hypocrite, lyingly contrary to himself. For** [208] **if such a man is holy beforehand, the luciferine**

non sanctus, inducit in se et populum blasfemum mendacium. Unde papa Petrus II Petri II, 1 prophetat de talibus: Erunt, inquit, pseudoprophete in populo, sicut in vobis erunt magistri mendaces, et post diffuse describit eos dicens, quod sunt velut irracionabilia pecora, in hiis que ignorant blasfemantes. Tales forent illi, qui dicerent, quod habent ex eleccione hominum eciam notorie perversorum potestatem absolvendi a pena et a culpa et concedendi ex supererogatis meritis sanctorum, distributis ad libitum indulgencias sine fine. Et tales communiter ignorant voces proprias: et illos beatus Judas describit per hoc, quod ma iestatem blasfemant, et ubi sanctus Michael disputans cum dyabolo pro Moysi corpore, non est ausus in ipsum inferre iudicium, hii tamquam muta animalia offendunt in hiis, que norunt noticia sensibili, cum audent ultra archangelum maledicere quibuscumque qui voluntati sue restiterint, licet ignorent de eis divinum iudicium. Et super hec blasfemant gravius dicentes, quod oportet Deum virtute eleccionis eis assistere et quecumque promiserint ad implere. Unde sanctus Apostolus describit eos nota sextuplici superborum: Hii, inquit, sunt in epulis suis macule, convivantes, sine timore se ipsos pascentes, nubes sine aqua, que a ventis circumferuntur, arbores autumpnales infructuose, bis mortue, eradicate fluctus feri maris, despumantes suas confusiones, sidera errancia, quibus procella tenebrarum conservata est in eternum. Et ista sex, cum sint scriptura sacra, decet [209] exponere. Quantum ad duo prima, patet quod spectant ad peccatum carnis, cum quantum ad modum convivandi sunt macule in abstracto, convivant enim mundi dominos et carnales amicos contra doctrinam Christi Luce XIV, 12 — 14: Cum facis prandium aut cenam, noli vocare amicos tuos neque cognatos neque vicinos neque divites, ne forte et ipsi reinvitent te et fiat tibi retribucio. Sed cum facis convivium, voca pauperes, debiles, claudos, cecos, et beatus eris. Istud autem servaretur in nobis potissime, qui vivimus de elemosinis laycorum et bonis pauperum. Quamvis autem licet convivare, tam spiritualiter infirmos quam sanos, ut spiritualiter edificentur et reedificent, hoc tamen non debet fieri racione commodi temporalis.

affection for the praise of men extinguishes the holiness it finds; if he is always unholy, he brings a blasphemous lie upon himself and the people. Hence Pope Peter, 2 Peter 2:1, prophesies of such: "There shall be," he says, "false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers";[2] and afterwards he describes them at length, saying that they are "as irrational beasts", "blaspheming those things which they know not". Such would be those who should say that they have, from the election of men, even of notoriously perverse men, the power of absolving from punishment and from guilt, and of granting indulgences without end out of the supererogated merits of the saints, distributed at their pleasure.[3] And such men are commonly ignorant of their own words; and blessed Jude describes them by this, that they "blaspheme majesty"; and whereas Saint Michael, "disputing with the devil" about "the body of Moses, durst not bring against him judgment", these men, "like dumb beasts, offend in the things which they know with a perceptible knowledge", since they dare, beyond the archangel, to curse whoever has resisted their will, although they are ignorant of God's judgement concerning them.[4] And beyond these things they blaspheme more gravely, saying that God must, by virtue of the election, stand by them and fulfil whatever they have promised. Hence the holy apostle describes them by a sixfold mark of the proud: "These," he says, "are spots in their banquets, feasting together without fear, feeding themselves: clouds without water, which are carried about by winds: trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead, plucked up by the roots: raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion: wandering stars, to whom the storm of darkness is reserved for ever."[5] And these six, since they are holy scripture, it is fitting [209] to expound. As to the first two, it is clear that they pertain to the sin of the flesh, since as to the manner of feasting they are spots in the abstract; for they feast the lords of the world and carnal friends, against the doctrine of Christ, Luke 14:12–14: "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends nor thy kinsmen nor thy neighbours nor the rich, lest perhaps they also invite thee again, and a recompense be made to thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind, and thou shalt be blessed."[6] And this should be kept most of all among us, who live on the alms of the laity and the goods of the poor. And although it is lawful to feast both the spiritually sick and the healthy, so that they may be spiritually edified and edify in turn, yet this must not be done for the sake of temporal advantage.

¶2 209.17–209.22

[209] **Secunda gentilitas est sessio, quam Christus docuit in facto aufugere, quando in eadem tabula atque perapside discipulos suos pavit, ut patet Matth. XXVI, quod non observant hii, qui sollempnizant convivia de bonis pauperum sedentes singulariter tamquam reges in solio.**

The second paganism is the seating, which Christ taught by deed to shun, when he fed his disciples at the same table and the same dish, as is clear from Matthew 26; which those do not observe who solemnize feasts from the goods of the poor, sitting apart like kings on a throne.[7]

¶3 209.23–209.30

[209] **Et quoad tercium scilicet modum prandii: Si in nostris episcopis sit gentilitas ritus ex superbia episcopi introducta, patet quod omnia eorum convivia sunt macule in abstracto, quod si secundo timore Dei postposito nimis sumptuose paverint se ipsos non pauperes, et hoc gracia voluptatis sue ac glorie secularis, quis dubitat, quin de illis prophetaverat sanctus Judas?**

And as to the third, namely the manner of the meal: if there is in our bishops a paganism of rite brought in from the pride of a bishop, it is clear that all their feasts are spots in the abstract; and if, secondly, setting aside the fear of God, they have fed themselves, not the poor, too sumptuously, and this for the sake of their own pleasure and secular glory, who doubts that Saint Jude prophesied of them?[8]

¶4 209.31–210.14
210.4 *Those who are like fruitless trees.*

[209] **Quantum ad secundum iugum, quod concernit peccatum mundi, dicitur primo, quod sunt nubes sine aqua, que a ventis circumferuntur, nubes, que exalantur de terra, ut sint medium inter laycos et celum, scilicet ecclesiam triumphantem, quod si sint sine pluvia predicacionis, ad quemlibet impulsum venti fortune pro congregandis et** [210] **conservandis temporalibus circumducti, signum est quod eclipsant radiacionem solis iusticie et signant pestilencias spirituales. Et quantum ad secundum, patet quod prelati racione ordinacionis divine, qua debent spiritualiter fructificare subiectis, debent esse arbores autumpnales. Quod si habent istam triplicitatem dyaboli, primo quod sint infructuosi quoad opus ewangeliste, secundo quod sint bis mortui secundum spiritualem racionem proprie persone et prelati, et tercio quod sint eradicati sine spe insercionis in vite vera fructificando secundum legem Christi, tunc sunt illi de quibus Apostolus prophetavit.**

As to the second yoke, which concerns the sin of the world, it is said first that they are "clouds without water, which are carried about by winds": clouds which are exhaled from the earth so as to be a mean between the laity and heaven, that is, the church triumphant; and if they are without the rain of preaching, carried about at every push of the wind of fortune for gathering and [210] **keeping temporal goods, it is a sign that they eclipse the radiance of the sun of justice and signify spiritual pestilences.**[9] **And as to the second, it is clear that prelates, by reason of the divine ordinance by which they ought to bear fruit spiritually for their subjects, ought to be "trees of the autumn". And if they have this threefold [mark] of the devil, first, that they are "unfruitful" as to the work of an evangelist, secondly, that they are "twice dead" in the spiritual respect of their own person and of a prelate, and thirdly, that they are "plucked up by the roots" without hope of grafting into the true vine, bearing fruit according to the law of Christ, then they are those of whom the Apostle prophesied.**[10]

Notes

1. "The things set out concerning Peter": the exposition of Peter earlier in the work. "The reward hidden in Christ" recalls Col. 3:3 ("your life is hid with Christ in God").
2. 2 Pet. 2:1, with Wyclif's *Erunt* ("there shall be") for the Vulgate's *Fuerunt* (DR "there were"); then 2 Pet. 2:12 in DR. *papa Petrus*: Wyclif gives Peter the title, as he gives it to Paul at 211.15.
3. *a pena et a culpa*: the formula of plenary indulgence, "from punishment and from guilt". *distributis ad libitum* agrees with *meritis*: the merits are distributed at pleasure. The manuscripts in the margin (208.4): *Prelati mali quomodo ab apostolis sunt descripti*.
4. Jude 8–10 (Loserth), paraphrased. *noticia sensibili* stands where the Vulgate has *naturaliter* (DR "naturally know"): knowledge through the senses. B reads *ut ubi* for *et ubi* (208.16). The manuscripts read *restituerint* (208.21); Loserth's *restiterint*, "resisted", is translated.
5. Jude 12–13 (Loserth), in DR; "the holy apostle" is Jude. Wyclif's *conservata* for the Vulgate's *servata* does not change the sense. The six phrases fall into three "yokes" (pairs): of the flesh, of the world, of the devil.

6. Luke 14:12–14, shortened: Wyclif omits "thy brethren", makes the rich a class of their own (*neque divites* for *vicinos divites*, DR "neighbours who are rich"), and stops at "thou shalt be blessed". *macule in abstracto*: "spots in the abstract", stains themselves, not merely stained men.
7. Matt. 26:23 ("he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish"; Vulgate *paropsis*, Wyclif *perapsis*). The three heads under "feasting together" are the manner of feasting, the seating and the meal.
8. *secundo*: the second of Jude's phrases, "feeding themselves" "without fear". *gracia voluptatis*: "for the sake of" their pleasure.
9. *iugum*, "yoke", is a pair of Jude's six phrases. "The sun of justice": Mal. 4:2.
10. "The work of an evangelist": 2 Tim. 4:5; "the true vine": John 15:1. "Twice dead": once as a person, once as a prelate. "The Apostle" is Jude.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 207: *speculo* (25 is the line number)
  - 208: *II Petri* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 208: *sicut*
  - 208: *iestatem* (ma | iestatem split by folio bar (213a), no hyphen)
  - 208: *hii*
  - 209: *dominos* [NW]
  - 209: *facis*
  - 209: *facis*
  - 209: *cecos* (10 is the line number)
  - 209: *quin* (30 is the line number)
  - 209: *Quantum*
  - 208: *papa Petrus* (papaPetrus -> papa Petrus (x1 in the volume; scans: papapetrus | papapetrus | papa | papapetrus))
  - 209: *12*— (dash between numerals; print 12—14)
  - 210: *autumpnales.* (LEFT-nw: print = printed)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 6. Matth. XXIII, 12. (207.32).

Part 6: The wandering stars, and the primacy not to be sought

Loserth pp. 210.15–214.2

¶1 210.15–212.14
210.15 *Those who are like wild waves and become the instruments of the devil.*
210.24 *Those are like wandering stars who in high place in the Church are afire with pride.*
211.4 *All prelates should shun human praise.*
212.5 *Desire of Church dignities wrong and foolish.*
212.15 *The contention of the rival popes marks them as Antichrists.*
212.31 *Primacy involves responsibility for souls at the judgment and service here on earth.*

[210] Quantum ad tercium iugum, quod concernit peccatum dyaboli, dicitur primo quod sunt fluctus feri maris despumantes suas confusiones; quod fit, quando Antichristi sunt instrumenta impii et crudelis dyaboli, cui proprietates maris inseparabiliter sunt coniuncte; tales enim involvunt simplices in caribdim, quando spumant mendacia de sua fantastica potestate; hoc enim erit eis blasfema confusio in die iudicii. Sexto et ultimo dicitur quod tales pseudo sunt sydera volancia; tradunt enim naturales quod ex materia terrestri viscosa ad supremum intersticium aeris exalata fit materia secundum formam et disposicionem variam sublimita; et dicitur, postquam fuerit ignita et mota, nunc stella cadens, nunc draco ardens, et nunc stella cometa. Ita mortaliter ex statu laycali lutoso sunt aliqui ad supremum statum militantis ecclesie exaltati, quos cum malignus tetigerit, sunt succensi superbia, cupiditate et omni genere peccatorum, sed cum summe in Deum, qui est ignis, recalcitrant, decidunt secundum [211] raciones Deo absconditas, nunc uno modo, nunc alio, in formam polipi vel abiecte materie, quibus procella tenebrarum perpetuo parata est post diem iudicii. Prepositi

As to the third yoke, which concerns the sin of the devil, it is said first that they are "raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion"; which comes about when Antichrists are the instruments of the impious and cruel devil, to whom the properties of the sea are inseparably joined; for such men wrap the simple in Charybdis when they foam out lies about their imaginary power; for this will be a blasphemous confusion to them on the day of judgement. Sixthly and lastly, therefore, it is said that such false men are "flying stars";[1] for the natural philosophers teach that from earthy, viscous matter exhaled to the highest interval of the air there comes to be matter sublimed according to varied form and disposition; and it is called, after it has been kindled and moved, at one time a falling star, at another a burning dragon, and at another a comet.[2] So, to their death, some are exalted from the muddy lay state to the highest state of the church militant; and when the evil one has touched them they are kindled with pride, covetousness and every kind of sin; but since they kick back to the utmost against God, who is fire,

autem et specialiter summus pontifex timerent sibi de sensu hoc mistico et specialiter de superbia vel laude humana, de extollencia sui status; ipsa enim est spuma fantasticum Antichristi, cum ad nichil valet nisi ad frustrandum mercedem Domini dicentis Matth. VI, 2: Amen, dico vobis receperunt mercedem suam, et Joh. V, 44 quomodo potestis credere, qui gloriam ab invicem recipitis, et gloriam que a solo Deo est non queritis? Debemus enim, laudes humanas et occasiones earum aufugere, dicente Paulo papa, prima Tessa. II, 5, 6. 9 Neque, inquit, aliquando fuimus in sermone adulacionis sicut scitis, neque in occasione avaricie, Deus testis est, neque querentes ab hominibus gloriam, operantes continue, ne aliquem vestrum gravaremus, predicavimus in vobis evangelium Dei. Et antequam papa fuerit conversacione contrarius vite Pauli, dimitteret omnem eleccionem, omnem gloriacionem et omnem occupacionem, que hodie consequitur papas nostros. Unde beatus Crysostomus Omelia XXVIII Operis Imperfecti super Matth. XX, 27: Quicumque voluerit inter vos primus esse erit vester servus. Secularem, inquam, primatum desiderare et si racio non est, tamen causa est, quia etsi iustum non est, tamen utile est, primatum autem ecclesiasticum concupiscere neque racio est neque causa, quia neque iustum est neque utile. Quis enim sapiens ultro se subiceret servituti laboris, et quod [212] maius est periculo tali, ut det racionem pro omni ecclesia apud iustum iudicem, nisi forte qui non credit iudicium Dei, nec timet uti abutens primatu suo ecclesiastico seculariter convertat eum in secularem. Ex istis videtur primo, quod non licet papatum vel aliquam dignitatem ecclesiasticam eleccione humana appetere, quia ut sic primatus stulte se supponit periculo, stulte quia non humana eleccio facit ius presidendi, sed promulgat in casu, quo in electo presint virtutum insignia, et insuper constituit se obligaciorem ad populum, nec accrescit exinde profectus, sed periculum, et ideo sancti apostoli non susceperunt primatum talem ab homine.

they fall down, for [211] reasons hidden with God, in one way at one time and in another at another, into the form of a polyp or of cast-off matter, "to whom the storm of darkness" is perpetually prepared after the day of judgement.[3] And superiors, and especially the highest pontiff, should fear for themselves from this mystical sense, and especially from pride or human praise, from the exaltation of their state; for it is the imaginary foam of Antichrist,[4] since it avails for nothing except to frustrate the reward, as the Lord says, Matthew 6:2: "Amen I say to you, they have received their reward", and John 5:44: "How can you believe, who receive glory one from another: and the glory which is from God alone, you do not seek?" For we ought to shun human praises and the occasions of them, as Paul the pope says, 1 Thessalonians 2:5, 6, 9: "Neither," he says, "were we at any time in the speech of flattery, as you know, nor in an occasion of covetousness, God is witness, nor seeking glory of men; working continually, lest we should be chargeable to any of you, we preached among you the gospel of God."[5] And before a pope should be contrary in manner of life to the life of Paul, he should give up every election, every glorying and every occupation that today attends our popes. Hence blessed Chrysostom, Homily 28 of the *Unfinished Work* on Matthew 20:27: "Whosoever will be first among you shall be your servant. To desire secular primacy," I say, "even if there is no reason, yet there is a cause, because even if it is not just, yet it is useful; but to covet ecclesiastical primacy there is neither reason nor cause, because it is neither just nor useful. For what wise man would of his own accord subject himself to a servitude of labour, and, what [212] is greater, to such a danger, that he must render account for the whole church before a just judge, unless perhaps one who does not believe the judgement of God, nor fears, so that, abusing his ecclesiastical primacy in a secular way, he turns it into a secular one?"[6] From these things it appears, first, that it is not lawful to seek the papacy or any ecclesiastical dignity by human election, because as such [one seeking] primacy foolishly puts himself in danger: foolishly, because human election does not make the right of presiding, but promulgates it in the case where the marks of the virtues are present in the one elected; and moreover he makes himself more bound to the people, nor does profit accrue from it, but danger; and therefore the holy apostles did not accept such primacy from man.[7]

¶2 212.15–213.13
213.1 *Rulers of the Church should sacrifice their own advantage in all things.*
213.16 *The duties of a primacy are hard and default in it dangerous,*

[212] **Videtur secundo quod, sive Robertus sive Urbanus, sive quicumque alius, appetit sic preesse ecclesie Anglie, signum probabile est quod sit fugibilis Antichristus; unde beatus Crysostomus ubi supra: Quicumque desideraverit primatum in terra, inveniet confusionem in celo, ut iam inter servos Christi non sit de primatu certamen, non festinet unusquisque, quomodo aliis maior appareat, sed quomodo omnibus inferior videatur, quoniam non qui maior fuerit in honore ille est iustior, sed qui inferior fuerit hic est maior. Ideo primatus in populo non est ab aliquo appetendus. Quomodo igitur non habebit ecclesia nostra talem suspectum, qui et nescit fidem scripture et se ipsum vel familiam suam privatam regere, et tamen presumit se digniorem sciencia et virtute, ut regat tantam ecclesiam? Utinam ecclesia vellet dicere talibus sentenciam Christi et beati Crysostomi Ad talem primatum pertinet respondere Deo pro animabus sibi subditis in die iudicii et servire illis evangelice laboriosius atque humilius,** [213] **contempto omni seculari commodo vel honore. Quod si Robertus vel alius nobis facere voluerit, non contradicimus, Deus sibi retribuat, unde beatus Crysostomus ubi supra: Principes ecclesie fiunt, ut serviant minoribus suis et ministrent eis quecumque acceperunt a Christo, ut suas utilitates negligant et illorum procurent, ut si opus fuerit nec mori recusent pro salute eorum, sicut fecit Apostolus. Cum igitur hec sit religio paparum, patet quam culpabiles a Deo sunt principes seculi, qui consensu stulto ipsam dissolverint, specialiter promittendo thesaurum regni et legiorum suorum ad ipsos confluere.**

It appears, secondly, that whether Robert or Urban or anyone else so seeks to preside over the church of England, it is a probable sign that he is an Antichrist to be fled;[8] hence blessed Chrysostom in the place cited: "Whoever desires primacy on earth will find confusion in heaven, so that now among the servants of Christ there may be no contest about primacy; let not each one hasten how he may appear greater than others, but how he may seem lower than all; since it is not he who is greater in honour that is more just, but he who is lower is the greater." Therefore primacy among the people is not to be sought by anyone. How then shall our church not hold such a man suspect, who knows neither the faith of scripture nor how to rule himself or his own private household, and yet presumes himself worthier in knowledge and virtue, so as to rule so great a church? Would that the church would tell such men the teaching of Christ and of blessed Chrysostom: to such a primacy it belongs to answer to God for the souls subject to it on the day of judgement, and to serve them in the manner of the gospel more laboriously and more humbly, [213] **scorning every secular advantage or honour.[9] And if Robert or another will do this for us, we do not gainsay it; may God reward him. Hence blessed Chrysostom in the place cited: "The princes of the church are made so that they may serve their inferiors and minister to them whatever they have received from Christ, so that they may neglect their own interests and see to theirs, so that if need be they may not refuse even to die for their salvation, as the Apostle did." Since, then, this is the religion of popes, it is clear how culpable before God are the princes of the world who by foolish consent have dissolved it, especially by promising that the treasure of the realm and of their lieges should flow to them.[10]**

¶3 213.14–213.28

[213] **Tercio patet ex dictis quomodo sancti susceperunt primatus huiusmodi, scientes quod humana eleccio vel est primatui suo impertinens vel nociva. Est enim in primatu tali servitus laboriosa et mundo abiecta ac infructuosa, sed meritoria quoad Deum, et illam voluerunt sancti doctores pro fructu premii promerendo. Est secundo in primatu extollencia mundana periculosa et insufficiencia vel negligencia perficiendi officium ruinosa, que paulative augebatur racione dotacionis ecclesie, et illam noluerunt sancti pastores ecclesie; et hinc post dotacionem inolevit religio prelatorum, quod verbo et mente dicerent in talibus eleccionibus nolens volo, quia nolens hoc secundum nefarium volo primum.**

Thirdly, it is clear from what has been said how the saints accepted primacies of this kind, knowing that human election is either irrelevant to their primacy or harmful. For there is in such a primacy a laborious servitude, cast off by the world and unfruitful [in it], but meritorious with respect to God; and this the holy doctors willed, for the fruit of the reward to be merited. There is, secondly, in primacy a dangerous worldly exaltation and a ruinous insufficiency or negligence in performing the office, which increased little by little by reason of the endowment of the church; and this the holy pastors of the church did not will. And hence, after the endowment, the religion of prelates grew up, that in such

elections they should say in word and mind, "Unwilling, I will": because, not willing this second, wicked thing, I will the first.[11]

¶4 213.29–214.2

[213]Et patet in parte quomodo solvenda sunt dicta Crysostomi et obiectus communes facti in ista materia. Modo autem cautela dyaboli et incuria secularium ad perturbacionem magnam ecclesie, dicitur in facto contrarium, scilicet quod nolens ministerium evangelicum vel mercedem volo primatum et commodum temporale, et necesse [214]est istam perversionem currere quousque hec duo separata fuerint sicut in ecclesia primitiva.

And it is clear in part how the sayings of Chrysostom and the common objections made in this matter are to be resolved. But now, by the wile of the devil and the carelessness of seculars, to the great disturbance of the church, the contrary is said in deed, namely: "Not willing the gospel ministry or the reward, I will the primacy and temporal advantage"; and [214]this perversion must run on until these two have been separated, as in the primitive church.[12]

Notes

1. Jude 13: Wyclif here writes *sydera volancia*, "flying stars", where the Vulgate (and his own quotation on p. 208) has *sidera errancia*, "wandering stars". *tales pseudo*: "such false men", a plural; not "the Pseudo" of ch. 6.
2. The meteorology is Aristotle's (*Meteorologica* I.4: shooting stars and "torches" from an exhalation kindled in the upper air); comets from the same kindled exhalation at I.7; the identification is ours. *nunc ... nunc*: "at one time ... at another". *draco ardens*: the "burning dragon" of the medieval meteorologists.
3. *mortaliter*: "to their death" (or "in mortal sin"). "God, who is fire": Deut. 4:24, Heb. 12:29 ("a consuming fire"). *Deo absconditas*: "hidden with God", or "hidden from God"; the first is likelier. *polipi*: "polyp", the sense is doubtful (perhaps the jelly thought to fall with a shooting star). "To whom the storm of darkness": Jude 13 again.
4. *spuma fantasticum*: the adjective does not agree with *spuma*; it is construed as "imaginary foam". *extollencia*: "exaltation", the raising of oneself.
5. *Paulo papa*: Loserth notes "ita cod." (211.15): the manuscript calls Paul pope. 1 Thess. 2:5–6, 9 in Wyclif's form: *operantes continue*, "working continually", for the Vulgate's *nocte ac die operantes* (DR "working night and day"); he omits the end of 2:6 and the opening of 2:9. DR's wording is kept where his Latin agrees.
6. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*: Wyclif's "Homily 28"; Loserth: "Recte Homilia XXXV ex cap. XX". The passage is hom. 35, PG 56, 830: *saecularem quidem primatum desiderare, etsi ratio non est, vel causa est ... nec timet uti abutens primatu suo ecclesiastico saeculariter, convertat eum in saecularem*. Matt. 20:27: Wyclif's *Quicumque* gives "whosoever" (DR "he that will be first"). *inquam* stands outside Loserth's italics, as Wyclif's "I say". *nec timet uti abutens*: *uti* is taken as *ut*, "so that". The manuscripts in the margin (211.25): *Appetere primatum secularem*.
7. *ut sic primatus stulte se supponit periculo*: the subject is taken to be the one who seeks primacy, as with *constituit se* below; possibly "primacy so [sought] foolishly exposes itself to danger". The page foot records readings at 212.10 (*causu*; the manuscripts *prefuit*), apparently against *casu* and *presint*; the print is translated.
8. Robert of Geneva (Clement VII) and Urban VI, the rival popes of the schism of 1378; Loserth's side-note speaks of "the rival popes". *fugibilis*: "to be fled".
9. "In the place cited": the same homily of the *Opus imperfectum*, PG 56, 829–30 (*quicumque autem desiderat primatum in terra, inveniet confusionem in caelo ... sed qui justior fuerit, ille est major*, where Wyclif has *inferior*), and so are the words at 213.4 (*principes autem Ecclesiae fiunt, ut serviant minoribus suis ...*). Loserth's italics do not mark the clause "to such a primacy it belongs ...", so it is given as Wyclif's statement of the teaching, not as a quotation.
10. *religio paparum*: the rule binding on popes by their office, not a religious order (glossary: *religio privata*). *a Deo*: "before God". *legiorum*: "lieges".
11. *nolens volo*: the elect's formula of reluctance, "unwilling, I will"; Wyclif glosses it: not willing the second thing in primacy (worldly exaltation, the ruinous burden), the elect wills the first (the laborious servitude). *servitus* is "servitude", as in Chrysostom's *servituti laboris*.
12. "The contrary": the formula turned round, refusing the service and willing the primacy. "These two": the gospel ministry and temporal advantage, joined since the endowment.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 210: *peccatum*
  - 210: *feri*
  - 210: *maris*
  - 211: *absconditas*
  - 211: *9* (verse range "5, 6, 9:" ends the line above the box; the main scan lost the 9)
  - 211: *si racio* (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 211: *non*
  - 212: *suo*
  - 212: *Crysostomi* (hyphenated Cryso-|stomi:; main token crysoad = Cryso + Ad with stomi lost, so the whole word here)

- **212: *Ad* (printed "Ad" before talem; main glued it into crysoad)**
- **212: *animabus* [NW]**
- **213: *facere* (the main "1" is a speck before facere; main misread facere as tacere at pos 13)**
- **213: *fiunt***
- **213: *suas***
- **213: *legiorum* [NW]**

Part 7: Human election, the Roman church, and the conditional law

Loserth pp. 214.3–218.24

¶1 214.3–215.17
214.3 *False election makes an apostate, not apostolic.*
215.4 *A pope is not truly such unless he follows Christ and Peter.*
215.19 *The papal dignity is founded on a grant of the emperor who had no right to make such.*

[214]**Et quantum ad implicatum de eleccione humana patet ex sepe dictis, quod confirmatur ex lege triplici; primo docetur LXXIX distinccione: Si quis pecunia vel gracia humana vel tumultu populari sine canonica eleccione fuerit intronizatus, non apostolicus sed apostaticus habeatur. Cum igitur sit maior error in eleccione activa, quando eligentes coacti sunt a dyabolo eligere personam quam Deus reprobat, quod patule patet ex opere et omissione papalis officii, multo magis vel a pari sequitur, quod electus talis non apostolicus sed apostaticus est habendus. Non enim licet humanitus reprobare, ut ex fide supponitur, nisi ut Deus ex lege sua docuerit reprobandum; nec valet vel deficit humana eleccio nisi de quanto eleccioni divine consentit vel discrepat. Ex quo patet, cum stat electores cogi humanitus ad eligendum aput Deum ydoneum, quod dicta lex debet intelligi, quando militaris vel popularis tumultus cogit ad eligendum inhabilem, quare igitur non, si dyabolus vel peccatum collegii electorum et observatis humanis ritibus cogit ad eligendum tam inhabilem, eque non apostolicus sed apostaticus habendus est? Nec est probacio legis humane tam valida, sicut sensibilis probacio docta ex vita prepositi: nam maior capta ex lege Domini et minor capta ad sensum ex vita prepositi, concludunt cercius, quam evidencie palliate ex humanis legibus. Secundo docetur eadem sentencia ex lege Jeronymi distinccione** [215]**XL sic loquentis: Non est facile stare in loco Petri et Pauli et tenere cathedram, quia non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum, sed qui exercent opera eorum. Ex quo patet quod nemo sit papa, nisi sit Christi et Petri filius, imitando eos in moribus, sed sicut non subiacet potestati eleccionis humane hoc facere, sic nec subiacet potestati humane papam constituere. Si autem vocetur papa quicumque quem occidentalis ecclesia acceptat ad capitaliter decidendum causas ecclesie, ad precipiendum fidelibus infundabiliter et blasfeme pro congregandis pecuniis et mundanis honoribus, abusio est termini infundabilis, iuxta quam oportet in casu concedere, quod maximus hereticus et antichristus sit papa, sed et**

And as to what is implied about human election, it is clear from what has often been said; and this is confirmed from a threefold law. First, it is taught in distinction 79: "If anyone has been enthroned by money or human favour or popular tumult without canonical election, let him be held not apostolic but apostatic."[1] Since, therefore, there is a greater error in active election when the electors are compelled by the devil to elect a person whom God reproves (which is openly clear from the doing and the omission of the papal office), it follows much more, or equally, that such a man elected is to be held not apostolic but apostatic. For it is not lawful to reprove humanly, as is supposed as faith teaches, except as God has taught by his law that one is to be reproved; nor does human election avail or fail except in so far as it agrees with or departs from divine election. From this it is clear, since it is possible for electors to be compelled humanly to elect one who is fit in God's sight, that the said law must be understood [of the case] when military or popular tumult compels the election of an unqualified man. Why then, if the devil or the sin of the college of electors, even with the human rites observed, compels the election of a man so unqualified, is he not equally to be held not apostolic but apostatic?[2] Nor is the proof from human law so strong as the perceptible proof taught from the life of the superior: for a major taken from the law of the Lord and a minor taken by sense from the life of the superior infer more certainly than evidences cloaked from human laws. Secondly, the same teaching is taught from the law of Jerome in distinction [215]**40, speaking thus: "It is not easy to stand in the place of Peter and Paul and to hold the chair, for it is not the sons of saints who hold the places of saints, but those who do their works."[3] From this it is clear that no one is pope unless he is a son of Christ and of Peter, imitating them in conduct; now just as it does not lie in the power of human election to bring this about, so neither does it lie in human power to constitute a pope. But if whoever the western church accepts to decide the church's cases as head,**

rudissimus laycus vel femella; et periret fides vel religio capiti ecclesie adhibenda.

to command the faithful without foundation and blasphemously for the gathering of money and worldly honours, is called pope, it is an abuse of the term, without foundation;[4] by which one must grant, in the case, that the greatest heretic and antichrist is pope, and even the rudest layman or a little woman; and the faith or religion to be given to the head of the church would perish.

¶2 215.19–217.13
216.11 *Even Christ's election is not enough without predestination as Judas shews,*
216.25 *The Roman Church is wherever the mass of the faithful are.*
217.14 *Proud and Cesarian priests are Antichrists.*
217.28 *Such are more numerous in England than true priests.*

[215]Unde notaremus cronicas predictas, quomodo inolevit papalis dignitas. Et narrat dominus Ardmacanus libro VII cap. XXIV de questionibus Armenorum, quomodo imperator Constantinus circa annum domini trecentesimum primum hoc censuit et precepit, quod suus episcopus ab omnibus papa vocaretur. Et Foca imperator circa annum domini sexcentesimum hoc idem ex cleri instancia confirmavit, ut legitur in suis annalibus, quomodo igitur saltaret in summum sacramentum ecclesie, quod imperator terrenus tam irreligiose instituit, ymo ut inquit: Si imperator Thartarie ecclesiam de Cambalek aut de Cathay conversus ad [216]christianismum caput omnium aliarum ecclesiarum constitueret, cederet ceteris paribus capitalitas Romane ecclesie. Horribile itaque atque necessario defectibile fundamentum ecclesie a seculari principe ita inductum. Numquid credimus quod humana eleccio plus iuris per se tribuit quam Christi eleccio? Christi autem eleccio non est per se sufficiens ad constituendum quamcumque partem ecclesie, cum requiritur eterna predestinacio cum gracia consumante. Et hinc credo quod ille qui nichil facit ex indifferencia reliquit nobis exemplum ad consenciendum isti sentencie per hoc quod ipsemet elegit dyabolum. Joh. VI, 71 dicitur: Nonne duodecim vos elegi et unus ex vobis dyabolus est? Tercio docetur eadem sentencia ex decreto beati Jeronymi posito XXIV questio I: Quoniam vetus oriens, ubi dicens mistice multa commendabilia de Romana ecclesia subiungit condicionem, quam oportet de ipsa subintelligi: Fatiscat, inquit, invidia Romani culminis, recedat ambicio; cum successore piscatoris et discipulo Christi loquor: Et concludit in fine. Quicumque tecum non colligit, spergit, hoc est qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. In qua lege sunt tria notanda, primo quod Romana ecclesia est ubicumque habitaverit universitas fidelium viatorum, sic quod si iam non esset alius Romanus christianus, adhuc fideles conversi a quocumque apostolo, quia sunt discipuli Petri et Pauli, qui fuerunt Romani, possunt dici Romana ecclesia; tanta namque fuit Christi et omnium apostolorum concors [217]amicicia, quod christiano sequente unum eorum in moribus, sequitur eorum quemlibet cuiuslibet eorum in gradu suo discipulus. Satis est, cum et omnino oportet quod

Hence we should note the chronicles mentioned before, how the papal dignity grew up. And the lord of Armagh relates in book 7, chapter 24 of the *Questions of the Armenians* how the emperor Constantine, about the year of the Lord 301, decreed and commanded this: that his bishop should be called pope by all.[5] And the emperor Phocas, about the year of the Lord 600, confirmed this same thing at the urging of the clergy, as is read in his annals.[6] How then would what an earthly emperor so irreligiously instituted leap up into the highest sacrament of the church?[7] Indeed, as he says: "If the emperor of Tartary, converted to [216]Christianity, were to constitute the church of Cambalek or of Cathay head of all the other churches, the capital standing of the Roman church would give way, other things being equal."[8] Horrible, then, and of necessity bound to fail, is a foundation of the church brought in in this way by a secular prince. Do we believe that human election of itself confers more right than Christ's election? Now Christ's election is not of itself sufficient to constitute any part of the church whatever, since eternal predestination is required, with consummating grace. And hence I believe that he who does nothing at random left us an example for assenting to this teaching, in that he himself chose a devil.[9] In John 6:71 it is said: "Have not I chosen you twelve? And one of you is a devil." Thirdly, the same teaching is taught from the decree of blessed Jerome placed in Causa 24, question 1, *Quoniam vetus oriens*, where, saying mystically many commendable things of the Roman church, he adds a condition which must be understood as implied of it: "Let envy of Roman eminence give way," he says, "let ambition withdraw; I speak with the successor of the fisherman and the disciple of Christ." And he concludes at the end: "Whoever gathereth not with thee, scattereth; that is, he who is not Christ's is Antichrist's."[10] In this law three things are to be noted. First, that the Roman church is wherever the whole body of the faithful who are wayfarers dwells; so that if there were now no other Roman Christian, the faithful converted by any apostle whatever, since they are disciples of Peter and Paul, who were Romans, could still be

christianus sit Christi discipulus, et sic nitetur explanacio beati Jeronymi in fine addita, quando dicitur: Quicumque non colligit cum Romano pontifice spargit, hoc est, inquit, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est, non tamen quod Romana ecclesia sepe sumitur pro qualicumque papa et suis cardinalibus, ubicumque habitaverint, quomodolibet conversando, sed ista significacio seculariter et infundabiliter est extorta, et ideo nimirum intricat ecclesiam.

called the Roman church. For so great was the concordant [217] friendship of Christ and of all the apostles that, when a Christian follows one of them in conduct, he follows every one of them, a disciple of each of them in his degree.[11] It is enough, since it is altogether necessary too that a Christian be Christ's disciple; and on this will rest the explanation of blessed Jerome added at the end, where it is said: "Whoever gathereth not with the Roman pontiff, scattereth; that is," he says, "he who is not Christ's is Antichrist's." Yet not as "Roman church" is often taken for any pope whatever and his cardinals, wherever they dwell and however they conduct themselves; but that signification has been extorted in a secular way and without foundation, and therefore no wonder it entangles the church.

¶3 217.14–218.6

218.7 *Obedience is not due to the Roman Church unless it ministers truly in return.*

[217] Secundo notandum ex dicto beati Jeronymi quod quicumque diviserit contra Christum est Antichristus, cuiusmodi sunt superbi et specialiter sacerdotes cesarei legi Christi contrarii. Nam secundum beatum Gregorium nullus in ecclesia magis nocet, ut allegatum est ex secundo cap. primi De Cura Pastorali, et per consequens nullus est nequior Antichristus. Et isto modo loquitur decretum de Antichristo sub autoritate Gregorii, XVI questio VII: Pervenit ad nos, ubi dicitur, quod quidam episcopi consumunt bona pauperum tribus modis: primo in militibus et aliis laycis, qui ipsos fovent et protegunt in gloria seculari, secundo in monstruosa familia et tercio quod est gravius in consanguineis. Et ex diffinicione sancti talis episcopus inter maximos hereticos et antichristos non minimus habeatur, et forte si omnes episcopi hodie in Anglia cum religiosis et secularibus eis consentaneis essent signati in fronte signo bestie, pateret quod longe [218] plures quam sunt catholici ex parte Christi forent infideles, quia heretici et realiter antichristi. Sic autem loquuntur tot sancti doctores de antichristis et hereticis cum lege ecclesie et scriptura. Alias autem significaciones somniant ut heretici et antichristi absconsius delitescant.

Secondly, it is to be noted from the saying of blessed Jerome that whoever divides against Christ is Antichrist; of which kind are the proud, and especially caesarean priests contrary to the law of Christ. For according to blessed Gregory no one in the church does more harm, as was alleged from the second chapter of the first [part] of the *Pastoral Care*; and consequently no one is a more wicked Antichrist.[12] And in this way the decree speaks of Antichrist under the authority of Gregory, Causa 16, question 7, *Pervenit ad nos*, where it is said that "certain bishops consume the goods of the poor in three ways: first on knights and other laymen who cherish and protect them in worldly glory, second on a monstrous household, and third, which is graver, on kinsmen."[13] And by the saint's definition such a bishop is to be held not the least among the greatest heretics and antichrists. And perhaps, if all the bishops in England today, with the religious and seculars who consent with them, were marked on the forehead with the mark of the beast, it would be clear that far [218] more than there are catholics on Christ's side would be unbelievers, because heretics and really antichrists.[14] And so do so many holy doctors speak of antichrists and heretics, with the law of the church and scripture. But they dream up other significations, so that heretics and antichrists may lie hidden more secretly.[15]

¶4 218.7–218.24

[218] Tercio notandum quod omnes leges que loquntur de papatu et obediencia fienda Romane ecclesie subintelligende sunt cum condicione, quod illa ecclesia correspondenter ad nomen excellencie in ministerio faciat recompensam. Aliter enim beatus Petrus non foret capitaneus inter apostolos, ut patet ex dictis; et aliter beatus

Thirdly, it is to be noted that all the laws which speak of the papacy and of the obedience to be rendered to the Roman church are to be understood as implied with a condition: that that church make recompense in ministry corresponding to its name of excellence.[16] For otherwise blessed Peter would not be captain among the apostles, as is clear from what has been

Jeronymus distinccione XL allegata cum archidiacono contradiceret sibi ipsi, cum aliter racione loci et nudi nominis consenciendum foret in casu pessimo antichristo. Sicut enim Deus non potest facere hominem album sine albedine, sic non potest hominem facere papam vel membrum ecclesie sine inducta debita qualitate, ad quod locus vel eleccio humana est impertinens, nisi de quanto consentanea est dominio ipsum vere notificans populo, quod si false promulgat, est error in ianuis.

said; and otherwise blessed Jerome, in distinction 40 as alleged, together with the Archdeacon, would contradict himself, since otherwise, by reason of place and bare name, one would have to consent, in the worst case, to Antichrist.[17] For just as God cannot make a man white without whiteness, so he cannot make a man pope or a member of the church without the due quality being brought in; to which place or human election is irrelevant, except in so far as it agrees with the lordship [of God], truly making him known to the people; and if it proclaims falsely, there is error at the doors.[18]

Notes

1. Gratian, *Decretum* D. 79 c. 9 (*Si quis pecunia*), as Loserth gives it; the form "D. 79 c. 9" is ours. The pun *apostolicus / apostaticus* is the canon's; "apostatic" keeps it. Both manuscripts note in the margin *Papa apostaticus*.
2. *Et observatis humanis ritibus*: "even with the human rites observed", the *et* taken as "even". The argument: the canon names outward force; inward force (the devil, the electors' sin) disqualifies as much, though the forms are kept.
3. *Decretum* D. 40 c. 2 (*Non est facile*), as Loserth gives it. Both manuscripts read *Petri et Petri*; Loserth prints *Petri et Pauli*, and we translate the print; the canon itself reads *stare loco Pauli et tenere gradum Petri* (PL 187, 214), so the emendation is Loserth's and not the canon's wording.
4. *Abusio est termini infundabilis*: *infundabilis* may be nominative with *abusio* ("an abuse ... without foundation", taken here) or genitive with *termini* ("an abuse of a term that has no foundation"). The sense is nearly the same.
5. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* 7.24 (Paris 1512, fol. 51v), where the interlocutor John reports that some try to prove the Roman church head of the others *eo quod imperator Constantinus circa annum domini 350 hoc censuit ... et Foca etiam imperator illud idem constituit circa annum domini .dc. sicut legitur in annalibus eorundem*; Loserth gives no reference. The date "301" and "called pope" are Wyclif's; FitzRalph has 350 and *caput aliarum*.
6. Loserth compares Higden, *Polychronicon* 5.416: Boniface "obtained from the emperor Phocas that the church of blessed Peter at Rome should be head of all the churches in the world". C. *In suis annalibus*: "his annals", i.e. the annals of Phocas's reign; the possessive may also refer loosely to the chronicles named above. G. *Ex cleri instancia*: "at the urging of the clergy" (*instancia* in its second sense).
7. The subject of *saltaret* is the clause *quod imperator terrenus ... instituit*. *Summum sacramentum ecclesie* is the papacy treated as a sacrament of the church; the phrase is Wyclif's irony.
8. Loserth's italics make this sentence a quotation; *ut inquit* refers back to FitzRalph, *Summa* 7.24 (Paris 1512, fol. 51v): *cur insuper imperator Tartarie ecclesiam de Cambalon aut de Cathai caput omnium ecclesiarum constituere non posset*. Cambalek (Khanbaliq, Peking) and Cathay are the Mongol capital and China. *Capitalitas*, the abstract of *capitalis*, is rendered "capital standing" to keep it apart from *capitas* "headship".
9. *Ex indifferencia*: "at random", without discrimination; that Christ does nothing at random makes his choice of Judas an intended lesson.
10. Gratian, *Decretum* C. 24 q. 1 c. 25 (*Quoniam vetus oriens*), from Jerome, *Ep.* 15.1–2 to Damasus (PL 22, 355–56; Loserth at 216.16: "Cap. XXV"); Jerome has *Facessat invidia*, the canon *Fatiscat*. The print reads *qui Christi non est* (216.24, so the plate; the OCR had lost *non*), as Wyclif repeats it at 217.4. At 216.20 B reads *cesset* for *fatiscat*, and A has *cesset* written above. The words echo Matthew 12:30 ("he that gathereth not with me, scattereth"), turned to Damasus.
11. *Sequitur eorum quemlibet* is the deponent "he follows every one of them", not the impersonal "it follows"; *cuiuslibet eorum ... discipulus* stands in apposition to the subject.
12. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 1.2: "no one does more harm in the church than one who, acting perversely, has the name or order of holiness" (PL 77, 16: *Nemo quippe amplius in Ecclesia nocet, quam qui perverse agens, nomen vel ordinem sanctitatis habet*; Loserth: *De cura pastorali*, l. c.). *Ut allegatum est*: Wyclif cited it earlier in this work.
13. *Decretum* C. 16 q. 7 c. 3 (*Pervenit ad nos*), a Palea under the name of Gregory VII (PL 187, 1044), which Loserth calls "loosely quoted": the canon speaks of tithes given to laymen, "soldiers or servants, or (what is worse) kinsmen".
14. The mark of the beast on the forehead: Apocalypse 13:16 and 14:9.
15. *Somniant* has no expressed subject: it is the defenders of the papal sense of "Roman church", against whom *sic autem loquuntur ... sancti doctores* is set.
16. At this line the apparatus reports *sub condicione* for the print's *cum condicione*; the sense is the same.
17. "The Archdeacon" is Guido de Baysio, the commentator on the *Decretum* (*Rosarium*), whose gloss on D. 40 Wyclif adds to Jerome.
18. *Consentanea est dominio*: the print has *dominio*, "lordship"; *Domino* "the Lord" would construe more easily. We translate the print and supply "[of God]". *Error in ianuis* echoes "at the doors" (Matthew 24:33).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):

- **214:** ***Nec***
- **216:** ***caput omnium*** **(one main token covers two printed words)**
- **216:** ***aliarum***
- **216:** ***constitueret***
- **216:** ***paribus***
- **216:** ***capitalitas***
- **216:** ***Romane*** **(hyphenated Ro-|mane; main token holds the whole word)**
- **216:** ***ecclesie***
- **216:** ***seculari***
- **216: ∅ (s is the end of the English side-note "Christ's")**
- **216:** ***predestinacio*** **(hyphenated predesti-|nacio; main token predestinobis is the whole word garbled. NB main scan has lost the following lines (nacio cum gracia ...) with no GAP flagged)**
- **216:** ***Quoniam*** **(zoomed leaf: Q with tail)**
- **216:** ***non***
- **217:** ***non***
- **217:** ***non***
- **217:** ***ista***
- **217:** ***tribus***
- **217:** ***in***
- **218:** ***heretici***
- **218:** ***fienda*** **[NW]**
- **218:** ***illa***
- **217:** ***Jeronymi*** **(one word; initial is J, not T)**

Part 8: The dignity of sees, worship in spirit, and the abomination of desolation

Loserth pp. 218.25–222.18

¶1 218.25–221.16
218.25 *Place is of little importance.*
219.8 *Of the four chief sees three are now schismatic.*
219.23 *We gain nothing by going up a mountain, like the Samaritans, or into Salomon's temple, like the Jews.*
221.17 *The popedom is the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel and Christ.*

[218]**Et patet ad quem sensum valent leges de eleccionibus et de locorum particularium dignitate, ut XXII distinccione: Sacrosancta dicitur, quod Romana ecclesia non ab apostolis, sed a Domino primatum obtinuit, et post illam primam sedem secunda sedes est apud Alexandriam, a beato Marco et evangelista Petri discipulo consecrata; tercia sedes est apud Anthiochiam, ubi Petrus antequam** [219]**Romam venerat, sedit episcopus et Ignacium episcopum constituit, ubi primum christianorum nomen exortum est et post synodus decrevit Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam tenere secundum sedem post Romam, propter hoc quod sit quodammodo nova Roma; frivola forent ista, nisi sedes dicta factis compensent. Ideo dicit Gregorius ibidem: Cum culpa non exigit, omnes secundum racionem humilitatis equales sumus. Et confirmacio est quod iste tres sedes a nostris tamquam scismatice sunt abiecte, et ipsi econtra censent nostros scismaticos, et Asyani et alii fideles reputant utrosque deliros maniacos, constituentes in suis ecclesiis sedes alias, asserentes vere, cum non locus sed virtus gentem sanctificat, quecumque ecclesia est maior, que humilius sequitur Ihesum Christum. Et ista est vera sentencia, cum Joh. IV. 20 dicit Veritas mulieri Samaritane opposite Christo: patres nostri in monte hoc adoraverunt, et vos dicitis quia**

And it is clear in what sense the laws about elections and about the dignity of particular places have force; as in distinction 22, *Sacrosancta*, it is said that "the Roman church obtained the primacy not from the apostles but from the Lord; and after that first see the second see is at Alexandria, consecrated by blessed Mark, evangelist and disciple of Peter; the third see is at Antioch, where Peter, before he came [219]**to Rome, sat as bishop and appointed Ignatius bishop, where the name of Christians first arose"; and afterwards a synod decreed that the church of Constantinople should hold the second see after Rome, "because it is in a manner a new Rome".[1] These things would be frivolous unless the said sees made up for them with deeds. Therefore Gregory says in the same place: "When fault does not require it, we are all equal by the measure of humility."[2] And the confirmation is that these three sees have been cast off by ours as schismatic, and they in turn reckon ours schismatics; and the Asians and other faithful reckon both to be raving madmen, setting up other sees in their own churches, and asserting truly, since not place but virtue sanctifies a people, that whatever church more humbly follows Jesus Christ is the greater. And this is the true teaching, since in John**

Jerusolimis est locus in quo adorare oportet; venit, inquit, hora et nunc est, quando veri adoratores adorabunt patrem in spiritu et veritate. Cum enim spiritus sit Deus, quemlibet locum replens, patet quod nec oportet in montem altum ascendere, ut Deus melius audiat preces nostras, ut Samaritani ex gestis patriarcharum crediderant, nec oportet in templum Salamonis cum Yudeis ascendere sed adorare in spiritu et montuose aspirando ad celestia secundum memorativam potenciam anime, scilicet intelligenciam, et cum anima sit, ubi afficitur, iuxta illud Apostoli ad Phil. III. 20 nostra [220]conversacio in celis est, patet, quod sic orans mons altus efficitur per Deum sibi ipsi, et ideo Veritas docens nos patrem orare Matth. VI. 9, docet consideracionem nostram incipere ab altitudine adorati: Pater noster, qui es in celis etc. quantum ad templum Yudeorum Jerusalem, oportet adorare in veritate, sic quod vita non discordet mendaciter a peticione et animo adorantis, et tunc fit templum infinitum domino prestancius quam basilica Yudeorum, quia I. Cor. III. 16 dicit Apostolus: templum Domini est, quod estis vos. Quando enim est veritas in conversacione et veritas in peticione, que quidem veritas est adequacio ad intellectum divinum, tunc ex plena conformitate voluntati divine, orans sic mente et spiritu constituitur templum Dei, et tunc sicut dicit digne primam peticionem oracionis dominice Deo patri propter intellectus sublimitatem, sic potest digne dicere duas peticiones sequentes ad secundas personas alias, cum taliter difformem oportet trahi ad regnum, ubi erit perfecte voluntatis increate et create conformitas. Ideo oramus, quod sicut in celo est plena conformitas sic in terra sit proporcionaliter conformitas voluntatum. Et patet ex ista duplici racione orandi, quomodo verificantur decreta distinccione XL: Non est facile cum duobus capitulis sequentibus et capitulo: Multi sunt sacerdotes cum eis similibus. In quibus plane docetur quod locus quicumque sicut et sacramentum vel ritus sensibilis est adoracioni isti et preeminencie persone apud [221]Deum impertinens, nisi forte per accidens excitaverit sanctitatem, unde signum est, quod adoramus samaritane sive yudaice tamquam irracionale animal, reptans depresso capite mentis nostre, quod tantum loca et cerimonias observamus. Christus autem ad hoc ascendit in celum, ut parvipendentes hec temporalia ascendamus per scalam virtutum ab istis sublunaribus in quibus infigimur ad spiritualia bona celestia finaliter affectanda. Unde Veritas correspondenter ad fidem mulieris, qua vere credidit Christum esse prophetam, ipsam alloquitur: Mulier, crede michi, quasi diceret propter imperfeccionem fidei es longe a sponsa, sed cum salus ex Yudeis est, oportet quod in fundamento scale orandi statuens tibi substanciam fidei credas michi.

4:20 Truth speaks to the Samaritan woman, who had set against Christ: "Our fathers adored on this mountain: and you say that at Jerusalem is the place where men must adore"; "the hour cometh," he says, "and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth."[3] For since God is a spirit, filling every place, it is clear that there is no need to go up a high mountain so that God may hear our prayers better, as the Samaritans had believed from the deeds of the patriarchs, nor to go up into Solomon's temple with the Jews; but to adore in spirit, and as on a mountain, aspiring to heavenly things according to the memorative power of the soul, namely the understanding.[4] And since the soul is where it has affection, according to that of the Apostle, Philippians 3:20, "our [220]conversation is in heaven", it is clear that one praying thus is made by God a high mountain to himself.[5] And therefore Truth, teaching us to pray to the Father (Matthew 6:9), teaches our consideration to begin from the height of the one adored: "Our Father who art in heaven" etc. As for the temple of the Jews at Jerusalem, one must adore in truth, so that the life does not disagree, lying, with the petition and mind of the one adoring; and then there comes to be a temple infinitely more excellent for the Lord than the basilica of the Jews, for in 1 Corinthians 3:16 the Apostle says: "the temple of the Lord is, which you are."[6] For when there is truth in manner of life and truth in petition (which truth is adequation to the divine intellect), then, from full conformity to the divine will, the one praying thus in mind and spirit is constituted the temple of God. And then, just as he worthily says the first petition of the Lord's prayer to God the Father on account of the sublimity of the intellect, so he can worthily say the two following petitions to the other persons, in the second place, since one so unconformed must be drawn to the kingdom, where there will be perfect conformity of the uncreated and the created will.[7] Therefore we pray that, as in heaven there is full conformity, so on earth there may be, proportionally, conformity of wills.[8] And it is clear from this twofold manner of praying how the decrees in distinction 40 are verified: *Non est facile*, with the two chapters following, and the chapter *Multi sunt sacerdotes*, with those like them.[9] In these it is plainly taught that any place whatever, as also a sacrament or a perceptible rite, is irrelevant to this adoration and to a person's preeminence with [221]God, unless perhaps it has stirred up holiness by accident. Hence it is a sign that we adore in the Samaritan or Jewish way, like an irrational animal creeping with the head of our mind bowed down, that we observe only places and ceremonies. But Christ ascended into heaven for this:

that, setting little store by these temporal things, we may ascend by the ladder of virtues from these sublunary things, in which we are fixed, to spiritual and heavenly goods, which are finally to be desired. Hence Truth, answering to the faith of the woman, by which she truly believed Christ to be a prophet, addresses her: "Woman, believe me";[10] as if he said: through the imperfection of your faith you are far from being a bride; but since "salvation is of the Jews", you must believe me, setting for yourself the substance of faith in the foundation of the ladder of prayer.

¶2 221.17–222.18
222.1 *A blasphemous hypocrite usurps Christ's place.*

[221]In istis igitur ymaginibus et fantasticis post dotacionem et affeccionis subversionem delusa est ecclesia in penam peccati et specialiter in constituendo sibi principem tamquam Christum. Et sic cum protestacione predicta intelligo illud Matth. XXIV, 15: Cum igitur videritis abhominacionem desolacionis, que dicta est a Daniele propheta, stantem in loco sancto, qui legit intelligat. Locus autem sanctus videtur michi esse status sanctus, quem papa vendicat, ideo dicitur stantem et Mar. XIII. 14 dicitur stantem, ubi non debet. Revera, quod auctoritate et imperio cesaris vel falsa eleccione cardinalium constituatur summus Christi vicarius, est abhominacio in abstracto, et si fideles anime viderent clare utrobique statum spiritualem ecclesie, quomodo solebat in ea presidere unus paterfamilias, qui graciose acceptaret invitando, pasceret refovendo atque defenderet [222]adiuvando quoscumque suos domesticos. Modo autem invenirent in eadem domo ecclesie presidere unum blasfemum ypocritam, omnino condicionis opposite, non mirum si plurimi desolentur, ut si itinerans solebat hospitari cum uno patrefamilias magnifice largitatis et post inveniat monstruosam beluam, que in hospites famelice, subdole et proditorie tyrannizet, intrans domum: videndo talem sedere in cathedra pii patrisfamilias desolaretur non modicum in aspectu. Sic igitur ego intelligo abhominacionem desolacionis prophetatam et evangelizatam quam Christus precipit parti intellectuali ecclesie intelligere ex effectu. Nec mirum si posteriores docti ab experiencia noscant hunc sensum particularius quam sancti priores quibus non est ex effectu vel prophetice revelatus. Non enim generaliter noticia sensus scripture et sanctitas correspondent.

In these images, then, and imaginary things, after the endowment and the overturning of affection, the church has been deluded in punishment of sin, and especially in setting up for itself a prince as if he were Christ. And so, with the declaration made above, I understand that of Matthew 24:15: "When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place: he that readeth let him understand."[11] Now the holy place seems to me to be the holy state which the pope claims; therefore it says "standing", and in Mark 13:14 it says "standing where it ought not". In truth, that by the authority and command of Caesar, or by a false election of the cardinals, a supreme vicar of Christ should be constituted is an abomination in the abstract. And if faithful souls saw clearly, on both sides, the spiritual state of the church: how there used to preside in it one householder, who would graciously receive by inviting, feed by refreshing, and defend [222]by helping all his domestics whatever.[12] But now they would find presiding in the same house of the church a blasphemous hypocrite, of altogether the opposite condition: no wonder if very many are made desolate. It is as if a traveller used to lodge with a householder of magnificent largesse, and afterwards, entering the house, found a monstrous beast which tyrannizes over guests hungrily, slyly and treacherously: seeing such a one sit in the chair of the kind householder, he would be made not a little desolate at the sight. So then I understand the abomination of desolation, prophesied and proclaimed in the gospel, which Christ commands the intellectual part of the church to understand from the effect. Nor is it a wonder if later men, taught by experience, know this sense more particularly than the earlier saints, to whom it was not revealed by the effect or prophetically. For knowledge of the sense of scripture and holiness do not in general correspond.

Notes

1. Gratian, *Decretum* D. 22 c. 2 (*Sacrosancta*), with c. 3 for the see of Constantinople, as Loserth gives them; the form is ours. Loserth's italics end the quotation at *exortum est* and resume at *propter hoc … nova Roma*; we follow them.
2. *Decretum* D. 22 c. 4, from Gregory, as Loserth gives it. *Ibidem* is the same distinction.
3. *Opposite Christo*: so Loserth, marked *(sic)*; the manuscripts read *oppositi*. We take *opposite* as a participle agreeing with *mulieri*, "the woman, who had set against Christ" the words of John 4:20, which are hers, not Christ's; Christ's answer, "the hour cometh …", is John 4:23. At 219.20 B omits *adorabunt*. S. Wyclif's *in quo* for the Vulgate's *ubi* (4:20) changes nothing in the English.
4. *Montuose*, "as on a mountain": the mind's ascent replaces the Samaritans' mountain. *Memorativa potencia* is the soul's faculty (*potencia* as "power", not Aristotle's potency); Wyclif glosses it as *intelligencia*. *Cum spiritus sit Deus* echoes John 4:24 ("God is a spirit").
5. Inside the Douay quotation of Philippians 3:20, DR's "conversation" (heavenly citizenship) stands for *conversacio*; elsewhere it is "manner of life". C. *Ubi afficitur*: the soul is where its affection is set.
6. Wyclif's *templum Domini est, quod estis vos* is closest to 1 Corinthians 3:17 (Vulgate *templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos*; DR "the temple of God is holy, which you are"); his reference is 3:16 ("you are the temple of God"). We translate his Latin.
7. *Ad secundas personas alias*: taken as the other two persons of the Trinity, addressed "in the second place" by the second and third petitions (thy kingdom come, thy will be done), after the first is said to the Father. *Difformem*: one not yet conformed to the divine will; the print is read on the plate.
8. At 220.23–24 the apparatus reports *sic in terra sit proporcionaliter conformitas* as missing in a manuscript (the siglum is not legible in the scan); the print governs.
9. *Decretum* D. 40 c. 2 (*Non est facile*), c. 3 (*Nos qui presumus*), c. 4 (*Non loca*), and c. 12 (*Multi sunt sacerdotes*), as Loserth gives them.
10. John 4:21; "salvation is of the Jews" is John 4:22. At 221.11 B reads *a fide* and *creditur*; the print governs.
11. *Cum protestacione predicta*: the submission formula Wyclif made earlier, that he will retract what is shown contrary to scripture or reason. S. The words of Christ (Matthew 24:15) agree with the Vulgate; Daniel 9:27.
12. The conditional *si fideles anime viderent …* has no main clause; the period breaks off, and *Modo autem invenirent* opens the contrast. We keep the break.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 218: *Et*
  - 218: *apud*
  - 218: *Anthiochiam*
  - 218: *Petrus*
  - 219: *venerat*
  - 219: *Ignacium*
  - 219: *episcopum*
  - 219: *ubi*
  - 219: *christianorum*
  - 219: *exortum*
  - 219: *est*
  - 219: *humilitatis*
  - 219: *Et*
  - 219: *veri*
  - 219: *III*
  - 220: ∅ (box is on the English side-note (temple / adoring); no Latin word there)
  - 221: *loco* (print "stantem in loco sancto"; the main scan lost loco)
  - 222: *Nec*
  - 220: *difformem* (LEFT-nw: print = printed; line number 20 follows)

Chapter 10

Part 1: The objection that the pope must be the mightiest lord

Loserth pp. 222.20–223.12

¶1 222.20–222.28

222.20 *It is argued that the pope's secular greatness is needed for the protection of the Church.*

[222]**Contra dicta arguitur per multa media tam raciones quam testimonia, et primo per deducens ad inconsequens probatur quod oportet papam esse dominum terre potissimum, quia aliter non sufficeret pro illo ministerio, sed subditi, eciam clerici, forent sibi inproporcionales quoad mundanam potenciam; ymo in possessione mundana vel securitate eius est occasio virtutis non vicii, et per consequens est racionabiliter appetenda.**

Against what has been said it is argued by appeal to many middle terms, reasons as well as testimonies.[1] And first, by an argument leading to what does not follow, it is proved that the pope must be the mightiest lord of the earth: because otherwise he would not be sufficient for that ministry, but his subjects, even clerics, would be out of proportion to him as regards worldly power;[2] indeed, in worldly possession, or in the security of it, there is occasion of virtue, not of vice, and consequently it is reasonably to be sought.

¶2 222.29–223.12

[222]**In isto oportet ex fide credere summo medico Ihesu Christo, cuius est palatum oris mentis sanissimum, omnes autem infecti febribus, et** [223]**cum alio genere morborum spiritualium, patimur discrasiam. Ideo sibi debemus credere, postposito nostro iudicio. Ipse autem verbis docuit et facto ac vita exposuit quod in diviciarum mundi affluencia est periculum et in earum parcitate ac remocione a seculo medicina, ideo reservavit illud regimen carioribus eius discipulis, ut patet Luce XVII et testatur Augustinus in De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus: Bonum est facultates cum dispensacione erogare pauperibus, sed melius est pro intencione sequendi Dominum semel donare, et absolutum sollicitudine egere cum Christo.**

In this one must, as faith teaches, believe the supreme physician Jesus Christ, whose palate of the mouth of the mind is most healthy; but all of us, infected with fevers and [223]**with another kind of spiritual diseases, suffer distemper.[3] Therefore we must believe him, setting our own judgement aside. Now he taught by words, and set forth by deed and life, that in the abundance of the world's riches there is danger, and in their scantiness and in withdrawal from the world a medicine; therefore he reserved that regimen for his dearer disciples, as is clear from Luke 17,[4] and as Augustine testifies in *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*: "It is good to pay out one's means to the poor with careful distribution; but it is better, with the intention of following the Lord, to give them all at once and, freed from care, to be in want with Christ."[5]**

Notes

1. ***Media***: the middle terms (premisses) of the arguments to come, divided into ***raciones*** (arguments from reason) and ***testimonia*** (authorities). Chapter 10 now gives the objections to chapter 9's account.
2. ***Per deducens ad inconsequens***: literally "by [an argument] leading to what does not follow", i.e. leading the opposite view to an untenable result; the usual form is ***ad inconveniens*** ("to an absurdity"), and ***inconsequens*** may be a slip, but the print stands. C. ***Potencia*** here is "power" (worldly might), not Aristotle's potency.
3. ***Discrasia*** (dyscrasia) is the physicians' term for a bad mixture of the humours, "distemper"; the image is the healthy palate that alone judges taste rightly. ***Autem*** here sets "all of us" against Christ: "but".
4. "Luke 17" is the print; the counsel to sell all and follow is Luke 18:22 (cf. Luke 14:33). We keep Wyclif's reference.
5. Gennadius of Marseilles, ***Liber de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*** 38 (71 in some editions), transmitted under Augustine's name; Loserth refers to the Maurist Augustine, vol. 8, appendix, p. 79, c. 38 (PL 58, 997, cap. 71: ***Bonum est facultates cum dispensatione pauperibus erogare. Melius est pro intentione sequendi Dominum insimul donare, et absolutum sollicitudine cum Christo egere***).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **222: *CAPITULUM DECIMUM.***
  - **222: *ad***
  - **222: *arguitur* (box sits on Contra; word with junk is arguitur, line number 20 at line end; print clean)**

Part 2: The plea of papal poverty and Otto's demand

Loserth pp. 223.13–228.13

¶1 223.13–228.13
223.13 *The plea is false, for the Church throve most when poor.*
223.23 *Attempt at extortion by the pope's legate Otto.*
224.22 *How it was repelled.*
225.9 *The request was scandalous.*
225.20 *It claimed much more than was needed and did not follow the precedent of St. Paul.*
226.12 *Experience shews evil of endowment.*
226.23 *The pope has no right to exact money from England.*
227.7 *Constantine's donation gives no dominion here.*
227.21 *Harm done by the popes in weakening the Empire.*
227.30 *Limits of obedience to the Pope.*

[223] **Quantum ad primum obiectum de ministerii pape insufficiencia, patet quod falsum assumitur, ut patet de Christo, Petro et ceteris papis, sub quibus crevit ecclesia. A tempore autem, quo dimisso papali officio mundo intenderant, de tanto erant magis circa temporalia sitibundi, quia Ecclesiastes V, 9 dicit Salamon: Avarus non implebitur pecunia, et qui amat divicias fructus non capiet ex eis. Unde in predicta cronica que intitulatur Flores historiarum dicitur, quomodo anno domini 1226 magister Otho nunccius domini pape ostendit literas domini pape consilio regni nostri apud Westmonasterium, in quibus papa allegavit scandalum Romane ecclesie et obprobrium vetustissimum, notam scilicet cupiditatis que radix est omnium malorum, in hoc precipue, quod nullus potest aliquod negocium in Romana curia expedire, nisi effusa magna summa pecunie et donorum exhibicione. Sed quoniam scandali huius et infamie Romana paupertas est causa, deberent matris inopiam** [224] **sublevare filii naturales, quia nisi a vobis et aliis viris honestis dona receperimus, deficerent nobis vite necessaria, quod esset omnino Romane incongruum dignitati. Ad illud itaque scandalum penitus eradicandum per consilium fratrum nostrorum sancte Romane ecclesie cardinalium, quandam providimus formam, cui si volueritis consentire, a scandalo matrem vestram poteritis liberare et in curia sine donorum obsequio exhibicionem iusticie obtinere. Forma autem provisa est hec: Petimus inprimis ab omnibus ecclesiis cathedralibus duas nobis prebendas exhiberi, unam de porcione episcopi et alteram de capitulo, et similiter de cenobiis, ubi diverse sunt porciones abbatis et conventus, a conventibus quantum pertinet ad unum monachum equali facta distribucione bonorum suorum, et tantumdem de abbate. Sed postquam maturatum est consilium, posuerunt responsum in ore magistri Johannis archidiaconi Bedfordensis, qui, cum dixisset nunccio quod peticio concernit ius regis, ius dominorum secularium et multorum absencium patronorum, clerus ille non potuit in eorum absencia finaliter respondere. Interimque venit dominus Johannes Marescallus et alii nunccii regis, districcius inhibentes quod nec clerus nec Otto nunccius attemptet aliquid quod tangit**

As to the first objection, on the insufficiency of the pope's ministry,[1] it is clear that a falsehood is assumed, as is clear in the case of Christ, Peter and the other popes under whom the church grew. And from the time when, having left off the papal office, they had given their minds to the world, they were by so much the more thirsty for temporal goods; for in Ecclesiastes 5:9 Solomon says: "A covetous man shall not be satisfied with money: and he that loveth riches shall reap no fruit from them." Hence in the aforesaid chronicle, which is entitled *Flores historiarum*, it is told how in the year of the Lord 1226 Master Otto, the lord pope's nuncio, showed the lord pope's letters to the council of our kingdom at Westminster, in which the pope alleged the scandal of the Roman church and its most ancient reproach, namely the mark of greed, "which is the root of all evils", in this especially, that no one can dispatch any business in the Roman curia except by pouring out a great sum of money and the offering of gifts. "But since the poverty of Rome is the cause of this scandal and ill fame, her natural sons ought to relieve their mother's [224] **need; for unless we received gifts from you and from other honest men, the necessaries of life would fail us, which would be wholly unbefitting the dignity of Rome.[2] Therefore, to root out that scandal entirely,[3] by the counsel of our brethren the cardinals of the holy Roman church we have provided a certain form, to which if you will consent, you will be able to free your mother from scandal and to obtain the showing of justice in the curia without the service of gifts. And the form provided is this: we ask first that two prebends be given us from all cathedral churches, one from the bishop's portion and the other from the chapter's; and likewise from monasteries where the portions of the abbot and of the convent are distinct, from the convents as much as pertains to one monk, an equal distribution of their goods having been made, and as much again from the abbot." But after the counsel had ripened, they put the answer in the mouth of Master John, archdeacon of Bedford, who, having told the nuncio that the request concerned the right of the king, the right of the**

feodum regis nec molestet clerum Anglie, qui tenet baronias vel alias elemosinas de rege in capite. Sic scandalosa pape peticio est frustrata. Habet autem mandatum regis racionem vivacem. Cum enim ante dotacionem ecclesie fuit regnum nostrum iure possessionatum conformiter legi Christi, nimis monstruosum foret quod papalis exaccio extorqueret aliquid contrarium iuri regni. Rex autem nedum debet defendere secularem ecclesiam, sed [225] ecclesiam cleri Anglie in sua libertate primeva, ut dicit beatus Ysidorus de summo bono libro III et corporatur XXIII questio V: Principes. Christus autem prohibuit vicariis suis dominacionem huiusmodi, et in signum confirmacionis ac subieccionis cleris seculari dominio dedit per Petrum tributum Cesari, ut patet Matth. XVII; potens igitur blasfemie tali resistere et omittens nimis est culpabilis ex consensu. Et dico quod fuit scandalosa peticio, quia non posset patencius accusare curiam, quam sibi contradictorius nominat sanctam sedem. Si enim tanta cupiditatis macula sic regnat in illa curia, indubie sequitur quod papa et cardinales sunt rei illius criminis vel consenciendo, auctorizando vel ipse in persona propria illam facinorosam cupidinem committendo; nam ex fide pro nullo bono possibili committerent tantum crimen, igitur multo magis non pro temporali iudicio tantum ab apostolicis alieno. Iterum, videtur quod forma excedit peticionem apostolicam, tum quia multi centenarii paparum possent de tanta elemosina sustentari, eciam complendo plenum papale officium, ut dicit Bernhardus libro IV ad Eugenium, et testatur Apostolus prima Thim. VI, 8—10, ubi dicens quod radix omnium malorum est cupiditas pro remedio sic subdit: Habentes igitur alimenta et quibus tegamur hiis contenti simus. Forma igitur apostolica ibi deest, cum Apostolus consulit pro relevamine multorum sanctorum Jerusalem quod quilibet ecclesie Chorinthiorum qui voluerit benediccionem dare sanctis Jerusalem reponat quod placuerit dare abscondite, ut patet II. Cor. IX. [226] Hic autem papa et cardinales diffiniunt dominative quantum de redditu annuali in animarum periculum papa vult habere de Anglia, Ista, inquam, non est vox egentis sed exactoris bona pauperum rapina subdola subtrahentis. Cum enim papa ante dotacionem ecclesie sine tali elemosina melius exercuit papale officium et post dotacionem ad valorem multiplicis regni nostri sit magis cupidus et in operibus plus remissus, probabile est quod plus elemosine magis accenderet eius cupidinem, ut dixi superius ex Salamonis sentencia Ecclesiastes V. Sic enim contingit in aliis regnis nostri temporis, quos dotarunt domini, ut quiecius complerent episcopale officium et minus subditos onerarent, in quo, quia dereliquerunt Christi regulam, in toto

secular lords and of many absent patrons, [said that] that clergy could not answer finally in their absence.[4] And meanwhile there came the lord John Marshal and other messengers of the king, strictly forbidding that either the clergy or Otto the nuncio attempt anything that touches the king's fee, or trouble the clergy of England who hold baronies or other alms of the king in chief.[5] So the pope's scandalous request was frustrated. And the king's mandate has a lively reason. For since before the endowment of the church our kingdom was possessioned by right, in conformity with the law of Christ, it would be exceedingly monstrous that a papal exaction should extort anything contrary to the right of the kingdom. And the king is bound to defend not only the secular church but [225] the church of the clergy of England in its first liberty, as blessed Isidore says in *On the Highest Good*, book 3, and it is incorporated in [Causa] 23, question 5, *Principes*.[6] Now Christ forbade his vicars exercise of lordship of this kind, and as a sign of the confirmation and subjection of the clergy to secular lordship he gave tribute to Caesar through Peter, as is clear in Matthew 17; therefore one who is able to resist such blasphemy and omits to do so is exceedingly culpable by consent.[7] And I say that it was a scandalous request, because he could not more openly accuse the curia, which, contradicting himself, he names "the holy see". For if so great a stain of greed reigns thus in that curia, it follows without doubt that the pope and the cardinals are guilty of that crime, either by consenting, by authorizing, or by himself committing that wicked greed in his own person;[8] for, as faith teaches, they ought not to commit so great a crime for any possible good; therefore much less for a temporal judgement so foreign to apostolic men. Again, it seems that the form exceeds an apostolic request: first because many hundreds of popes could be sustained by so great an alms, even fulfilling the full papal office, as Bernard says in book 4 to Eugenius,[9] and as the Apostle testifies in 1 Timothy 6:8–10, where, saying that "the desire of money is the root of all evils", he adds this as a remedy: "Having therefore food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content."[10] Therefore the apostolic form is lacking there, since the Apostle counsels, for the relief of many saints of Jerusalem, that each one of the church of the Corinthians who wishes to give a blessing to the saints of Jerusalem should lay up secretly what it pleases him to give, as is clear in 2 Corinthians 9.[11] [226] But here the pope and the cardinals define in the manner of lords how much yearly revenue the pope wills to have from England, to the peril of souls. This, I say, is not the voice of one in need but of an exactor who takes away the

contingit oppositum. Sunt enim in visitacionibus plus cupidi, minus intendentes spirituali profectui et plus subditis onerosi, in tantum quod, ut experti referunt, multitudo ministrorum episcopi excoriat pauperes, ut scriptor, sigillator, barbitonsor et ceteri secundum superfluas cerimonias introducti. Item, querendum est quo iure papa vendicat a regno Anglie tam dominanter subsidium; non iure divino, cum ipsum limitat vite necessaria, de quanto sustentat in evangelio laborantem, ut patet I. Cor. IX. Cum igitur papa non evangelizat Anglie, sed consumendo personas atque pecuniam per suam vocatam iusticiam multipliciter debilitat regnum nostrum, videtur quod non exinde meretur a nobis benediccionem recipere. Ideo oportet quod iure cesaris vendicet huiusmodi principatum, ut multipliciter declaratum est VIII cap. Sed cum regnum Anglie non subiacet Romano imperio, videtur quod non iure vel concessione [227]cesaris debet ipse dominium in nobis vel nostris possessionibus vendicare. Non enim habet ex titulo cesaris amplius dominium, quam originaliter habuit qui donavit. Sed patet ex facto et cronicis quod rex noster devicit cesarem, licet ad morulam ex casu proditorio sibi per modum tyrannidis est subiectus. Notet igitur homo cartam cesaris de dotacione ecclesie XCVI distinccione Constantinus cum aliis cronicis, et videbit quod regnum nostrum, sicut non subiugatur imperio, sic nec Romano pontifici, nisi sicut quilibet christianus debet ex lege caritatis subdi alteri, et conversi fuerunt subditi sancto Petro. Sed longe hoc a forma sic vendicandi subsidium. Unde videtur michi quod consulendum est regno Anglie quod eo accepcius subdatur vero pape (sicut contigit de multis Romanis episcopis) quo liberius modo quo debet homo promerens illud facit, cavendo semper ne aliquis pontifex vendicando dominium blasfemet in eum, quia nichil magis enervat imperium. Sic enim translatum est Romanum imperium in Germanos et tantum aporiatur quod vix sibi subditur civiliter dux vel comes. Et generaliter sic decrescit dominium quod est blasfemo clericali dominio subiugatum. Satis est igitur quod regnum nostrum tantum sibi obediat, quantum docere potest ex scriptura, in qua est omnis veritas, quod populus obedire debuit sancto Petro, docto ex sanctitate vite et operis quod sit verus Petri vicarius, ymo posito quod sit blasfemus, adhuc videtur michi quod populus debet obedire sibi dupliciter: [228]primo in quantum est creatura Dei, dicens naturaliter veritatem catholicam faciendam, et secundo resistendo, dum a lege Dei exorbitat, cum naturaliter illud petit. Sic autem obedivit Paulus Petro Gal. II et sic obedierunt reges et clerici pseudopapis ipsos deponendo. Obediendo autem homini secundum racionem falsam, ut puta secundum racionem qua false

goods of the poor by sly robbery. For since before the endowment of the church the pope exercised the papal office better without such alms, and after an endowment worth many times our kingdom he is more covetous and slacker in works, it is probable that more alms would kindle his greed the more, as I said above from Solomon's teaching, Ecclesiastes 5. For so it happens in other kingdoms of our time [with the bishops] whom the lords endowed so that they might fulfil the episcopal office more quietly and burden their subjects less;[12] in which, because they have abandoned Christ's rule, the opposite happens altogether. For in visitations they are more covetous, less intent on spiritual profit and more burdensome to their subjects, so much so that, as the experienced report, the bishop's multitude of servants flays the poor: the scribe, the sealer, the barber and the rest, brought in according to superfluous ceremonies. Again, it must be asked by what right the pope claims so lordly a subsidy from the kingdom of England. Not by divine right, since that limits it to the necessaries of life, in so far as it sustains one who labours in the gospel, as is clear in 1 Corinthians 9.[13] Since, therefore, the pope does not preach the gospel to England, but, consuming persons and money through his so-called justice, weakens our kingdom in many ways, it seems that he does not on that account deserve to receive a blessing from us. Therefore he must claim a principality of this kind by Caesar's right, as was shown in many ways in chapter 8. But since the kingdom of England is not subject to the Roman empire, it seems that he ought not to claim lordship over us or our possessions by the right or grant [227]of Caesar. For he does not have more lordship from Caesar's title than the one who gave it originally had. Now it is clear from the fact and from the chronicles that our king overcame Caesar, although for a short while, by a treacherous mischance, he was subjected to him by way of tyranny.[14] Let a man therefore note Caesar's charter on the endowment of the church, distinction 96, *Constantinus*, together with other chronicles, and he will see that our kingdom, as it is not subjugated to the empire, so neither to the Roman pontiff, except as any Christian ought by the law of charity to be subject to another, and as converts were subject to St Peter.[15] But this is far from the form of claiming a subsidy in this way. Hence it seems to me that the kingdom of England should be counselled to submit to a true pope (as happened with many Roman bishops) the more acceptably the more freely it does so, in the way in which a man who merits ought to,[16] always taking care that no pontiff, by claiming lordship, blaspheme against him; for nothing more enervates an empire. For so the Roman

creditur habere potestatem vel excellenciam quam adeo non habeat, est utrumque peccatum dampnabile, cum ut sic colitur Antichristus et abhominacio desolacionis stans in templo, de qua legitur evangelium cum propheta.

empire was transferred to the Germans, and is so impoverished that scarcely a duke or count is civilly subject to it. And in general, lordship that is subjugated to blasphemous clerical lordship dwindles in this way. It is enough, therefore, that our kingdom obey him as far as one can show from scripture, in which is all truth, that the people ought to have obeyed St Peter, [he being] shown by holiness of life and work to be the true vicar of Peter;[17] indeed, supposing that he is a blasphemer, it still seems to me that the people ought to obey him in two ways: [228] first in so far as he is God's creature, by nature declaring the catholic truth that is to be done; and secondly by resisting him while he swerves from God's law, since by nature he asks for that.[18] And so Paul obeyed Peter (Galatians 2), and so kings and clerics obeyed pseudo-popes by deposing them. And to obey a man on a false account, as for instance on the account by which he is falsely believed to have a power or excellence that he does not have at all, is on both sides a damnable sin,[19] since in that way Antichrist is worshipped, and "the abomination of desolation standing in the temple", of which one reads in the gospel together with the prophet.[20]

Notes

1. The "first objection" was put in the preceding part of the chapter: that the pope's ministry cannot be sustained without a subsidy from the kingdoms. Wyclif answers that the church grew under poor popes (Loserth's side-note at 223.13).
2. *Flores historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, vol. 2, p. 184, for the year 1226 (Loserth). Loserth's italics run from "Otto, the lord pope's nuncio" to "from the abbot", one quotation of the chronicle; we put quotation marks only where the letter speaks in its own person ("But since the poverty ..."), since the opening is the chronicle's report. "The root of all evils" is 1 Tim. 6:10, quoted inside the letter. The shift from *filii* (third person) to *a vobis ... receperimus* is the letter's.
3. *Eradicandum* is not in the manuscripts; Loserth supplied it ("Codd.: eradicandum deest. Addidi", 224.5), and the *Flores historiarum* he follows reads *eradicandum*. Translated as printed.
4. The sentence breaks off: the relative *qui, cum dixisset ...* gets no verb of its own, and *clerus ille non potuit ... respondere* gives what John said. We supply "[said that]".
5. *Feodum* "fee" (the fief); *in capite* "in chief", tenure of the king directly. The clergy's baronies are counted among their "alms" held of the king (the tenure in alms).
6. Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) 3.51.4 (old chapter 53); received in Gratian, *Decretum* C.23 q.5 c.20 *Principes saeculi* (Loserth gives "Decreti Secunda Pars, Causa XXIII, Quaest. V, cap. XX"; the modern form is ours). *Corporatur*: "is incorporated" in the Decretum.
7. Matt. 17:23–26, the stater found in the fish's mouth and paid "for me and thee" (DR 17:26). *Cleris* is dative plural with *subieccionis*: the clergy's subjection to secular lordship. *Autem* brings the premiss on which *igitur* closes: "Now".
8. *Auctorizando* is Loserth's emendation; the manuscripts read *autendo* (225.15). The singular *ipse ... committendo* after "the pope and the cardinals" is the manuscripts' reading (Loserth: "ipse; ita codd."): Wyclif turns to the pope alone. *Committerent*: "ought not to commit", the subjunctive of obligation (or potential: "they would not commit").
9. Bernard, *De consideratione* 4.3.6 (to Eugenius III; PL 182, 776): Peter went without gems, silk, gold, horse, soldiers and ministers, *absque his tamen credidit satis posse impleri salutare mandatum: Si amas me, pasce oves meas ... In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino*. Loserth gives no reference; the "hundreds of popes" are Wyclif's.
10. 1 Tim. 6:10, 6:8. Wyclif's *igitur* stands where the Vulgate has *autem* (DR "But having food ..."); otherwise he agrees with the Vulgate, and DR is kept.
11. 2 Cor. 9:5–7 ("this blessing ... so as a blessing"; "every one as he hath determined in his heart"); the laying up (*reponat*) is closer to 1 Cor. 16:2 ("laying up what it shall well please him"). *Benediccio* is Paul's word for the collection, a gift: "blessing" (DR), so again at 226.27.
12. *Quos* has no expressed antecedent (226.11; the plate shows no word lost): Wyclif means the bishops whom the lords endowed, and we supply "[with the bishops]".
13. At *iure divino* (226.25) the manuscripts read *iure dominio* (Loserth, foot; so the plate); the print is translated. A reads *sustentant* (226.26). The rule is 1 Cor. 9:14: "they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel."
14. Richard I, taken by the duke of Austria (1192) and sold to the emperor Henry VI: Loserth's reference, *Flores historiarum* 2.107, 114 (Loserth prints "I", but Luard's first volume ends at 1066), and Matthew Paris 2.394.
15. Gratian, *Decretum* D.96 c.14 *Constantinus*, the Donation of Constantine, quoted at 232.18 (Loserth there: "Cap. XIV").

16. Loserth: "Codd.: Sed contigit. Hic locus corruptus esse videtur" (227.17). The print's *sicut contigit* is translated, and the *eo … quo* comparison as it stands: the submission is the more acceptable the more freely it is given; *promerens* "who merits", i.e. who does it meritoriously. *In eum* ("against him") most likely means the true pope, or God.
17. *Docto* agrees with *sibi*: the pope, "shown" by holiness of life to be Peter's true vicar. The subject of *docere potest* is unexpressed; we take it as general ("one"); it may be the pope himself.
18. *Cum naturaliter illud petit*: his nature as God's creature itself asks to be resisted when he swerves. *Illud* could instead be the catholic truth just named. Paul's obedience by resistance: Gal. 2:11, "I withstood him to the face" (Loserth 228.16).
19. *Utrumque*: on the side of the one who obeys and of the one obeyed. *Racio* is the ground on which obedience is given.
20. Matt. 24:15; Dan. 9:27 (Loserth 228.11). Wyclif's *stans in templo* is Daniel's *in templo* set into Matthew's phrase; the Vulgate of Matthew has *stantem in loco sancto* (DR "standing in the holy place").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 223: *ut* (15 is the line number)
  - 223: *Flores*
  - 224: *naturales*
  - 224: *penitus*
  - 224: *obtinere* [NW]
  - 224: *multorum*
  - 224: *clerus*
  - 225: *illa*
  - 225: *8—10* (print "Thim. VI, 8—10,"; one token)
  - 225: *cupiditas*
  - 225: *hiis*
  - 226: *annuali*
  - 226: *nostri*
  - 227: ∅ (15 is the line number)
  - 227: *vite* (30 is the line number)
  - 225: *relevamine* (LEFT-nw: hyphenated rele-|vamine; print has v)
  - 226: *rapina* (box in blank gap after rapina; nothing printed there)

Part 3: Primacy from the Lord, the submission of kingdoms, the doctors

Loserth pp. 228.14–232.13

¶1 228.14–230.21
228.14 *The pope said to have his primacy direct from God.*
228.26 *This is true only of a pope who follows Peter and Paul*
228.33 *and of a spiritual primacy.*
230.4 *Perplexity in which the popes are involved by their claims.*
230.22 *The right to rule is not increased because subjects submit rashly.*

[228]Sed secundo arguitur quod papa habet potestatem talem a Domino, ut dicit decretum XXII distinccione Sacrosancta, ubi Anacletus papa sic loquitur: Sacrosancta Romana ecclesia non ab apostolis sed ab ipso Domino primatum obtinuit. Ex quo sequitur quod non ab imperatore vel homine sed immediate a Deo papa habet excellentissimam dignitatem. Et idem confirmatur secundo ex submissione regnorum, et tercio ex testimonio doctorum de potestate pape absolvendi a pena et a culpa scribencium. Quantum ad primam partem huius argucie debet supponi quod iste papa intellexit per sacrosanctam Romanem ecclesiam non basilicam vel mixtum putridum, sed sanctos Petrum et Paulum et ceteros qui inhabitaverant illum locum. Ideo in eodem decreto dicit quod Petrus et Paulus erant socii in urbe Romana, unde signanter dicitur quod primatum obtinuit. Debet supponi secundo quod loquitur de primatu hominum quoad Deum, ex primicia virtutum et edificacionis ecclesie et non [229]

But secondly it is argued that the pope has such power from the Lord, as the decree says in distinction 22, *Sacrosancta*, where Pope Anacletus speaks thus: "The most holy Roman church obtained the primacy not from the apostles but from the Lord himself."[1] From which it follows that the pope has the most excellent dignity not from the emperor or from man but immediately from God. And the same is confirmed, secondly, from the submission of kingdoms, and thirdly from the testimony of doctors who write on the pope's power to absolve from punishment and from guilt. As to the first part of this quibble,[2] it must be supposed that this pope understood by "the most holy Roman church" not a basilica or a rotting mixture, but Saints Peter and Paul and the others who had dwelt in that place. Therefore in the same decree he says that "Peter and Paul were companions in the city of Rome"; hence it is said pointedly that it "obtained the primacy". It must be supposed secondly that he speaks

de primatu diviciarum temporalium vel glorie humane. In hoc enim Scarioth qui possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis, ut dicit Petrus Act. primo, Petrum excesserat, propter quod sancti et specialiter apostoli timuerunt impetrare sibi redditus de bonis pauperum. Et ex istis patet tercio quam nuda foret argucia: Romana ecclesia non ab apostolis sed ab ipso Domino primatum obtinuit, igitur omnis Romanus pontifex vel alius debet in gloria mundana precellere vel seculariter dominari, quin pocius ex decreto sequitur quod Romanus pontifex tenetur servire illi populo, non sibi dominando vel ipsum suspendendo, sed pro illo efficaciter exorando, ut allegat Paulum fecisse Rom. primo: Licet, inquit, pro omnibus apud Dominum omnium sanctorum effundatur oracio, hiis tamen verbis Paulus beatissimus Romanis proprio cyrographo pollicetur dicens: Testis enim michi est Deus, cui servio in spiritu meo, in evangelio filii eius, quod sine intermissione memoriam vestri facio semper in oracionibus meis. Ex isto decreto videtur quod papa Anacletus noluit asserere quod ipse debuit super omnes alios dominari civiliter vel primatum habere quoad Deum super omnes alias personas ecclesie militantis, quia sic querendo gloriam propriam, ut dicitur Joh. V, haberet signum evidentissimum Antichristi, ymo Bonifacius VIII. in sua extravagante Unam sanctam non audebat expresse illud asserere, quia tam fideles quam infideles pertinenter sibi obicerent: Tu de te ipso testimonium perhibes, testimonium tuum non est verum. Unde in istam perplexitatem ex dotacione et exaltacione cesaris involvuntur Romani pontifices, quod imperatore [230] querente ab eis: si ipsi in potestate, dignitate vel primatu quoad Deum excedunt omnes mortales alios iam viventes, oportet ipsos illud concedere, quia aliter, ut inquiunt, nemo debet credere quod sunt pape, et cum a Deo non habent illam preeminenciam, ut patet ex dictis, nec beatus Petrus illud concederet, patet eis concedendum quod hoc habent a cesare. Nam beatus Paulus Petri socius confessus fuit fideliter prima Cor. XV, 9: Ego, inquit, sum minimus apostolorum, qui non sum dignus vocari apostolus. Quare igitur sic non profiteretur Romanus pontifex, si imperialis dignitas non obstaret? Et sic necessitari videtur ex dotacione tam imperator quam suus episcopus involvi blasfemiam. Et sic verum concluditur quod a Deo immediate et non a natura humana papa habet excellenciam dignitatis, sed oportet quod mereatur illam excellenciam dignitatis humiliter sine pompa. Et revera non est medium merendi ipsam accipere dignitatem talem cesaream.

of men's primacy with respect to God, from being first in virtues and in the building up of the church,[3] and not [229] of a primacy of temporal riches or of human glory. For in this Iscariot, who "possessed a field of the reward of iniquity", as Peter says in Acts 1, had surpassed Peter; for which reason the saints, and especially the apostles, feared to obtain revenues for themselves from the goods of the poor. And from these things it is clear, thirdly, how bare the quibble would be: "The Roman church obtained the primacy not from the apostles but from the Lord himself; therefore every Roman pontiff, or anyone else, ought to excel in worldly glory or to lord it in secular fashion." Rather, from the decree it follows that the Roman pontiff is bound to serve that people, not by lording it over it or suspending it, but by praying effectively for it, as [the decree] alleges Paul to have done, Romans 1: "Although," it says, "prayer is poured out for all before the Lord of all the saints, yet with these words the most blessed Paul promises the Romans in his own handwriting, saying: 'For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make a commemoration of you, always in my prayers.'"[4] From this decree it seems that Pope Anacletus did not wish to assert that he ought to exercise civil lordship over all others or to have primacy with respect to God over all the other persons of the church militant; for, seeking his own glory in this way, as is said in John 5, he would have the most evident sign of Antichrist.[5] Indeed, Boniface VIII in his extravagant *Unam sanctam* did not dare to assert that expressly, because believers and unbelievers alike would pertinently object to him: "Thou givest testimony of thyself: thy testimony is not true."[6] Hence the Roman pontiffs are entangled, through the endowment and exaltation [they had] from Caesar, in this perplexity: that if the emperor [230] asks them "whether they themselves, in power, dignity or primacy with respect to God, exceed all other mortals now living", they must grant it, because otherwise, as they say, no one ought to believe that they are popes; and since they do not have that preeminence from God, as is clear from what has been said, nor would blessed Peter grant it, it is clear that they must grant that they have it from Caesar.[7] For blessed Paul, Peter's companion, faithfully confessed in 1 Corinthians 15:9: "I am," he says, "the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle." Why therefore would the Roman pontiff not profess so, if the imperial dignity did not stand in the way? And so it seems to be made necessary by the endowment that both the emperor and his bishop are entangled in blasphemy. And so it is truly inferred that the pope has excellence of dignity immediately

¶2 230.22–231.27
231.1 *Scandalous saying of a pope.*

[230] **Quantum ad secundum partem argucie, patet quod non est color si regna vel persone submittunt se improvide Antichristo, quod propterea ampliatur in eo potestas vel iurisdiccio; ymo dyabolus negaret istam arguciam, cum filii sui subiecti per peccatum non augent in eo potenciam, eo quod tam ipse quam fidelis concederet quod non capit potestatem suam ab indignissimo servo suo, sed habet ipsam ab inicio a solo Deo. Non igitur ex submissione tali docetur quod papa habet a Deo vel homine preeminenciam aliqualem, sed pocius cum omnis populus vel involuntarie sic sibi subicitur vel non debet sic sibi subici, evidenter sequitur ex tali subieccione blasfema carencia dignitatis. Unde non video quomodo papa posset patencius accusare se ipsum** [231] **quam respondendo, ut narratur in quodam gesto Anglie, quomodo vacante episcopatu Dunelmie ex quadam subdola subtilitate clerici rex dicitur misisse pape, ut illud beneficium conferat suo clerico: rex autem et regnum ex scitu pape perante decreverant quod non obstante quacumque donacione pape promotus pape non perciperet fructus beneficii regni nostri, nisi regi et regno visus habilis, distribuendo illos fructus provide infra regnum, ipsum regnum velit incolere. Habito itaque longo consilio de literis regis papa fertur taliter respondisse: Et si rex misisset asinum pro illo beneficio, habuisset. Quod responsum manifeste indicat papam, et si prius dignus fuit ex lege privata papali illud officium contulisse, ab illo privilegio excedisse, quia XI questio III ex decreto beati Gregorii sic habetur: Privilegium omnino debet amittere, qui sibi permissa abutitur potestate. Maior autem in isto non posset esse abusio, quam scienter constituere indignum in clericali officio. Ista autem fallacia imaginatur de potestate ecclesiastica quod secularis potest eam dare sicut bovem vel asinum, vel quod ex defectu defensionis partis contrarie preposito spirituali acquiritur, si instituitur in quibusdam tradicionibus humanis. Sed deliramenta sunt ista.**

from God and not from human nature; but he must merit that excellence of dignity humbly, without pomp. And in truth to accept such a caesarean dignity is no means of meriting it.

As to the second part of the quibble, it is clear that there is no colour [for saying], if kingdoms or persons submit themselves improvidently to Antichrist, that his power or jurisdiction is therefore enlarged in him;[8] indeed, the devil would deny this quibble, since his sons, subjected [to him] through sin, do not increase power in him, because both he and a believer would grant that he does not take his power from his most unworthy servant, but has it from the beginning from God alone.[9] Not therefore from such submission is it shown that the pope has any preeminence from God or from man; but rather, since every people is either subjected to him thus involuntarily or ought not to be subjected to him thus, from such blasphemous subjection there follows evidently a lack of dignity.[10] Hence I do not see how the pope could accuse himself more openly [231] **than by answering as is told in a certain English chronicle: how, when the bishopric of Durham was vacant, the king, through some sly subtlety of a cleric, is said to have sent to the pope that he should confer that benefice on his cleric. And the king and the kingdom, with the pope's knowledge, had decreed beforehand that, notwithstanding any gift of the pope, the pope's promoted man should not receive the fruits of a benefice of our kingdom unless, having seemed qualified to the king and the kingdom, and distributing those fruits providently within the kingdom, he were willing to dwell in the kingdom itself.[11] So, having held long counsel over the king's letters, the pope is reported to have answered thus: "Even if the king had sent an ass for that benefice, he would have had it." Which answer plainly shows that the pope, even if before he was worthy by private papal law to have conferred that office, has gone out from that privilege; for in [Causa] 11, question 3, from a decree of blessed Gregory, it is held thus: "He ought wholly to lose privilege who abuses the power permitted to him."[12] Now there could be no greater abuse in this than knowingly to set an unworthy man in a clerical office. And this fallacy imagines, concerning ecclesiastical power, that a secular can give it like an ox or an ass, or that it is acquired by a spiritual superior from the failure of the opposing party to make a defence, if he is instituted in certain human traditions.[13] But these are ravings.**

¶3 231.28–231.31

[231] **Quantum ad tercium partem, patet quod doctoribus istis non debet credi nisi ut testibus vel autoribus in quibus Christus loquitur velut probantibus suam sentenciam racione.**

As to the third part, it is clear that these doctors ought not to be believed except as witnesses or authors in whom Christ speaks, as proving their teaching by reason.[14]

¶4 232.1–232.3

232.1 *The absolving power of the pope cannot be proved.*

[232] **Quantum ad testimonium eorum, patet, cum tam potestas quam absolucio sit insensibilis, testimonium tante distancium non est conveniens.**

As to their testimony, it is clear that, since both power and absolution are imperceptible, the testimony of men so far removed is not fitting.[15]

¶5 232.4–232.13

[232] **Quantum ad secundum membrum, non est signum quod Deus eis revelavit istam sentenciam, cum non patet ex scriptis vel factis apostolorum, et quatuor maiores doctores hoc non recitent. Augustinus autem sepe recitat quomodo non debet credi sibi nisi de quanto se fundaverit ex scriptura. Nec dubito quin nec racio nec autoritas hoc convincit. Ideo ve illis, qui introduxerunt hunc errorem novellum infundabilem in ecclesiam sanctam Dei.**

As to the second member, it is no sign that God revealed this teaching to them, since it is not clear from the writings or deeds of the apostles, and the four greater doctors do not relate it. And Augustine often relates how he is not to be believed except so far as he has grounded himself on scripture.[16] **Nor do I doubt that neither reason nor authority proves this. Therefore woe to those who brought this new error, without foundation, into the holy church of God.**

Notes

1. Gratian, *Decretum* D.22 c.2 *Sacrosancta* (Loserth 228.16 "Cap. II"; the modern form is ours), a Pseudo-Isidorian decretal under the name of Anacletus. The words "Peter and Paul were companions in the city of Rome" (228.28) are from the same canon.
2. *Argucia* (here "quibble") names the whole argument just stated, with its three parts: the decree (228.24), the submission of kingdoms (230.22), the doctors (231.28).
3. *Ex primicia virtutum*: *primicia*, from *primicie* "first-fruits", is being first in virtue; kept apart from *primatus* "primacy" and *primitas* "firstness". The *primatus quoad Deum* is primacy in God's sight, set against primacy in riches.
4. Rom. 1:9–10, quoted within the canon (D.22 c.2), whose words Wyclif gives. *Pro omnibus apud Dominum omnium sanctorum*: we take *omnium sanctorum* with *Dominum*, "the Lord of all the saints"; it could also go with *omnibus*, "for all the saints". *Proprio cyrographo*: in his own hand, i.e. in his own letter.
5. John 5:41–44 ("the glory which is from God alone, you do not seek"); cf. John 7:18. Reference only.
6. Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam* (1302), *Extrav. comm.* 1.8.1 (Loserth 229.29; the modern form is ours). The objection is John 8:13, the Pharisees' words to Christ.
7. Loserth italicises the emperor's question (*si ipsi ... viventes*); we quote it. The *perplexitas* is the dilemma: the popes must claim a primacy over all, and since it is not from God it can only be from Caesar.
8. *Color*: a plausible ground, as in "colour of title"; not "pretext".
9. *Potencia* here is "power", as *potestas* in the same sentence; Wyclif uses the two words for the same thing.
10. We take *blasfema* with *subieccione* (ablative): "from such blasphemous subjection". Taken with *carencia* it gives "a blasphemous lack of dignity follows".
11. A vacancy at Durham: Loserth refers to Walsingham, *Ypodigma Neustriae* p. 284 (Loserth: 283), and *Historia Anglicana* 2.382 (appendix); the vacancy is that of 1345, when Clement VI gave Durham at the king's request to his secretary Thomas Hatfield and answered the objecting cardinals *si Rex pro asino supplicasset, obtinuisset*, with his own *Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Englands im 14. Jahrhundert*, *Sitzungsberichte* Vienna 136, 27. *Promotus pape*: the man the pope has provided to the benefice.
12. Gratian, *Decretum* C.11 q.3 c.63 *Privilegium* (Loserth 231.18 "Cap. LXIII"; the modern form is ours), under Gregory's name. *Excedisse*: he has gone out of, forfeited, the privilege.
13. *Ista autem fallacia* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *Istam autem fallaciam* (231.21). At *si instituitur* (231.25) the manuscripts read *si*; Loserth asks whether *sed* is meant ("but he is instituted [only] in human traditions"). The print *si* is translated.
14. *Suam sentenciam*: "their teaching", the doctors'; *suam* could refer to Christ ("his teaching").
15. *Tante distancium*: men far removed (in time from the apostles, or from the things they testify to, which cannot be perceived). The third part has two members: the doctors as witnesses (¶4) and as receivers of revelation (¶5).
16. Augustine says this of his own writings at *De Trinitate* 3 prooem. 2 (PL 42, 869: *Noli meis litteris quasi Scripturis canonicis inservire*), and of all writers outside the canon at *Epistula* 82.3 (PL 33, 277). The manuscripts note in the margin (232.8): *Credere doctoribus quando debemus* ("when we ought to believe the doctors"). The "four greater doctors" are Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome and Gregory.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **228: *obtinuit***
  - **228: *putridum* [NW]**
  - **228: *illum***
  - **229: *Deus***
  - **231: *literis***
  - **231: *beneficio* [NW]**
  - **232: *insensibilis* [NW]**
  - **228: *Petrus* (Petrns -> Petrus (scans: petrns | petrns | pclrus | petrus))**
  - **228: *supponi* (supponi + glued line number 25)**

Part 4: The donation of Constantine and the caesarean jurisdiction

Loserth pp. 232.14–235.34

¶1 232.14–235.34
232.19 *A decretal attributes the pope's primacy to the gift of the Emperor.*
233.1 *Eastern Christians disregard its indulgences and privileges.*
233.10 *The Cardinals revolted from Urban VI, because he tried to keep them to the apostolic life.*
234.1 *Many Roman pontiffs have been worldly.*
234.11 *These false claims cause a loss of jurisdiction.*
235.4 *Why do not modern popes exert the power they claim.*
235.29 *Paul had the power of edifying even more than Peter.*

[232] **Patet autem ex predictis quomodo Romanus pontifex fuit consocius aliis pontificibus usque ad dotacionem ecclesie et exhinc ex auctoritate cesaris cepit capitaliter dominari, unde decretum XCVI distinccione quod non possumus pro verecundia negare sic loquitur: Constantinus imperator quarto die sui baptismi privilegium Romane ecclesie pontifici contulit, ut in toto orbe pontifices ita hunc caput habeant sicut iudices regem. In quo privilegio ita inter cetera legitur: Tribuimus ei potestatem atque vigorem et honorificenciam imperialem, decernentes ut principatum teneat tam super quatuor sedes: Alexandrinam, Anthiochinam, Jerusolimitanam et Constantinopolitanam; celsior et princeps cunctis sacerdotibus tocius mundi existat. Et specificat posterius iurisdicionem sui episcopi, specificando patrias, Yndiam, Greciam et cetera secundum quatuor partes mundi. Propter hoc quidam vocant hanc potestatem iurisdicionis indulgencias et alia privilegia paparum cesarea.** [233] **Et hinc nimirum defidant christiani in Yndia, in Grecia et aliis contratis hoc privilegium, scientes quod non est hominis dare potestatem spiritualem, sed solius Dei, ut dicit Lynconiensis, Epistola XXIII, et sic postponunt indulgencias suas et privilegia, scientes quod secundum dignitatem persone habebit a Deo indulgenciam, nec suum est talem concedere, nisi instrumentaliter in quantum fuerit fidelis Domini promulgator; et aliter illudit populo. Quam sentenciam audivi de papa nostro Urbano VI ipsum dixisse cardinalibus Gregorii qui excessit decalogum ac quia increpans eorum limitavit eos ad vitam apostolicam primevam, conspiraverant contra eum, eligendo sibi Robertum Gilbonensem, virum ut dicitur dissolutum, superbum, bellicosum et legis Christi ignarum. Ideo procul ab Anglicis scola sua, cum Luce XVII, 23 de tali divisione dicit Christus: Nolite abire neque sectemini; nolite abire a religione primeva quam ab**

And it is clear from what has been said how the Roman pontiff was a fellow of the other pontiffs until the endowment of the church, and from then on, by Caesar's authority, began to exercise lordship as head; hence the decree in distinction 96, which we cannot for shame deny, speaks thus: "The emperor Constantine on the fourth day after his baptism conferred a privilege on the pontiff of the Roman church, that throughout the world the pontiffs should have him as head, as judges have the king. In which privilege, among other things, it reads thus: 'We grant him power and vigour and imperial honour, decreeing that he hold the principate as well over the four sees, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Constantinople; let him be loftier than, and prince over, all the priests of the whole world.'"[1] And afterwards he specifies the jurisdiction of his bishop, specifying the lands, India, Greece and the rest, according to the four parts of the world.[2] For this reason some call this power of jurisdiction, the indulgences and other privileges of the popes, caesarean. [233] **And hence it is no wonder that Christians in India, in Greece and other countries distrust this privilege, knowing that "it is not man's to give spiritual power, but God's alone", as Lincoln says, Letter 23,[3] and so they set aside his indulgences and privileges, knowing that one will have indulgence from God according to the worthiness of the person, and that it is not his to grant it except instrumentally, in so far as he is a faithful proclaimer of the Lord; and otherwise he makes sport of the people. This teaching I heard that our pope Urban VI spoke to the cardinals of Gregory, who transgressed the decalogue; and because, rebuking their [avarice or luxury], he limited them to the first apostolic life, they conspired against him, electing for themselves Robert of Geneva, a man, as is said, dissolute, proud, warlike and ignorant of**

apostolis didicistis, neque sectemini talem ducem, cum duceret edos suos in precipicium principis tenebrarum. Sequamur autem Urbanum, de quanto precurrat reccius viam Christi et non ulterius; ymo supposito quod dictus Robertus miraculose sic currat, cum eo debemus humiliter sequi ambos, quia ut recitatur a Gregorio, XXII[a] distinccione, De Constantinopolitana sedes vel loca non distrahunt, quin debemus in bono indifferenter imitari meliores; cum, inquit, culpa nou exigit omnes secundum racionem humilitatis equales sumus. Licet igitur multi [234]Romani pontifices sint preeminenter boni, de quibus intelliguntur leges et dicta doctorum, multi tamen ignari vite apostolice mundanum dominium siciebant; hoc autem et consensum eius ac aliorum errorum debemus fugere ut venenum, et specialiter errorem de indulgenciis et de ficta potestate iurisdicionis sive regiminis quam dicunt ex auctoritate imperatoris se extendere per totam habitabilem nostram singulariter quoad Romanum pontificem. Et ex ista radice fingunt quod solus ipse potest indiffinite concedere indulgenciam et alia spiritualia dona Dei. Et error huiusmodi, ut estimo, est causa, quare nec imperator nec papa sufficit exercere in Yndia, in Grecia, vel Yudea et aliis patriis, dissencientibus quibusdam suis erroribus et quibusdam Antichristi legibus, iurisdicionis officium. Error enim modicus in principio inducit maximum consequenter. Si igitur solus Romanus pontifex habet iurisdicionem universalem super Yndos, Saracenos et Barbaros, quare non exercet eam in eos, sicut apostoli fecerunt in infideles populos et rebelles? Si tantum habet iurisdiccionem super eos qui volunt obedire suo dominio, tunc est papalis iurisdiccio mirabiliter diminuta et dependens a voluntate populi ab eis capitur. Illa autem est alterius racionis quam potestas regiminis apostolica quam imperator non potest concedere, sed divisa per istam divisionem bipapalem variaretur ut populus sibi consenciens, vel diminueretur finaliter ad non quantum; quod superbia non sinit concedere, ideo dicit quod habet potestatem regiminis super totum mundum. Ymo cum illa potestas sit subiective [235]in spiritu, videtur quod manet perpetuo ut caracter; et sic haberemus plurimos papas simul, et sic pape moderni redderent se nimis dampnabiliores ex ocio potestatis; cum enim, ut inquiunt, habent tantam potestatem ut Petrus et Paulus simul, ymo ut Ihesus habebat humanitus, nec potest fingi defectus ex Deo, sed ex eis, quare non fructificant ut ante dotacionem cum huiusmodi potestate? Videtur quod ex potestatis abusu durissimum iudicium ex confessione propria illis fiet. Petrus enim veniet ad iudicium cum suis conversis et quilibet apostolorum cum suis, ut dicit beatus Gregorius super evangelia Omelia XVII, sed talis antichristus veniet cum

the law of Christ.[4] Therefore far from the English be his school, since in Luke 17:23 Christ says of such a division: "Go ye not away, nor follow"; do not go away from the first religion that you learned from the apostles, nor follow such a leader, since he would lead his kids into the precipice of the prince of darkness.[5] But let us follow Urban, in so far as he runs ahead more rightly on the way of Christ, and no further;[6] indeed, supposing that the said Robert should miraculously run so, we ought humbly to follow both, him together [with Urban], because, as is related from Gregory in distinction 22, *De Constantinopolitana*, sees or places do not draw [us] apart so that we should not imitate the better in good without distinction: "when," he says, "fault does not require [otherwise], we are all equal according to the reckoning of humility."[7] Although therefore many [234]Roman pontiffs are eminently good, of whom the laws and the sayings of the doctors are understood, yet many, ignorant of the apostolic life, thirsted for worldly lordship; and this, and consent to it and to other errors, we ought to flee like poison,[8] and especially the error about indulgences and about the feigned power of jurisdiction or rule, which they say extends by the emperor's authority over the whole of our inhabited world uniquely as regards the Roman pontiff. And from this root they feign that he alone can grant without limit indulgence and the other spiritual gifts of God. And an error of this kind, as I judge, is the cause why neither emperor nor pope is able to exercise the office of jurisdiction in India, in Greece, or Judea and other lands, since certain men dissent from some of his errors and from certain laws of Antichrist. For a small error in the beginning brings on the greatest in consequence.[9] If therefore the Roman pontiff alone has universal jurisdiction over Indians, Saracens and barbarians, why does he not exercise it upon them, as the apostles did upon unbelieving and rebellious peoples? If he has jurisdiction only over those who wish to obey his lordship, then papal jurisdiction is wonderfully diminished and, depending on the will of the people, is received from them. And that [jurisdiction] is of another kind than the apostolic power of rule, which the emperor cannot grant; but, divided by this two-pope division, it would vary as the people consenting to him [varies], or would at last be diminished to no quantity at all;[10] which pride does not allow [him] to grant, and so he says that he has power of rule over the whole world. Indeed, since that power is in the spirit as in its subject, [235]it seems that it remains perpetually, like a character; and so we should have very many popes at once,[11] and so the modern popes would make themselves far more damnable through the

suis perversis condempnandus. Nec valet antichristiana ficticia qua dicitur papam habere tantam potestatem secundum legem Christi, sicut apostoli ad regulandum populum et insuper habet potestatem ad regulandum populum secundum leges quas ipse condidit et illi regimini propter variacionem temporis oportet attendere, quia nichil patencius indicaret condiciones filii perdicionis, qui secundum Apostolum extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus, quia certum est quod Christus non potest tales leges condere, sic regere vel taliter dominari. Sacerdotes itaque Christi habent potestatem ante istam iurisdicionem cesaream edificandi populum, ubicumque terrarum quantum sufficiunt, predicando, sancte conversando vel instar sanctorum doctorum scriptis sentenciam catholicam commendando; talem autem potestatem regiminis independentem ab invicem habuerunt apostoli plus et minus, Paulus ut estimo magis Petro.

idleness of their power. For since, as they say, they have as much power as Peter and Paul together, indeed as Jesus had in his humanity, and no defect can be feigned on God's side but on theirs, why do they not bear fruit with power of this kind as before the endowment? It seems that, from the abuse of power, "a most severe judgment" will be passed on them by their own confession.[12] For Peter will come to the judgement with his converts, and each of the apostles with his own, as blessed Gregory says on the gospels, Homily 17, but such an antichrist will come with his perverted ones, to be condemned.[13] Nor does the antichristian fiction hold by which it is said that the pope has as much power according to the law of Christ as the apostles to regulate the people, and besides has power to regulate the people according to laws that he himself has made, and that because of the change of the times one must attend to that rule;[14] for nothing would show more plainly the conditions of the "son of perdition", who according to the Apostle "is lifted up above all that is called God", because it is certain that Christ cannot make such laws, rule thus, or exercise lordship in such a way.[15] The priests of Christ, therefore, have power, prior to this caesarean jurisdiction, to build up the people wherever on earth, as far as they are able, by preaching, by living holily, or, like the holy doctors, by commending the catholic teaching in writings; and the apostles had such power of rule, independent of one another, more and less, Paul, as I judge, more than Peter.

Notes

1. Gratian, *Decretum* D.96 c.14 *Constantinus*, the Donation of Constantine (Loserth 232.18: "Cap. XIV. Loosely quoted"; the modern form is ours). *Tam super quatuor sedes* has no answering *quam*: the Donation goes on "as over all the churches of God in the whole world" (PL 187, 461: *tam super quatuor praecipuas sedes … quam etiam super omnes in universo orbe terrarum ecclesias Dei*), which the quotation here leaves out; we translate *tam* "as well". The manuscripts note in the margin (232.19): *Pape institucio a cesare*.
2. *Yndiam*: Loserth's foot reads "Indiam; recte: Judeam" (232.30): the Donation names Judaea. The print is translated; Wyclif's own argument takes "India" up below (233.1, 234.12).
3. Grosseteste, *Epistolae*, ed. Luard, p. 90 (Loserth 233.4).
4. "[avarice or luxury]": Loserth's supplement after *eorum* ("adde: avariciam vel luxuriam", 233.13); the print does not construe without a noun. *Qui excessit* is singular: we take Gregory (XI) as its subject; the manuscripts carry a marginal note here that Loserth's foot gives only in part ("… falsus Gregorius XI", 233.12). *Robertum Gilbonensem*: Robert of Geneva, elected by the rebel cardinals in 1378 as Clement VII. *Limitare* in its restricting sense, "limited".
5. Luke 17:23. Wyclif's *abire* stands for the Vulgate's *ire* (DR "Go ye not after, nor follow them"), and his gloss turns on it ("go away from the first religion"); his Latin is translated. *Edos*: the kids (goats) of Matt. 25:33.
6. *Precurrat* is Loserth's correction; the manuscripts read *precucurrit* (233.23).
7. Gratian, *Decretum* D.22 c.4 *De Constantinopolitana*, under Gregory's name. The bracketed "[otherwise]" fills the ellipsis of *cum culpa non exigit*.
8. *Sint* (234.1): Loserth's foot "recte: fuerint" ("have been"); the print is translated. *Consensum* is his correction; the manuscripts read *consensui* (234.4).
9. The proverb from Aristotle, *De caelo* 1.5, 271b8–13: "the least initial deviation from the truth is multiplied later a thousandfold".
10. *Bipapalem*: the division of the schism of 1378, two popes. Loserth reports *Codd.: ut* against a printed *vel* at 234.31 (that is, *ut diminueretur* or *vel populus*); the print is translated. *Ad non quantum*: to nothing, "no quantity".
11. *Subiective in spiritu*: the power inheres in the soul as in its subject, so (like the character of orders) it cannot be lost: a deposed pope would remain pope, hence "many popes at once".
12. Wis. 6:6: "a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule." Loserth marks no italics here; we quote the scriptural words.
13. Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 17 (Loserth: "Gregor. l. c. Opp. (ed. Migne) II, 1148", i.e. PL 76, 1148: *Ibi Petrus cum Judaea conversa, quam post se traxit, apparebit*).

14. The objectors' "fiction" claims a double power: the apostles' power under the law of Christ, and a power to rule by the pope's own laws, required by the change of the times.
15. 2 Thess. 2:3–4 (Loserth 235.23). Wyclif's *super* is the Vulgate's *supra*; DR is kept.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 232: ***negare***
  - 232: ***quarto***
  - 232: ***ut***
  - 232: ***iudices***
  - 232: ***Anthiochinam***
  - 232: ***Jerusolimitanam*** (box on the J; main split the word (i + erusolinutanam, the latter DEL))
  - 233: ***contratis*** [NW]
  - 233: ***non*** (main split no + u)
  - 233: ***Quam***
  - 233: ***cardinalibus***
  - 233: ***Gregorii***
  - 233: ***primeva*** (20 is the line number)
  - 233: ***Constantinopolitana*** (hyphenated Constantinopoli-|tana; main token holds De + the whole word, De already stands at the preceding position)
  - 233: ***equales***
  - 234: ***sint***
  - 234: ***preeminenter***
  - 234: ***intelliguntur***
  - 234: ***ex***
  - 234: ***ista***
  - 234: ***radice***
  - 234: ***Illa***
  - 234: ***illa***
  - 235: ***quas*** (20 is the line number)
  - 233: ***XXII[a] distinccione,*** (LEFT-nw: two printed words, superscript a after XXII)
  - 234: ***pontificem.*** (glued line number 10)

Part 5: The argument from what the community believes, and a third rejoinder for the endowment

Loserth pp. 236.1–237.27

¶1 236.1–237.14

236.1 *Some argue that the powers ascribed to the pope tend to piety, though they cannot be proved,*
236.27 *Then we should credit every priest with every possible power and admit the pretensions of Antichrist.*
237.1 *It is said that withdrawing endowment would ruin the Church.*

[236] **De indulgenciis vero quas ipsi distribuebant per bullas non recolo, sed committebant illas sine bullis divino iudicio. Nec credo quod omnes falsigraphi fundabunt oppositum. Arguitur igitur communiter: quod Deus posset concessisse Petro et cuicumque Romano pontifici, ut communitas credit, preeminenciam potestatis, nec probari poterit quod non fecit; igitur cum ista fides multum intererat devocionis fidelium, videtur quod theologus debet ipsam defendere et non infundabiliter impugnare. Ista argucia est plena mendacio, nam communitas credit multa impossibilia et heretica de potestate vicaria, ut puta quod quilibet papa habet tantam potestatem sicut Christus habebat humanitus, quod quilibet Romanus pontifex in quantum talis habet infinitum maiorem potestatem quam habet alius in concedendo indulgencias, cum terminum potestatis ponunt in aliis non in illo, sic quod eo ipso quo pretendit se quovismodo**

[236] **And as for indulgences which they distributed by bulls, I do not recall [any], but they committed those matters without bulls to the divine judgement.[1] Nor do I believe that all the false writers will ground the opposite. It is argued, therefore, commonly: that God could have granted to Peter and to every Roman pontiff, as the community believes, preeminence of power, and it cannot be proved that he did not; therefore, since this faith mattered greatly to the devotion of the faithful, it seems that a theologian ought to defend it and not attack it without foundation. This quibble is full of lying, for the community believes many impossible and heretical things about the vicarial power: for instance, that every pope has as much power as Christ had in his humanity; that every Roman pontiff, in so far as he is such, has infinitely greater power than another has in granting indulgences, since they set the limit of power**

solvere vel ligare, eo ipso sic solvit vel ligat; et sic de infinitis summe impossibilibus atque hereticis. De veritatibus autem, quas credere debet communitas de pape preeminencia, non dubium quin probari potest ex scripture testistimonio vel ex sensu. Loquendo autem de excessu ficte potestatis, patet quod minor est falsa. Sed si loquamur de gradu potestatis possibili, patet quod non est color in hoc concludere quod debemus illum concedere, quia sic concederemus in papa et quocumque presbitero omnem potestatem sibi possibilem. Ex ista blasfema evidencia potest habere istam potenciam, igitur habet. Sed quis tunc resisteret Antichristo, cum iuxta hoc debemus mendaciter credere falsissimam extollenciam [237] potestatis? Est igitur argumentum sufficiens, si quis extollit se de preeminencia potestatis ecclesiastice, ultra quod scitur fundari ex scriptura verbo vel opere fecisse sanctos apostolos, tunc non debemus credere huiusmodi potestatem. Et sic aliquam potestatem vendicatam debemus non credere, ut ego non credo, non obstante concessione Cesaris quod quilibet papa habet potestatem iurisdicionis sive regiminis super totam Yndiam, Yudeam et alias naciones, ymo credo quod non habet, sicut nec credo quod Petrus superstes habuit tam ample singulariter tantam potenciam, quia tunc nimis graviter ex negligencia peccavisset.

in others, not in him,[2] so that by the very fact that he claims to loose or bind in any way whatever, by that very fact he so looses or binds; and so on for infinitely many things supremely impossible and heretical. But as for the truths which the community ought to believe about the pope's preeminence, there is no doubt that they can be proved from the testimony of scripture or from sense.[3] And speaking of the excess of a feigned power, it is clear that the minor is false.[4] But if we speak of a possible degree of power, it is clear that there is no colour in inferring from this that we ought to grant it,[5] since so we would grant, in the pope and in any presbyter, every power possible to him. By this blasphemous evidence: "He can have this power, therefore he has it." But who then would resist Antichrist, since according to this we ought lyingly to believe a most false exaltation [237] of power?[6] It is therefore a sufficient argument: if anyone exalts himself on the preeminence of ecclesiastical power beyond what the holy apostles are known, on the ground of scripture, to have done by word or deed, then we ought not to believe in power of this kind.[7] And so some claimed power we ought to disbelieve, as I do not believe, notwithstanding the grant of Caesar,[8] that every pope has power of jurisdiction or of rule over all India, Judaea and other nations; indeed I believe that he does not have it, just as I do not believe either that Peter, while he lived, had singly so great a power so amply, for then he would have sinned exceedingly gravely by negligence.

¶2 237.15–237.27

[237] Tercio replicatur contra dicta per hoc quod multi sancti pape et episcopi, multi beati seculares domini et populi dotacionem ecclesie approbarunt, ymo aliter non haberemus papam vel ordinem episcoporum, et per consequens nec causarum ecclesiasticarum decisiones nec privilegiaciones nec sacramentorum aut ministrorum ecclesiasticorum ministraciones, quod est contra racionem naturalem, ut ecclesia sit ita acephala. Sicut igitur oportet esse principes seculares ita et principes spirituales, sicut exemplatum est in veteri testamento; nimis magna itaque foret presumpcio cessare dotaciones, elecciones et leges ecclesie super istis.

[237] Thirdly, it is rejoined against what has been said,[9] on the ground that many holy popes and bishops, many blessed secular lords and peoples approved the endowment of the church; indeed, otherwise we would not have a pope or the order of bishops, and consequently neither decisions of ecclesiastical cases, nor privilegings, nor ministrations of sacraments or of ecclesiastical ministers, which is against natural reason: that the church should be so acephalous. Just as, therefore, there must be secular princes, so also spiritual princes, as is exemplified in the old testament; so it would be exceedingly great presumption to put an end to the endowments, elections and laws of the church concerning these things.

Notes

1. ***De indulgenciis vero … non recolo***: ***vero*** continues the preceding account (in part 4) of the early popes, who are the ***ipsi***; ***non recolo*** "I do not recall" is Wyclif's dry way of saying there were none. ***Illas*** (fem. pl.) most naturally takes up ***indulgencias***: they left the remission of sins to God's judgement rather than issuing bulls for it.
2. ***Cum terminum potestatis ponunt in aliis non in illo***: the subject of ***ponunt*** is the community of believers. They grant that every other prelate's power has a limit (***terminus***), but set none to the pope's, hence the copyists' marginal note at 236.4, ***Pape potestas infinita*** ("the pope's power infinite").

3. 236.22–23: the manuscripts read *quas de papa credere debet communitas de pape preeminencia*; Loserth's print drops the redundant *de papa*, and we follow the print. *Testistimonio* (236.23) is translated as *testimonio*.
4. *Minor*: the minor premiss of the argument stated at 236.3–5, "it cannot be proved that he did not [grant it]". Of a feigned excess of power the denial can be proved, so the minor is false; of a merely possible degree (the next sentence) the inference to "we ought to grant it" fails.
5. *Non est color*: "colour" in the period sense of a plausible ground (as in "colour of title"), not a pretext.
6. 237.1 *extollenciam*: so Loserth's print; the manuscripts read *excellenciam* "excellence". The print is kept; it echoes *extollit se* in the next sentence.
7. 237.4: the manuscripts read *vel nostro opere vel fecisse*; Loserth prints *verbo vel opere fecisse* (cf. 283.3), which we translate. The clause is construed with *sanctos apostolos* as subject of *fecisse*: what the apostles are known from scripture to have done "by word or deed". The alternative, "known to be grounded in scripture, by word or deed", leaves *fecisse* without a construction.
8. *Concessione Cesaris*: the Donation of Constantine, the grant by which Wyclif holds the caesarean papacy was made. *Debemus non credere* is stronger than "need not believe": "we ought to disbelieve".
9. 237.15: A in the margin, *Tercio arguitur* ("thirdly it is argued"); both manuscripts, *Pape necessitas, nota bene* ("the necessity of the pope, note well"). The rejoinder is answered in part 6.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 236: *indulgenciis* (the bar after it is a folio mark)
  - 236: *ipsi*
  - 236: *in* (15 is the line number)
  - 236: *quantum talis* (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 236: *Ex*
  - 236: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar before falsissimam)
  - 237: *sufficiens*
  - 237: *preeminencia* [NW]
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 236.9 codd. *interterat* (print *intererat*).

Part 6: The answer: the saints who approved the endowment sinned

Loserth pp. 237.28–241.33

¶1 237.28–241.3
237.28 *Answer. 1. It is forbidden by God.*
238.16
2. Endowment has spread discord in the Church.
238.21
3. It is a constant source of error and contention.
239.16 *Laymen should not fear excommunication for withdrawing endowments.*
240.6 *The saints who approved endowment now know that they erred.*
241.8 *We must believe that the saints who approved endowment repented.*

[237] Quantum ad istud sunt multa dicenda: primo quod argumentum non valet, cum omnes peccaverunt et egent gracia Dei, ideo docet decretum distinccione VIII: Si solus Christus, quod debemus solum sequi Christum, qui errare non potuit [238] vel alios de quanto sequamur ipsum, ipse autem summus medicus non autorizavit dotacionem huiusmodi, sed verbo et opere reprobavit; et sic videtur michi quod omnes approbantes dotacionem illam peccaverant in hoc mortaliter vel venialiter plus vel minus; nec feramus hoc graviter de beatis, quia beatus Evangelista, qui detestatus est approbacionem huiusmodi fuit sanccior omnibus illis, et tamen ipse dicit: Si dicimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus et veritas in nobis non est I. Joh. I, 8. Nec est color si multa ecclesie utilia ex hoc processerant, ideo non fuit in illa peccatum; nam multa mala ex illa processerant, cum ex hoc deiecta est ecclesia cleri a statu perfecciori ad statum minus perfectum sine equivalencia recompense. Secundo seminavit discordiam in ecclesia, ut homines plus appetant preposituram propter fastum et questum quam propter meritum, ut patet superius VIII capitulo. Et tercio facit errores in eleccionibus, in legibus et omnino in officii cleri execucionibus. Aliter enim non est

[237] As to this, there are many things to be said.[1] First, that the argument is not valid, since all have sinned and need the grace of God;[2] therefore the decree teaches, in distinction 8, *Si solus Christus*, that we ought to follow Christ alone, who could not err, [238] or others to the extent that we follow him [in them];[3] now he, the supreme physician, did not authorize an endowment of this kind, but reproved it by word and deed; and so it seems to me that all who approved that endowment had sinned in this, mortally or venially, more or less. Nor let us take this hard of the blessed, for the blessed Evangelist, who detested approval of this kind, was holier than all of them, and yet he says: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John 1:8).[4] Nor is there colour [in arguing]: "Many things useful to the church had proceeded from this, therefore there was no sin in it";[5] for many evils had proceeded from it, since by it the church of the clergy was cast down from a more perfect state to a less perfect state without an equivalent recompense. Secondly, it sowed discord in the church, so that men seek the office of superior more for pomp and gain than for merit, as is clear above in chapter 8. And thirdly, it causes errors in elections, in laws, and altogether in the

facile fingere, quare indigni tam frontose, tam impetuose et tam ociose ultra quam ante dotacionem aspirant ad pinguiores ecclesiasticas prelacias. Unde vellem eos qui sompniant quod quicquid mali regno contigerit est propter parcitatem vel subtraccionem dotacionis aut privilegiacionis cesaree discere et docere clare suas causales, et quare post dotacionem circa papatus tales magis contenditur quam perante; cuius causa experiencia doceri poterit, si subtracta dotacione cessaret aspiracio ad huiusmodi dignitates. Causa enim secundum philosophos est qua posita vel subtracta correspondenter [239] effectus, posicio vel subtraccio consequetur. Cum igitur ante dotacionem non fuit talis divisio nec adhuc est, ubi non est ecclesia sic dotata, evidentissimum est, quod litura temporalium et voluptas honoris mundani est causa. Cum igitur omnia ista pericula evacuantur per expropriacionem et observanciam status quem Christus instituit, manifestum est (ut sepe repecii) quod elemosina foret expergefacere illum statum. Unde magna infidelitas est qua Antichristi discipuli excecant laycos, quod instar phariseorum Matth. V predicant esse sacrilegium auferre bona consecrata ecclesie, et sic sollempnizant facta que layci cecati stulte et superbe donaverant, sed decretum Christi non curant; et tamen luce clarius patet quod seculares debent postposito excommunicacionis timore in hoc errata corrigere, quia ut docet glossa ordinaria super decreto XXIV questio I cap. I: Sacerdos hereticus vel excommunicatus non excommunicat nisi se ipsum, et indubie omnis excommunicans propter restitucionem istius perfeccionis status sancte matris ecclesie est ut sic excommunicatus. Ideo non obstante maledicione sua bonum ecclesie est constanter et celeriter consummandum, ymo (ut patet alibi) sive excommunicatus sive insons maledixerit homini, non est timendum sibi, nisi de quanto declinaverit a Christi consiliis vel preceptis. Ideo (ut dicit glossa) non obstante excommunicacione tali homo debet saltem abscondite celebrare et facere quecumque bona de genere inturbate. Quod si pars Antichristi ad tantum prevaleat, quod sit Christiano plurior, christianus debet publice reclamare, quia talis foret gloriosa causa [240] martyrii. Quod si queratur de gravedine peccati sanctorum episcoporum primitive ecclesie qui dotacionem receperant, certum est quod peccarunt graviter sed venialiter ex ingrata negligencia et consensu, ut patet ex decreto beati Jeronymi posito in De Consecracione, distinccione V: Non mediocriter. Et ista sciunt modo Silvestri, Augustini, Gregorii et consimiles, qui in hoc graviter peccaverunt. Sed secundo notanda est cecitas, quam sepe repecii, quod per locum ab insufficientissima similitudine cadimus paulative a statu apostolico, qui fuit status viantis perfectissimus, usque ad statum cleri cesareum qui est status

executions of the clergy's office. For otherwise it is not easy to imagine why the unworthy aspire so brazenly, so impetuously and so idly, beyond what they did before the endowment, to the fatter ecclesiastical prelacies. Hence I should like those who dream that whatever evil befalls the realm is on account of the sparingness or withdrawal of the endowment or of caesarean privileging to learn and teach clearly their causal [propositions],[6] and why after the endowment there is more contention about such papacies than before; the cause of which could be taught by experience, if, the endowment being withdrawn, the aspiring to such dignities ceased. For a cause, according to the philosophers, is that which being posited or withdrawn, the positing or withdrawal of the [239] effect correspondingly follows.[7] Since, therefore, before the endowment there was no such division, nor is there still where the church is not so endowed, it is most evident that the stain of temporal goods and the pleasure of worldly honour is the cause.[8] Since, therefore, all these dangers are emptied out by the renunciation of property and the observance of the state which Christ instituted, it is manifest (as I have often repeated) that it would be an alms to awaken that state.[9] Hence it is a great unbelief by which the disciples of Antichrist blind lay people, in that, after the manner of the Pharisees (Matt. 5), they preach that it is sacrilege to take away goods consecrated to the church; and so they solemnize the deeds which blinded lay people had foolishly and proudly given, but they do not care for the decree of Christ.[10] And yet it is clearer than light that seculars ought, setting aside the fear of excommunication, to correct the errors in this, because, as the ordinary gloss on the decree, C. 24 q. 1 c. 1, teaches: "A heretical or excommunicated priest excommunicates none but himself";[11] and without doubt everyone who excommunicates on account of the restoration of this perfection of the state of holy mother church is, as such, excommunicated. Therefore, notwithstanding his curse, the good of the church is to be accomplished steadfastly and swiftly; indeed (as is clear elsewhere), whether an excommunicate or an innocent man has cursed a man, there is nothing for that man to fear, except to the extent that he has turned aside from Christ's counsels or precepts. Therefore (as the gloss says), notwithstanding such an excommunication, a man ought at least secretly to celebrate and to do, undisturbed, whatever things are good in kind. But if Antichrist's party should prevail so far that it is more numerous than the Christian [party], a Christian ought to protest publicly, because such would be a glorious cause of [240] martyrdom.[12] And if it is asked about the gravity of the sin of the holy

cleri abiectissimus; capimus enim illud quod consonat peccatum in gestis sanctorum patrum, et illud extendimus, sed illud quod sonat virtutem omittimus. Ut sophistice arguitur, si dicti sancti receperunt temporalia supereffluenter ex pura secularium elemosina et totum residuum pauperibus erogarunt, igitur per idem licet nobis quantumcumque ample extorquere dominia tamquam sine elemosina secularium primo nobis debita, et dimisso eorum usu eis abuti quantumcumque voluptuose et seculariter conversando. Sic enim concludimus in effectu et, amplificando culpam ac dimittendo perfeccionem laudabilem, augemur nimirum difformiter ambobus partibus in voraginem viciorum. Ideo perfeccius atque securius foret nobis tenere limites quos Deus instituit, vivendo de decimis, oblacionibus et privatis elemosinis, quia transgrediendo terminos quos Christus instituit damus nobis et posteris evidenciam corruendi. Et hec fuit causa quare [241] beatus Gregorius percussit iam mortuus successorem suum usque ad mortem, ut recitatum est VIII cap.

bishops of the primitive church who had received the endowment, it is certain that they sinned gravely but venially, by displeasing negligence and consent, as is clear from the decree of blessed Jerome placed in *De consecratione*, distinction 5, *Non mediocriter*.[13] And the Silvesters, Augustines, Gregories and the like, who sinned gravely in this, know these things now.[14] Now, secondly, there is to be noted the blindness, which I have often repeated, that by the topic from a most insufficient likeness we fall little by little from the apostolic state, which was the most perfect state of one on the road, down to the caesarean state of the clergy, which is the most abject state of the clergy;[15] for we take what accords with sin in the deeds of the holy fathers, and extend it, but what sounds of virtue we omit. As it is sophistically argued: "If the said saints received temporal goods overflowingly from the pure alms of seculars, and paid out all the residue to the poor, then by the same token it is lawful for us to extort lordships however amply, as though they were owed to us in the first place, without alms from seculars, and, having abandoned the use of them, to abuse them, living however voluptuously and worldlily."[16] For so we infer in effect, and, by amplifying the fault and abandoning the praiseworthy perfection, we are, no wonder, swollen deformedly on both counts into the whirlpool of vices.[17] Therefore it would be more perfect and safer for us to keep the limits which God instituted, living on tithes, offerings and private alms, because by overstepping the bounds which Christ instituted we give to ourselves and to our posterity evidence for falling. And this was the reason why [241] blessed Gregory, already dead, struck his successor to death, as was recounted in chapter 8.[18]

¶2 241.4–241.6

[241] Sed instatur quod dicti sancti non penitebant de istis peccatis finaliter nec revocarunt errorem, sed pocius tamquam meritoriam auxerunt dotacionem.

[241] But it is objected that the said saints did not repent of these sins at the end, nor revoke the error, but rather increased the endowment as meritorious.[19]

¶3 241.8–241.33

[241] Hic dicitur quod false assumitur nec umquam probabitur, ymo sancti ut remisse perceperunt errorem sic remisse laborarunt ad eius extinccionem, ut beatus Possidonius narrat de beato Augustino, quomodo rogavit cives suos, ut caperent possessiones quas sibi et sociis suis contulerunt, ut possint pure vivere de sorte Domini, tamquam clerici, sicut vixerunt in veteri testamento. Et sic videtur michi quod clerici et religiosi possessionati in ista appropriacione et proposito decedentes sine fructuosa penitencia sunt damnandi; et hanc reor racionem, quare Christus Matth. XXIV. 21- dicit: hoc tempus esse

[241] To this the answer is that it is falsely assumed and will never be proved; indeed the saints, as they perceived the error faintly, so faintly laboured for its extinction, as blessed Possidius relates of blessed Augustine: how he asked his citizens to take [back] the possessions which they had conferred on him and his companions, so that they might live purely on the Lord's lot, as clerics, as they lived in the old testament.[20] And so it seems to me that clerics and possessioned religious who die in this appropriation and purpose without fruitful penance are to be damned;[21] and this I reckon the reason why Christ (Matt. 24:21) says that this time

tantum horribile, non propter tribulacionem corporis sed anime infinitum maiorem, unde Apostolus II Thym. III, 1, 2 dicens, quod instabunt tempora periculosa, annectit tamquam signum et causam precipuam: Erunt, inquit, homines se ipsos amantes. Dyabolus enim ex cupiditate temporalium trahit plurimos ad infernum. Sancti igitur percipientes saltem confuse huius peccati maliciam, saltem confuse finaliter penitebant. Nos autem qui oculata fide percipimus huius avaricie invalescentis gravedinem, oportet penitere distinccius de tali avaricia et omnino de consensu et correpcionis negligencia, si volumus esse salvi.

is so horrible, not on account of tribulation of the body but [on account of tribulation] of the soul, infinitely greater; hence the Apostle (2 Tim. 3:1–2), saying that "dangerous times shall come", adds as the sign and chief cause: "Men", he says, "shall be lovers of themselves."[22] For the devil, by covetousness of temporal goods, draws very many to hell. The saints, therefore, perceiving at least indistinctly the malice of this sin, at least indistinctly repented at the end. But we, who perceive with our own eyes the gravity of this growing avarice, must repent more distinctly of such avarice, and altogether of consent and of negligence in correction, if we wish to be saved.

Notes

1. The answer to the third rejoinder (237.15). At 237.31 both manuscripts note in the margin *Dotacionem approbantes sancti peccaverunt* ("the saints who approved the endowment sinned"); at 238.11 *Dotacio quomodo prodest [et] nocet* ("how the endowment profits and harms"); at 240.9 *Dotationem recipientes sancti quomodo peccaverunt* ("how the saints who received the endowment sinned").
2. Rom. 3:23; Wyclif reads *gracia Dei* where the Vulgate has *gloria Dei* (DR "the glory of God").
3. Gratian, *Decretum* D. 8 c. 9 (*Si solus Christus*), from Cyprian, *Ep.* 63 to Caecilius (Gratian's inscription *Idem … ad Caecilium*, PL 187, 48B); Loserth's foot gives only "Cap. IX". *Vel alios de quanto sequamur ipsum*: literally "or others in so far as we follow him", i.e. other teachers are to be followed only as far as following them is following Christ.
4. 1 John 1:8. Wyclif's *Si dicimus quia … nos ipsos* departs slightly from the Vulgate (*Si dixerimus quoniam … ipsi nos*) without changing the sense; the Douay–Rheims wording is kept.
5. *Nec est color*: "colour" is a plausible ground (as in "colour of title"). The rejected inference is quoted as an argument.
6. *Suas causales*: the logicians' *propositiones causales*, propositions of the form "this happens because of that". Wyclif asks his opponents to state and prove their claim that the realm's misfortunes are caused by the withdrawal of endowment.
7. The philosophers' rule that a cause is that whose positing or removal is followed by the positing or removal of the effect; Loserth gives no reference.
8. *Litura*: Loserth glosses it *i. e. macula*, "stain" (239.4), and we follow him; the word is properly an erasure or smear.
9. *Elemosina foret expergefacere illum statum*: to rouse the clergy back to Christ's state would itself be a work of alms, the kind of alms the laity owe the clergy.
10. *Instar phariseorum Matth. V*: so the print. The Pharisees' rule that a gift vowed to the temple frees a man from his duty to his parents stands at Matt. 15:5 (DR "The gift whatsoever proceedeth from me, shall profit thee"), the passage meant: Wyclif cites it as *Matth. XV* for the same point at 245.2, so *V* has lost an *X*. *Facta* are the acts or deeds of gift. At 239.15 the manuscripts read *non curant postponere*; Loserth prints *non curant*, which we translate.
11. Glossa ordinaria on Gratian C. 24 q. 1 c. 1 (modern form ours); Loserth cites the Venice 1595 edition, vol. I, p. 1295. "As the gloss says", later in the paragraph, is taken to refer to the same gloss; this has not been checked against the gloss.
12. *Quod sit Christiano plurior*: *Christiano* is a dative of comparison standing for the Christian party, "more numerous than the Christian [party]". *Celebrare* (239.28) is to say mass: the case is a priest under an unjust sentence.
13. Gratian, *De consecratione* D. 5 c. 24 (*Non mediocriter*), from Jerome; Loserth's "Cap. XXIV", modern form ours.
14. 240.7 *modo*: Loserth's reading; the manuscripts read *modi*. *Silvestri, Augustini, Gregorii* are nominative plurals ("the Silvesters, Augustines, Gregories"), subject of *sciunt* with *consimiles*: the saints who accepted endowment now, in the other life, know their error (cf. the side-note at 240.6).
15. *Per locum ab … similitudine*: the dialectical topic from likeness (*locus a simili*), here "a most insufficient likeness". *Clerus cesareus*, the clergy endowed by Caesar, gives "the caesarean state of the clergy".
16. *Dimisso eorum usu eis abuti*: *eorum* and *eis* both take up *dominia*, so the contrast is use against abuse of the lordships. *Tamquam … primo nobis debita* "as though owed to us in the first place", i.e. by right and not by the laity's alms.
17. 240.27 *augemur*: Loserth marks it *Ita codd.* ("so the manuscripts"), signalling doubt; we translate it ("we are swollen"). *Ambobus partibus* is taken as the two moves just named, amplifying the fault and abandoning the perfection.
18. The story that Gregory the Great, after his death, appeared to his successor Sabinian and struck him for his avarice, so that he died; told at chapter 8. Wyclif there follows Higden, *Polychronicon* V, 412; the story is in Paul the Deacon's *Life of Gregory* 29 (PL 75, 58C–D) and Sigebert of Gembloux, *Chronica*, a. 607 (PL 160, 114B).
19. 241.4: the manuscripts in the margin, *Dotacionis argumentum* ("an argument for endowment").

20. ***Possidonius***: so the print; Loserth notes *Recte: Possidius*, and the English gives the right name. Possidius, *Life of Augustine*, where Augustine offers to give back the church's estates to the people of Hippo (chapter 23, PL 32, 53: *paratum se esse illis cedere … Sed nunquam id laici suscipere voluerunt*); Loserth compares *De civili dominio* III, 225. ***De sorte Domini***: the Lord's lot (*kleros*), the root of the word "cleric", and the Levites' portion in the old law.
21. ***Appropriacione*** here is the clergy's making the endowment their own, not only the canonists' appropriation of a parish church.
22. Matt. 24:21 is paraphrased, not quoted (Vg *erit enim tunc tribulatio magna*). 2 Tim. 3:1–2 is quoted in the Douay–Rheims wording. At 241.22 the manuscripts read *Tim. II* (an omitted margin reference in the print, line 33).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 237: *peccaverunt* (hyphenated pecca-|verunt; main token holds the whole word)
  - 238: *peccatum*
  - 238: *habemus*
  - 238: *Joh*
  - 238: *I* (italic capital I (I. Joh. I, 8))
  - 238: *illa*
  - 238: *illa*
  - 238: *recompense* [NW]
  - 238: *qui* (25 is the line number)
  - 238: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar before est)
  - 239: *illum*
  - 241: *II Thym* (one token covers two printed words (II. Thym.))
  - 241: *III*
  - 241: *1* (old-style arabic 1, x-height (III, 1, 2))
  - 238: *legibus* (LEFT-nw: print = printed)
  - 240: *insufficientissima* (LEFT-nw: hyphenated insuffi-|cientissima)
  - 241: *21-* (box on Matth.; token is verse number 21 followed by dash before dicit)
  - 241: *huius* (box in blank gap after huius)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 22. Codd.: Tim. II. (241.33).
- Variants noted but not affecting the English: 238.21 codd. *exequencionibus*; 238.27–28 B *dotaciones*.

Part 7: Cutting the root of cupidity; the caesarean order not needed for salvation

Loserth pp. 242.1–246.21

¶1 242.1–242.5

242.6 *It is said we should correct the clergy instead of taking away endowments.*
242.13 *The best way to correct is to take away the occasion of evil,*

[242] **Consideraremus itaqae, quantum sancti eciam posteriores et peiores apostolis ab isto peccato cupidinis se servarunt et ipsum in scriptis ac verbis vivacibus reprobarunt, ut specialiter patet in scriptis et decretis beati Gregorii.**

[242] **We should consider, then, how far the saints, even those later than the apostles and worse than they, kept themselves from this sin of cupidity and reproved it in writings and in living words, as is especially clear in the writings and decrees of blessed Gregory.**[1]

¶2 242.6–242.30

[242] **Sed adhuc replicatur, quomodo melius foret corrigere cleri cupidinem quam devote collata auferre? cum ista possunt meritorie possideri et securitas ac copia temporalium confortat et auget clericos, ymo habent hoc, cum sit meritorium et iuste petitum ex titulo doni Dei; grave itaque foret cum tanta subtraccione perturbare ecclesiam. Hic videtur michi quod evidencia non procedit, cum melius foret clericos conversari ut clericos generaliter quoad quoscumque dotatos; optimum itaque foret radicitus corrigere cleri cupidinem, auferendo**

[242] **But it is further rejoined that it would be better to correct the cupidity of the clergy than to take away what was devoutly conferred,**[2] **since these things can be possessed meritoriously, and the security and plenty of temporal goods strengthens and increases the clerics; indeed they have this, since it is meritorious and justly sought by the title of God's gift; so it would be a grave thing to disturb the church with so great a withdrawal. Here it seems to me that the evidence does not go through,**

venenosam occasionem, sic quod clerus reductus ad perfeccionem status primevi allidat parvulos reatus ad petram iusticie. Ista itaque foret correccio cupiditatis cleri fructuosior, permanencior et complecior, quam blasfema extorsio humanitus palliata. Qui enim sanaret vulnus vel morbum hominis, destrueret radicalem causam; qua dimissa remaneret patens occasio frutices cupidinis producendi; oportet tamen prudenter auferre radicem istam pestiferam, quando ex peccato notorio datur occasio auferendi, specialiter incipiendo a fonte cupidinis producendi, quia non cessabunt cupiditatum litigia nisi ipse fuerit exsiccatus.

since it would be better for clerics to live as clerics generally, as regards all who are endowed whatever;[3] so it would be best to correct the clergy's cupidity at the root, by taking away the poisonous occasion, so that the clergy, brought back to the perfection of its primeval state, may "dash the little ones" of guilt "against the rock" of justice.[4] This, then, would be a correction of the clergy's cupidity more fruitful, more lasting and more complete than a blasphemous extortion cloaked in human fashion. For whoever would heal a man's wound or disease would destroy the root cause; if that were left, there would remain an open occasion of producing shoots of cupidity. Yet this pestilent root must be taken away prudently, when occasion of taking it away is given by a notorious sin, beginning especially from the fount of cupidity that is to be produced, for the lawsuits of cupidities will not cease unless that fount has been dried up.[5]

¶3 242.31–246.21
243.1 *Mammon sows his gifts among the clergy, inviting God's vengeance.*
244.17 *Except for spiritual blessings We should be moderate in our prayers and submissive to God's will.*
245.1 *The priests of the Old Law were less corrupt than ours.*
245.15 *There must be popes and bishops, but they must be such as God has chosen.*
246.2 *Popes of human appointment not necessary to salvation.*
246.10 *For 300 years*
246.11 *bishops and priests were the same.*

[242] Sunt autem mille occasiones sanandi ecclesiam, sed cautela dyaboli sparsi sunt favores et pax, quam Christus venit dissolvere, et sic dona mamone [243] sunt inter legistas et clericos eciam exproprietarios et dominos seminata. Sed oportet quod Deus gladio vindicte quem venit mittere modo sibi abscondito, ut pestilencia, guerra vel alia pena racionali dissipet istas fraudes; tunc enim foret clerus proporcionatus in numero et virtute, ubi iam nocivus est undique vivis et mortuis: vivis non faciendo clericale officium peccati populi destructivum, et mortuis non mitigando penam defunctorum quam ex stultis donariis paciuntur. Et ista argucia: Hoc bene potest fieri, igitur non debet corrigi, multos cecat; securitas autem debet confidenter exspectari a Deo non seculo, et in hoc debet sperari tam nobis quam laycis vera securitas, et ideo precipit nobis Apostolus Hebre, ultimo, quod sumus contenti presentibus, ita quod confidenter dicamus: Dominus michi adiutor et non timebo, quid faciat michi homo. Et hinc petimus in oracione dominica: panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie. Sed et nos sacerdotes innitentes ritibus legis veteris confidenter annuatim sine thaurizacione diutina porcionem Domini scilicet oblaciones et decimas expectamus. Quantum ad dacionem Domini, patet quod in penam peccati dat indignis, quod eis obedit, ut dicit Augustinus in De Verbis Domini Sermone LIII: Deus, inquit, iratus dat creature ad eius voluntatem et alias placidus dat creature ad eius utilitatem, eciam quod non appetit habere. Triplex autem ponitur exemplum primi, nam [244] Yob primo legitur quomodo Deus dedit dyabolo potestatem ad temptandum beatum Yob in sui confusionem et sancti probacionem, sic eciam demones exauditi sunt petendo se mitti in porcos Mar. V, et sic Israhelite exauditi sunt secundum

[242] And there are a thousand occasions of healing the church; but by the devil's wile favours have been scattered, and the peace which Christ came to dissolve, and so the gifts of mammon [243] have been sown among legists and clerics, even the propertyless, and lords.[6] But God must, with the sword of vengeance which he came to send, in a way hidden with himself, as by pestilence, war or another reasonable penalty, scatter these frauds;[7] for then the clergy would be proportioned in number and in virtue, whereas now it is harmful on every side to the living and to the dead: to the living, by not doing the clerical office that destroys the people's sin; and to the dead, by not mitigating the punishment of the departed which they suffer for their foolish gifts.[8] And this quibble, "This can be well done, therefore it ought not to be corrected", blinds many. But security ought to be awaited confidently from God, not from the world, and in this true security is to be hoped for, by us as by the laity; and therefore the Apostle commands us (Hebrews, the last chapter) that we be content with present things, so that "we may confidently say: The Lord is my helper: [and] I will not fear what man shall do to me."[9] And hence we ask in the Lord's prayer: "Give us this day our daily bread."[10] And we priests too, relying on the rites of the old law, confidently await year by year, without long hoarding, the Lord's portion, namely offerings and tithes. As to the Lord's giving, it is clear that in punishment of sin he gives to the unworthy, in that he obeys them,[11] as Augustine says in *On the Words of the Lord*, sermon 53: "God", he says, "when angry gives to a creature according to its will, and at other times, when pleased, gives to a creature according to its advantage, even what it does not desire to have."[12] And a

suum desiderium, scilicit confusionem in escis carnalibus, ut patet Psalmus LXXVII, 30: Adhuc esce eorum erant in ore ipsorum et ira Dei ascendit super eos. Sed Apostolus exauditus est in contrario illius, quod peciit. Nam II. Cor. XII, 8 ita dicit: Ter Dominum rogavi, ut discederet a me angelus sathane, et dixit mihi: Sufficit tibi gracia mea, nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur. Sunt enim nonnulli qui ex carencia temptacionis superbiunt, et sunt nonnulli qui ex fortitudine temptacionis senciunt de se ipsis humilius et gloriosius coronantur; et ideo preter beatitudinem et alia per se bona debemus condicionaliter petere moderate, ut petendo temporalia debemus modum attendere; et condicionaliter petere, si et quatenus nobis prosunt. Et hec racio, quare petimus sub forma panis cottidiani temporalia necessaria hodie nobis dari, que Apostolus vocat presencia. Et constat, quod nimis levis est evidencia, Deus concedit eciam sanctis copiam temporalium et gloriam mundanam, igitur eis expedit vel est licitum sic habere, quamvis sint aliunde apud Deum laudabiles, verumtamen non in illo. Unde videtur quod nostri episcopi sunt Christo ingratiores quam Scarioth et legis veteris sacerdotes; ipsi enim tenuerunt se superficietenus, quoad possessiones in limitibus legis Dei, sed [245]adulterati sunt abscondite in adulacione voti aut elemosine, ut patet Matth. XV; et ideo remansit penes eos palliata clavis sciencie; unde et Christus Joh. V, 39 dicit eos putare vitam eternam habere in scripturis. Et Matth. XXIII, 3: Omnia quecumque dixerint vobis, facite, quod non diceret hodie de nostris episcopis propter ingratiorem defectum sentencie, ideo videtur quod sunt plus debriati avaricia et ingratitudine ignorancie, sapiencie prime opposite, quam irreligiositas Scariothis. Melius utique foret semel ad sanitatem perfectam perturbare ecclesiam quam quod remaneat continue periculosius, irreligiosius et lacius perturbata. Ulterius notandum est tercio, quod necesse est paparum et episcoporum ordinem esse in ecclesia militante. Sed duplicem ordinem talium ministrorum considera, scilicet cesareum et divinum. Quamvis autem oporteat ex malicia ordinem cesareum quem Christus approbat secundum totum bonum virtutis in eo bonum utile vel nature, necesse tamen est in eo esse malum culpe quod Deus reprobat, et sic dat Deus tyrannis et blasfemis bona que occupant sine eorum vero dominio. Alium autem ordinem divinum oportet esse integre secundum ordinacionem divinam, cum non per se sapit peccatum ut prior. Ipse autem ex institucione humana capit gradus suos, secundum quod variantur gradatim mundi divicie vel honores. Alius autem ordo hec respuens respicit pure et mundo abscondite ordinacionem divinam ad plus vel minus prodessendum ecclesie; quando autem ordinacio

threefold example of the first is given: for [244]in Job 1 it is read how God gave the devil power to tempt blessed Job, to the devil's confusion and the saint's proving; so also the demons were heard when they asked to be sent into the swine (Mark 5); and so the Israelites were heard according to their desire, namely to their confusion in fleshly foods, as is clear from Psalm 77:30: "As yet their meat was in their mouth: and the wrath of God came upon them."[13] But the Apostle was heard in the contrary of what he asked. For in 2 Cor. 12:8 he says thus: "Thrice I besought the Lord that the angel of Satan might depart from me. And he said to me: My grace is sufficient for thee: for power is made perfect in infirmity."[14] For there are some who grow proud from lack of temptation, and there are some who from the strength of temptation think more humbly of themselves and are more gloriously crowned; and therefore, apart from blessedness and the other goods in themselves, we ought to ask conditionally [and] moderately, so that in asking for temporal goods we ought to attend to measure, and to ask conditionally, if and in so far as they profit us.[15] And this is the reason why we ask, under the form of daily bread, that the necessary temporal goods be given us today, which the Apostle calls "present things". And it is evident that this is exceedingly light evidence: "God grants even to saints plenty of temporal goods and worldly glory, therefore it is expedient for them, or lawful, so to have them", although they are praiseworthy with God on other grounds; nevertheless not in that. Hence it seems that our bishops are more ungrateful to Christ than Iscariot and the priests of the old law;[16] for these kept themselves outwardly, as to possessions, within the limits of God's law, but [245]were secretly adulterated in flattery of a vow or of alms, as is clear in Matt. 15; and therefore the key of knowledge remained with them, cloaked; hence Christ too (John 5:39) says that they think they have life everlasting in the scriptures.[17] And Matt. 23:3: "All things whatsoever they shall say to you, do", which he would not say today of our bishops, because of the more displeasing defect of teaching;[18] therefore it seems that they are more drunk with avarice and with the ingratitude of ignorance, opposed to the first wisdom, than the irreligion of Iscariot [was].[19] It would certainly be better to disturb the church once, to perfect health, than that it should remain continually disturbed, more dangerously, more irreligiously and more widely. Further, thirdly, it is to be noted that it is necessary that there be an order of popes and bishops in the church militant. But consider a twofold order of such ministers, namely the caesarean and the divine. Now although it is needful, out of malice, [that there be]

humana concordat in persona quam Deus ad gradum talem elegerit, [246]sapit minus peccatum et aliter colitur Antichristus. Unde nichil maius hereticum quam quod tam necessarius est iste ordo cesareus, ut nemo posset sine papa istius ordinis esse salvus, primo quod multis pseudopapis non existentibus, ut patet ex dictis, sancta duravit predestinatorum ecclesia, secundo quia trecentis annis et amplius, quibus sine dotacione crevit ecclesia, regulabatur sine tali primatu cesareo communi consilio sacerdotum. Pro quo tempore idem fuit sacerdos et episcopus, ut patet ex dictis. Tercio quod totus ordo talis fuit, institutus a cesare preter Christum, ut patet ex dictis VIII cap. Et nichil infidelius quam quod nemo potest modo salvari sine suo decreto tam extraordinario preter fidem. Sicut igitur conversi in Yndia et Grecia et aliis locis, ubi papatus noster non colitur, sunt christiani salvandi, eciam qui religiosius nobis vivunt: sic in Europa stat esse perfectos christianos secundum fidem Christi, etsi non cognoscant preeminenciam pontificis Constantini.

the caesarean order, which Christ approves in respect of all the good of virtue in it, the useful good or [the good] of nature, yet it is necessary that there be in it the evil of fault, which God reproves; and so God gives to tyrants and blasphemers the goods which they occupy, without their true lordship.[20] But the other order, the divine, must be wholly according to the divine ordinance, since it does not of itself savour of sin as the former does. And the former takes its grades from human institution, according as the riches or honours of the world vary by degrees.[21] But the other order, spurning these things, looks purely, and hidden from the world, to the divine ordinance, for profiting the church more or less; and when the human ordinance agrees on a person whom God has chosen for such a grade, [246]it savours less of sin; and otherwise Antichrist is worshipped. Hence nothing is more heretical than [the claim] that this caesarean order is so necessary that no one could be saved without a pope of this order: first, because, with many pseudo-popes not being [popes], as is clear from what has been said, the holy church of the predestinate endured;[22] secondly, because for three hundred years and more, during which the church grew without endowment, it was ruled without such caesarean primacy, by the common counsel of priests. For that time priest and bishop were the same, as is clear from what has been said. Thirdly, because the whole of such an order was instituted by Caesar, apart from Christ, as is clear from what was said in chapter 8. And nothing is more unbelieving than [the claim] that no one can now be saved without his decree, so extraordinary, beyond the faith.[23] As, therefore, converts in India and Greece and other places, where our papacy is not honoured, are Christians to be saved, even those who live more religiously than we: so in Europe there may be perfect Christians according to the faith of Christ, even if they do not acknowledge the preeminence of Constantine's pontiff.[24]

Notes

1. ***Consideraremus*** (imperfect subjunctive) is hortatory, "we should consider". ***Itaqae*** is a misprint for ***itaque***.
2. ***Quomodo*** after ***replicatur*** is taken in its medieval use as "that", introducing the rejoinder (so Loserth's side-note at 242.6); the print's question mark would give "how would it be better ...?", which inverts the sense. The manuscripts note in the margin ***Dotacionis argumentum*** (242.5) and ***Ablacio temporalium*** ("taking away of temporal goods", 242.8).
3. ***Generaliter quoad quoscumque dotatos***: construed "generally, with respect to all the endowed whoever they are", i.e. the remedy should apply to every endowed cleric. An alternative is to join ***generaliter*** to ***clericos***: "for clerics in general to live as clerics".
4. Ps. 136:9 (Loserth), DR "dash thy little ones against the rock"; Wyclif applies the verse allegorically, the little ones being the first stirrings of guilt.
5. ***A fonte cupidinis producendi***: literally "from the fount of cupidity to be produced", the source from which cupidity springs, i.e. the endowment itself. ***Ipse*** takes up ***fons***.
6. ***Pax, quam Christus venit dissolvere***: after Matt. 10:34 (DR "I came not to send peace, but the sword"), to which the "sword of vengeance which he came to send" in the next sentence also alludes. "Mammon": Luke 16:9.

7. ***Modo sibi abscondito***: "in a way hidden with himself", i.e. known to God alone. ***Pena racionali*** is a penalty fitted by reason to the fault.
8. 243.9 ***destructivum***: Loserth's reading; the manuscripts read ***destructum***. Margin of both manuscripts at 243.8: ***Clerus quomodo nocet vivis et mortuis*** ("how the clergy harms the living and the dead"). ***Virtus*** is taken as "virtue" beside ***numerus***; "power" is possible.
9. Heb. 13:5–6 (Loserth). Wyclif turns the Vulgate's ***contenti praesentibus*** (DR "contented with such things as you have") into a precept in the first person, ***quod sumus contenti presentibus***, translated from his Latin; the rest is the Douay–Rheims (Wyclif's ***et*** before ***non timebo*** is supplied in brackets).
10. Luke 11:3 (Loserth).
11. 243.24 ***dacionem***: B reads ***dotacionem*** "endowment". ***Quod eis obedit***: "in that he obeys them", i.e. God grants the wish of the unworthy as a punishment; the margin of both manuscripts at 243.17: ***Dat Deus indignis ad penam peccati*** ("God gives to the unworthy for the punishment of sin"), and at 243.30, ***Exaudiuntur mali a Deo sibi in penam*** ("the wicked are heard by God to their own punishment").
12. Augustine, ***De verbis Domini*** sermon 53, as Wyclif cites it; Loserth refers to Augustine's ***Opera***, tom. V, col. 1378, where the words run ***Aliquando Deus iratus dat quod petis et Deus propitius negat quod petis*** ("sometimes God in anger gives what you ask, and God when gracious refuses what you ask"). Wyclif's wording is his own paraphrase; the passage is ***Sermo*** 354.7 (***Ad continentes***), PL 39, 1567.
13. Job 1:12; Mark 5:12–13 (Loserth gives Matt. 8:32); the quails, Num. 11:33; Ps. 77:30–31 in the Douay–Rheims wording. The manuscripts read ***Psalm. LXXIX***; Loserth corrects to LXXVII. He notes the same three examples in Augustine's sermon. ***In sui confusionem***: ***sui*** is the devil.
14. 2 Cor. 12:8–9. Wyclif writes ***angelus sathane*** (from v. 7) as the subject of ***discederet***, where the Vulgate has no subject (DR "that it might depart from me"); the rest is the Douay–Rheims. The manuscripts divide ***in firmitate***.
15. ***Debemus condicionaliter petere moderate***: the print sets two adverbs side by side; we join them with "[and]". The sentence may instead break after ***petere***, making ***moderate*** begin the next clause ("moderately, so that ..."); the sense is the same. ***Per se bona*** are goods in themselves, as against temporal goods, which are good only as they serve.
16. ***Christo ingratiores***: of persons toward someone, ***ingratus*** is "ungrateful", the bishops being set beside Iscariot; at 245.6 ***ingratiorem defectum*** is said of a thing and is "more displeasing".
17. Matt. 15 is the passage on the Pharisees' vowed gift (15:5, ***munus***), which lets a son escape the duty to his parents. ***Adulacione*** "flattery" is the print; ***adulteracione***, matching ***adulterati***, may have been meant (Latin doubt, not settled). "The key of knowledge" is from Luke 11:52 (DR). John 5:39 is given in indirect speech (DR "you think in them to have life everlasting"). ***Re mansit*** is read as ***remansit***.
18. Matt. 23:3; Wyclif omits the Vulgate's ***ergo*** and ***servate et*** (DR "All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do"), and his shorter text is translated.
19. ***Plus ... quam irreligiositas Scariothis***: the comparison is between the bishops' state and Iscariot's irreligion, as the nominative shows: "than the irreligion of Iscariot [was]". ***Sapiencie prime opposite*** qualifies ***ignorancie***: the ignorance opposed to the first wisdom.
20. At 245.21 Loserth notes ***Hic verbum deesse videtur*** ("a word seems to be missing here"). The sentence lacks an infinitive after ***oporteat***; we supply "[that there be]" (***esse***), in line with ***necesse ... est in eo esse*** that follows. ***Secundum totum bonum virtutis in eo bonum utile vel nature*** is construed as a list of the goods Christ approves in the caesarean order: the good of virtue, the useful good, the good of nature. Margin of both manuscripts at 245.17: ***Ordo duplex sacerdotum*** ("the twofold order of priests").
21. ***Ipse*** takes up ***prior***, the caesarean order; ***Alius autem ordo*** in the next sentence is again the divine order.
22. ***Multis pseudopapis non existentibus***: an ablative absolute, literally "many pseudo-popes not existing [as popes]", i.e. while the see was held by men who were no true popes. The alternative "while many [true popes] did not exist" gives the same argument. Margin of both manuscripts at 246.2: ***Sine papa potest homo salvari*** ("without a pope a man can be saved").
23. ***Nichil infidelius***: the comparative of ***infidelis*** said of a claim, "more unbelieving", i.e. more contrary to faith. ***Suo decreto***: the decree of the caesarean pope.
24. ***Pontificis Constantini***: "Constantine's pontiff", the pope as made by the Donation (cf. 237.6 ***concessione Cesaris***). ***Stat esse*** is "it can be that there are".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 242: ***itaqae*** (misprint kept: zoomed leaf clearly reads itaqae) [NW]
  - 242: ***Sed***
  - 242: ***auferre***
  - 243: ***legistas***
  - 243: ***faciat***
  - 243: ***LIII***
  - 244: ***ut***
  - 245: ∅ (elemosine already stands at pos 7 (the established text replaced the folio mark 222b there); this is a duplicate)
  - 245: ***in*** (5 is the line number) [NW]
  - 245: ***quecumque*** (hyphenated que-|cumque; main token holds the whole word)
  - 245: ***facite***
  - 246: ***fuit***
  - 246: ***fuit*** (main "same" is the English side-note word; the print has fuit here (line opens "fuit institutus") and the main scan lost it; institutus follows at pos 79)
  - 246: ***institutus*** (print = institutus)

Part 8: The schism and the oaths of obedience

Loserth pp. 246.22–250.21

¶1 246.22–247.3
246.22 *The Church would be better without such prelates and without endowments.*
247.4 *It is objected that disendowment would destroy the oaths and services by which men are bound to the pope.*
247.15 *Such bonds must be conditional or men would find themselves bound to Antichrist e. g. in swearing to Robert or Urban.*

[246]**Feci autem ad hoc raciones multiplices ex sufficiencia legis Christi et ex vertibilitate Romani pontificis; ymo patet ex dictis quomodo corpus Christi militaret securius atque perfeccius subducto tali ordine cesareo; nam vivendo omnino exproprietarie, sicut ante dotacionem tempore quo crevit ecclesia, quando pure regulabatur per legem Christi et regebatur per sacerdotes socios sine preeminencia humanitus instituta, melius et perfeccius vixit quam modo. Nec est racio quin per idem hodie viaret sic perfeccius quam nunc viat, igitur cum hoc sit possibile, patet conclusio. Tolle igitur dotacionem et tradiciones humanas, quibus preter scripturam** [247]**sacram occupatur ecclesia et oriretur ecclesie prior status, qui foret indubie similior et disposicior ad ecclesiam triumphantem.**

And I have made many arguments to this end, from the sufficiency of the law of Christ and from the changeableness of the Roman pontiff; indeed, it is clear from what has been said how the body of Christ would fight more securely and more perfectly if such a caesarean order were withdrawn.[1] For by living altogether without property, as before the endowment, in the time when the church grew, when it was ruled purely by the law of Christ and governed by priests who were fellows, without a preeminence instituted by men, it lived better and more perfectly than now. Nor is there any reason why, by the same token, it would not today be a wayfarer in this way more perfectly than it now is; therefore, since this is possible, the conclusion is clear. Take away, then, the endowment and the human traditions with which, beyond holy [247]**scripture, the church is occupied, and the church's former state would arise, which would without doubt be more like the church triumphant and more disposed toward it.**

¶2 247.4–247.7

[247]**Sed obicitur contra illud tripliciter, primo quod tunc perirent iuramenta et lige tam personarum quam ordinum quibus obediencie pape et Romane curie obligantur.**

But it is objected against this in three ways: first, that then the oaths and leagues, of persons as much as of orders, by which they are bound to the obedience of the pope and of the Roman curia, would perish.[2]

¶3 247.8–248.5
248.6 *We should obey the pope and prelates only so far as they accord with Christ.*
248.17 *Christ has ordained the Schism to make this clear,*

[247]**Sed constat quod lige tales forent infidelissime, nisi subintelligantur condicionaliter, de quanto sedes illa et persone compensant in facto imitando Christum similius et tenendo religionem suam perfeccius, ut verbaliter profitentur. Aliter quidem contingeret quod persone et ordines obligate forent tenere cum Antichristo et eius discipulis contra Christum, nam (ut patet ex dictis) est magna disposicio, ut ista comitiva sit realiter Antichristus. Unde ad tantum dicitur hodie perplexa ecclesia, quod fratres necessitantur Parisius iurare Roberto obedienciam tamquam capiti, quod sciunt vel credunt firmiter verum papam; in Anglia autem necessitantur iurare Urbano nostro forma consimili, licet illi sint directe contrarii, ubi oportet quod altera pars infideliter incurrat periurium sive perfidiam. Et cum ex famosis principiis legistarum oportet facere sub pena peccati mortalis quicquid papa mandaverit, oportet credere ut fidem, quicquid in excomunicacione et infidelitate papa decreverit. Et sic de iudicio pape ad propositum. Manifeste sequitur cum paribus quod oportet utramque partem imponere**

But it is evident that such leagues would be most faithless unless they are understood as implied conditionally: to the extent that that see and its persons make return in deed by imitating Christ more closely and keeping their religion more perfectly, as they profess in words. Otherwise, indeed, it would come about that the persons and orders so bound would be obliged to hold with Antichrist and his disciples against Christ; for (as is clear from what has been said) there is a great disposition for this company to be in reality Antichrist. Hence the church is said today to be perplexed to such a degree that the friars are compelled at Paris to swear obedience to Robert as head, whom they know or firmly believe [to be] the true pope; and in England they are compelled to swear to our Urban in a like form, although those two are directly contrary, where one party or the other must faithlessly incur perjury or perfidy.[3] And since, by the well-known principles of the legists, one must do on pain of mortal sin whatever the pope has commanded, one must believe as faith whatever

infidelitatem secte Antichristi alteri et relinquere comunicacionem cum reliqua tamquam excomunicata, heretica et omni possessione ac iure indigna; et sic de infinitis inconvenientibus, [248] que ad nimis magnam equivocacionem fidei sequerentur. Ideo tam prelati qui onerarunt homines sic iurare quam illi qui sic sollempnizarunt hanc obedienciam, discuterent et declararent suam sentenciam pro instruccione ecclesie.

the pope has decreed in [matters of] excommunication and unbelief. And so with the pope's judgement on the matter in hand.[4] It follows plainly, with like [premisses], that each party must impute the unbelief of the sect of Antichrist to the other, and abandon communion with the other as excommunicate, heretical, and unworthy of every possession and right; and so on with infinite absurdities[5] [248] that would follow upon an exceedingly great equivocation of faith.[6] Therefore both the prelates who laid it on men to swear thus and those who so solemnized this obedience should discuss and declare their teaching[7] for the instruction of the church.

¶4 248.6–249.12
249.6 *I should be ashamed to shew miself at Oxford, if I had upheld such obedience in the schools.*
249.18 *Half Christendom would be lost eternally.*

[248] Sentencia autem catholica quam sepe repecii stat in isto quod nec est credendum nec obediendum pape, episcopo, abbati vel cuicumque spirituali preposito, nisi de quanto dixerit vel mandaverit legem Christi, et per consequens nec Urbano nec Roberto tenetur fidelis credere, nisi de quanto fidem scripture dixerit; nec est de substancia fidei explicite credere alterum eorum esse papam. Benedictus Deus veritatis, qui ordinavit istam dissensionem, ut veritas huius fidei elucescat. Nam ego fidelis philosophus extra utramque istarum parcium sic opinancium, unam istarum parcium hec negantem de reliqua sic arguo; nec credo quod evadet iuxta sua principia: Dicit enim quod subditus tenetur sub pena mortalis obedire papa suo in quibuscumque neutris que ipse mandaverit. Cum igitur iuxta sua principia omnis verus papa habens iurisdicionem super totam ecclesiam precipit vel debet precipere cuilibet membro eius, ut declinet reliquum ut excomunicandum Antichristum, patet quod utraque secta tenetur credere consequenter de reliqua, quod sit a fide Christi scismatica. Dicit enim utraque secta quod omnis subiectus pape sub pena peccati mortalis debet facere omne possibile sibi quod papa suus virtute sacre obediencie sibi mandaverit, et per consequens ipso mandante ut veniat sibi, ut det sibi medietatem [249] sue substancie, et sic de neutris similibus tenetur sub pena mortalis illud perficere; et sic uno precipiente suis quod non veniant ad concilium generale, et alio precipiente suis quod veniant, diu foret antequam esset utrumque concilium congregatum. Unde medium empericum foret ad temptandum religiosos qui sic magnificant suam obedienciam, si loquuntur ex animo, quod papa suus precipiat ista neutra. Et revera ego verecundarer in Oxonia caput erigere, si istam sentenciam de obediencia in scolis publice seminassem.

And the catholic teaching, which I have often repeated, consists in this: that one is neither to believe nor to obey pope, bishop, abbot or any spiritual superior, except to the extent that he has spoken or commanded the law of Christ; and consequently the faithful man is not bound to believe either Urban or Robert except to the extent that he has spoken the faith of scripture; nor is it of the substance of faith to believe explicitly that either of them is pope. Blessed be the God of truth, who ordained this dissension, that the truth of this faith might shine forth. For I, a faithful philosopher outside both of these parties that so opine, argue thus against one of these parties, which denies these things of the other; and I do not think it will escape, by its own principles.[8] For it says that a subject is bound, on pain of mortal [sin], to obey his pope in any neutral things whatever that he has commanded.[9] Since, therefore, by its principles every true pope having jurisdiction over the whole church commands, or ought to command, every member of it to shun the other as an Antichrist to be excommunicated,[10] it is clear that each sect is bound to believe, consequently, of the other that it is schismatic from the faith of Christ. For each sect says that every subject of the pope, on pain of mortal sin, must do everything possible to him that his pope has commanded him in virtue of holy obedience; and consequently, if he commands him to come to him, or to give him half [249] of his substance, and so with like neutral things, he is bound on pain of mortal [sin] to carry it out; and so, with one commanding his own not to come to the general council and the other commanding his own to come, it would be long before either council was assembled. Hence it would be an empirical means of testing the religious who so magnify their obedience, whether they speak from the heart, that their pope should command these neutral things. And in

¶5 249.13–249.35

[249]**Est igitur tractatus istius articuli cuicumque fideli necessarius et specialiter isti opinioni, cum dicit se esse membrum dyaboli et nisi resipiscat dampnandum, nisi adhereat vero pape; et revera pro querendo minori bono quam est regnum celorum, et profugiendo minori malo quam est dampnacio gehenne, daret operam ad scrutinium veritatis, ymo antequam scandalizaret tantum numerum de exercitu christiano, tum oportet eos dicere, quod maior pars vel quasi medietas christianismi relicta sit per unum Antichristum perdita. Noticiam igitur veri pape discuterent et post noticiam verum papam eligerent ac pro salvacione sui et populi veritatem catholicam publice predicarent; ideo vel sunt segnes infidelibus nequiores vel credunt sentenciam suam de obediencia esse ficticiam. Ego autem credo ex necessitate divina sentenciam quam dixi superius esse fidelibus instancius detegendam, ut si Deus voluerit, fideles moveantur dotacionem destruere, que est radix istius magne versucie vel saltem primatum cesareum minus attendere.**

truth I would be ashamed to raise my head in Oxford if I had sown this teaching on obedience publicly in the schools.

The treatment of this article, then, is necessary to every faithful man, and especially to this opinion, since it says that [a man] is a member of the devil, and to be damned unless he comes to his senses, unless he adheres to the true pope; and in truth, for seeking a lesser good than the kingdom of heaven, and for fleeing a lesser evil than the damnation of gehenna, it would give its effort to the scrutiny of the truth, indeed before it scandalized so great a number of the Christian army; for then they must say that the greater part, or almost half, of Christendom has been left lost through one Antichrist.[11] They should therefore discuss the knowledge of the true pope, and after the knowledge elect the true pope, and for the salvation of themselves and of the people preach the catholic truth publicly; therefore either they are sluggish, more wicked than unbelievers, or they believe their teaching on obedience to be a fiction. But I believe, from divine necessity, that the teaching I stated above must be exposed to the faithful more urgently, so that, if God wills, the faithful may be moved to destroy the endowment, which is the root of this great craftiness, or at least to pay less heed to the caesarean primacy.

¶6 249.36–250.6
250.10 *St. Jerome's reliance on the Roman Church.*

[249]**Oportet igitur studere, ex quo signo debemus cognoscere verum papam, cum eleccio, opinio** [250]**aut reprobacio humana sit huic impertinens. Ista enim non auctoritative constituunt vel faciunt verum papam, quia tunc recurreretur ad hoc fundamentum fidei, ut salus exinde consequens habeatur, sed omittendo vel incurrimus notam infidelitatis vel subsannamus istam ficticiam.**

We must therefore study by what sign we ought to know the true pope, since human election, opinion [250]**or reprobation is irrelevant to this. For these do not authoritatively constitute or make a true pope, since then recourse would be had to this as a foundation of faith, so that salvation would be held to follow from it; but in passing [it] over we either incur the mark of unbelief or mock this fiction.[12]**

¶7 250.7–250.21

[250]**Secundo replicatur per decretum beati Jeronymi positum XXIV distinccione prima, ubi sic scribitur: Hec est fides, papa beatissime, quam in ecclesia catholica didicimus quamque semper tenuimus, in qua si quid minus perite aut parum caute aliquid positum est, emendari cupimus a te, qui Petri sedem tenes et fidem. Si autem hec nostra confessio apostolatus tui iudicio comprobatur, quicumque me culpare voluerit, se imperitum aut malivolum vel eciam non catholicum sed hereticum comprobabit. Et sequitur: Sancta Romana ecclesia, que semper immaculata permansit, Domino concedente et beato Petro apostolo opem ferente in futuro manebit sine ulla hereticorum insultacione firmaque et immobilis persistet omni tempore.**

Secondly, it is rejoined, by appeal to the decree of blessed Jerome set down in XXIV, first distinction, where it is written thus:[13] "This is the faith, most blessed pope, which we have learned in the catholic church and have always held; in which, if anything has been set down less skilfully or with too little caution, we desire to be corrected by you, who hold the see and the faith of Peter. But if this our confession is approved by the judgement of your apostleship, whoever wishes to blame me will prove himself unskilled or malevolent, or even not catholic but heretical." And it follows: "The holy Roman church, which has always remained immaculate, with the Lord granting it and blessed Peter the apostle

bringing help, will remain in future without any assault of heretics, and will persist firm and immovable at all times."[14]

Notes

1. *vertibilitate*: "changeableness", the mutability of whoever holds the see (a good pope may be followed by a heretic), set against the sufficiency of Christ's law. *subducto tali ordine cesareo* is an ablative absolute, read as a condition.
2. Both manuscripts mark the objection in the margin: *Obicitur*. The second and third objections follow at 250.7 and 256.3 (*Secundo replicatur*, *Tercio replicatur*).
3. Robert of Geneva, elected at Fondi in September 1378 as Clement VII, and Urban VI, elected at Rome in April 1378: the two obediences of the Great Schism, Paris holding to Clement and England to Urban. C. *quod sciunt vel credunt firmiter verum papam*: *quod* is taken as a relative ("whom") with the head *capiti*; it could also be "that", with an ellipse ("[swear] that they know or firmly believe [him] the true pope").
4. *Et sic de iudicio pape ad propositum* has no verb: "and the same holds of the pope's judgement, as bears on the point", i.e. what holds of his commands holds of his judgements in matters of faith.
5. *inconvenientibus*: the absurd consequences of a premiss (the argument's sense), not "troubles"; the glossary's CONTEXTUAL row.
6. Loserth suggests at 248.1 *an enervacionem?* ("or weakening?") for *equivocacionem*. The print's *equivocacionem* construes ("equivocation", one word "faith" made to name contrary things) and is translated.
7. *sentenciam*: "teaching", the position taught (the glossary's CONTEXTUAL row), not a judicial sentence; so throughout this chunk.
8. Both manuscripts write *unam istarum parcium ... opinancium* twice (Loserth on 248.18); the print gives it once. C. Loserth italicises *ego fidelis philosophus*; no source is identified and it is rendered as Wyclif's own phrase, without quotation marks.
9. *neutra*: "neutral things", acts neither commanded nor forbidden by God's law (things indifferent). Both manuscripts note in the margin at 248.19: *Obediencia in neutris*.
10. *excomunicandum* is Loserth's; both manuscripts read *excommunicativum* ("excommunicative", 248.27). The print governs.
11. The period is loose: *daret operam* ("it would give effort") argues from the lesser to the greater (men labour even for lesser goods; the more should this opinion search out the truth when heaven and hell are at stake). *tum oportet eos dicere* is taken as "for then they must say"; the plural *eos* passes from the opinion to those who hold it.
12. The sense of the last clause is compressed: if human election made a pope authoritatively, it would become a foundation of faith on which salvation depends; since it is not, to pass it over is either (on their view) unbelief or (on ours) a mocking of their fiction. The alternative, *omittendo* as "by leaving [the true sign] aside", gives the same result.
13. Decretum, Part II, C. 24 q. 1 c. 14 (Loserth; modern form ours); Wyclif calls the *quaestio* a *distinccio*. The text is the profession of faith that circulated under Jerome's name (the *Libellus fidei* of Pelagius, § 14, PL 45, 1718). R. B notes in the margin at 250.7: *Replicacio notabilis*; A, the Catholic copyist, at 250.8: *Nota argumentum optimum pro papam esse et pro eius regimine, sed cave extortam evasionem istius*, "note a very good argument for the pope's existence and his rule, but beware this man's forced evasion".
14. The second quotation (*Sancta Romana ecclesia ...*) is given by Wyclif as following in the same place; it is § 1 of the same canon, C. 24 q. 1 c. 14 (PL 187, 1269C), joined by Gratian with *Item*, and is not part of Pelagius' *Libellus*; Loserth gives no separate reference.
How the Latin of this passage was established
- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **246: *pontificis***
  - **247: *lige* [NW]**
  - **247: *lige* [NW]**
  - **247: *illa***
  - **247: *legistarum* [NW]**
  - **248: *stat* (main "preiates" is the side-note word prelates; the print line opens "stat in isto")**
  - **248: *in***
  - **248: *isto***
  - **248: *credo***
  - **248: *quod***
  - **248: *matica* (word split by the folio bar (scis | matica, 223b); this is the printed second part) [NW]**
  - **249: *publice***
  - **250: *parum***
  - **250: *hereticum***
  - **250: *ulla***
  - **248: *istarum* (print = istarum)**

Part 9: Jerome's Roman church is the race of the predestinate

Loserth pp. 250.22–253.27

¶1 250.22–253.27
250.28 *We must note how Jerome speaks of the predestinate.*
251.1 *Their faith sprang from Rome, but is not restricted to Rome or any place.*
251.15 *We know not who are of this true church.*
251.25 *Jerome may have had a revelation as to the Pope to whom he submitted.*
252.6 *Contradictory utterances of various popes.*
253.12 *Mutual charges of heresy.*

[250]Multe sunt et leges et sanctorum sentencie de preeminencia Romane ecclesie. Sed ad intelligendum ista decreta sanctorum doctorum theologie oportet postponere glossas Johannis de Deo, Johannis Andree, Johannis Monachi et eis similium, qui logice, methaphisice, theologice sanctorum sentencie sunt ignari. Oportet (inquam) notare iuxta dicta quod beatus Jeronymus loquitur de genere predestinatorum fidelium, qui principium sumpserant a Romanis. Paulus enim fuit Romanus ex genere, ut patet Act. XVI et [251]XXII, et Petrus ex occisione. Illam autem predestinatorum generacionem, cuius racio est insensibilis, oportet necessario semper stare fidelem ubicumque migraverit; nec oportet nunc aliquam eius partem Romam vel Avinonam incolere vel esse presbiterum, nisi forte necessitate ex supposicione, quod est nobis ambiguum; et de tali Romana ecclesia intelligit decretum Jeronymi, quia certum est ex VIII. capitulo quod pape plurimi Romani et Avinonici erant manifesti heretici et signantissimi Antichristi. Istam autem generacionem simpliciter et concrete intelligendo non est possibile peccare dampnabiliter, quia cum sit predestinata, necessario salvabitur, et quomodocumque peccaverit, habebit veniam. Sed de tali privilegio non est pompa, cum ignoramus, qui sunt de illa ecclesia. Beatus autem Jeronymus reputative locutus est et credibiliter ex fide quam sumpsit ex apostolicis operibus huius pape, sicut sancti reputative loquuntur, quando vident prelatos declinantes a Christi vestigiis, dicentes quod sunt dampnandi vel membra dyaboli. Utrum autem beatus Jeronymus habuit revelacionem de predestinacione huius pape et iusticia suorum operum, ignoratur. Subtilitas autem huius sensus est valde remota a noticia legistarum. Et patet quomodo intelligenda est condicionalis Jeronymi quod si illa sua confessio confirmatur illius pape iudicio, quicumque impugnare voluerit foret hereticus; reputative enim vel ex revelacione asseruit, quod ille papa non confirmaret aliud nisi verum. Sed dementis foret credere quod hoc debet trahi in consequenciam de quocumque Romano pontifice, quia certum est, quod multi eorum, quantum in eis fuit, ratificarunt multas hereses propter lucrum, [252]ut Gregorius, qui excessit decalogum, vel saltem pseudocardinales, qui sunt hodie cum Roberto, dicuntur dampnasse tamquam valde hereticum quod domini temporales possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente; et tamen Urbanus noster succedens mercede conduxit temporales dominos ad practizandum illam catholicam veritatem; sicut prior ecclesia commendavit et privilegiavit imperatorem ex hoc, quod

There are many laws and teachings of the saints on the preeminence of the Roman church.[1] But to understand these decrees of the holy doctors of theology one must set aside the glosses of Johannes de Deo, Johannes Andreae, Johannes Monachus and those like them, who are ignorant, in logic, metaphysics and theology, of the teachings of the saints.[2] One must (I say) note, in keeping with what has been said, that blessed Jerome speaks of the race of the predestinate faithful, who had taken their beginning from the Romans. For Paul was a Roman by race, as is clear from Acts 16 and [251]22, and Peter by his slaying.[3] Now that generation of the predestinate, whose character is imperceptible,[4] must necessarily always stand faithful wherever it has migrated; nor need any part of it now dwell in Rome or Avignon, or be a presbyter, except perhaps by necessity on supposition, which is doubtful to us; and it is of such a Roman church that the decree of Jerome understands [it], for it is certain from chapter 8 that very many Roman and Avignonese popes were manifest heretics and most notable Antichrists. And understanding this generation without qualification and concretely, it is not possible for it to sin damnably, since, being predestinate, it will necessarily be saved, and however it has sinned, it will have forgiveness.[5] But there is no boasting over such a privilege, since we do not know who are of that church. And blessed Jerome spoke by estimation, and credibly, from the faith that he took from the apostolic works of this pope, as the saints speak by estimation when they see prelates turning aside from the footsteps of Christ, saying that they are to be damned, or members of the devil.[6] But whether blessed Jerome had a revelation of the predestination of this pope and of the justice of his works is unknown. And the subtlety of this sense is very remote from the knowledge of the legists. And it is clear how Jerome's conditional is to be understood, that if that confession of his is confirmed by that pope's judgement, whoever wishes to attack it would be a heretic: for he asserted, by estimation or from revelation, that that pope would confirm nothing but the true. But it would be a madman's part to believe that this must be drawn into an inference for any Roman pontiff whatever,[7] for it is certain that many of them, as far as in them lay, ratified many heresies for gain, [252]as Gregory, who exceeded the decalogue, or at least the pseudo-cardinals who are today with Robert, are said to have condemned as very heretical [the proposition] that temporal lords can take away temporal goods from a delinquent church;[8] and yet our Urban,

pseudopapas deposuit et tam temporalia quam insignia pape ab illis abstulit nec non papas quos ipse instituit, approbavit, ut patet XXIII distinccione: In nomine Domini, ubi textus narrat, quomodo papa conqueritur quod crebris tunsionibus symoniace heresis sedes illa sepius est percussa, ideo volendo providere de remedio in futurum decrevit, quod mortuo papa cardinales, religiosi, clerici et layci conveniant ad eligendum unum papam idoneum de illius ecclesie gremio vel alterius, ubi magis fuerit idoneus, salvo semper privilegio imperatoris Henrici, quod in eleccione pape habeat cum suis heredibus interesse. Electus autem tamquam verus papa habebit ante consecracionem suam instar beati Gregorii potestatem disponendi papaliter de bonis ecclesie, et quemcumque qui ordinem eligendi impedierit anathematizat tamquam pessimum antichristum. Glossa autem ordinaria dicit, quod hic tangitur latenter quod legitur in cronicis, quomodo Benedictus qui successit Stephano eiectus est de pontificatu et Johannes Sabinensis episcopus factus est papa pro pecunia; cui impositum est nomen [253]Silvester. Sed iste deiectus est et restitutus Benedictus, qui iterum est eiectus; et datus est papatus Johanni archipresbitero ante portam Latinam, cui impositum est nomen Gregorius; et hic ab Henrico imperatore est deiectus et ultra montes translatus; et hoc totum uno anno factum est. Et propter hoc datum fuit hoc privilegium Henrico. Hec glossa decreti. Considerarent itaque clerici nostri imponentes heresim detegentibus has leges ecclesie, quomodo ipsi ex scandalo sunt econtra heretici. Sicut secta Roberti imponit nobis quod sumus heretici, nos econtra. Si enim iuxta illud decretum Jeronymi ille est hereticus, qui impugnat acrius, quod verus papa fecerit in se ipso, et sic secte iste dicunt altrinsecus se esse hereticos, ita quod ab origine mundi, ut credo, non fuit crebrior imposicio heretice pravitatis. Sicut enim sacerdotes imposuerunt Christo blasfemiam, que est peior pars heresis, sic ignari Antichristi discipuli imponunt heresim tamquam inimicis ecclesie eis qui plus zelant pro eius privilegiis que Christus concesserat conservandis, in tantum quod quidam doctor ignarus quia adeptus est dotacionem pontificis declamat acucius in locis plus publicis, quod talis est hereticus et hostis ecclesie. Nullus enim peior est apostata, quam qui post altiorem statum ecclesie ad mundum excidit.

succeeding, hired temporal lords for pay to put into practice that catholic truth; just as the former church commended and privileged the emperor for having deposed pseudo-popes and taken from them both the temporal goods and the insignia of the pope, and approved the popes whom he himself instituted, as is clear in distinction 23, *In nomine Domini*, where the text tells how the pope complains that "by frequent blows of simoniacal heresy that see has been struck rather often", and therefore, wishing to provide a remedy for the future, he decreed that "on the death of the pope, cardinals, religious, clerics and laymen should come together to elect one suitable pope from the bosom of that church or of another, where a more suitable one may be found, saving always the privilege of the emperor Henry, that he with his heirs should have a part in the election of the pope. And the one elected, as true pope, shall have before his consecration, after the example of blessed Gregory, power to dispose papally of the goods of the church; and whoever has impeded the order of electing he anathematizes as the worst antichrist."[9] And the ordinary gloss says that "here is touched covertly what is read in the chronicles: how Benedict, who succeeded Stephen, was ejected from the pontificate, and John, bishop of Sabina, was made pope for money, to whom was given the name [253]Silvester. But he was cast out and Benedict restored, who was ejected again; and the papacy was given to John, archpriest at the Latin Gate, to whom was given the name Gregory; and he was cast out by the emperor Henry and taken across the mountains; and all this was done in one year. And for this reason this privilege was given to Henry."[10] This is the gloss on the decree. Let our clerics therefore consider, who impute heresy to those who uncover these laws of the church, how they themselves, by the scandal, are on the contrary heretics.[11] Just as the sect of Robert imputes to us that we are heretics, we [impute it to them] in return. For if, according to that decree of Jerome, he is a heretic who attacks too sharply what the true pope has done in himself, then these sects too say of one another that they are heretics, so that from the origin of the world, as I believe, there has not been a more frequent imputation of heretical depravity.[12] For just as the priests imputed blasphemy to Christ, which is the worse part of heresy, so the ignorant disciples of Antichrist impute heresy, as to enemies of the church, to those who are more zealous for preserving its privileges, which Christ had granted; so much so that a certain ignorant doctor, because he has obtained the pontiff's endowment, declaims more sharply in the more public places that such a man is a heretic and an enemy of the church.[13] For no apostate

is worse than one who, after a higher state of the church, has fallen away to the world.

Notes

1. ***sentencie*: "teachings", positions taught (the glossary's CONTEXTUAL row), not judicial sentences; so throughout this chunk.**
2. Johannes de Deo, Johannes Andreae and Johannes Monachus (Jean Lemoine), canonists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. C. *logice, methaphisice, theologice* are adverbs qualifying *ignari*: they lack the logic, metaphysics and theology needed to read the saints. *postponere*: "set aside", literally "put after".
3. Acts 16:37 and 22:25–28, Paul a Roman citizen; Wyclif's *ex genere* makes it a matter of race. *Petrus ex occisione*: Peter became Roman by his martyrdom at Rome.
4. *racio* here is the ground by which the generation is what it is (predestination), not the technical "aspect" of the glossary's *racio* row; "imperceptible" because no one can see who is predestinate (251.15).
5. B reads *simpliciter conecte* for *simpliciter et concrete* (251.12); the print governs.
6. *reputative* (also 251.26, 251.30): "by estimation", speaking on a presumption drawn from the evidence, not asserting as known; opposed to *ex revelacione* here and to *assertive* at 257.22.
7. *consequenciam* is Loserth's expansion of the manuscript's *conam* (251.33). C. *trahi in consequenciam*, the canonists' idiom "to be drawn into a precedent", i.e. made a general rule; kept as "inference" under the the glossary row.
8. Loserth identifies the Gregory as Gregory XI (d. 1378), whose bulls of 1377 condemned propositions of Wyclif's, among them that temporal lords may take temporal goods from a delinquent church (Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* I, 354, the sixth conclusion: *domini temporales possunt legitime ac meritorie auferre bona fortunae ab Ecclesia delinquente*). Both manuscripts note in the margin at 252.1: *Auferre bona temporalia dampnatum est*. "Exceeded the decalogue" recurs at 254.25.
9. Decretum, Part I, D. 23 c. 1, *In nomine Domini*, the election decree of Nicholas II (1059) (Loserth; modern form ours). The quoted phrases follow Loserth's italics; the last clause is Wyclif's report in the present tense (*anathematizat*). Both manuscripts note in the margin at 252.12: *Simonia sedis Romane*, and at 252.27: *Deposicio paparum*. T. B reads *habeant* for *habeat* (252.21).
10. The *Glossa ordinaria* to the Decretum, D. 23 c. 1 (Loserth cites a Venice edition, vol. I, p. 97). The events are those of 1044–1046 (Benedict IX, Silvester III, Gregory VI, the last deposed by Henry III at Sutri); Loserth's foot to 253.1 reads *Glossa ordinaria: Benedictus X*, i.e. the gloss calls the restored Benedict the tenth; he was Benedict IX (Sigebert of Gembloux, *Chronica*, a. 1045–46, PL 160, 208C–209A, has the three rival popes and Henry's deposition of them).
11. *imponentes* is Loserth's; both manuscripts read *impotentes* (253.8–9). The print governs.
12. The *Si enim ...* clause has no clean apodosis: *et sic ... dicunt* is taken as its consequent ("then these sects too say"). The object of *impugnat* is read as "what the true pope has done in himself", i.e. confirmed by his own judgement (Jerome's condition); the alternative, that *quod* gives the content of the heresy, does not change the argument.
13. Matt. 26:65, the high priest's charge of blasphemy. C. *quidam doctor* is not named.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **251: *Sed* (the box also takes in the side-note "We who")**
  - **251: *illa***
  - **251: *legistarum* [NW]**
  - **251: *illa***
  - **252: *nomine***
  - **252: *illa***
  - **252: *suis***
  - **252: *tangitur***
  - **253: *et restitutus* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **253: *iterum***
  - **253: *eiectus***
  - **253: *Johanni***
  - **253: *archipresbitero***
  - **253: *Latinam***
  - **253: *montes***
  - **253: *translatus***
  - **253: *uno***
  - **253: *imponunt* (LEFT-nw: line number 20 glued; print = imponunt)**

Part 10: The king charged with heresy, and Lincoln on the cardinals

¶1 253.28–255.20
254.1 *Prelates go so far as to charge the king with heresy.*
254.28 *The cardinals elected Urban and then declared that his election was not lawful.*
255.6 *We think Urban is probably a true pope, and that Robert is not even a member of the Church.*
255.21 *Others may think the Opposite.*

[253]Consolacio autem a Christo est in operando in causa ista fideliter et constanter, cum Matth. X, 25 dicat: Si patremfamilias Belzebub vocaverunt, quanto magis domesticos eius? Ideo ibant apostoli gaudentes quod digni habiti sunt pro nomine Jhesu contumeliam pati. Sed et consolacio quedam mundana exoritur, quod ad tantum insane prorumpunt satrape in suis sermonibus, quod imponunt [254]principalem heresim regi suo. Rex, inquiunt, care conduxit stipendiarios contra sanctam ecclesiam; ex quo patenter implicant quod rex eorum sit heresiarcha non obstante ignorancia puerili. Apostolus enim non fuit excusatus a blasfemia, non obstante quod per ignoranciam stulte fecit, ut prima Timothei primo. Videtur itaque nimis magna presumpcio sic imponere heresim toti consilio tanti regni; predicarent enim iuxta suam opinionem atque scienciam de periculosiori heresi adversancium pape suo, et si umquam valet sciencia decretiste, valet ad cerciorandum ecclesiam in hac parte. Dicit enim quod ad illos singulariter pertinet cognoscere disposicionem veri pape et rectitudinem sue consuetudinis cum aliis annexis difficultatibus, sicut ad eos pertinet cognoscere quiditatem heresis et penam sui subditi. Doceant igitur in istis populum de fraude, quia (ut inquiunt) sine fide istius articuli non est salus; ostendant igitur artem suam in isto fideliter, quia maior et famosior est multitudo decretistarum eis contraria in hac parte et specialiter cuneus pseudocardinalium, quibus videbatur regi ecclesie tempore Gregorii excedentis decalogum. Ipsi enim in tradicionibus humanis periti, qui melius noverunt qualitatem eleccionis quam ipsimet celebrarunt, testantur nobis cartis et nunciis, quod eleccio eorum non fuit legitima, et sic (ut inquiunt) noster Urbanus, quem colimus infideliter, non est papa. Nostri autem theologi dicunt primo, quod licet eleccio eorum, ut vere creditur, fuerit maledicta, eleccio tamen passiva Urbani nostri ex eleccione activa Dei est valida, dum tamen fiat ab ipso electo in veris factis papalibus [255]recompensa. Dicunt secundo quod nedum catholice sed melius quam modo conversaretur fidelis ecclesia quocumque papa cesareo subducto, quia Act. IV, 12 dicitur, quod non est aliud nomen sub celo, in quo oportet nos salvos fieri preter nomen domini Jhesu Christi. Et dicunt tercio quod pensando virtutum insignia probabiliter reputant Urbanum nostrum verum papam, cum omnes sancti episcopi erant pape, et Robertum non reputant explicite papam vel membrum sancte ecclesie, quia in De Verbis Domini sermone LIII sic scribitur: Caput humile et membrum superbum absit; non vult esse de corpore capitis Christi, quia amat

And consolation from Christ lies in working in this cause faithfully and constantly, since Matt. 10:25 says: "If they have called the good man of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?" Therefore the apostles went "rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus."[1] But a certain worldly consolation also arises, in that the satraps break out so madly in their sermons that they impute [254]principal heresy to their king. "The king," they say, "has dearly hired mercenaries against holy church"; from which they plainly imply that their king is a heresiarch, notwithstanding his boyish ignorance.[2] For the apostle was not excused from blasphemy, notwithstanding that he acted foolishly through ignorance, as in 1 Timothy 1.[3] It seems, then, exceedingly great presumption so to impute heresy to the whole council of so great a kingdom; for they should preach, according to their opinion and knowledge, about the more dangerous heresy of those opposing their pope; and if the knowledge of a decretist is ever worth anything, it is worth it for certifying the church in this matter. For it says that it pertains to them uniquely to know the disposition of the true pope and the rightness of his custom, with the other difficulties annexed, just as it pertains to them to know the quiddity of heresy and the penalty of their subject. Let them therefore teach the people in these things about the fraud, since (as they say) without faith in this article there is no salvation; let them therefore show their art faithfully in this, since the multitude of decretists contrary to them in this matter is greater and better known, and especially the wedge of pseudo-cardinals, by whom the church seemed to be ruled in the time of Gregory, who exceeded the decalogue.[4] For they, skilled in human traditions, who knew best the quality of the election that they themselves conducted, testify to us by charters and messengers that their election was not lawful, and so (as they say) our Urban, whom we faithlessly honour, is not pope.[5] But our theologians say, first, that although their election, as is truly believed, was accursed, yet the passive election of our Urban, from the active election of God, is valid, provided that, in true papal deeds, it is [255]repaid by the one elected himself.[6] They say, second, that the faithful church would live not only in a catholic manner but better than now with any caesarean pope whatever withdrawn, since Acts 4:12 says that "there is no other name under heaven" in which we must be saved, except the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.[7] And they say, third, that, weighing

superbiam. Unde cum secundum eundem Augustinum sermone L Christus vere loquens de quibuscumque pastoribus, cum in se habet omnes pastores bonos vere dicit: Ego sum unus, mecum omnes in unitate unum sunt. Prescitus autem cum sit membrum dyaboli, non compaginatur ordinate huic capiti.

the marks of the virtues, they reckon with probability that our Urban is the true pope, since all holy bishops were popes, and they do not reckon Robert explicitly pope or a member of holy church, since in *On the Words of the Lord*, sermon 53, it is written thus: "Far be it [that there be] a humble head and a proud member; he does not wish to be of the body of the head, Christ, because he loves pride."[8] Hence since, according to the same Augustine in sermon 50, Christ, speaking truly of all pastors whatever, since he has in himself all good pastors, truly says: "I am one; with me all are one in unity."[9] And the foreknown man, since he is a member of the devil, is not fitted in due order to this head.[10]

¶2 255.21–256.2

[255] Istam autem negativam dico opinando, sicut secta altera possit catholice dicere conformiter de Urbano. Ideo oportet, quod opera iusta dent fidem papatus, cum nichil sit fallacius quam humana eleccio et tradicio phariseica cum suo iudicio. Nam easdem tradiciones habet secta Roberti et nostra, et tamen in iudicio quo maxime servirent ecclesie sunt directe opposite, et indubie neutra pars noscit evidenciam vie sue; theologus autem neutram sectam dampnat, sed instar libertatis christianorum primeve ecclesie dicit quod utraque pars potest viare satis catholice, et sive uter eorum credat explicite, et quicumque [256] theologus dixerit huius contrarium, a facultate sua degenerat.

And this negative I state as an opinion, just as the other sect could say the like of Urban in a catholic manner. Therefore it must be just works that give credence to a papacy, since nothing is more deceptive than human election and pharisaic tradition with its judgement.[11] For the sect of Robert and ours have the same traditions, and yet in the judgement in which they would most serve the church they are directly opposed, and without doubt neither party knows the evidence for its way; but the theologian condemns neither sect, but, after the pattern of the freedom of the Christians of the primitive church, says that each party can be a wayfarer catholicly enough, whether or not either of them believes explicitly; and whatever [256] theologian says the contrary of this degenerates from his faculty.[12]

¶3 256.3–257.10

257.14 *Grosseteste's claims for the pope are conditional on his being what he ought to be.*

[256] Tercio replicatur ex dicto Lynconiensis Epistola XXXVI, ubi sic loquitur: Sicut super mundi cardines mundus innititur eorumque fulcimine supportatur, sic super sancte Romane ecclesie cardinales orbis terrarum qui non commovebitur, id est universalis ecclesia que nullis commocionibus a stabilitate fidei deicitur, fixe innititur et ab eisdem forte et firmiter sustinetur. Ipsi enim sunt quos vocat psalmista fundamenta orbis terrarum, ipsi sunt de quibus in Yob scribitur: Sub quo curvantur qui portant orbem; dum enim curas ecclesie oneraque cunctorum tolerant, quasi sibi superimpositum orbem portant. Et sicut in mundo visibili sol iste conspicuus suo preeminenti lumine mundi tenebras purgat singulariterque mundum illustrat motuque suo ordinatissimo ceteros motus corporales naturales ordinat et regulat, sic in orbem ecclesie summus pontifex vicem solis obtinet precellenti luce doctrine et eximiorum operum, mundum purgans ab errorum tenebris, ad veritatis cognicionem singulari prerogativa eundem illuminans, omnes eciam motus

Thirdly, it is rejoined, from the saying of Lincoln in Letter 36, where he speaks thus:[13] "Just as the world rests upon the hinges of the world and is supported by their prop, so upon the cardinals of the holy Roman church 'the world which shall not be moved', that is, the universal church, which is cast down from the stability of faith by no commotions, rests fixedly, and is sustained by them strongly and firmly.[14] For they are those whom the psalmist calls 'the foundations of the world'; they are those of whom it is written in Job: 'Under whom they stoop that bear up the world'; for while they bear the cares of the church and the burdens of all, they carry, as it were, the world laid upon them.[15] And just as in the visible world this conspicuous sun by its preeminent light purges the darkness of the world and singularly illumines the world, and by its most ordered motion orders and regulates the other natural bodily motions, so in the orb of the church the highest pontiff holds the place of the sun, by the surpassing light of doctrine and of excellent works,

accionum in universali ecclesia disposicione sua ordinans, regulans et gubernans. Quemadmodum igitur mundi status, decor et ordo post mundi conditorem angelicosque spiritus ad conditoris nutum administratorios debent subesse soli visibili mundique cardinibus, sic ut veraciter senciunt qui que sursum sunt sapiunt, post mundi conditorem et redemptorem curiamque celestem ex spiritibus beatis angelorum et sanctorum [257]adunatam, status, decor et ordo universalis ecclesie debet subesse suo soli suisque cardinibus, hoc est, summo pontifici sibique assistentibus cardinalibus. Ideoque sancte Romane ecclesie debetur ab universis ecclesie filiis devotissima obediencia, honoratissima reverencia, id est, ferventissimus amor, subiectissimus timor. Hec et hiis similia ab eis debentur obligacius et forcius, qui pro sublimitate gradus ecclesiastici fastigio ecclesie, id est, summo pontifici et cardinalibus adherent proximius.

purging the world from the darkness of errors, illuminating it with a singular prerogative to the knowledge of truth, ordering, regulating and governing also all the motions of actions in the universal church by his disposition. As, therefore, the state, beauty and order of the world, after the world's maker and the angelic spirits ministering at the maker's nod, ought to be subject to the visible sun and the hinges of the world, so, as those truly perceive who 'mind the things that are above', after the maker and redeemer of the world and the heavenly court gathered [257] from the blessed spirits of angels and saints, the state, beauty and order of the universal church ought to be subject to its sun and its cardinals, that is, to the highest pontiff and the cardinals assisting him.[16] And therefore to the holy Roman church is owed, by all the sons of the church, most devoted obedience, most honoured reverence, that is, most fervent love, most subject fear. These things, and things like them, are owed more bindingly and more strongly by those who, for the sublimity of their ecclesiastical rank, cling more closely to the summit of the church, that is, to the highest pontiff and the cardinals."

¶4 257.11–257.13

[257]Talia sunt multa dicta Lyncolniensis et aliorum doctorum, que ex defectu intelligencie inferiores infatuant et superiores faciunt insanire.

Many sayings of Lincoln and of other doctors are of this kind, which, through a defect of understanding, make fools of inferiors and make superiors go mad.

¶5 257.14–257.18

[257]Unde pro intentu dictorum huius sancti notandum, primo quod describitur in dictis qualis debet esse summus pontifex cum cardinalibus, cum, ut dicit in sermone suo ad papam, ipse gerit in militante ecclesia vicem Christi.

Hence, for the intent of the sayings of this saint, it is to be noted, first, that these sayings describe what kind of man the highest pontiff with the cardinals ought to be, since, as he says in his sermon to the pope, he bears in the church militant the place of Christ.[17]

¶6 257.19–257.21

[257]Ex quo patet quod oportet verum papam conversari Christo similius et aliter est ex mendacio dolosissimus Antichristus.

From which it is clear that a true pope must live more like Christ, and otherwise he is, by [his] lie, a most deceitful Antichrist.

¶7 257.22–257.32

[257]Secundo notandum quod iste sanctus intelligit predicta re putative vel condicionaliter, et non assertive competere pape secum viventi, quia aliter foret nimis sompniferus contradictorius sibi ipsi. Ipse enim obedienter pape tamquam Antichristo restitit ad tribunal Christi ab eius iudicio appellando et post mortem eundem usque ad mortem quasi cuspide baculi vulneravit, ut dixi VIII capitulo. Et patet quod nichil insanius quam credere quod eo ipso quo quis fungitur vice pape iste condiciones sibi conveniunt.

Secondly, it is to be noted that this saint understands the foregoing to belong to the pope living in his time by estimation, or conditionally, and not assertively; for otherwise he would be exceedingly dreamy, contradictory to himself.[18] For he obediently resisted the pope as Antichrist, appealing from his judgement to the tribunal of Christ, and after [his own] death wounded the same [pope] even to death, as it were with the point of his staff, as I said in chapter 8.[19] And it is clear that nothing is more insane than to believe that, by the very fact that someone discharges the office of pope, these conditions belong to him.

Notes

1. Acts 5:41; Wyclif cites only the phrase from *gaudentes*, and gives no reference.
2. The king is Richard II, born 1367, hence "boyish ignorance"; the occasion of the charge about "mercenaries" has not been identified. G. *satrape*: Wyclif's derogatory word for the officials of the church courts, as at its first use in this work.
3. 1 Tim. 1:13, "who before was a blasphemer ... but I obtained the mercy of God, because I did it ignorantly"; Wyclif turns the verse to say that ignorance did not clear Paul of the name of blasphemer.
4. *cuneus* and *pseudocardinalium* are Loserth's; the manuscripts read *timens* and *pseudocarnalium* (B *carnalia*) (254.23). The print governs. C. *quibus videbatur regi ecclesie*: read as *regi* passive with *ecclesie* for *ecclesia*, "by whom the church seemed to be ruled"; the alternative, "to whom it seemed good to rule the church", is possible. Gregory: Gregory XI (see 252.1).
5. The cardinals who elected Urban VI in April 1378 declared the election invalid in August 1378 (Anagni) and elected Robert of Geneva at Fondi (Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* I, 369, 393). T. B reads *de tradicionibus* for *in tradicionibus* (254.25).
6. "Passive election", Urban's being elected; "active election", God's electing him: the cardinals' act may be void and God's choice still stand, provided Urban repays it in deeds.
7. Acts 4:12; the Vulgate reads *nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri* (DR "For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved"). Wyclif's version drops *datum hominibus* and adds *preter nomen domini Jhesu Christi*; his Latin is translated, the words common to both in DR's wording.
8. Augustine, *De verbis Domini*, sermon 53, as Wyclif cites it, i.e. *Sermo* 354.9 (*Ad continentes*), PL 39, 1568: *Caput humile, et membrum superbum? Absit. Non vult esse de corpore capitis humilis, qui amat superbiam* (Loserth: Opera, tom. V, col. 1375). C. *cum omnes sancti episcopi erant pape*: *papa*, "father", was once the title of every bishop. R. A notes in the margin at 255.12: *Prescitus non est membrum*.
9. Augustine, *Sermo* 138.5, PL 38, 765 (Wyclif's "sermon 50" is an older numbering; Loserth: ibid., p. 671), on the pastors: *Ego sum, unus sum, mecum omnes in unitate unum sunt*; cf. John 10:16. C. The sentence is an anacoluthon: *cum ... Christus ... vere dicit* has no main clause; the next sentence supplies the conclusion.
10. *Prescitus*: "the foreknown", those God foreknows will be damned (glossed at the first occurrence in this work).
11. *fidem papatus*: "credence to a papacy", i.e. ground for believing a man pope.
12. *et sive uter eorum credat explicite*: an incomplete *sive* clause, taken as "whether or not either of them believes explicitly" [in his pope]; the faculty is the faculty of theology.
13. Robert Grosseteste, *Epistolae*, ed. Luard, letter 36, to the cardinal Giles, p. 125 (Loserth). R. Both manuscripts note in the margin at 256.3: *Argumentum pro papa*, and at 256.6: *Cardinalium laus per Lincolniensem*. T. B omits *sicut super mundi* (256.4–5).
14. Grosseteste's figure turns on *cardines* "hinges" (the poles on which the world turns) and *cardinales* "cardinals". S. "The world which shall not be moved": Ps. 92:1 (Vulgate numbering; also Ps. 95:10).
15. Ps. 17:16 and Job 9:13 (Loserth).
16. "Mind the things that are above": Col. 3:2; the "ministering spirits": Heb. 1:14. T. Loserth's foot to 257.2 reads *Recte: debet se soli suo* (so the plate) against the print's *debet subesse suo soli*; there is no such note at 256.28–29. The print is translated in both places.
17. Grosseteste's sermon before Innocent IV at Lyon (1250; his visit to the curia, Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora* V, 96–98). R. Both manuscripts note in the margin at 257.14: *Papa qualis debet esse*.
18. *sompniferus contradictorius*: two predicates with no connective; a lost *et* is possible. *secum viventi*: "living with him", i.e. contemporary. R. A notes in the margin at 257.22: *Cave*.
19. Grosseteste's appeal against Innocent IV, and the story (Matthew Paris) that after his death he appeared to the pope and struck him with the point of his pastoral staff, from which the pope died (Higden, *Polychronicon* VIII, 240–42, as at chapter 8; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora* V, 429–30, 470–71). C. *post mortem* is taken as Grosseteste's own death.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 253: *X*
  - 253: *Belzebub*
  - 254: *ex* (print "ex quo patenter"; the main scan lost ex)
  - 254: *dicunt* (print "theologi dicunt 30 primo"; the main scan lost dicunt (30 is the line number))
  - 255: *preter*
  - 255: *eundem* (15 is the line number)
  - 256: *non*
  - 256: *fidei*
  - 256: *deicitur*
  - 256: *fixe*
  - 256: *innititur*
  - 256: *suo*
  - 256: *motuque*
  - 256: *ordinat*

- 256: ***administratorios***
- 256: ***redemptorem***
- 256: ***celestem*** (hyphenated ce-|lestem; main token holds the whole word)
- 256: ***spiritibus***
- 257: ***adunatam***
- 257: ***ferventissimus***
- 257: ***amor***
- 257: ***subiectissi*** (hyphenated subiectissi-|mus; main token subiectissi111 holds the first half plus the m, the rest (us) is at pos 38)
- 257: ***mus*** (second half of subiectissi-|mus; main split it as ...111 + us)
- 257: ***timor***
- 257: ***hiis***
- 256: ***preeminenti*** (one word)

Part 11: New articles of faith: no one must believe the pope is pope

Loserth pp. 257.33–261.7

¶1 257.33–258.18
258.19 *Some even say it is a matter of faith that the pope is the source of spiritual profit.*

[257] **Notandum est tercio quod iste doctor videtur prudenter innuere quod nullus episcopus cesareus** [258] **assumeret illud papale officium, quia obligat se ut sic quod sit in terris proximus sequax Christi, quod forte statui quem accipit est incompossibile. Ideo dicit Crysostomus Omelia XXVIII Operis Imperfecti: Quicumque, inquit, Domino humilitati studente iactancie studet, non est imago Christi, et qui Domino paupertatem amante diviciarum amator est in hoc seculo, repellit a se Christi similitudinem nec est vere discipulus qui non imitatur magistrum. Studeat igitur Romanus pontifex, si imitatur simillime vias Christi. Ideo dicit Epistola XLIII: Scio, inquit, domini pape et sancte sedis hanc esse potestatem, ut de omnibus beneficiis ecclesiasticis posset libere ordinare, scio quoque quod quisquis abutitur hac potestate edificat ad gehennam. Ideo (ut videtur multis) descripcio quam ponit de papa non convenit apostolis, sed solummodo pape summo.**

It is to be noted, thirdly, that this doctor seems prudently to hint that no caesarean bishop [258] **would take up that papal office, because he binds himself, as such, to be on earth the nearest follower of Christ, which is perhaps incompossible with the state he takes on.**[1] **Therefore Chrysostom says in Homily 28 of the *Opus imperfectum*: "Whoever," he says, "is zealous for boasting while the Lord was zealous for humility is not the image of Christ; and he who is a lover of riches in this world while the Lord loved poverty repels from himself the likeness of Christ; nor is he truly a disciple who does not imitate the master."**[2] **Let the Roman pontiff, therefore, be zealous [to see] whether he imitates the ways of Christ most closely. Therefore he says in Letter 43: "I know," he says, "that this is the power of the lord pope and of the holy see, that he could freely dispose of all ecclesiastical benefices; I know also that whoever abuses this power builds toward Gehenna."**[3] **Therefore (as it seems to many) the definition that he gives of the pope does not fit the apostles, but only the highest pope.**[4]

¶2 258.19–259.8
259.1 *If so, all the apostles and primitive christians were damned.*
259.9 *The pope owed his position to being the emperor's bishop.*
259.24 *Faith is not dependent on the pope.*

[258] **Unde propter talia verba quidam ad tantum insaniunt, quod dicunt neminem posse salvari nisi credat istum articulum fidei, quod quilibet papa sit per se causa tocius profectus spiritualis ecclesie. Unde Lyncolniensis Epistola XXXV: Ex generali debito subieccionis, quo non solum populus christianus sed totum humanum genus obligatur et sine cuius solucione nullus salutem consequitur, debitor sum sanctissime paternitati vestre excellentissimeque dominacioni plenitudinis, obediencie et reverencie, honoris et timoris. Et forte ex talibus verbis declamatoriis fuit iste doctor punitus a Domino**

Hence, because of such words, some go so far in madness that they say that no one can be saved unless he believes this article of faith, that every pope is of himself the cause of all the spiritual profit of the church.[5] **Hence Lincoln, Letter 35: "By the general debt of subjection, by which not only the Christian people but the whole human race is bound, and without the payment of which no one attains salvation, I am a debtor to your most holy paternity and most excellent exercise of lordship of fullness of obedience and reverence, of honour and fear."**[6] **And perhaps for such**

per eum quem verbis floridis [259]sic palpavit. Si enim iste sit tam necessarius articulus fidei, cum apostoli et omnes christiani ante dotacionem non crediderunt istum articulum, videtur quod absit quod eorum quilibet sit dampnandus. Sed dicti beati possunt de sic errantibus dicere irridendo: Novi recentesque articuli fidei per constitucionem imperatoris venerunt quos non coluerunt patres eorum.

declamatory words this doctor was punished by the Lord through him whom he [259]so flattered with flowery words.[7] For if this is so necessary an article of faith, since the apostles and all Christians before the endowment did not believe this article, it seems (God forbid) that every one of them is to be damned. But the said blessed ones can say mockingly of those who err so: "New and recent" articles of faith "have come" by the constitution of the emperor, "whom their fathers worshipped not".[8]

¶3 259.9–259.23

[259]Item (ut patet ex decretis et cronicis tactis VIII capitulo) licencia et auctoritate cesaris factum vel fictum est quod generaliter suus episcopus sit caput ecclesie. Sed ille imperator non habet plus potestatem condendi novos articulos fidei quam quilibet alius christianus; sic enim posset condere novam legem Christi et legem conditam abrogare; non enim licet vel angelo de celo onerare sanctam ecclesiam novis articulis vel ritibus extra scripturam sacram a Spiritu Sancto doctam, ut patet in materia De Cessacione Legalium. Magna (inquam) libertas et privilegium fuit facilitas in qua Christus posuit suam ecclesiam, ut patet Gal. II; et hoc privilegium debent cuncti christiani defendere.

Again (as is clear from the decrees and chronicles touched on in chapter 8), it was by Caesar's licence and authority made, or feigned, that his bishop should generally be head of the church.[9] Now that emperor has no more power of making new articles of faith than any other Christian; for so he could make a new law of Christ and abrogate the law already made; for it is not lawful even for an angel from heaven to burden holy church with new articles or rites outside holy scripture, taught by the Holy Spirit, as is clear in the matter *De cessatione legalium*.[10] A great liberty and privilege (I say) was the lightness in which Christ set his church, as is clear in Gal. 2; and this privilege all Christians ought to defend.[11]

¶4 259.24–259.32

[259]Item, non est possibile quod fidei orthodoxe sit falsitas substrata; sed sepe contingit quod Romanus pontifex non est papa, ymo posito quod sit; non est tantum necessarium ad salutem cuiuslibet christiani hoc credere, quod sine hoc non posset salvari, nam papa mortuo vel perverso non ex hoc titubat fides in quolibet christiano; et illud testarentur conversi per apostolos nostram nimirum demenciam deridendo.

Again, it is not possible that falsehood should underlie the orthodox faith; now it often happens that the Roman pontiff is not pope. Indeed, supposing that he is, it is not so necessary to the salvation of every Christian to believe this that without it he could not be saved; for when a pope is dead or perverted, the faith of any Christian does not totter on that account; and those converted by the apostles would testify to this, mocking, no doubt, our madness.[12]

¶5 259.33–260.20
260.21 *Explicit and implicit belief.*

[259]Assumptum patet ex hoc quod aliter Deus necessitaret hominem ad menciendum et per consequens ad peccandum, et unus alius ymo sic [260]illusus pie crederet eius contradiccionem, sicut christianus credit implicite esse verum; et sic oportet utramque sectam Urbani et Roberti dicere quod reliqua sit heretica, quia articuli fidei non limitantur sic ad loca, ut in ista villa teneantur credi et in proxima villa discredi. Nec valent sophismata quibus putantes subtiliare referunt quod papa potest facere novos articulos fidei et per consequens facere antiquos cessare, ymo facere christianos teneri credere falsitati, quia si quelibet veritas sit articulus fidei, tunc sacramenta potest facere, novos articulos ymo musca; sed et illum articulum sollempnizatum, quod iste sit papa, potest nedum imperator facere vel electores, sed quodcumque animatum vel inanimatum fuerit ad hoc movens.

The assumption is clear from this, that otherwise God would necessitate a man to lie, and consequently to sin; and another man, indeed one so [260]deluded, would piously believe its contradictory, as a Christian implicitly believes it to be true; and so each sect, Urban's and Robert's, must say that the other is heretical, because articles of faith are not so limited to places that they are to be believed in this town and disbelieved in the next town.[13] Nor do the sophisms avail by which those who think to refine report that the pope can make new articles of faith, and consequently make the old ones cease, indeed make Christians bound to believe a falsehood; for if every truth is an article of faith, then [one] can make sacraments, new articles, indeed a fly [can].[14] And indeed that solemnized article, that this man is pope, not only the emperor or the electors can

Sed evidencius foret, quod quis rogando Deum et perficiens papale officium, faciat se ipsum et plus timeat quod venenum peccati quam quod venenum corporis corrumpat istum christiane fidei articulum.

make, but whatever thing, animate or inanimate, has been moving to it. But it would be more evident that someone, by praying to God and carrying out the papal office, should make himself [pope], and should fear more that the poison of sin than that the poison of the body should corrupt this article of the Christian faith.[15]

¶6 260.21–260.32

[260] In ista materia dixi alias quomodo quedam est credulitas explicita vel distincta, et quedam est implicita vel confusa; et isto modo tenetur omnis christianus credere singulas veritates, quia tenetur credere Deum esse, quod est omnis veritas. Hoc autem omnis fidelis tenetur pro aliquo tempore vie distincte credere, et sic quicumque in Deum finaliter crediderit salvabitur, etsi non plus de grano synapis habuerit. Alios autem oportet plus et alios minus de fide distincte credere secundum quod plus vel minus de gracia ad hoc obligante habuerit.

On this matter I have said elsewhere how one credence is explicit or distinct, and another implicit or indistinct; and in this way every Christian is bound to believe each single truth, because he is bound to believe that God is, which is every truth.[16] And this every believer is bound to believe distinctly for some time of the way; and so whoever has finally believed in God will be saved, even if he has had no more than a grain of mustard seed.[17] And some must believe more and others less of the faith distinctly, according as they have had more or less of the grace that binds them to it.

¶7 261.1–261.7

[261] Unde quidam vocant solum illas veritates catholicas quas oportet viatorem distincte credere articulos fidei, cuiusmodi sunt veritates expresse in symbolo; alii autem quamlibet veritatem catholicam articulum fidei, quia partem parvulam totalis fidei. Et illa concedit conclusiones sequentes, que equivocantibus videntur mirabiles.

Hence some call articles of faith only those catholic truths which the wayfarer must believe distinctly, such as are the truths expressed in the creed; but others [call] any catholic truth an article of faith, because [it is] a small part of the whole faith.[18] And that [usage] grants the following conclusions, which seem marvellous to those who equivocate.

Notes

1. "This doctor" is Grosseteste (Lincoln), whose sayings the chapter has been weighing since 256.3. *ut sic*: "as such", i.e. as pope. A "caesarean bishop" is the bishop endowed by Caesar (glossary: *prelatus / sacerdos cesarius*).
2. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, Wyclif's "homily 28"; in Migne the passage closes hom. 35, on Matt. 20:20–28 (PG 56, 832) (Loserth: Opp. tom. VI, p. 771). C. *Domino humilitati studente* and *Domino paupertatem amante* are ablatives absolute, "while the Lord ...".
3. Wyclif cites "Letter 43"; Loserth identifies it as Grosseteste's Letter 49 (*Epistolae*, ed. Luard, p. 145). C. *Studeat ... si imitatur*: *si* is "whether". The speaker of the letter is Grosseteste, "this doctor".
4. *pape summo*, "the highest pope": the definition fits only the pope at the summit, perhaps Christ himself, whom alone it would fit without qualification; Wyclif does not say which.
5. Both manuscripts note in the margin (Loserth, 258): *Papam dicunt esse necessarium ad salutem*; and at the letter: *Lincolniensis de papa nota bene*. C. *per se*: "of himself", as a cause in his own right.
6. Grosseteste, Letter 35 (Luard, p. 123) (Loserth). C. *plenitudinis* is read with *obediencie ... timoris*, "[a debtor] of fullness of obedience ..."; the print's comma would instead join it to *dominacioni* ("lordship of plenitude"). G. *dominacio*, here a title of address, kept as "exercise of lordship" (the glossary).
7. Letter 35 is addressed to Gregory IX (Luard, p. 123); Wyclif seems to take the pope flattered and the pope who punished as one, presumably Innocent IV, whom Grosseteste later resisted and, after his own death, is said to have struck with his staff (257.27–30; chapter 8; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora* V, 429–30, 470–71).
8. Deut. 32:17, "gods ... that were newly come up, whom their fathers worshipped not"; Wyclif sets "articles of faith" in the place of the gods. Not italic in the print; quoted here as scripture. T. B omits *per constitucionem imperatoris* (259.7). C. "The said blessed ones": the apostles and the Christians before the endowment.
9. Chapter 8 rehearsed the imperial grants by which the Roman bishop came to be called head (Phocas, the Donation of Constantine) and the chronicles that report them: at 177–78 Wyclif cites Higden IV, 36 and V, 10 and the Decretum's *Constantinus* (D. 96 c. 14), and concludes *Quotlibet tales fideles cronice et decreta testantur* .... C. *suus episcopus*: Caesar's bishop, the bishop of his capital.

10. "Even ... an angel from heaven": Gal. 1:8. *De cessatione legalium* is Grosseteste's treatise, which Wyclif cites by name at *De veritate sacrae scripturae* I, 135 (*Lincolniensis de cessacione legalium*); he has no work of that title, and uses the same phrase *in materia de cessacione legalium* at *De officio regis* 208. C. *doctam* is taken with *scripturam*, "scripture taught by the Holy Spirit"; it can agree with *ecclesiam*, "the church taught by the Holy Spirit". T. The manuscripts omit *a* (259.19), with the same sense.
11. Gal. 2:4–5, "our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus", against those "that they might bring us into servitude". C. *facilitas*: the lightness of the burden Christ laid on his church.
12. *sed* brings the minor premiss; the conclusion (that "this man is pope" is no article of faith) is left to the reader. *ymo posito quod sit* is read with what follows, against the print's semicolon.
13. The assumption is the major premiss of ¶4. *unus alius ymo sic illusus*: "another man, indeed one so deluded", i.e. the believer of the other obedience, deceived as the first. R. Urban VI and Robert of Geneva (Clement VII), rival claimants since 1378. T. B reads *sic teneantur* (260.6), with the same sense.
14. Loserth at 260.13: *Musca; hic aliquot verba exciderunt*, "some words have fallen out here". The print is translated as it stands, with *musca* taken as the subject of *potest*: if every truth is an article, whatever makes a truth (a fly landing) makes an article. C. *subtiliare*: here "to refine", to argue subtly, not the the glossary's provisional "lighten" (from the *Dialogus*). R. Both manuscripts at 260.8: *Articuli novi fidei a papa*.
15. *faciat se ipsum*: a complement ("pope") is understood or lost. A pope makes good the article "this man is pope" by prayer and the work of the office, and should fear sin, which would make it false, more than bodily poison.
16. "I have said elsewhere": Loserth compares *Trialogus*, p. 413 (ed. Lechler, *Supplementum Trialogi* ch. 2: *aliqua creduntur explicite et aliqua implicite ... sive quas confuse credimus*). C. "In this way": implicitly. *quod est omnis veritas*: God, who is all truth. R. Both manuscripts at 260.21: *Credulitas duplex*.
17. Matt. 17:19, "if you have faith as a grain of mustard seed".
18. *illa* (read on the plate) is taken as the second way of speaking; its conclusions begin at 261.8. T. B reads *pervulgam* for *parvulam* (261.5). R. Both manuscripts at 261.3: *Articuli fidei*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 258: *seculo* [NW]
  - 258: *non*
  - 258: *nisi*
  - 258: *credat*
  - 258: *totum*
  - 260: *illum*
  - 261: *illa*

Part 12: May the pope be reproved? three arguments answered

Loserth pp. 261.8–265.16

¶1 261.8–263.5

261.8 *We are not bound to believe that every Roman bishop is pope.*
262.20 *If he does not follow Christ he is a devil and antipope.*
262.28 *Popes even declare that no one may reprove them.*
263.2 *It is said falsely that between equals there is no authority.*

[261]Sed quomodocumque loquatur, fideli nichil insanius quam credere quod omnis fidelis debet credere quod omnis episcopus Romanus sit papa vel quod omnis subditus tenetur facere quicquid preceperit aut quod auctoritate et declaracione illius tenetur omnis christianus credere cuicumque scripture quam ipse limitat; nam mille sunt fideles, qui habent immediate a Deo fidem scripture independenter ab illo, eciam plus quam ipse; verumtamen cum multi pape sunt gloriosi post dotacionem ecclesie, quilibet christianus tenetur saltem confuse credere quod multi Romani episcopi sunt veri pape, et illi qui non fecerunt exaccionem talis fidei Antichristi; sed hoc non est generaliter ad laudem Romani pontificis, quia sic tenentur credere quod multi Romani pontifices non sunt pape, quia multi sunt dampnati, non membra sancte ecclesie, et sic de omni veritate tenetur omnis christianus credere quia est, etsi non sonat in pompam pape, quod omnis christianus tenetur ipsum credere esse papam, sicut non sonat in pompam cuiuscumque predestinati quod omnis homo tenetur credere ipsum esse salvandum, sicut omnem prescitum

But however one speaks, to a believer nothing is more insane than to believe that every believer ought to believe that every Roman bishop is pope, or that every subject is bound to do whatever he has commanded, or that on his authority and declaration every Christian is bound to believe whatever scripture he assigns;[1] for there are a thousand believers who have the faith of scripture immediately from God, independently of him, even more than he [has]. Nevertheless, since many popes after the endowment of the church are glorious, every Christian is bound at least indistinctly to believe that many Roman bishops are true popes, and [that] those are who did not make an exaction of such a faith, [the faith] of Antichrist;[2] but this is not in general to the praise of the Roman pontiff, because in the same way they are bound to believe that many Roman pontiffs are not popes, because many are damned, not members of holy church. And so every Christian is bound to believe of every truth that it is [true], although it does not sound to the pope's boasting that every Christian is

tenetur credere esse dampnandum, cum oportet Deum distincte illud cognoscere; ymo est michi evidens quod tam subtilis logicus atque theologus, sicut fuit Robertus Lyncolniensis [262]non induceret hunc errorem fidei ad onus ecclesie, quod quemlibet Romanum pontificem tenetur credere esse papam, vel quod alius non habens ad hoc revelacionem de se ipso vel quocumque alio conversante secum tenetur expresse credere quod sit predestinatus vel apud Deum acceptus; de se ipso tamen tenetur hoc sperare et de aliis si moveat evidencia operis reputare. Nam ante dotacionem fuit privilegium et libertas ecclesie quod non tenebatur sic credere. Ideo non obstante dotacione debent ecclesie filii defendere pristinam libertatem; et sic intelliguntur multa dicta Roberti Grostest, que dicit condicionaliter aut reputative, quia aliter contradiceret sibi ipsi. Unde Epistola XXXVII. ut recitavi in fine secundi cap. libri V, dicit Lynconiensis quod iniustarum possessionum quas occupat ecclesia abscisio non est ecclesiarum imminucio, sed pocius earum pulcrificacio vel plurificacio. Et sic secundum eum et alios sanctos, qui iniuste occupat locum papalem, non sequendo Christum in moribus, non est papa vel clericus, sed unus dyabolicus antipapa. Ex istis patet consideranti quantum malum et onus irreligiosum ecclesie induxit dotacio; ad tantum enim insaniunt pape cesarei, quod tenent cum suis satrapis quod papa non debet corripi ab aliquo viatore. Quod probant tripliciter: primo per hoc gentile principium: par in parem non habet imperium, cum igitur papa excedit omnem personam viantem, videtur quod non interest alicuius viantis papam corripere. Sed quantum ad illud patet, quod tam deficit [263]in forma quam in materia; in forma, quia necesse est antecedens esse verum, cum necessario pater in Spiritum Sanctum non habet imperium sed missionem et tamen necessario sunt pares.

bound to believe him to be pope, just as it does not sound to the boasting of any predestinate [man] that every man is bound to believe him to be saved, as [every man] is bound to believe every foreknown [man] to be damned, since God must know it distinctly.[3] Indeed it is evident to me that so subtle a logician and theologian as Robert of Lincoln was [262] would not bring in this error of faith, to the burden of the church, that [a man] is bound to believe every Roman pontiff to be pope, or that another, not having a revelation to that effect about himself or about any other who lives with him, is bound to believe expressly that he is predestinate or accepted with God;[4] yet of himself he is bound to hope this, and of others, if the evidence of works moves [him], to esteem it. For before the endowment it was the privilege and liberty of the church that it was not bound to believe so. Therefore, notwithstanding the endowment, the sons of the church ought to defend their former liberty; and so are to be understood many sayings of Robert Grosseteste, which he says conditionally or by estimation, because otherwise he would contradict himself. Hence in Letter 37, as I recited at the end of the second chapter of book 5, Lincoln says that "the cutting off of the unjust possessions which the church occupies is not a diminishing of the churches, but rather their beautifying" or "multiplying".[5] And so, according to him and other saints, he who unjustly occupies the papal place, not following Christ in his morals, is not pope or cleric, but a devilish antipope.[6] From these things it is clear to one who considers how great an evil and irreligious burden the endowment brought upon the church; for the caesarean popes go so far in madness that they hold, with their satraps, that the pope ought not to be reproved by any wayfarer.[7] This they prove in three ways: first, by this pagan principle, "an equal has no command over an equal"; since, therefore, the pope exceeds every person on the road, it seems that it is not the business of anyone on the road to reprove the pope.[8] But as to that, it is clear that it fails as much [263]in form as in matter: in form, because the antecedent is necessarily true, since necessarily the Father has no command over the Holy Spirit but a sending, and yet necessarily they are equals.[9]

¶2 263.6–263.10

[263]Iterum, necessario imperium habet pater in filium secundum humanitatem assumptam, et tamen absolute necessario sunt pares; ideo si nullus par in parem habet imperium, periret fides catholica.

Again, the Father necessarily has command over the Son according to the assumed humanity, and yet they are equals with absolute necessity; therefore if no equal has command over an equal, the catholic faith would perish.

¶3 263.11–263.16

[263]Et iterum quoddam est imperium vicarium, cuiusmodi est omne humanum imperium, quomodo loquitur Apostolus prima Thym. VI, 17: Divitibus huius seculi precipe non sublime sapere. Quoddam autem imperium est per se vel originaliter autenticum super quamlibet creaturam.

And again, one command is vicarial, of which kind is every human command, in the way the Apostle speaks in 1 Tim. 6:17: "Charge the rich of this world not to be highminded." But another command is of itself, or originally, authentic over every creature.[10]

¶4 263.17–264.11
264.24 *Such a claim implies that the pope is impeccable.*

[263]Et patet quam nuda sit ista argucia quoad materiam et formam. Intelligit enim per hoc principium quod par non habet imperium autoritativum in suum parem, sub racione qua par est taliter imperanti. Sed quid obest huic quod excellencior virtute corripiat inferiorem in moribus, licet sit superior quoad statum. Aliter enim periret lex Christi, que ordinat quemcumque christianum prelatum peccabilem, et cum peccaverit, ab alio corrigendum, ut patet Matth. XVIII, in tantum quod si per impossibile Christus peccaverit, foret ab ecclesia corrigendus; cum enim sit frater noster Hebre. II. 12 et lex sua dicit universaliter: si peccaverit in te frater tuus, corripe eum, patet quod omnis viator peccando debet corripi a confratre. Aliter enim deficeret lex [264]Christi ordinando remedium contra maculam sponse sue, cui Paulus contradicit Gal. II. cum pro levi culpa in facie restitit Petro pape; ideo nichil infidelius quam negare quod statu superior et inferior quoad mores potest corripi a subiecto. Ideo secundo arguitur per hoc quod papa gerit in terris vicem domini Ihesu Christi, sed ipsum non licuit alicui corripere, ut patet Matth. XVI, 23 ubi propter correpcionem Christi Petrus vocatur sathanas, igitur nec eius vicem gerentem licet corripere.

And it is clear how bare this quibble is as to matter and form. For by this principle he understands that an equal has no authoritative command over his equal, in the respect in which he is equal to the one so commanding.[11] But what stands in the way of this, that one more excellent in virtue should reprove one inferior in morals, although he is superior as to state? For otherwise the law of Christ would perish, which ordains that any Christian prelate, being able to sin, and when he has sinned, is to be corrected by another, as is clear in Matt. 18:15; so much so that if, per impossibile, Christ had sinned, he would have to be corrected by the church.[12] For since he is "our brother" (Heb. 2:12), and his law says universally: "If thy brother shall offend against thee, rebuke him," it is clear that every wayfarer, by sinning, ought to be reproved by a fellow brother.[13] For otherwise the law [264]of Christ would fail in ordaining a remedy against the stain of his bride; which Paul contradicts in Gal. 2, when for a light fault he "withstood" Peter the pope "to the face";[14] therefore nothing is more faithless than to deny that one superior in state and inferior as to morals can be reproved by a subject. Therefore, secondly, it is argued by appeal to this, that the pope bears on earth the place of the Lord Jesus Christ; now it was not lawful for anyone to reprove him, as is clear in Matt. 16:23, where, for reproving Christ, Peter is called Satan; therefore neither is it lawful to reprove one who bears his place.[15]

¶5 264.12–264.16

[264]Sed ista argucia nimis claudicat, cum oporteret dicere quod omnis Christi vicarius sit impeccabilis sicut Christus: et sic vere concluditur quod nec papa nec alius debet corripi vel corrigi, in quantum sequitur caput Christum.

But this quibble limps exceedingly, since one would have to say that every vicar of Christ is impeccable as Christ is; and so it is truly inferred that neither the pope nor another ought to be reproved or corrected in so far as he follows Christ the head.[16]

¶6 264.17–264.21

[264]Sed tercio arguitur ex lege XXI distinccione Nunc autem divina, ubi dicitur, quod nullus sanctorum episcoporum ausus est in Marcellinum papam inferre sentenciam, sed dixerunt: tuo ore iudica causam tuam, non nostro iudicio subiacebis.

But, thirdly, it is argued from the law, Distinction 21, *Nunc autem divina*, where it is said that "none of the holy bishops dared to pass sentence on Pope Marcellinus, but they said: 'Judge your cause with your own mouth; you will not be subject to our judgement.'"[17]

¶7 264.22–265.5
265.7 *Case of Marcellinus.*

[264]Sed constat quod illud verbum episcoporum non potest tollere legem Dei, qua in archiepiscopo Paulo corripuit papam Petrum, ut patet Gal. II. Ideo idem foret dicere quod non licet papam corripere et dicere quod est personaliter impeccabilis dominus Ihesus Christus vel ipseLucifer, qui per correpcionem fraternam non potest corrigi. Unde cum papa racione multiplici sit pronior et periculosior in peccando, oportet de correpcione et correccione sua prudencius precavere; et ad hoc ordinantur leges ecclesie, ut patet distinccione [265]XL: Si papa, et distinccione LXXIX: Si quis pecunia; et aliter forent omnia facta in deposicione paparum iniusta et per consequens deponentes forent heretici, sicut et ecclesia approbans eius correpcionem et pape novi intronizacionem.

But it is evident that that word of the bishops cannot dispose of the law of God, by which, in the archbishop Paul, it reproved Peter the pope, as is clear in Gal. 2.[18] Therefore it would be the same to say that it is not lawful to reprove the pope and to say that he is personally the impeccable Lord Jesus Christ, or Lucifer himself, who cannot be corrected by fraternal correction. Hence, since the pope for many reasons is more prone and more dangerous in sinning, it is necessary to take precaution more prudently for his reproof and correction; and to this [end] the laws of the church are ordained, as is clear in Distinction [265]40, *Si papa*, and Distinction 79, *Si quis pecunia*;[19] and otherwise all the things done in the deposition of popes would be unjust, and consequently those deposing would be heretics, as also the church that approves his reproof and the enthronement of a new pope.

¶8 265.7–265.16

[265]Et quantum ad dictum episcoporum de correpcione Marcellini, dicitur quod valde superfluum foret eos ipsum in tali casu corripere, quia perceperunt ex eius contricione quod fuit plene correptus a Domino, Ideo nimis levis evidencia foret ex isto facto concludere quod nullus papa debet in aliquo casu a fratribus reprehendi, ut patet ex libro beati Bernhardi ad papam Eugenium. Mille autem sunt blasfemie cum nonnulla intronizacione pape cesarei introducte.

And as to the saying of the bishops about the reproof of Marcellinus, the answer is that it would have been quite superfluous for them to reprove him in such a case, because they perceived from his contrition that he had been fully reproved by the Lord. Therefore it would be exceedingly light evidence to infer from this fact that no pope ought in any case to be rebuked by his brothers, as is clear from the book of blessed Bernard to Pope Eugenius.[20] And there are a thousand blasphemies brought in with many an enthronement of a caesarean pope.[21]

Notes

1. The manuscripts read *loquatur fidelis* for the print's *loquatur, fideli* (261.9): "however a believer speaks, nothing is more insane ...". The print is translated. C. "He" throughout is the pope. G. *limitat*: "assigns", i.e. designates which scripture is to be believed.
2. *et illi qui non fecerunt exaccionem talis fidei Antichristi* is read as a second object of *credere*, "[that] those are [true popes] who did not exact such a faith", with *Antichristi* naming the faith exacted; it could instead be predicate, "those who did not exact such faith [are not] of Antichrist". The construal is doubtful.
3. *sonat in pompam*: "sounds to the boasting", i.e. redounds to his glory. Every truth is believed at least indistinctly, so a pope's being pope (where true) is believed only as every truth is, which no more flatters him than the like belief flatters a predestinate man. G. *prescitus*: "the foreknown" (glossed at its first occurrence in this work).
4. B reads *christianum* for *Romanum* (262.2), "every Christian pontiff"; the print is translated.
5. Grosseteste, Wyclif's "Letter 37", which is Luard's Letter 72, to John Romanus (p. 226: *earum abscisio per justum judicium non est ecclesiarum imminutio, sed potius pulcrificatio quaedam*); Wyclif recites it, as "Letter 73", in *De civili dominio* III, p. 30, as Loserth notes. Wyclif's "book 5" is *De civili dominio* III in his *Summa*, and the recital stands there at the end of chapter 2. T. B has *vel plurificacio* in the margin (262.19).
6. B notes in the margin at 262.26, in a later hand: *Moderni pontifices Romani sunt diabolici antipape*; both manuscripts at 262.15: *Papa malus si est papa*. C. *in moribus*: "in his morals", his way of living.
7. Both manuscripts note in the margin at 262.25: *Papa non debet corripi, probat tripliciter*. C. *corripere* is "reprove" throughout, kept apart from *corrigere* "correct" (264.14). *Satrapa*: glossed at its first occurrence in this work.
8. *Par in parem non habet imperium*, a maxim of Roman and canon law (e.g. Innocent III, *cum non habeat imperium par in parem*, PL 216, 1195C); not italic in the print, quoted here as a stated principle. C. *gentile*: "pagan", i.e. drawn from pagan law. *imperium* is "command" throughout the passage (Loserth's side-note says "authority").

9. B omits *quam in materia; in forma* (263.1). C. The formal defect is put compressedly: the principle is necessarily true of some equals (the Father has over the Spirit a sending, *missio*, not command), so it cannot carry the inference. Translated as printed.
10. Command "of itself" is God's; human command is exercised in another's place, as Paul charges Timothy to command the rich. R. Both manuscripts at 263.15: *Imperium duplex*.
11. *sub racione qua*: "in the respect in which" (not the technical *racio* "aspect"). So read, the principle denies only command between equals as equals.
12. The margin reference printed beside 263.30 (OCR "XVIII, 2 5") is taken as Matt. 18:15. C. *peccabilem*: "able to sin"; the print's semicolon after *peccaverit* is passed over in construing.
13. Heb. 2:11–12, "he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying: I will declare thy name to my brethren"; "our brother" is Wyclif's summary. Matt. 18:15, where the Vulgate has *vade, et corripe eum* (DR "go, and rebuke him"); Wyclif drops *vade*.
14. Gal. 2:11, "I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." R. Both manuscripts at 264.25 and 264.27: *Correpcio patris necessaria*; *Correpcio pape licita*.
15. Matt. 16:22–23: Peter "began to rebuke him", and is told "Go behind me, Satan".
16. *corripi vel corrigi*: "reproved or corrected", the two verbs kept apart. The concession is limited: in so far as anyone follows Christ, he needs no reproof.
17. Decretum, D. 21 c. 7 (Loserth: *Decreti prima pars, dist. XXI, cap. VII*; the modern form is ours). Marcellinus, bishop of Rome (d. 304), was said to have offered incense in the persecution and to have confessed it before a council of bishops who would not judge him (the canon itself, PL 187, 120D–121A; *Liber pontificalis*, PL 128, 1410C, for the incense); the apocryphal acts set the council at Sinuessa. C. *sentenciam*: a judicial sentence, hence "sentence" (glossary: *sentencia*).
18. *qua ... corripuit*: the subject is taken as the law of God, which reproved Peter through Paul; "archbishop" and "pope" are Wyclif's titles for the apostles. G. *correpcio fraterna* is "fraternal correction" (the glossary); *correpcio* standing alone is "reproof".
19. Decretum, D. 40 c. 6 and D. 79 c. 9 (Loserth; the modern form is ours). T. B reads *iri posicione* for *in deposicione* (265.2–3), a slip.
20. Bernard, *De consideratione*, addressed to Eugenius III, cited as a whole: the book is itself a reproof of a pope by his former abbot (e.g. I.5.6, PL 182, 733B: *Audi ergo quid redarguam*); chapter 11 quotes it at length.
21. *cum nonnulla intronizacione*: singular in the Latin, "with many an enthronement".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 261: *nam* (15 is the line number)
  - 262: *secundi* (hyphenated se-|cundi; main token holds the whole word)
  - 262: ∅ (second half of se-|cundi, which the main scan already holds whole at pos 104)
  - 263: *in*
  - 263: *in*
  - 263: *materia*
  - 263: *in*
  - 263: *noster*
  - 263: *universaliter* (30 is the line number)
  - 263: *peccaverit*
  - 263: *te*
  - 263: *frater*
  - 264: *Marcellinum*
  - 264: *papam*
  - 264: *nostro*
  - 264: *legem Dei* (one token covers two printed words)
  - 264: *qua in* (one token covers two printed words (qua in archiepiscopo)) [NW]
  - 265: *Marcellini*
  - 264: *licet* (hcet -> licet (scans: hcet | hcet | licet | hcet))
  - 261: *Romanus* (LEFT-nw: capital R)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 3o. Matth. XVIII, 2 5. (263.32).

Chapter 11

Part 1: Order in the priesthood, and Bernard against papal lordship

Loserth pp. 265.18–268.27

¶1 265.18–266.3

265.18 *It is argued that God has made all things in order, which we are bound to keep.*

[265]**Contra dicta arguitur per hoc quod Deus posuit quamlibet universitatem suam in mensura, numero et pondere, ut dicitur Sapiens XI, 31 et per consequens oportet esse ordinem in sacerdotali potestate sacramenta et sacramentalia ministrandi. Sic enim in lege veteri fuit unicus summus sacerdos, cui erant excellenciora officia limitata, in cuius signum Deus ordinavit unicam vestem sacerdotalem pro Aaron, ut patet Exod. XXVIII, 4; unde et consequenter dicitur: Vestem autem sanctam qua utitur Aaron habebunt filii eius post eum, ut ungantur in ea et consecrentur manus eorum. Summo autem sacerdoti appropriata sunt multa officia, ut patet Exod. XXIX,** [266] **XXX et Levitici VIII, multo magis igitur in novo testamento, ubi debet esse in perfecciori ordine maior distinccio.**

Against what has been said, it is argued by appeal to this, that God has set each whole of his "in measure, and number, and weight", as is said in Wisdom 11:31; and consequently there must be order in the priestly power of ministering the sacraments and sacramentals.[1] For so in the old law there was a single high priest, to whom the more excellent offices were assigned; in sign of which God ordained a single priestly vestment for Aaron, as is clear in Exod. 28:4; hence it is also said in consequence: "And the holy vesture, which Aaron useth, his sons shall have after him, that they may be anointed, and their hands consecrated in it."[2] Now to the high priest many offices are appropriated, as is clear in Exod. 29, [266] **30, and Lev. 8; much more, therefore, in the new testament, where in a more perfect order there must be a greater distinction.**

¶2 266.4–266.8

[266]**Hic dicitur quod prima conclusio est concedenda. Omne enim quod erit contingenter oportet esse necessitate ex supposicione, cum Deus necessario eternaliter noscit illud et ordinat vel ipsum vel de ipso bonum.**

To this the answer is that the first conclusion is to be granted. For everything that will be contingently must be by necessity on supposition, since God necessarily and eternally knows it, and ordains either it or some good from it.[3]

¶3 266.9–268.27

[266]**Sed pro materia argumenti notandum quod aliquis pretenditur esse ordo, in quo propter defectum ordinis homo peccat et aliquis ordo est, circa quem propter defectum preponderancie homo peccat. Pretenditur autem esse ordo, quod papa sit mundo ditissimus, et tamen est abusus ordinis abiectissimus, cum Christus cuius ordini strictissime obligatur fuit mundo pauperrimus; potest tamen titulo elemosine accipere benediccionem ab homine, sic quod nec sit exinde fastu vel avaricia soporatus nec a papali officio plus abstractus. Quod si elemosinacio perversa est in dominacionem, sancta predicacio in litis secularis defensionem et affeccio spiritualis lucri ecclesie in mundialium affeccionem, tunc est plena abhominacio desolacionis Dan. IX et Matth. XXIV capitulis prophetata. Et talem vocant quidam papam cesareum et alium condicionis opposite papam Christi. Unde beatus Bernhardus ad Eugenium destruit multas hereses istius materie, nam in fine libri**

But for the matter of the argument it is to be noted that something is pretended to be an order in which, through a defect of order, a man sins; and there is some order about which a man sins through a defect of preponderance.[4] And it is pretended to be an order that the pope should be the richest in the world, and yet it is the most abject abuse of order, since Christ, to whose order he is most strictly bound, was the poorest in the world; yet he can, by title of alms, accept a blessing from a man, provided that he is neither lulled to sleep by it with pride or avarice nor drawn further away from the papal office.[5] But if almsgiving is perverted into exercise of lordship, holy preaching into the defence of secular litigation, and the affection for the spiritual gain of the church into affection for worldly things, then there is the full "abomination of desolation" prophesied in the ninth chapter of Daniel and the twenty-fourth of Matthew.[6] And such a one some call a caesarean pope, and

IV loquitur contra dominium ecclesie sub hiis verbis: Consideres ante omnia sanctam Romanam ecclesiam, cui Deo autore prees, [267]ecclesiarum matrem esse non dominam: te vero non dominum esse episcoporum sed unum ex ipsis, qualem de cetero oportet te esse. Considera formam iusticie, sanctimonie speculum, pietatis exemplar, assertorem veritatis, fidei defensorem, doctorem gencium, christianorum ducem, amicum sponsi, sponse paranimfum, cleri ordinatorem, pastorem plebium, magistrum insipiencium refugium oppressorum, pauperum advocatum, miserorum spem, tutorem pupillorum, iudicem viduarum, oculum cecorum, linguam mutorum, baculum senum, ultorem scelerum, malorum metum, bonorum gloriam, virgam potentum, malleum criminosorum, regum patrem, legum moderatorem, canonum dispensatorem, sal terre orbis lumen, sacerdotem altissimi, vicarium Christi, christum Domini postremo Deum Pharaonis. Talis debet esse papa: quod si in istis triginta quatuor deficiat induens vestem lupi oppositam, nullum est in ecclesia horribilius monstrum, ut docet in fine III libri et libro II: Nunc audi canticum meum minus suave sed salutare. Monstruosa res gradus summus et animus infimus, sedes prima et vita yma, lingua magniloqua et manus ociosa, sermo multus et fructus nullus, vultus gravis et actus levis, ingens auctoritas et nutans subtilitas. Unde II in principio libri III declarat et modificat: potestatem, quam papa debet habere si vitam novam inculpabiliter recompensat et incipiens ab apostolis, a quibus oportet exemplari papalem potenciam Occumbebant, inquit, fortissimi bellatores: et non succumbebant triumphabant eciam mortui; nimis confortatus est principatus eorum; constituti sunt [268]principes super omnem terram; eis tu successisti in hereditatem; ita tu heres et orbis hereditas, ac quamvis hec porcio te contingat, id sobria consideracione pensandum; non enim reor per omnem modum, sed sane quodamtenus; dispensacio, inquit, super illum tibi credita est, non data possessio. Et post detegit heresim, qua Antichristus extollit se super omne quod dicitur Deus. Si quis, inquit, usurpat hanc potestatem, contradicit illi, qui dicit: Meus est orbis terre et plenitudo eius. Non tu ille, de quo propheta: Et erit omnis terra possessio eius. Christus hic est, qui possessionem sibi vendicat et iure creacionis et merito redemcionis et dono Patris. Cui enim alteri dictum est: Postula a me et dabo tibi gentes, hereditatem tuam et possessionem tuam, terminos terre, possessionem et dominium, cede huic, tu curam illius habe, pars tua hec, ultra ne extendas manum. Et post obicit per hoc quod idem est preesse et dominari, sed hoc negat, cum bene preest, qui preest in sollicitudine, villa eciam subiecta est villico et dominus parvulus

the other, of the opposite condition, a pope of Christ. Hence blessed Bernard, [writing] to Eugenius, destroys many heresies on this matter; for at the end of book 4 he speaks against the lordship of the church in these words: "Consider before all things that the holy Roman church, over which by God's authorship you preside, [267]is the mother of the churches, not their mistress; and that you are not lord of the bishops but one of them, such as henceforth you must be.[7] Consider [that you are] the form of justice, the mirror of holiness, the exemplar of piety, the asserter of truth, the defender of the faith, the teacher of the nations, the leader of Christians, the friend of the bridegroom, the bridesman of the bride, the ordainer of the clergy, the shepherd of the peoples, the master of the foolish, the refuge of the oppressed, the advocate of the poor, the hope of the wretched, the guardian of orphans, the judge of widows, the eye of the blind, the tongue of the dumb, the staff of the old, the avenger of crimes, the terror of the wicked, the glory of the good, the rod of the powerful, the hammer of criminous men, the father of kings, the moderator of laws, the dispenser of the canons, the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the priest of the Most High, the vicar of Christ, the anointed of the Lord, lastly the God of Pharaoh."[8] Such ought the pope to be; and if he fails in these thirty-four, putting on the opposite garment of the wolf, there is no more horrible monster in the church, as he teaches at the end of book 3 and in book 2: "Now hear my song, less sweet but wholesome. A monstrous thing: the highest rank and the lowest mind, the first seat and the basest life, a grandiloquent tongue and idle hands, much speech and no fruit, a grave countenance and light conduct, immense authority and wavering subtlety."[9] Hence at the beginning of book 3 he declares and qualifies the power which the pope ought to have, if he blamelessly repays [it] with a new life, and [he does so] beginning from the apostles, from whom the papal power must take its pattern:[10] "There fell," he says, "the bravest warriors, and they did not succumb; they triumphed even when dead; 'their principality is exceedingly strengthened'; they were made [268]'princes over all the earth'. To them you have succeeded in inheritance; so you are the heir, and the world the inheritance; and although this portion falls to you, this is to be weighed with sober consideration; for I do not think [it falls to you] in every way, but soundly, up to a point. A dispensation over it," he says, "is entrusted to you, not a possession given."[11] And afterwards he exposes the heresy by which Antichrist lifts himself up "above all that is called God".[12] "If anyone," he says, "usurps this power, he contradicts him who says:

pedagogo. Ita et tu, inquit, presis, ut provideas, ut consulas, ut procures et serves, presis ut prosis, presis ut fidelis servus et prudens, ut des subiectis escam in tempore, hoc est, ut dispenses, non ut imperes; hoc fac et dominari te non affectes hominum homo, ut non dominetur tui iniusticia.

'The world is mine, and the fulness thereof.' You are not he of whom the prophet [says]: 'And all the earth shall be his possession.' This is Christ, who claims the possession for himself both by right of creation, and by merit of redemption, and by gift of the Father.[13] For to what other was it said: 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession'? The possession and the lordship, yield them to him; you, have the care of it: this is your part; do not stretch out your hand beyond it."[14] And afterwards he objects, by appeal to this, that to preside and to exercise lordship are the same; but he denies this, since he presides well who presides "with carefulness"; the estate too is subject to the steward, and the little lord to his tutor.[15] "So you too," he says, "preside in order to provide, to counsel, to manage and to preserve; preside to profit; preside as 'a faithful and wise servant', to give your subjects 'meat in season', that is, to dispense, not to command. Do this, and do not desire to lord it, a man over men, so that no injustice may lord it over you."[16]

Notes

1. Wis. 11:21 in the Vulgate (Wyclif "XI, 31"), "thou hast ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight"; *posuit quamlibet universitatem suam* is Wyclif's own phrasing. C. *universitas*: each whole, each ordered totality God has made.
2. Exod. 29:29; the Vulgate has *utetur* (DR "shall use") and *consecrantur*, Wyclif *utitur* and *consecrentur*. Exod. 28:4 names "the holy vestments for thy brother Aaron and his sons". T. B reads *Si* for *Sic* (265.23). G. *summus sacerdos*: the Old Testament "high priest" (DR), kept apart from *summus pontifex* "highest pontiff".
3. "The first conclusion": that God has set everything in order. It is granted, as every contingent thing is necessary on supposition of God's knowing and ordaining it; the *sed* of 266.9 then turns to the kind of order the argument wants.
4. *preponderancia*: taken as a failure of due weighting, an order rightly held but outweighed by something preferred to it; the first kind is a false order. The sense is not certain.
5. *benediccio*: a gift, in the biblical sense (cf. 2 Cor. 9:5, *benedictionem*). *sic quod*: "provided that".
6. Dan. 9:27; Matt. 24:15, "the abomination of desolation". C. *mundialium* is taken as neuter, "worldly things"; masculine, "worldly men" (glossary: *mundialis*), is possible.
7. Bernard, *De consideratione* IV.7.23 (PL 182, 788A), the last section of book 4. T. For *unum ex ipsis* the manuscripts have another reading, illegible in the OCR of Loserth's foot (267.2); the print is translated.
8. *Considera* governs the accusatives that follow, with *te esse* understood; Wyclif counts the titles as thirty-four. S. "The salt of the earth", "the light of the world": Matt. 5:13–14; "the god of Pharao": Exod. 7:1. *christum Domini*: "the anointed of the Lord".
9. Bernard, *De consideratione* II.7.15 (PL 182, 750C); for the "monster" Wyclif places at the end of book 3, book 3 has only *Monstrum facis* at III.4.17 (PL 182, 768C), on disordering the members. T. The print's *nutans subtilitas* is translated; Bernard's text reads *nutans stabilitas*, "wavering stability" (PL 182, 750C). R. Both manuscripts note in the margin (267): *Monstruosa res*.
10. *potenciam*: "power" here (glossary: *potencia*, CONTEXTUAL), the papal power in the ordinary sense, beside *potestatem* earlier in the sentence; Wyclif uses the two words interchangeably. *si vitam novam inculpabiliter recompensat*: "if he blamelessly repays [it] with a new life"; the clause is compressed.
11. Bernard, *De consideratione* III.1.1–2 (PL 182, 758B–C), with Ps. 138:17 and Ps. 44:17. T. The print's *ac quamvis* is translated, "and although"; Bernard's text reads *At quatenus*, "but how far" (PL 182, 758B).
12. 2 Thess. 2:4, "is lifted up above all that is called God"; Wyclif's *extollit se* is active.
13. Ps. 49:12 (Loserth: Ps. XLIX, 11), "the world is mine, and the fulness thereof". The prophet's words are quoted from Bernard (*De consideratione* III.1.1, PL 182, 758B), where Migne refers them to Ps. 103:24 and Loserth to Ps. CIII, 27; neither verse has them (the Vulgate's 103:24 reads *impleta est terra possessione tua*), and they are translated as quoted. T. For *et iure creacionis* the manuscripts read *opere creacionis*, and for *Patris*, *potestatis* (268.12–13); the print governs. R. Both manuscripts at 268.8: *Dominacio pape interdicitur universaliter*.
14. Ps. 2:8 (Loserth).

15. Rom. 12:8, "he that ruleth, with carefulness". G. *dominari*: "to exercise lordship" where Bernard denies it is the same as presiding; in his closing words (*dominari te non affectes*, *non dominetur*) the pejorative "lord it".
16. Matt. 24:45, "a faithful and wise servant ... to give them meat in season"; the closing words echo Ps. 118:133, "let no iniquity have dominion over me".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 265: *suam*
  - 266: *VIII* (p. 266 strip from tractatusdepotes00wycl:327)
  - 266: *preponderancie*
  - 266: *Dan*
  - 266: *materie*
  - 266: *hiis*
  - 266: *sanctam* (p. 266 strip from tractatusdepotes00wycl:327)
  - 266: *autore* (p. 266 strip from tractatusdepotes00wycl:327)
  - 267: *matrem*
  - 267: *cetero*
  - 267: *assertorem* (5 is the line number (main b))
  - 267: *paranimfum*
  - 267: *ordinatorem*
  - 267: *tutorem* (10 is the line number)
  - 267: *pupillorum* (main split the one printed word pupillorum into puri + rum; the whole word goes here)
  - 267: ∅ (second piece of pupillorum, which main split (puri + rum); the whole word is at pos 54)
  - 267: *ultorem* (hyphenated ul-|torem; main token holds the whole word)
  - 267: *terre orbis* (one token covers two printed words (terre, orbis))
  - 267: *Domini* (main split Domini into do + miui; the whole word goes here)
  - 267: ∅ (second piece of Domini (main do + miui); the whole word is at pos 88)
  - 267: *postremo*
  - 267: *III*
  - 267: *et*
  - 267: *infimus*
  - 267: *vita*
  - 267: *et*
  - 267: *et*
  - 267: *III*
  - 267: *modificat*
  - 267: *potenciam* (blurred line: main split potenciam into pc + er + iara (pos 190-192); the whole word goes at the first piece)
  - 267: ∅ (piece of potenciam (main pc + er + iara); whole word at pos 190)
  - 267: ∅ (piece of potenciam (box ciam.); whole word at pos 190)
  - 267: *Occumbebant* (hyphenated Occum-|bebant; main token rbebant holds the m- and bebant, Occu is lost in the garbage of pos 192; whole word here)
  - 267: *fortissimi*
  - 267: *bellatores* (main split bellatores into beiiai + res)
  - 267: ∅ (piece of bellatores (main beiiai + res); whole word at pos 196)
  - 267: *et*
  - 267: *non* (print "et non succum-|bebant": the main scan lost non and split succumbebant into 5 + u + bebant (pos 199-201); words reassigned in print order)
  - 267: *succumbebant* (hyphenated succum-|bebant; see pos 199 (non) and 201 (∅))
  - 267: ∅ (bebant, the second half of succum-|bebant, given whole at pos 200)
  - 267: *confortatus* (hyphenated con-|fortatus; main token holds the whole word)
  - 267: *constituti*
  - 268: *tu*
  - 268: *et*
  - 268: *quodamtenus*
  - 268: *illum*
  - 268: *est*

- **268:** ***Deus***
- **268:** ***Meus***
- **268:** ***iure***
- **268:** ***et***
- **268:** ***eciam***
- **268:** ***ut***

Part 2: The caesarean priest and the disciple of Christ; Christ the one prince of priests

Loserth pp. 268.28–271.21

¶1 268.28–271.16
268.28 *How to discern a Caesarian priest from a disciple of Christ.*
269.7 *The two may be confused at times but not finally.*
270.1 *St. Bernard's ideal pope.*
270.10 *He did not say the pope of his time was such.*
270.21 *Christ is the chief priest; no other should claim the office.*

[268] **Ex istis plane colligitur sensus discernendi sacerdotem cesareum a Christi discipulo, nam cesareus innititur titulo cesaris, dominacionem exigens et observans, ac intentus mundialibus fit exhinc in officio quod Christus instituit negligens** [269] **vel remissus. Sed presbiter christianus innititur titulo elemosine ex gracia nec affidatur cum temporalium perpetuitate, sed reputans hoc ad onus instanter, inturbate et humiliter sine dominio complet ministerium sibi creditum, paratus sustinere cum gaudio ablacionem ymo rapinam temporalium si contingat. Nec videtur quod ista nomina sint directe opposita, cum sacerdos christianus sit sacerdos cesareus vel remisse simul vel per vices; oportet tamen omnem sacerdotem cesareum salvandum titulum imperialem deserere et in predicto titulo finaliter consumare. Unde multi decipiuntur in hoc, quod ignorant sensum scripture et doctorum, qui sepe simpliciter et in sensu composito intelligunt huiusmodi aggregata, ut sicut Apostolus dicit, quod nichil potest eos separare a caritate Dei, subintelligendo simpliciter predestinatos. Sic Aristoteles concedit de eodem, quod album desinit esse et musicum manet, et ignorancia logice facit stultos credere quod nullus papa potest peccare, eo quod peccare repugnat racioni papali vel saltem ipsam denigrat, et sic faceto scemate dicta doctorum de papa intelligunt condicionaliter, reputative, vel in una persona generalis et debiti officii descripcionem, ut Christus sepe alloquitur Petrum et ceteros omnes apostolos. Et istomodo loquitur Jeronymus cum Lyncolniensi de papa, ut patet ex dictis. Sed et Bernhardus libro II de papa sic loquitur: Indagemus ad hoc diligencius, quis sis, quam geris pro tempore personam in ecclesia Dei, quis es, sacerdos magnus, summus pontifex, tu princeps** [270] **episcoporum, tu heres apostolorum, tu primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedech, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moyses, iudicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unccione Christus. Et sequitur: Sunt quidam et alii Celi ianitores et gregum pastores, sed tu tanto gloriosius, quanto differencius utrumque pre ceteris nomen**

From these things the sense in which a caesarean priest is to be discerned from a disciple of Christ is plainly gathered.[1] For the caesarean rests on the title of Caesar, demanding and maintaining the exercise of lordship, and, intent on worldly things, he becomes thereby negligent [269] **or slack in the office that Christ instituted. But the Christian presbyter rests on the title of alms, by grace, and is not affianced to the perpetuity of temporal goods, but, reckoning this a burden, he fulfils the ministry entrusted to him earnestly, untroubled and humbly, without lordship, ready to bear with joy the taking-away, indeed the plunder, of temporal goods if it happens.[2] Nor does it seem that these names are directly opposed, since a Christian priest may be a caesarean priest, either slackly at the same time or by turns;[3] yet every caesarean priest who is to be saved must abandon the imperial title and end at last in the aforesaid title. Hence many are deceived in this, that they are ignorant of the sense of scripture and of the doctors, who often understand such aggregates without qualification and in the composite sense:[4] as when the Apostle says that "nothing can separate them from the charity of God", understanding as implied, without qualification, the predestinate.[5] So Aristotle grants of the same thing that the white ceases to be and the musical remains;[6] and ignorance of logic makes fools believe that no pope can sin, because sinning is incompatible with the papal aspect, or at least blackens it; and so, by a witty figure, the sayings of the doctors about the pope are understood conditionally, by estimation, or as the definition of a general and due office in a single person, as Christ often addresses Peter and all the other apostles.[7] And in this way Jerome, with Lincoln, speaks of the pope, as is clear from what has been said. But Bernard too, in book 2, speaks thus of the pope: "Let us inquire into this more diligently: who you are, what person you bear for the time in the church of God. Who are you? A great priest, the highest pontiff. You are the prince** [270] **of bishops, you the heir of the apostles; you are Abel in primacy, Noah in**

hereditasti, habent illi sibi assignatos greges singuli singulos, tibi universi crediti, unus uni nec modo omnium, sed pastorum cum unus omnium pastor. In istis tredecim et aliis descripcionibus foret beatus Bernhardus stulto stulcior, si sine revelacione diffinitive assereret quod papa sibi contemporaneus huiusmodi sit de facto; sed talis debet esse ex veritate assumpti nominis, sicut erant alique persone eiusdem nominis, cum prophetetur se gerere personam Christi in terris, in quo congregantur omnium sanctorum patrum laudum principia, quod si mentitur ex obliquitate vite in nomine: Ve mendaci illi cum suis complicibus. Ex istis colligo tercio, concedendo quod oportet in ordine sacerdotali tam quoad potestatem quam ministerium esse gradus, ut prepositi innitantur, quis paracius, humilius aut fructuosius ministret ecclesie, et sic conceditur quod sicut in lege veteri figuratum est tam per Moysen quam Aaron et ceteros succedentes, oportet esse in lege nova unum omnium aliorum sacerdotum principem dominum Ihesum Christum, qui non posset patencius ostendere suam stulticiam aut huius dignitatis carenciam quam promulgando de se ipso in populo illud nomen; licet enim Christus sepe expressit et sepius tacuit unigeniti dignitatem, alia tamen racio subest in aliis, cum necesse fuit illam fidem de Christo detegere. In nobis autem oportet cum timore sperare quod erimus Christi membra, quod est valde continens. [271] In ipso autem necesse fuit verbum Dei esse unigenitum Dei patris, unde videtur quod cogens ad credendum ut fidem, quod ipse sit caput sancte matris ecclesie, extollitur super Christum, quia Christus docuit illud abscondite in tantum quod elicere ex scriptura unionem ypostaticam humanitatis et divinitatis Christi, sine qua non foret caput universalis ecclesie est multis difficile. Illud autem, quod Christus docuit latenter et abscondite de se ipso, illud docmatizat Antichristus inordinate, publice et infideliter de se ipso. Inordinate dico, quia sine evidencia que fidem gigneret quoscumque qui illud negaverint conatur extinguere; et hoc non est medium apostolicum sed apostaticum antichristive fidei inductivum.

governance, Abraham in patriarchate, Melchisedech in order, Aaron in dignity, Moses in authority, Samuel in judgeship, Peter in power, Christ in anointing."[8] And it follows: "There are some others too, door-keepers of heaven and shepherds of flocks; but you have inherited both names the more gloriously, the more distinctively, beyond the rest. They have flocks assigned to them, each one his own; to you all are entrusted, one to one; and not only of all, but of the shepherds, since [you are] the one shepherd of all."[9] In these thirteen definitions and others blessed Bernard would be more foolish than a fool if, without revelation, he asserted definitively that the pope contemporary with him was such in fact; but such he ought to be from the truth of the name he has assumed, as there were certain persons of the same name, since he declares that he bears the person of Christ on earth,[10] in whom are gathered the first principles of the praises of all the holy fathers; and if he lies in the name by the crookedness of his life: woe to that liar, with his accomplices. From these things I gather, thirdly, granting that in the priestly order there must be degrees as regards both power and ministry, so that superiors may strive over who ministers to the church more readily, more humbly or more fruitfully,[11] and so it is granted that, as was figured in the old law both by Moses and by Aaron and the others who succeeded, there must be in the new law one prince of all the other priests, the Lord Jesus Christ; [and any other] could not show his folly, or his lack of this dignity, more plainly than by proclaiming that name of himself among the people.[12] For although Christ often expressed, and more often kept silent about, the dignity of the only-begotten, yet another reason underlies [the case] in others, since it was necessary [in him] to expose that faith about Christ. But in us we must hope with fear that we shall be members of Christ, which is a strong restraint.[13] [271] But in him it was necessary that the Word of God be the only-begotten of God the Father; hence it seems that one who compels [men] to believe, as faith, that he himself is head of holy mother church is lifted up above Christ,[14] because Christ taught that so covertly that to draw out of scripture the hypostatic union of the humanity and divinity of Christ, without which he would not be head of the universal church, is difficult for many. And what Christ taught of himself hiddenly and covertly,[15] that Antichrist teaches as dogma of himself, disorderly, publicly and faithlessly. "Disorderly", I say, because without evidence that would beget faith he tries to extinguish whoever may have denied it;[16] and this is not an apostolic middle term but an apostate one, leading on to antichristian faith.[17]

¶2 271.17–271.21

[271] **Sed contra illud multi arguunt quod stat feminam vel laycum esse papam, cum verisimile sit beatam virginem post ascensionem inter ceteros propinquius sequi Christum, et stat laycum esse superiorem in moribus quocumque presbitero.**

But against this many argue that it is consistent for a woman or a layman to be pope, since it is likely that the blessed Virgin, after the ascension, followed Christ more closely than the rest, and it is consistent for a layman to be superior in morals to any presbyter whatever.[18]

Notes

1. B in marg. at 268.28 (later hand): *Omnes pape post dotacionem e. v.* [probably *ecclesie vocantur*] *dicuntur cesarei sacerdotes*, "all popes after the endowment of the church are called caesarean priests". *Sacerdos cesareus*: the glossary "caesarean priest" (the priest who holds by Caesar's title).
2. *Affidatur cum*: the betrothal figure (glossary: *affidacio*): the Christian presbyter is not wedded to perpetual temporal goods. *Sustinere cum gaudio … rapinam* echoes Heb. 10:34 (DR "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods"; Vulg. *rapinam bonorum vestrorum cum gaudio suscepistis*).
3. *Vel remisse simul vel per vices*: one man may be both at once, with the caesarean side held slackly, or each in turn; the side-note (269.7) reads it so.
4. *Aggregata*: compound terms such as "Christian priest" or "pope" taken with their qualification. *In sensu composito*: the logicians' composite sense, in which the predicate is said of the subject as qualified (the predestinate, as predestinate, cannot be separated), as against the divided sense.
5. Rom. 8:39, in indirect speech and of "them": Vulg. *neque creatura alia poterit nos separare a caritate Dei* (DR "the love of God"); *caritas* is "charity" here as throughout.
6. Aristotle's stock example of one accident ceasing in a subject while another remains ; Loserth gives no reference, and the pair is not found in this form: Aristotle has the unmusical ceasing while the man remains (*Physics* 1.7, 190a; *De generatione* 1.4, 319b), and white and musical as two accidents of one subject (*Physics* 1.2, 185b).
7. *Intelligunt* ("they understand") has no expressed subject; rendered as a passive, since the adverbs (*condicionaliter, reputative*) name the right way of reading the doctors. It could be taken of the "fools" just named, but they read the doctors as fact, not conditionally. The B and A margins at 269.21 carry the heading *Papam non posse peccare*.
8. Bernard, *De consideratione* 2.8.15; Loserth's foot gives "l. c. pag. 751", the column in PL 182 (751B–D). Thirteen titles, from "great priest" to "Christ", hence "these thirteen" below.
9. The print reads *sed pastorum cum unus omnium pastor* (270.10, so the plate; the OCR had lost *unus omnium*). *Nec modo omnium*: Bernard's text has *nec modo ovium* ("not only of the sheep"); translated as printed. Bernard also reads *quidem* for *quidam*, *uni unus* for *unus uni*, and *sed et pastorum tu unus omnium pastor* (PL 182, 751C–D).
10. *Prophetetur se gerere*: with the reflexive *se* the verb must be active in sense ("declares, proclaims that he bears"); *profitetur*, "professes", may lie behind it. Translated as "declares".
11. *Ut prepositi innitantur, quis …*: taken as "strive over who …", i.e. the degrees exist so that superiors may compete in service; *inniti* elsewhere in this paragraph is "rest on".
12. *Qui non posset …*: the relative has no fitting antecedent (grammatically Christ, which cannot be the sense); the side-note (270.21, "no other should claim the office") reads it of any other claimant, and "[and any other]" is supplied to that effect. A word may have been lost before *qui*.
13. *Quod est valde continens*: the hope with fear "holds [us] in check"; *continens* taken as restraining, not "self-controlled".
14. *Extollitur super Christum* echoes 2 Thess. 2:4 (DR "is lifted up above all that is called God"). Codd. in marg. at 271.1: *Caput universalis ecclesie non est papa*.
15. *Latenter* is Loserth's reading; both manuscripts read *rarenter*, "rarely".
16. *Gigneret* is the print; the manuscripts are reported (in a rough OCR of the foot) as *digueret*, probably *digneret*. Translated as printed.
17. *Medium … inductivum*: the logicians' middle term that leads on to a conclusion (the glossary); *medium* could also be taken as "means". The pun *apostolicum / apostaticum* is Wyclif's.
18. *Contra illud*: against the definition of the pope as the wayfarer who follows Christ most closely (answered at 271.24). *Stat* is "it is consistent", i.e. possible. Codd. in marg. at 271.18: *Papa fuit virgo Maria*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 268: *Ex*
  - 269: *christianus* (hyphenated chri-|stianus; main token holds the whole word)
  - 270: *patriarchatu*
  - 270: *Abraham*
  - 270: *Petrus*
  - 270: *unccione*
  - 270: *et* (5 is the line number)
  - 270: ∅ (the is the English side-note)
  - 270: *sacerdotali*
  - 270: *innitantur*
  - 270: *descripcionibus* (descripciombus -> descripcionibus (scans: descripcionibus | descnpciombus | descripciombus | descripciombus))

Part 3: The Virgin, a woman, a layman as pope; the old priesthood no ground for primacy

Loserth pp. 271.22–274.33

¶1 271.22–273.3
271.22 *Cavil; that doctrine would make the B. Virgin pope.*
271.31 *A woman may not be pope.*
272.5 *A lay man might be pope,*
272.18 *even though he had no degree and had not been ordained by man.*
273.12 *With Christ's coming the rites of the old law are done away.*
273.28 *We should take as model the Church triumphant.*

[271]**Hic dicitur quod beata virgo fuit papa secundum extensionem nominis doctam superius; fuit enim excellenter mirabilis sanctitate, sicut et fuit sacerdos; et concordat genus gramatice cum sanctis peritis linguarum sic de papa loquentibus. Limitando autem signum ad propositum, dictum est quod papa est quicumque viator, qui sequitur Christum similius, ubi femella excluditur, quia quantumcumque sit sancta femina, propter infirmitatem sexus non permittitur evangelizare publice in ecclesia nec orare detecto capite, ut dicit Apostolus prima Cor. XI. Ideo mulier non est ydoneus capitaneus ecclesie nec** [272]**viator simillimus sequax Christi. Et sic excluditur tam mulier quam angelus a pape nomine. De papa vero Agnete, de qua Cestrensis libro V, que post vocata est Johannes Anglicus, cum ceteris pseudopapis, patet quod false vendicaverat nomen pape. Quoad secundum obiectum de laycis, patet logico quod laycus potest esse papa. Et videtur de Dei potencia absoluta possibile quod omnis nunc vians foret membrum dyaboli vel quod desit clerus ecclesie, quod esset magis mirabile. Ego autem credo quod est necessarium ex supposicione quod sint multi viantes continue a tempore ascensionis usque ad diem iudicii sancciores ceteris, qui teneant statum et ordinem clericalem, sic quod ordinacioni divine repugnat, quin toto clero perverso usque ad laycos Deus subito illuminaret aliquem eorum, sic quod viveret pure exproprietarie et sancte de sorte Domini: et tunc foret clericus, licet nec aliqua septem arcium sit imbutus nec secundum ritus episcopales sit humanitus ordinatus. Ista autem evidencia non probat quod sic est de facto, sed videtur suadere quod sic potest esse de Dei potencia absoluta, Eleccionem autem Dei in talibus oportet omnem fidelem concedere, quia homo non eligit racionaliter alium ad aliquam dignitatem, nisi quia reputat eum dignum, sed si est dignus ad aliquid, est a Deo preelectus, quod debet credere; ideo nemo debet eligere quemquam ad aliquid, nisi reputet eum a Domino preelectum, et hoc est notum apud eos qui vident quod necesse est Deum ad** [273]**omnem accionem creature concurrere preagendo. Et patet ex lege triplici ad idem ex IX cap. allegata.**

The answer here is that the blessed Virgin was pope according to the extension of the name taught above; for she was excellently wonderful in holiness, as she was also a priest; and the grammatical gender agrees with the saints skilled in languages who speak thus of the pope.[1] But, limiting the sign to the matter in hand, it has been said that the pope is whatever wayfarer follows Christ more nearly; and there the female is excluded, because however holy a woman may be, on account of the weakness of the sex she is not permitted to preach the gospel publicly in the church nor to pray with uncovered head, as the Apostle says, 1 Cor. 11.[2] Therefore a woman is not a fit captain of the church, nor [272]**the wayfarer who most nearly follows Christ. And so both a woman and an angel are excluded from the name of pope. But of Pope Agnes, of whom the Chester [chronicler speaks] in book 5, who was afterwards called John the Englishman, with the other pseudo-popes, it is clear that she had falsely claimed the name of pope.[3] As to the second objection, about laymen, it is clear to a logician that a layman can be pope. And it seems possible by God's absolute power that every [one] now on the way should be a member of the devil, or that the church should lack clergy, which would be more wonderful. But I believe that it is necessary on supposition that there are continually, from the time of the ascension to the day of judgement, many on the road holier than the rest, who hold the clerical state and order; so that it is incompatible with the divine ordinance that, were the whole clergy perverted, God should not, [reaching] down as far as the laity, suddenly enlighten one of them, so that he lived purely without property and holily from the Lord's lot:[4] and then he would be a cleric, although he were neither versed in any of the seven arts nor ordained in human fashion according to the episcopal rites. But this evidence does not prove that it is so in fact, but seems to persuade that it can be so by God's absolute power. And every believer must grant God's election in such [cases], because a man does not rationally elect another to any dignity except because he reckons him worthy; now if he is worthy of anything, he is pre-elected by God, which he must believe; therefore no one ought to elect anyone to anything unless he reckons him pre-elected by the Lord. And this is known among those who see that God must concur with** [273]**every action of a creature by acting beforehand. And it is clear from the threefold law alleged for the same [point] from chapter 9.[5]**

¶2 273.4–273.11

[273]**Sed ulterius pro materia argumenti miror in tribus, primo quomodo adversarius non erubescit concludere primatum cuiuscumque Romani pontificis ex primatu sacerdotis Aaronitici in veteri testamento, secundo quomodo concluderetur officiorum singularis preeminencia ex lege veteri, et tercio quomodo tot ritus et ornatus episcopales ex legalibus legis veteris surrepserunt.**

But further, on the matter of the argument, I wonder at three things: first, how the adversary does not blush to infer the primacy of any Roman pontiff whatever from the primacy of the Aaronic priest in the old testament; second, how a singular preeminence of offices would be inferred from the old law; and third, how so many episcopal rites and ornaments crept in from the legal precepts of the old law.[6]

¶3 273.12–273.16

[273]**Quantum ad primum, cum legalia cessare debuerant, summum autem sacerdocium cum ritibus suis figuravit Dominum, qui iam venit, quare igitur non debuerunt cessare in sacerdocio Christi, nisi forte adhuc expectetur infideliter Antichristus?**

As to the first: since the legal precepts had to cease, and now the high priesthood with its rites figured the Lord, who has already come, why then ought they not to have ceased in the priesthood of Christ, unless perhaps Antichrist is still faithlessly awaited?[7]

¶4 273.18–273.25

[273]**Item, non videtur racio quare sequi debemus summum sacerdotem legis in hiis ritibus, quin per idem in aliis iam omissis, ut puta in uxoracione et successione hereditaria summi pontificis in suo oneroso officio et in parva porcione de sorte Domini. Non enim est racio diversitatis sufficiens, quod Machomed et Sergius colarunt de utroque testamento eis placitum, cetera displicibilia omittentes.**

Again, there seems no reason why we should follow the high priest of the law in these rites and not, by the same token, in others now omitted: for instance, in the marrying and the hereditary succession of the high priest in his burdensome office, and in the small portion from the Lord's lot. For it is no sufficient reason for the difference that Mahomet and Sergius strained out of both testaments what pleased them, omitting the rest, which displeased them.[8]

¶5 273.27–274.33
274.8 *Christ the one high-priest.*
274.16 *The apostles did not call themselves popes or heads of the Church.*

[273]**Item, in novo testamento debet ecclesia magis dimittere figuras et tamquam etate proveccior evacuando que erant parvuli, plus simulari ecclesie triumphanti; sed in beatis cessat omnis talis figura atque exaccio, cum sint ad ultimum unicordes; igitur in ecclesia apostolica debent ultra legem veterem ad illum statum accedere. Et hec racio, quare apostoli docuerunt in facto, verbo et** [274]**scripto, quod cessarunt huiusmodi legalia; nec inducerentur nova ad onus ecclesie, ut patet Act. XV, ymo apostoli fuissent nimis immemores future ecclesie pretermittendo exempla in facto, verbo et scripto, quomodo successores sui episcopi militarent. Unde pro ulteriori sensu notandum quod omnis summus sacerdos legis veteris figuravit Christum in omnibus factis suis legalibus. Ideo autonomastice et singulariter ipse dicitur summus sacerdos et episcopus animarum et hinc illa multitudo sacerdotum et suorum officiorum fuit in Christo unico consumata, ut pulchre docet Apostolus Heb. IX, et Heb. VII dicitur: plures facti sunt sacerdotes secundum legem etc. Et hec racio quare apostoli non vocarunt se papas sanctissimos, capita universalis ecclesie vel universales pontifices, sed habendo secum summum pontificem usque ad consumacionem seculi, vocarunt se servos Christi in tribulacione, socios et ministros ecclesie; unde ista religio servata**

But further, on the matter of the argument, I wonder at three things: first, how the adversary does not blush to infer the primacy of any Roman pontiff whatever from the primacy of the Aaronic priest in the old testament; second, how a singular preeminence of offices would be inferred from the old law; and third, how so many episcopal rites and ornaments crept in from the legal precepts of the old law.[6]

As to the first: since the legal precepts had to cease, and now the high priesthood with its rites figured the Lord, who has already come, why then ought they not to have ceased in the priesthood of Christ, unless perhaps Antichrist is still faithlessly awaited?[7]

Again, there seems no reason why we should follow the high priest of the law in these rites and not, by the same token, in others now omitted: for instance, in the marrying and the hereditary succession of the high priest in his burdensome office, and in the small portion from the Lord's lot. For it is no sufficient reason for the difference that Mahomet and Sergius strained out of both testaments what pleased them, omitting the rest, which displeased them.[8]

Again, in the new testament the church ought rather to put away figures and, as one more advanced in age, putting away the things of a child, be made more like the church triumphant;[9] now in the blessed all such figure and exaction ceases, since at the last they are of one heart; therefore in the apostolic church they ought to come nearer that state, beyond the old law. And this is the reason why the apostles taught in deed, word and [274]**writing that such legal precepts had ceased; and new ones were not to be brought in to burden the church, as is clear from Acts 15;[10] indeed, the apostles would have been exceedingly unmindful of the future church had they left out examples, in deed, word and writing, of how their successors the bishops should serve as soldiers. Hence, for the further sense, it is to be noted that every high priest of the old law figured Christ in all his legal acts. Therefore by antonomasia and singularly he is called the high priest and "bishop of souls"; and hence that multitude of priests and of their offices was consummated in the one Christ, as the Apostle finely teaches, Heb. 9; and in Heb. 7 it is said: "Many were made priests according to the law", etc.[11] And this is the reason why the apostles did not call themselves most holy popes, heads of the universal church or universal pontiffs, but,**

fuit tunc tempore beati Gregorii, et ex decreto suo incorporata legi ecclesie distinccione XCIX Prime sedis et cap. Ecce. Quare igitur non magis periculoso tempore plus indigni sine divisione vel phariseica expectacione inniterentur unite pontifici. Revera videtur iuxta distinccionem predictam et veritatem facti paparum sequi quod vel sunt personaliter Ihesus noster, vel quod sunt infidelitate peiores sacerdotibus legis veteris figuraliter expectantibus Ihesum Christum, cum propinquissime preparant viam Antichristo. Non igitur sequitur hec dominativa precellencia ex lege veteri.

having with them the highest pontiff "even to the consummation of the world", called themselves servants of Christ, partners in tribulation, and ministers of the church.[12] Hence this observance was kept then, in the time of blessed Gregory, and by his decree incorporated into the law of the church, Distinction 99, *Prime sedis* and the chapter *Ecce*.[13] Why then should not the more unworthy, in a more perilous time, rest in unity on the pontiff, without division or pharisaic expectation?[14] In truth it seems to follow, according to the aforesaid distinction and the truth of the popes' deeds, that either they are personally our Jesus, or they are worse in unbelief than the priests of the old law who awaited Jesus Christ in figure, since they prepare the way for Antichrist most nearly. This lordly pre-excellence, therefore, does not follow from the old law.[15]

Notes

1. ***Concordat genus gramatice*: *papa*** has the form of a first-declension (mostly feminine) noun, and Wyclif notes that the grammar fits a woman; the "saints skilled in languages" are not named. The construal is uncertain; the sentence may instead mean only that their usage ("pope" in the wide sense of holiness) agrees with the grammar.
2. 1 Cor. 11:5 (DR "every woman praying or prophesying with her head not covered disgraceth her head"); the bar on public speaking is 1 Cor. 14:34 ("it is not permitted them to speak"). ***Similius***, "more nearly", is a comparative where the next sentence has the superlative ***simillimus***.
3. ***Cestrensis*:** Ranulf Higden, ***Polychronicon*** V, 32 (Rolls Series VI, 330–32), the tale of Pope Joan, whom Higden, after Martin of Troppau, calls ***Johannes Anglicus, natione Maguntinus***. Codd. in marg. at 272.2: ***Papa Agnes mulier***. Loserth's foot compares Hus, ***De ecclesia*** fol. 220 (ch. 13, quoting Higden on Agnes), and Wyclif's ***Cruciata*** (***Polemical Works***, ed. Buddensieg, 619), where she is called Anna.
4. ***Toto clero perverso usque ad laycos Deus ... illuminaret aliquem eorum*: *eorum*** taken of the laity: if the clergy failed entirely, God would reach to the laity and make one of them a cleric. "The Lord's lot" (***sors Domini***) is the clergy's share, the root of ***clerus***.
5. B reads ***Exo.*** at 273.2, possibly "Exodus 9" for ***ex IX cap.***; the print, "from chapter 9" (of this treatise), is followed. The threefold law there is not identified here.
6. A reads ***singularum*** at 273.9 ("a preeminence of singular offices"). Codd. in marg.: ***Primatus pape non concluditur ex similitudine***.
7. ***Summum autem sacerdocium*:** the ***autem*** brings the minor premiss (the high priesthood was a figure) inside the ***cum*** clause; ***igitur*** draws the inference as a question.
8. ***Non enim est racio ... quod Machomed et Sergius colarunt*:** i.e. choosing some rites and dropping others is the method of Mahomet and the monk Sergius (the medieval legend of Muhammad's Christian teacher), not a reason. Wyclif names him so elsewhere: ***Sergium monachum Machometi ... dydascalum*** (***De civili dominio*** II, ch. 13), and, of the same picking from both laws, ***tamquam alter Sergius, seductor Machometi, volunt eligere carni placencia de lege utraque*** (***De blasphemia***, ch. 6, p. 84). The small portion: Num. 18:20 (DR "I am thy portion and inheritance").
9. ***Evacuando que erant parvuli*:** 1 Cor. 13:11 (DR "I put away the things of a child"). ***Simulari* = *assimilari***, "be made like".
10. Acts 15:28 (DR "to lay no further burden upon you"). ***Militarent*:** the Pauline soldiering of 2 Tim. 2:3–4.
11. "Bishop of souls": 1 Pet. 2:25 (DR "the shepherd and bishop of your souls"). Heb. 7:23, Vulg. ***Et alii quidem plures facti sunt sacerdotes*** (DR "And the others indeed were made many priests"); Wyclif adds ***secundum legem***. Heb. 9:11–12 on Christ the high priest.
12. Matt. 28:20 (DR "even to the consummation of the world"); "partners in tribulation", Apoc. 1:9. Codd. in marg. at 274.11: ***Apostoli non vocarunt se sanctissimos vel capita***. Loserth's foot at 274.17 compares Hus, ***Opera*** 219: Hus, ***De ecclesia*** ch. 12, copies the passage almost word for word.
13. Gratian, ***Decretum*** D.99 c.3 (***Prime sedis***) and c.5 (***Ecce***, Gregory refusing the title "universal pope"); Loserth gives "Cap. III", "Cap. V"; the modern form is ours (PL 187, 471B, 472B). ***Religio*** here is "observance" (scruple about titles), not the "religion" of the orders.
14. The print has no question mark; the sentence is taken as a question after ***quare igitur***. ***Unite***, adverb, "in unity", "united"; ***unico***, "the one [pontiff]", would read more easily and may lie behind it. The pontiff is Christ.
15. ***Precellencia*:** rendered "pre-excellence", kept apart from ***preeminencia*** "preeminence" (proposed for the glossary). ***Dominativa***, "lordly", as ***potestas dominativa***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 271: ***nominis*** [NW]
  - 272: ***ritus*** [NW]
  - 272: ***racionaliter*** (hyphenated raciona-|liter; main token holds the whole word)
  - 272: ∅ (second half of raciona-|liter, which the main scan already holds whole at pos 180)

- 273: ***iam***
- 273: ***cessat***
- 273: ***omnis***
- 273: ***talis***
- 273: ***figura***
- 273: ***illum***
- 274: ***singulariter*** [NW]
- 274: ***illa***

Part 4: Sacramental power equal in all priests; episcopal rites and vestments

Loserth pp. 275.1–279.15

¶1 275.1–276.23
275.4 *Sacerdotal powers are equally and indivisibly in all priests, yet some acts may be limited to those fittes to perform them.*
276.7 *Yet the danger of such distinctions must always be kept in mind.*

[275] **Quantum ad secundum scribit dominus Ardmacanus in De Questionibus Armenorum libro XI in fine cap. V de questione Armenorum: Ex isto capite sequi michi videtur, quod conclusio ad potestatem ligandi et solvendi sive remittendi peccata sive retinendi, sive baptisandi aut consecrandi aut benedicendi, et breviter quoad quantumcumque potestatem actus sacramentalis expressam a Christo in evangelio, quiscumque sacerdos in ordinacione sua totam accipit aut nichil ipsius, quoniam singulis in simul et indivise sunt date a Christo, et Matth. XIV, 6 ac Mar. X, 9 mandat ipse, quod Deus coniunxit, homo non separet. Unde videtur racionabiliter posse concludi, quod hec potestates sacramentales in omnibus sacerdotibus sunt equales. Hec doctor. Sed notandum quod crescente multitudine presbiterorum in sciencia et potencia variata, potest racionabiliter limitari sacerdotibus habilioribus singulariter officium, attestans in eis preeminenciam dignitatis, salva tamen potestate sacerdotibus inferioribus tempore necessitatis vel indisposicionis superioris presbiteri sacramenta ista et sacramentalia ministrandi; nam in lege veteri, ubi magis attenderant ad tales ritus sensibiles, propter indisposicionem summi pontificis non solum licuit sacerdoti inferiori, sed debuit supplere ministerium summi pontificis: aliter enim quando summus sacerdos foret infirmus vel sompno nocturno vel alia causa pollutus, sequeretur inconveniens legis Dei; aliquando enim polluti sunt ad vesperum, ut dicitur Levitici XV, 5 et Deuteronomio XXIII, et aliquando usque ad septimum diem, ut dicitur Ezech. XLV. Cum igitur debuerunt cottidie offerre super altare incensi** [276] **vespere et mane, ut patet Exod. XXX, patet, quod inferior sacerdos potestatem habuit defectus summi pontificis exsupplere. Quare igitur non in lege nova, ubi ritus talis minus attenditur? Hoc enim officium pertinebat singulariter cum paribus ad summum pontificem, ut patet Exod. XXX et XXXIX et Levitici VIII, oportet tamen tam ex parte superiorum quam inferiorum quam eciam tocius populi cavere**

As to the second, the lord of Armagh writes in *On the Questions of the Armenians*, book 11, at the end of chapter 5, on the question of the Armenians: "From this chapter it seems to me to follow that, as regards the power of binding and loosing, or of remitting sins or retaining them, or of baptizing or consecrating or blessing, and in short as regards any power whatever of a sacramental act expressed by Christ in the gospel, every priest in his ordination receives the whole of it or nothing of it, since they were given by Christ to each together and undividedly; and in Matt. 19:6 and Mark 10:9 he commands: What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. Hence it seems that it can reasonably be inferred that these sacramental powers are equal in all priests." So the doctor.[1] But it is to be noted that, as the multitude of presbyters grew, varied in knowledge and power, an office may reasonably be assigned singularly to the more qualified priests, attesting in them a preeminence of dignity; saving, however, to the lower priests the power of ministering these sacraments and sacramentals in time of need or of the unfitness of the superior presbyter.[2] For in the old law, where they attended more to such perceptible rites, because of the unfitness of the high priest it was not only lawful for a lower priest, but he was bound, to supply the ministry of the high priest: for otherwise, when the high priest was sick, or polluted by sleep at night or by another cause, an ill consequence for God's law would follow;[3] for sometimes they are polluted "until the evening", as is said in Leviticus 15:5 and Deuteronomy 23, and sometimes until the seventh day, as is said in Ezek. 45.[4] Since therefore they had to offer daily upon the altar of incense [276] **evening and morning, as is clear from Exod. 30, it is clear that the lower priest had power to make up the defects of the high priest. Why then not in the new law, where such a rite is less attended to? For this office belonged singularly, with its like, to the high priest, as**

pericula. Ex parte superiorum, ne exinde superbiant, putantes hoc eis contingere pure ex institucione divina, secundo ne ad illum statum sumantur inhabiles, et tercio omnino ne ex cupiditate eorum tale ministerium sit venale. Sacerdotem autem inferiorem oportet cavere ab istis et omnino, ne ex presumpcione temeraria det scandalum fratri suo. Et omnem fidelem oportet attendere ne talibus nimis ponderante precio innitatur. Aliqui enim plus appreciantur hos ritus bene sed humanitus adinventos quam evangelium vel mandata decalogi. Periculosum est, inquam, iudaice hos ritus preternecessarios nimis attendere; Deus enim supplet defectus eorum ex aliis operibus virtuosis.

is clear from Exod. 30 and 39 and Lev. 8;[5] yet dangers must be guarded against, on the part of the superiors as well as of the inferiors, and also of the whole people. On the part of the superiors: lest they grow proud from it, thinking that this befalls them purely by divine institution; second, lest the unqualified be taken up into that state; and third, above all, lest through their covetousness such a ministry be for sale. And the lower priest must beware of these things, and above all lest from rash presumption he give scandal to his brother. And every believer must take heed lest he rest on such things, setting too heavy a price on them.[6] For some prize these rites, well but humanly devised, more than the gospel or the commandments of the decalogue. It is dangerous, I say, to attend too much, in Jewish fashion, to these rites, which are beyond necessity; for God supplies their defects from other virtuous works.[7]

¶2 276.25–277.10
277.11 *Too much stress is laid on difference in orders.*

[276]Secundo principaliter sic arguitur: Ex lege veteri eliciunt sancti et leges ecclesie quod propter distincciones ordinum sunt ministeria episcopo deputata. Unde Dyonisius in De Ecclesiastica Yerarchia ponit tres ordines ecclesie, scilicet ordinem yerarchicum, quem episcopalem intelligit, ordinem sacerdotalem vel presbiteralem et ordinem ministerialem, et distinguens proprias operaciones uniuscuiusque istorum ordinum, [277]narrat quomodo ad supremum ordinem, scilicet episcopalem, spectat sacerdotum consecracio, divini ungenti perfeccio et sacri altaris benediccio. Unde censeretur hodie insanus qui diceret quod quilibet sacerdos habet potestatem ordines conferendi, baptizatos confirmandi, ecclesias et ornamenta sacerdotalia benedicendi et sic de benediccionibus ornamentis et aliis ritibus, que per sapientes et sanctos antiquos episcopali dignitati sunt propria.

Second, principally, it is argued thus: from the old law the saints and the laws of the church draw out that, because of the distinctions of orders, ministries are deputed to the bishop. Hence Dionysius, in *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, sets down three orders of the church, namely the hierarchic order, which he understands as the episcopal, the priestly or presbyteral order, and the ministerial order; and, distinguishing the proper operations of each of these orders, [277]he relates how to the highest order, namely the episcopal, belong the consecration of priests, the perfecting of the divine ointment and the blessing of the holy altar.[8] Hence he would today be thought mad who said that any priest whatever has the power of conferring orders, of confirming the baptized, of blessing churches and priestly ornaments, and so of the blessings, ornaments and other rites which, by the wise and holy ancients, are proper to the episcopal dignity.

¶3 277.11–279.15
278.8 *Vestments may be rightly used. Their origin and purpose.*
278.22 *What were used in the old law.*
278.23 *The Alb.*

[277]Quantum ad istud, patet ex dictis quomodo licite possunt fieri et licite pretermitti. Ideo requiritur magna prudencia ad acceptandum ista in suo ordine. Quidam enim putant sine istorum sacramentorum et sacerdotum ordine non posse recte viare ecclesiam, unde tantum ponderant has cerimonias, quod offendentem plus puniunt quam qui infideliter in caritate deficiat. Conceditur igitur cum beato Dyonisio quod sunt tales tres ordines sacerdotum, cum iuxta decretum Crysostomi positum distinccione XL Multi sunt sacerdotes et pauci sunt sacerdotes. Sed non oportet, quod sacerdos ex gracia Dei factus superior accipiat exinde novum ecclesiasticum sacramentum, dum ego omnino omitterem habere episcopalem consecracionem,

As to this, it is clear from what has been said how they can lawfully be done and lawfully be left undone. Therefore great prudence is required to accept these things in their order. For some think that without the order of these sacraments and priests the church cannot rightly be a wayfarer; hence they weigh these ceremonies so heavily that they punish one who offends [against them] more than one who faithlessly fails in charity.[9] It is granted, therefore, with blessed Dionysius that there are such three orders of priests, since, according to the decree of Chrysostom placed in Distinction 40, "Many are priests and few are priests".[10] But it is not necessary that a priest made superior by the grace of God should receive

antequam accipere presumerem hoc episcopale ministerium; est enim preternecessarium et predicacione, oracione ac multis aliis cultibus Dei inferius, nec non ad multos cultus Dei non tam necesse sicut creditur requisitum. Conceditur ergo, quod benediccio, consecracio et alia ministracio episcopalis est laudabilis rite facta. Sed grave est quod ecclesia [278]oneretur tam multiplici cerimonia, gravius quod tantam vim ponat in illa, et gravissimum quod nemo potest salvari a Deo, ut dicunt, nisi credat et accipiat secundum formam iam currentem huiusmodi sacramenta. De istis autem in tractatu De Sacramentis est sermo lacior. Et sic conceditur quod vestes sacerdotales et ornamenta episcopalia possunt introduci pie et religiose, licet mendaciter et impie communius sint accepte, ut tractantes ritus humanos et statuta hominum, notant quinque vestimenta sacerdotalia, quibus communiter induitur celebrando, et variantur in parte ab ornamentis sacerdotum veteris testamenti, ut declarat Hugo libro secundo De Sacramentis parte IV. Singularis, inquit, habitus sacerdotibus Christi in ministerio traditur, ut per id quod foris apparet quales intus esse debeant ostendatur, sacrarum autem vestium ritus partim a veteri testamento assumptus est et partim a patribus novi testamenti adiectus. Legitur enim Exod. XXVIII, XXIX, XXX et XXXIX quomodo Moyses indueret Aaron fratrem suum, primo tunica bissina, que grece poderis id est talaris dicitur, que a collo usque ad talos extenditur, que in novo sacerdocio non solum de bisso sed de lino contexitur; ipsa autem modificata membris corporis et aptata nichil superfluum aut dissolutum in vita sacerdotis debere esse ostendit. Sed in novo testamento laxatur post dotacionem ecclesie, cum multa temporalia preter necessaria officio sacerdotis sibi monstruoso adiaceant. Hec autem vestis ob spem candoris nomen Albe sortitur, que signat spiritualem mundiciam ministrorum, iuxta [279]illud Apok XIX, 8: Datum est sponse ut operiat se bissino splendenti candido. Et sequitur exposicio: Bissinum enim iustificaciones sunt sanctorum. Caro quidem hominis mundiciam quam ex natura non habet, studio bono aquirit per graciam, sicut bissus vel linum candorem suum, quem natura non habuit, per studium et industriam artificis aquisivit, dum multis tunsionibus ac locionibus illustracione solis siccantis quasi quadam violencia attritum vertitur in alborem. Oportet quidem crebro castigare corpus et in servitutem redigere, sicut dicit Apostolus prima Cor. IX se fecisse; et sic positus in aqua tribulacionis et tunsus tortoribus ac interim sole iusticie consolatus a tribulacionibus siccatus et calore veritatis accensus.

thereby a new ecclesiastical sacrament; for my part I would altogether forgo having episcopal consecration sooner than presume to receive this episcopal ministry.[11] For it is beyond necessity, and lower than preaching, prayer and many other acts of the worship of God, and moreover is not so necessarily required for many acts of worship of God as is believed. It is granted, therefore, that blessing, consecration and the other episcopal ministration is praiseworthy when duly done. But it is grievous that the church [278]should be burdened with so manifold a ceremony, more grievous that it should set such force in it, and most grievous that no one can be saved by God, as they say, unless he believes and receives such sacraments according to the form now current. And of these there is fuller discussion in the treatise *On the Sacraments*.[12] And so it is granted that priestly vestments and episcopal ornaments can be introduced piously and religiously, although more commonly they have been received lyingly and impiously; as those who treat of human rites and the statutes of men note five priestly vestments, with which [the priest] is commonly clothed in celebrating, and these vary in part from the ornaments of the priests of the old testament, as Hugh declares in the second book of *On the Sacraments*, part 4: "A singular habit," he says, "is handed down to the priests of Christ in the ministry, so that by what appears without it may be shown what they ought to be within; and the rite of the sacred vestments was in part taken from the old testament and in part added by the fathers of the new testament.[13] For one reads in Exod. 28, 29, 30 and 39 how Moses clothed Aaron his brother, first with a tunic of fine linen, which in Greek is called *poderis*, that is, ankle-length, which reaches from the neck to the ankles, and which in the new priesthood is woven not only of fine linen but of linen; and it, measured and fitted to the members of the body, shows that there ought to be nothing superfluous or loose in the life of the priest." But in the new testament it is loosened after the endowment of the church, since many temporal goods beyond what the priest's office needs lie about him, made monstrous.[14] "And this vestment, for the hope of its whiteness, takes the name Alb, which signifies the spiritual cleanness of the ministers, according to [279]that of Apoc. 19:8: It is granted to the bride that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white."[15] And the exposition follows: "For the fine linen are the justifications of saints. The flesh of man indeed acquires by grace, through good effort, the cleanness which it does not have by nature, as fine linen or linen acquired its whiteness, which it did not have by nature, through the effort and industry of the craftsman, when, worn down by

many beatings and washings, by the shining of the drying sun, as by a kind of violence, it is turned to whiteness." It is needful indeed often to chastise the body and bring it into subjection, as the Apostle says, 1 Cor. 9, that he did; and so, placed in the water of tribulation and beaten by tormentors, and meanwhile consoled by the sun of justice, dried from tribulations and kindled by the heat of truth.[16]

Notes

1. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* XI; Wyclif says "end of chapter 5", but in the Paris 1512 print the passage stands early in chapter 6. *Quod conclusio ad potestatem*: FitzRalph reads *quod quo ad potestatem*, "that as regards the power"; the print's *conclusio* is a corruption of *quo ad*, and the English follows FitzRalph (our emendation). FitzRalph also has *simul et indiuise ac coniuncte* and cites "mat. 19". The gospel reference is Matt. 19:6 (print XIV); Wyclif omits *ergo* (DR "What therefore God hath joined together"). Codd. in marg. at 275.1: *Potestatem plenam accipit sacerdos quilibet in consecracione*.
2. *Limitari … officium*: "assigned" (glossary: *limitare*), not "restricted"; Loserth's side-note says "limited". *Attestans* agrees loosely with *officium*: the office attests the preeminence.
3. *Inconveniens* here leans to the "troubles" sense: the law would be left unfulfilled, not an absurdity in argument. At 275.30 the manuscripts read *antea enim* for the print's *aliter enim*; the print is followed.
4. Lev. 15:5 (DR "shall be unclean until the evening"); Deut. 23:10–11 (B reads *Deut. XXVIII*). The seven days are Ezek. 44:26 (DR "they shall reckon unto him seven days"), not ch. 45 as printed; the slip is FitzRalph's, whose same column (1512, scan p. 176) prints "ezech. c.45" in the run Wyclif follows here. Incense evening and morning: Exod. 30:7–8.
5. *Cum paribus*: "with its like", i.e. with offices of the same kind; it might also mean "with his peers" (the other priests). Taken of the offices, since the sentence is about what was the high priest's alone.
6. *Nimis ponderante precio*: ablative absolute, "the price weighing too much", i.e. valuing them too highly.
7. *Preternecessarios*: "beyond necessity" (also 277.24; proposed for the glossary). *Defectus eorum* is taken as the lack of these rites: where they are missing, God makes up from other virtuous works.
8. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 5.1.5: to the hierarch alone belong *ierarchicorum ordinum sanctificationem, et divini unguenti consummationem, et sacram altaris purificationem* (Eriugena's version, PL 122, 1097B; Loserth: ed. Lyon 1572, p. 151); the myron itself is ch. 4. A in marg. at 277.31: *Dionysius concedit tres ordines ecclesie secundum officia distinctos*.
9. *Viare*: the glossary, the verb of *viator*. *Qui* at 277.18 is lacking in both manuscripts and is Loserth's supply; followed.
10. Gratian, *Decretum* D.40 c.12 (*Multi sacerdotes*, from pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*); PL 187, 217B: *Multi sacerdotes, et pauci sacerdotes; multi nomine, pauci opere*; Loserth: "Cap. XII"; the *Opus imperfectum* homily is 43, on Matt. 23.
11. *Dum ego omnino omitterem … antequam accipere presumerem*: *antequam* in the sense "sooner than, rather than"; Wyclif speaks of himself.
12. *In tractatu De Sacramentis*: not identified; probably Wyclif's own (projected or lost) treatment rather than Hugh's work cited in the next sentence: Wyclif's bare *in tractatu De …* elsewhere names his own works (e.g. *in tractatu De Papa*), others' with *in tractatu suo*.
13. Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* 2.4 (on sacred vestments); Loserth: "Opp. (ed. Mog. 1617) III, 449"; PL 176, 433B–D. At 278.19–20 the manuscripts read *a fratribus* for *a patribus*; the print (Hugh) is followed. Vestments: Exod. 28–29, 39 (and 30). Codd. in marg. at 278.8: *Vestimenta episcopalia possunt introduci pie et religiose*.
14. Wyclif's own aside inside Hugh's text (not italic in the print). *Sibi monstruoso adiaceant*: the dative *monstruoso* agrees with *sibi*: the goods cling to a priest who is made monstrous by them.
15. *Ob spem candoris*: printed *spem*, "hope"; Hugh reads *ob speciem candoris*, "appearance" (PL 176, 433D), of which *spem* is a misread abbreviation; translated as printed and flagged. Apoc. 19:8, Vulg. *Et datum est illi ut cooperiat se byssino splendenti et candido* (DR "And it is granted to her that she should clothe herself with fine linen, glittering and white"); Wyclif reads *sponse*, "to the bride". At 279.1–2 the manuscripts read *bissinum splendentis candidum* and lack *ut*; the print is followed.
16. 1 Cor. 9:27 (DR "I chastise my body and bring it into subjection"). B reads *Sed* for *Oportet* at 279.10. The last sentence has no main verb at the chunk's end (the participles await one, presumably "he acquires whiteness"); translated as it stands. Codd. in marg. at 279.3: *Alba prima vestis*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 275: *videtur*
  - 275: *et*
  - 275: *et*
  - 275: *sua* (10 is the line number)
  - 275: *et*
  - 275: *equales*

- 276: ***illum***
- 276: ***pre*** (hyphenated pre-|sumpcione; main token holds the first half (the i is the line number 15); sumpcione follows at pos 104)
- 278: ***illa***
- 278: ***foris***
- 278: ***novi***
- 278: ***primo***
- 279: ***Apok XIX*** (one token covers two printed words (Apok. XIX,))
- 279: ***ut***
- 279: ***bissino*** (hyphenated bis-|sino; main token holds the whole word)
- 279: ***mundiciam quam*** (one token covers two printed words)
- 279: ***ex natura*** (one token covers two printed words)
- 279: ***non***
- 279: ***sicut***
- 279: ***in*** (10 is the line number)
- 276: ***Quare igitur*** (Quareigitur -> Quare igitur (two words run together))
- 278: ***sint accepte,*** (sintaccepte, -> sint accepte, (two words run together))
- 277: ***tam*** (box in blank gap after tam)
- 279: ***attritum*** (LEFT-nw: italic; t before r and u read as t (one crossbar tall t))

Part 5: The vestments of the priesthood: girdle, breeches, inner tunic, superhumeral

Loserth pp. 279.16–282.33

¶1 279.16–281.17
279.16 *The girdle of four colours. Their significance.*
281.4 *How to tame the flesh.*
281.18 *The breeches a symbol of chastity.*

[279]**Secunda vestis est zona, baltheus vel cingulum, latitudinis quasi quatuor digitorum, reticulatam, quasi pellis vipperea vel stricta tunica linea circa renes, per cuius fortem tinccionem notatur, ut castitas sacerdotis nullo incentivorum estu, cogitacione vel opere dissolvatur, iuxta illud Luce XII, 35: Sint lumbi vestri precincti. Et sic candor vestis signat mundiciam, zona vero continenciam, ut illic non sordescat, hic non effluat conversacio sacerdotis. De zona legitur Exod. XXVII: distincta quatuor coloribus, scilicet bisso et purpura, iacincto et cocco. Per que iuxta signacionem predictam duplicem duplex quaternarius designatur: Primo notantur quatuor virtutes cardinales, scilicet iusticia, fortitudo, temperancia et prudencia, per quas cinctus animus servat albedinem vestis, per quam sit digna, ut dicitur Apoc. XIV, 1 sequi agnum quocumque ierit. Et est correspondencia electorum in istis quatuor coloratis ad istas quatuor virtutes,** [280]**cum bissus terre admodo, ut patet de combustis cineribus, ossibus et ceteris albis siccis notat iusticiam, que instar terre solide stat in omni temptacione, ut Aristoteles dicit I Ethicorum sicut tetragonus sine vituperio. Purpura vero ignem pretendens, racione ruboris signat fortitudinem purgatam, ut aurum in camino tribulacionis, ut loquitur scriptura, laccinctus autem celestis coloris, aquam induratam signans, notat temperanciam que massam corporis humani sic temperat, ut in via morum propter amorem celestium non effluat terminis alienis. Coccus vero bis tinctus**

The second vestment is the girdle, belt or cincture, about four fingers broad, netted[1] like a viper's skin, or "a close linen tunic about the loins, by whose firm binding[2] it is signified that the chastity of the priest is not to be loosened by any heat of incitements, in thought or in deed, according to that of Luke 12:35: 'Let your loins be girt.' And so the whiteness of the vestment signifies cleanness, and the girdle continence, so that there the manner of life of the priest may not grow foul, and here may not flow away. Of the girdle we read in Exodus 27: distinguished with four colours, namely fine linen and purple, violet and scarlet."[3] By these, according to the twofold signification already stated, a twofold four is designated. First, the four cardinal virtues are signified, namely justice, fortitude, temperance and prudence; girt with these the mind keeps the whiteness of the vestment, by which it is worthy, as is said in Apocalypse 14:1, "to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth."[4] And there is a correspondence of the elements[5] in these four coloured things to these four virtues, [280]**since fine linen, after the manner of earth[6] (as is clear from burnt ashes, bones and other white, dry things), signifies justice, which like solid earth stands in every temptation, as Aristotle says in *Ethics* I, "like a square [man] without reproach."[7] And purple, representing fire, by reason of its redness signifies fortitude purged, like "gold in the furnace of tribulation", as scripture says.[8] And violet, of**

est genus tincture medius inter rubeum et croceum, quem nos dicimus vermiculum vel subrubeum colorem ex silvestribus frondibus, vel (ut aliis placet) ex quodam verme decoctum; et signat prudenciam vigentem in sanguineis instar aeris temperatis et specialiter si tincti fuerint preter virtutes morales in prudencia conversacionis penalis domini Ihesu Christi. Secundo notantur quatuor humores, scilicet melancolica et colerica, flegma et sanguis, quibus nature sagacitate commixtis humana complexio denotatur. Sic inquam istis quatuor moribus continencia figuratur. Sicut enim electa in mixtis, sic humores in animalibus et proprietates spirituales in mentibus habent sua officia. Terra enim facit mixto constanciam, aqua continuacionem, aer capacitatem celestis influencie et ignis est via recipiendi peregrinas impressiones et quasi luna instrumentalis, mediante qua mitigantur frigiditas et humiditas inferioris duplicis elementi et confortatur qualitas aeris, ut puta raritas atque caliditas. Sic est de complexione hominis corporali [281]et de continencia mentis spirituali, dum memoria proprie fragilitatis ut terra, continuacio dulcis devocionis ut aqua, tenuitas corporalis cibacionis ut aer et raritas muliebris conversacionis ut ignis, faciunt sacerdotem Domini continentem. Nichil enim tantum valet ad domandum carnis desideria, sicut pensare quomodo incinerabitur post mortem hominis facta terra; continuacio vero devocionis, extinguens ocium, precavet omne crimen et per consequens carnis luxum. Ieiunium vero cavens crapulam cum adiutorio celestis radii extinguit ignem libidinis, et caritativa fuga muliebris consorcii et pro fugienda luxuria supereminens medicina. Evanescas igitur et non expectes in cogitacione vel corpore muliebre consorcium instar ignis, quia nisi habueris ignem amoris, non calesces supernaturaliter.

heavenly colour, signifying hardened water, denotes temperance, which so tempers the mass of the human body that on the way of morals, for love of heavenly things, it does not flow out into alien bounds. And scarlet twice dyed is a kind of dye midway between red and saffron, which we call vermilion or a reddish colour, boiled out of woodland leaves or (as others prefer) out of a certain worm; and it signifies prudence flourishing in the sanguine, who are tempered like air, and especially if they have been dyed, beyond the moral virtues, in the prudence of the hard manner of life of the Lord Jesus Christ.[9] Second, the four humours are signified, namely the melancholic and the choleric, phlegm and blood, by whose mixture through the skill of nature the human complexion is denoted. So, I say, by these four habits[10] continence is figured. For as the elements in mixed bodies, so the humours in animals and spiritual properties in minds have their offices. For earth gives the mixed body stability, water continuity, air a capacity for celestial influence, and fire is the way of receiving foreign impressions and, as it were, an instrumental moon,[11] by means of which the coldness and moisture of the lower twofold element are mitigated and the quality of air is strengthened, namely rarity and heat. So it is with the bodily complexion of man [281]and with the spiritual continence of the mind: memory of one's own frailty as earth, continuity of sweet devotion as water, slenderness of bodily feeding as air, and rareness of converse with women as fire,[12] make the priest of the Lord continent. For nothing avails so much for taming the desires of the flesh as to ponder how, become earth after the man's death, [it] will be turned to ashes; and continuity of devotion, putting out idleness, guards against every crime and consequently against the wantonness of the flesh. And fasting, guarding against surfeit, with the help of the heavenly ray puts out the fire of lust; and charitable flight from the company of women [is], for the lechery that must be fled, the supereminent medicine.[13] Vanish, therefore, and do not wait, in thought or in body, for the company of women, which is like fire; for unless you have the fire of love, you will not grow warm supernaturally.

¶2 281.18–282.2
282.3 *The inner tunic.*
282.16 *The Ephod patience.*

[281]Tercia vestis sunt femoralia, que preter braccas com munes sacerdos induet in signum castitatis eciam interioris, dum vacat divinis officiis. Non enim credi debet sacerdotes veteris testamenti alias continue discooperta carne pudoris incedere, ut solum intrando in sancta verenda tegere iubeantur, sed servando continue castitatem coniugalem voluit sermo Dei, ut sacerdotem fungentem

The third vestment is the breeches, which the priest puts on besides the common drawers as a sign of chastity, inward chastity too, while he is free for the divine offices. "For it must not be believed that the priests of the old testament otherwise went about continually with the flesh of shame uncovered, so that only on entering the holy place were they bidden to cover their privy parts; but, by keeping conjugal chastity

officio sacri ministerii cooperiat castitas singularis; unde quia sacerdotes novi testamenti inconiugati servare debent castitatem virginalem continue, ideo tantum utuntur femoralibus communibus ad denotandum, quod continue non licet eis ut sacerdotibus legis veteris post completum officium, laxare ministerium carnalis copule; eis enim pro servanda castitate [282]est cottidiana necessitas, quibus continue offerrendi summum sacrificium concessa est potestas.

continually, the word of God willed that a singular chastity should cover the priest performing the office of the sacred ministry.[14] Hence, because the unmarried priests of the new testament must keep virginal chastity continually, therefore they use only the common breeches, to denote that it is not lawful for them, as it was for the priests of the old law after their office was completed, to loose themselves continually to the ministry of carnal union; for they have [282]a daily necessity of keeping chastity, to whom the power of continually offering the highest sacrifice has been granted."[15]

¶3 282.3–282.15

[282]Quarta vestis est tunica interior vel iacinctina, qua in utroque testamento utuntur soli pontifices ad denotandum, quod in illis debet precipue duplex castitas scilicet mentis et corporis observari. Pontifex quidem, qui de thesauro suo debet proferre nova et vetera, cum carnalis copula distrahit a spirituali noticia duplicis testamenti, debet observare duplicem castitatem. Ista igitur tunica priori superaddita signat quod dissimilis terrestribus debet de celestibus cogitare. Ideo vocatur tunica interior iacinctina, ut significet cordis mundiciam, et de celestibus cogitatum. Phil. III. 20 dicit Apostolus: nostra conversacio in celo est.

The fourth vestment is the inner or violet tunic, which in both testaments the pontiffs alone use, to denote that in them a twofold chastity, namely of mind and of body, ought especially to be observed. For the pontiff, who must bring forth out of his treasure new things and old, must observe a twofold chastity, since carnal union draws [a man] away from the spiritual knowledge of the twofold testament.[16] This tunic, therefore, added over the former, signifies that, unlike earthly men, he must think of heavenly things. Therefore it is called the inner violet tunic, to signify cleanness of heart and thought of heavenly things. In Philippians 3:20 the Apostle says: "our manner of life is in heaven."[17]

¶4 282.16–282.33

[282]Quinta uestis est superhumerale, que hebrayce ephot dicitur quasi casula vel planeta; et contextum erat pilis de auro ac coloribus supradictis. In veteri vero testamento soli pontifices usi sunt hac veste quatuor distincta coloribus, ad sensum de zona expositum; tempore vere gracie utuntur ea quilibet sacerdotes. Signat autem superhumerale fortitudinem operum et pacienciam laborum, per duos humeros denotatas, unde altrinsecus super humeros fibulabantur duo lapides onichini, in quorum dextro inscripta erant sex nomina seniorum filiorum Ysrahel, et sex in alio, denotando quod sacerdos debet recolere de patriarcharum constancia tam in prosperis quam in adversis. Nostrum autem superhumerale non sic inscribitur, quia tempore gracie dimissis cerimoniis antiquis, veniente unico patriarcha, debemus plus inniti simplici veritati.

The fifth vestment is the superhumeral,[18] which in Hebrew is called ephod, like a chasuble or planeta; and it was woven of strands of gold[19] and of the colours aforesaid. And in the old testament the pontiffs alone used this vestment, distinguished with four colours, in the sense expounded for the girdle; in the time of true grace[20] any priests whatever use it. "And the superhumeral signifies the fortitude of works and the patience of labours, denoted by the two shoulders; hence on either side two onyx stones were clasped on the shoulders, on the right one of which were inscribed six names of the elder sons of Israel, and six on the other, denoting that the priest ought to recall the constancy of the patriarchs in prosperity as in adversity. But our superhumeral is not so inscribed, because in the time of grace, the ancient ceremonies having been dismissed and the one patriarch having come, we ought to lean more on the simple truth."

Notes

1. The print's *reticulatam* (so on the plate) agrees with nothing in the sentence (*zona*, *pellis*, *tunica* are nominative); we translate as if *reticulata*.

2. The print reads *tinccionem*, "dyeing", which does not suit a girdle that keeps chastity from being "loosened" (*dissolvatur*); we translate *cinccionem*, "girding" (our emendation; *t* and *c* are readily confused). Loserth italicises 279.18–27 (*stricta tunica … iacincto et cocco*) as a quotation but gives no reference. It is Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II.4.3 (PL 176, 434C): *tunica linea circa renes fortiter astringitur, ut castitas sacerdotis nullo incentivorum aestu dissolvatur*. Hugh's *astringitur* supports *cinccionem*.
3. The four-coloured girdle is Exod. 28:39 and 39:28 (Vulgate 39:28 *cingulum vero de bysso retorta, hyacintho, purpura, ac vermiculo bis tincto*), not ch. 27; the words given are not the Vulgate's. Chapter numbers in references are Wyclif's, verse numbers Loserth's.
4. Apoc. 14:4 (DR); the print has "XIV, 1".
5. The print reads *electorum* (and at 280.25 *electa in mixtis*), both confirmed on the plate; neither construes. The pairing that follows (linen with earth, purple with fire, violet with water, scarlet with air) and *elementi* at 280.32 require *elementorum*, *elementa* (our emendation, both places); Hugh of St Victor, whom Wyclif follows here, refers the colours *ad quatuor elementa* (*De sacr.* II.4.3, PL 176, 434).
6. The plate has a comma after *virtutes* (279.34), so *cum bissus* continues the sentence: "since". *Terre admodo* is taken as *ad modum terre*, "after the manner of earth".
7. Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* 1.10, 1100b21–22, the good man as "four-square without reproach". Loserth notes the same example in *De civili dominio* I, 54, l. 26.
8. Loserth refers to Prov. 17:3 ("gold in the furnace", DR); the wording is nearer Ecclus. 2:5, "in the furnace of humiliation".
9. *Tincti fuerint* has the sanguine (*sanguineis*) as its subject. *Penalis*, the adjective beside *penalitas* "hardship", is rendered "hard": Christ's life of hardship.
10. The plate reads *moribus*, "habits [of conduct]"; we take it forward, to the four practices of continence set out at 281.1–4. *Humoribus* would make it point back to the humours; the print is kept.
11. The plate reads *luna*; why fire should be "an instrumental moon" is not explained, and the word may be corrupt.
12. *Conversacio* here is converse, dealings with women, not the priest's "manner of life" of 279.25.
13. *Profugienda* is read as two words, *pro fugienda*; "is" is supplied, the sentence having no verb.
14. *Servando* has no expressed subject: the old priests kept conjugal chastity at all times, and the word of God required a singular chastity in addition while they ministered.
15. Loserth italicises 281.19–282.2 and refers to Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* ("l. c., p. 460", the Mainz 1617 *Opera* III; II.4.4, PL 176, 434D–435B), "very loosely quoted".
16. Matt. 13:52, "who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old" (DR), said there of the scribe instructed in the kingdom.
17. Wyclif's form; the Vulgate reads *Nostra autem conversatio in caelis est*, DR "But our conversation is in heaven". *Conversacio* keeps the glossary's "manner of life".
18. *Superhumerale* is the Vulgate's word for the ephod (DR "ephod"); "superhumeral" keeps Wyclif's word visible, as he gives *ephot* beside it. The two onyx stones are Exod. 28:9–12. Loserth marks no quotation, but 282.3–33 (the inner tunic and the ephod) follows Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II.4.5–6 (PL 176, 435) closely, as the rest of this account of the vestments does.
19. *Pilis*, "hairs, strands"; *filis*, "threads" (cf. *filis iacinctivis*, 285.5), may be the reading.
20. *Vere* may stand for *vero*, "but in the time of grace"; the print gives "true grace".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 279: *signat*
  - 279: *hic*
  - 279: *1* (print "Apoc. XIV, 1 sequi": old-style arabic 1, x-height; the main scan lost it)
  - 280: *sicut*
  - 280: *loquitur*
  - 280: *coloris* (hyphenated co-|loris; main token holds the whole word)
  - 281: *induet* [NW]
  - 282: *cottidiana*
  - 282: *offerrendi*
  - 282: *planeta* [NW]
  - 281: *inconiugati* (one word)
  - 282: *onichini,* (LEFT-nw: hyphenated oni-|chini, ; line number 25 follows)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Tlie Ephod (282.16).

Part 6: The pontiff's vestments: rational, mitre, golden plate, bells, and what they figure

Loserth pp. 283.1–286.29

¶1 283.1–284.16
283.1 *The breastplate of judgment.*
284.17 *The Mitre.*

[283]Sexta vestis est racionale vel logyon, quod pectori pontificis in foramine superhumeralis contexitur. Et fuit vestis conformis texture cum superhumerali, habens nomina duodecim filiorum Ysrahel inscripta secundum quatuor ordines in duodecim lapidibus,

"The sixth vestment is the rational or logion, which is woven onto the breast of the pontiff in the opening of the superhumeral."[1] And it was a vestment conformed in weaving to the superhumeral, having the names

ut recolendo de sanctis patribus non degenerent ab eis in moribus. In medio autem fuit lapis sardonicus, cui inscribebantur hec duo nomina: iudicium vel doctrina et veritas. Unde secundum Yosephum, dum populus fuit domino placabilis sacerdosque daret populo secundum inspiracionem Dei responsum prosperum, lapis in signum placacionis divine in solito splendore emicuit. Sed ducentis annis antequam scripsit librum Antiquitatum, quod fuit tempore Tyti et Vaspasiani cessavit dictus splendor, quod fuit prenosticum reprobacionis populi ex peccato. Rasa dicit, quod urin et thyrin Hebreum, quod sonat doctrina et veritas, fuit nomen Domini tetragramaton, virtute cuius responsum et splendor populo innuebant et signat mistice, quod pontifex medians inter Deum et populum debet docere doctrinam inhaustam secundum Dei iudicium; et sicut non docebit aliam quam veritas suggerit, sic doctrinam suam opere et racione confirmare non desistit. Concathenatur autem racionale superhumerali [284] in signum, quod habitus et opera sibi debeant coherere, sic quod totum corpus operum a caritate pectoris procederet. Que caritas licet sit modica in sua essencia, tamen extenditur in quadratum, quia secundum lineam protensam a summo in infimum a dextris amicorum ad sinistrum inimicorum, et ab antiquo ad patres preteritos ad retro quoad filios successores, latitudo vero in operibus debet effectualiter practisari correspondenter ad istam quadraturam, unde ad denotandum istum ordinem prius recitatur racionale in Exodo XXVIII ante superhumerale, quia oportet thesaurum habitus procedere, cum nemo doceat antequam sciat. Sed in ordini docendi oportet opus precedere iuxta illud Act. primo, 1: Cepit Ihesus facere et docere.

of the twelve sons of Israel inscribed in four rows on twelve stones, so that, recalling the holy fathers, they might not degenerate from them in morals. And in the middle was a sardonyx stone, on which these two names were inscribed: judgment or doctrine, and truth.[2] Hence, according to Josephus, while the people was pleasing to the Lord and the priest gave the people a favourable answer according to the inspiration of God, the stone shone out with its accustomed splendour as a sign that God was appeased. But two hundred years before he wrote the book of the *Antiquities*, which was in the time of Titus and Vespasian, the said splendour ceased, which was a presage of the people's rejection for sin.[3] Rasa says that *urin* and *thyrin* in Hebrew, which sounds "doctrine and truth", was the name of the Lord, the tetragrammaton, by whose power they gave the people answer and splendour;[4] and it signifies mystically that the pontiff, mediating between God and the people, must teach the doctrine he has drawn in, according to the judgment of God; and as he will teach no other than truth suggests, so he does not cease to confirm his doctrine by work and by reason. And "the rational is chained to the superhumeral [284] as a sign that habit and works ought to cohere with each other, so that the whole body of works should proceed from the charity of the breast."[5] And this charity, although it is small in its essence, is yet extended into a square: for along a line stretched from the highest to the lowest, from the right hand of friends to the left of enemies, and from of old to the fathers gone by, [and] backward as regards the sons who succeed, its breadth in works must be effectually put into practice in correspondence with this square.[6] Hence, to denote this order, the rational is recited in Exodus 28 before the superhumeral,[7] because the treasure of habit must go first, "since no one teaches before he knows." But in the order of teaching the work must go first, according to that of Acts 1:1: "Jesus began to do and to teach."[8]

¶2 284.17–285.3
285.4 *The gold plate on the mitre.*
285.21 *There were besides rings etc. reckoned as parts of the garments mentioned.*
285.31 *Four reasons for thus adorning the priests.*

[284] Septimum ornamentum est mitra, cydaris vel thyara, que imposita capiti, in quo viget sensus, signat quod illis debet committi cura regendi alios, qui ad sensum preexpositum sciunt preeminenter se ipsos regere. Sic enim loquitur Apostolus prima Cor. XI 3 de capite ponens caput uxoris virum, caput autem viri Christum et caput Christi Deum; ex quo sequitur, quod Christus est creatura, cum secundum humanitatem regitur a se Deo. Dicitur autem mitra fuisse duplicata, cuius pars interior est bissina, pars vero exterior iacinctiva habens in parte inferiori semicirculum aureum ab auribus

The seventh ornament is the mitre, cidaris or tiara, which, placed on the head, in which sense flourishes, signifies that the care of ruling others ought to be committed to those who, in the sense set out above, know how to rule themselves preeminently. For so the Apostle speaks of the head in 1 Corinthians 11:3, setting down: "the head of the wife [is] the man, and the head of the man Christ, and the head of Christ God";[9] from which it follows that Christ is a creature, since according to his humanity he is ruled by himself as God. And the mitre is said to have been doubled, its inner part of fine linen and its outer part violet, having on its lower

occupat amplectentem; per hanc igitur signatur vite mundicia, cum bissus supponitur, celestis conversacio, cum iacinctivus color eminet; donum autem caritatis et sapiencie connectens hec in capitaneo signatur per semicirculum [285]aureum transeuntem per mitram capiti conectentem. Semicirculus autem signat, quod semiplene in via suscipimus ista dona.

part a golden semicircle embracing the back of the head[10] from the ears; by this, then, cleanness of life is signified, since the fine linen is placed beneath, [and] a heavenly manner of life, since the violet colour stands out; and the gift of charity and wisdom, which connects these in the captain,[11] is signified by the golden semicircle [285]passing across the mitre and connecting it to the head. And the semicircle signifies that on the way we receive these gifts half-fully.

¶3 285.4–285.19

[285]Octavum ornamentum est lamina aurea, que transiens ab aure in aurem per frontem iuncta est; cum mitra filis iacinctivis, cui insculpebatur nomen Domini tetragramaton, quod in Hebreo ineffabile nominatur; per quod consignatur Deum omnium conditorem et rectorem secundum suam sapienciam esse precipue a pontificibus ostendendum tam opere quam sermone, ita quod nomen inscriptum significet essenciam, aurum sapienciam, semicirculus patens in fronte significet eius lucernam ad extra in fabrica quam creavit accione eius ad intra a nobis abscondita: ora autem huius lamine supposita signat opus creacionis, ora vero superior signat opus gubernacionis, et connexio huius lamine cum mitra signat, quod officio spiritualis prepositure coniungi debeat hec doctrina.

The eighth ornament is the golden plate which, passing from ear to ear across the forehead, was joined to the mitre with violet threads; on it was engraved the name of the Lord, the tetragrammaton, which in Hebrew is called ineffable. By this it is signified that God, the maker and ruler of all things according to his wisdom, is to be shown forth chiefly by the pontiffs, as much by work as by word; so that the name inscribed signifies [his] essence, the gold [his] wisdom, and the semicircle open on the forehead signifies his lantern outwardly in the fabric which he created, his action inwardly being hidden from us; and the lower edge of this plate signifies the work of creation, the upper edge the work of governance, and the joining of this plate with the mitre signifies that this doctrine ought to be joined to the duty of the spiritual office of superior.[12]

¶4 285.21–285.30

[285]Preter hec octo ornamento sunt anuli, vitte vel fibule et tyntinabula, que computantur ut partes vestium predictarum. Debet enim pontifex in suo officio habere tunicam iacinctinam, que poderis dicitur, in cuius margine inferiori forent septuaginta tyntinabula aurea et tot vasculi vel noduli quasi mala punica commixti, ut ingradiendo sanctuarium sonitus audiatur. Sic sub pena mortis debet pontifex sonare verbum sapiencie predicando et opera fructifera commiscendo.

Besides these eight ornaments there are rings, bands or clasps, and bells, which are counted as parts of the vestments aforesaid. For the pontiff in his office must have a violet tunic, which is called the poderis, on whose lower hem there were to be seventy golden bells and as many little vessels or knots like pomegranates mixed among them, so that the sound might be heard on entering the sanctuary. So, under pain of death, the pontiff must sound the word of wisdom by preaching, and mix in fruitful works.[13]

¶5 285.31–286.29
286.8 *How the vestments signify parts of the universe.*

[285]Alia autem confibulancia has vestes ad invicem signat cathenam auream, qua caritas connectit omnia opera grata Deo. Unde quatuor causas in [286]genere ponunt doctores talis ornatus pontificis, prima ut excellencia Dei consideretur affectuosius dum eius abiectus vicarius sic ornatur. Secunda ut sacerdotes medii inter Deum et populum tractentur honorabilius. Tercia ut populus intendat cultui divino delectabilius. Et quarta ut divina excellencia consideretur in fabrica sua expressius. Per tunicam quidem lineam dicunt doctores offigurari terram cum suis ornamentis: Baltheus ligans hanc tunicam

And the other clasping pieces, which bind these vestments to one another, signify the golden chain by which charity connects all works pleasing to God. Hence the doctors set down four causes, [286]in general, of such adornment of the pontiff: first, that the excellence of God may be considered more affectionately while his lowly vicar is so adorned; second, that the priests, as mediators between God and the people, may be treated more honourably; third, that the people may attend to divine worship with more delight; and fourth, that the divine excellence may be considered more expressly in his fabric. By the linen tunic, the doctors say,

figuratur occeanum. Tunica iacinctina racione coloris signat aerem. Et tyntinabula cum malogranatis notant tonitrua cum aliis aeris impressionibus. Quidam autem ponunt baltheum cingentem hanc tunicam figurare speram ignis cingentem aerem, superhumerale cum racionali sibi iuncto signat celum ethereum, et multitudo colorum diversitatem stellarum. Duo lapides onichini signant duo luminaria magna celi, duodecim gemme in racionali signant duodecim signa zodiaci, in quibus sunt raciones istorum sublunarium; unde Yob XXXVIII: Numquid nosti ordinem celi et pones racionem eius in terra? Per mitram vero figuratur celum empireum et per laminam auream dominus presidens omnibus creaturis. Et hinc nomen Domini magnum sibi inscribitur. Et hinc creditur Alexandrum magnum adorare Deum pronum in terram, dum vidit formam pontificis sic vestiti, ut narrat Magister Historiarum in historia Machabeorum primo cap.

the earth with its ornaments is figured; the belt binding this tunic figures the ocean; the violet tunic by reason of its colour signifies the air; and the bells with the pomegranates denote thunders with the other impressions of the air. But some hold that the belt girding this tunic figures the sphere of fire girding the air; the superhumeral with the rational joined to it signifies the ethereal heaven, and the multitude of colours the diversity of the stars; the two onyx stones signify the two great lights of heaven; the twelve gems in the rational signify the twelve signs of the zodiac, in which are the reasons of these sublunar things;[14] hence Job 38: "Dost thou know the order of heaven, and canst thou set down the reason thereof on the earth?" And by the mitre the empyrean heaven is figured, and by the golden plate the Lord presiding over all creatures; and hence the great name of the Lord is inscribed on it. And hence it is believed that Alexander the Great worshipped God, prostrate on the ground, when he saw the form of the pontiff so vested, as the Master of the Histories relates in the history of the Maccabees, chapter 1.[15]

Notes

1. ***Racionale*** is the Vulgate's name for the breastplate (DR "the rational of judgment", Exod. 28:15, made "according to the workmanship of the ephod"); ***logyon*** is the Greek name. ***Superhumerale*** is "superhumeral", the ephod, as at 282.16. Loserth italicises 283.1–3 and 283.21–284.3 as quotation but gives no reference. Both are from Hugh of St Victor, ***De sacramentis*** II.4.7 (PL 176, 435D–436B): ***rationale sive logion, quod pectori pontificis superimponitur … concatenantur rationale et superhumerale, quia cohaerere et concordare debent, ratio et opera***.
2. Exod. 28:30 puts "doctrine and truth" (DR) in the rational; the sardonyx in the middle is not in Exodus but in Josephus (note 3).
3. Josephus, ***Antiquities*** III, 9 (Loserth, citing the Frankfurt 1588 edition, p. 38b, and quoting it at the page foot): the stones ceased to shine two hundred years before Josephus wrote; modern form ***Ant.*** 3.8.9.
4. "Rasa" is Rashi (R. Solomon ben Isaac), known to Wyclif through Nicholas of Lyra on Exod. 28:30, who sets Josephus beside "Rabbi Solomon", for whom the tetragrammaton was enclosed in the rational (Rashi on Exod. 28:30). ***Urin*** and ***thyrin*** are Urim and Thummim; the plural verb ***innuebant*** has the two names for its subject.
5. ***Habitus*** is the habit of knowledge (the "treasure of habit" below), set against works: knowing and doing.
6. The sentence names the lines of the square without a verb for each: height (highest to lowest), width (friends to enemies), and time (the fathers before, the sons after), then "its breadth in works". A word may be lost (a ***longitudo*** answering ***latitudo***); the print is translated as it stands. The colon after ***a*** at 284.5 is not on the plate.
7. Exod. 28:4 lists the vestments ***rationale et superhumerale***, the rational first, although the making of the superhumeral (28:6) precedes that of the rational (28:15). Loserth's foot reads "Exod. XXV, 28; XXIX, 5": 25:28 (the bars of the table) is presumably a misprint, and 29:5 names the superhumeral first. Hugh of St Victor, whom Wyclif follows here, says the reverse: ***non prius rationale quam superhumerale nominatur*** (***De sacr.*** II.4.7).
8. Acts 1:1 (DR); the plate reads "Act. primo, 1:". ***In ordini*** is the print's form for ***in ordine***.
9. Wyclif's order and wording; the Vulgate reads ***omnis viri caput, Christus est: caput autem mulieris, vir: caput vero Christi, Deus*** (DR "the head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man: and the head of Christ is God"). Christ "ruled by himself as God": by himself in his divinity.
10. The print reads ***occupat*** (so on the plate), which does not construe; we translate ***occiput***, "the back of the head" (our emendation). The manuscripts have ***per occiput mitram*** at 285.1, where Loserth prints ***per mitram***.
11. ***Capitaneus*** is the wearer, the pontiff as captain of the people; "in the head" (***capite***) would also suit the mitre, but the print has ***capitaneo***.
12. ***Connexio*** is the plain joining of plate and mitre, not the logicians' "conditional". ***Doctrina*** is the teaching of God as maker and ruler just described.
13. Exod. 28:33–35: "that the sound may be heard, when he goeth in and cometh out of the sanctuary … and that he may not die" (DR). Exodus gives no number of bells.
14. Wyclif's "doctors" are Nicholas of Lyra on Exod. 28 (at 28:43). Wyclif follows him nearly word for word for the causes of the adornment (***cum essent medii inter Deum et populum***) and for the reading of the vestments as the universe, including the second view of the girdle as the sphere of fire, the text of Job 38 and the ***nomen … magnum***. Lyra's sources are Josephus, ***Antiquities*** 3.7.7, Peter Comestor, ***Historia scholastica***, Exod. c. 66, and Wisd. 18:24. The ***raciones*** of sublunar things are their causes in the heavens, answering ***racionem eius*** in Job 38:33 (DR; Loserth's foot reference reads "Job XVIII, 33").

15. Peter Comestor, ***Historia scholastica***, the chapter ***De Alexandro*** that opens the Maccabees history (PL 198, 1496D–1497A: ***nomen Dei adoravit***) (Loserth, "Petr. Comest. l. c."); the story is from Josephus, ***Antiquities*** 11.8.5.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 283: ***logyon***
  - 283: ***foramine***
  - 283: ∅ (the 1 is the folio bar (231d) before Sed)
  - 283: ***urin*** [NW]
  - 284: ***habitus***
  - 284: ***antiquo***
  - 284: ***doceat***
  - 286: ***Tunica*** (10 is the line number)
  - 283: ***tetragramaton, virtute*** (LEFT-nw: two printed words, comma between)

Part 7: The priest's six vestments, and signs become false

Loserth pp. 286.30–290.27

¶1 286.30–288.6

286.30 *Certain ornaments reserved to the high priest.*
287.1 *Vestments common to all priests and their significance,*
287.7 *The Amice.*
287.14 *The Alb.*
287.21 *The Maniple.*
287.27 *The Stole.*
288.8 *The Chasuble.*
288.28 *The Dalmatic.*

[286] **Notandum autem quod sacerdotibus inferioris ordinis non datur tunica iacinctinam nec superhumerale nec racionale nec lamina aurea, sed soli summo pontifici, sicut in nostris sacerdotibus** [287] **est ordo vestium. Sex enim ornamenta habent simplices sacerdotes in missa; scilicet amictam, albam, zonam, manipulam, stolam et casulam. Per amictam notatur custodia sensuum sacerdotis, quia illud ornamentum tegit caput et collum, in quo sunt omnes sensus; sic clericus debet velare omnes sensus et specialiter tempore misse, ne adulterinis sensacionibus temptet mentem, nec collum, in quo est organum vocis, ministret vocem ab interioribus ad vicium lingue. Sed iuxta Petri monita: Si quis loquitur, quasi sermones Dei prima Petr. IV, 11. Verba enim sacerdotis debent esse evangelium. Alba camisia, que est stricta linea in veteri testamento signat omnia membra corporis sacerdotis divino servicio mancipanda. Sed tempore ecclesie Judeorum, qui spiritu servitutis erant astricti, erat hec tunica striccior, quam est modo, quando dilatamur libertate qua Christus nos liberavit. Sed quia surrepit ommissionis negligencia, cum inordinatis operibus quantumcumque divino cultui mancipemur, ideo quarto ponitur in sinistra manu mapula vel manipula, denotans quod crebro debemus ab oculis mentis sordes abstergere, et contra facta sinistre perpetrata ad opera penalia gratis obligacione perpetua nos parare. Unde quinto assumit stolam sive orarium, que collo sacerdotis imposita, signat, quod iuxta consilium Christi Matth. XI 29 sustulit super se iugum Domini longenimitatis sufferendum. Quod autem stola cancellata per anteriora descendit, signat quod sacerdos sustulit crucem suam sequendo Christum, per** [288] **arma iusticie a dextris et a sinistris, ut loquitur Christus Luce IV et Apostolus**

And it is to be noted that to priests of the lower order are given neither the violet tunic nor the superhumeral nor the rational nor the golden plate, but to the high priest alone,[1] as among our priests [287] **there is an order of vestments. For simple priests have six ornaments at mass, namely the amice, the alb, the girdle, the maniple, the stole and the chasuble. By the amice is signified the custody of the priest's senses, because that ornament covers the head and neck, in which are all the senses; so the cleric ought to veil all his senses, and especially at the time of mass, lest he tempt his mind with adulterous sensations, and lest the neck, in which is the organ of the voice, minister the voice from within to the vice of the tongue. But according to Peter's admonitions: "If any man speak, let him speak, as the words of God", 1 Peter 4:11. For the words of a priest ought to be gospel. The alb, a shirt, which in the old testament is the close linen [tunic], signifies that all the members of the priest's body are to be given over to divine service.[2] But in the time of the church of the Jews, who were bound by the spirit of bondage, this tunic was narrower than it is now, when we are enlarged by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free.[3] But since negligence of omission creeps in, with disordered works, however much we are given over to the worship of God, therefore, fourth, the mappula or maniple is put on the left hand, denoting that we must often wipe filth from the eyes of the mind, and, against deeds done amiss, prepare ourselves freely, by perpetual obligation, for works of hardship. Hence, fifth, he takes the stole or orarium, which, placed on the priest's neck, signifies that according to Christ's counsel, Matthew**

II Cor. VI et debet stola huius perseverancie que sola coronabitur usque ad pedes affeccionum se extendere. Connexio vero cum zona signat concathenacionem perpetue castitatis cum ceteris virtutibus sacerdotis.

11:29, he has taken upon himself the yoke of the Lord, to be borne with long-suffering.[4] And that the stole descends crossed over the front signifies that the priest has taken up his cross, following Christ, through [288]"the armour of justice on the right hand and on the left", as Christ speaks in Luke 4 and the Apostle in 2 Corinthians 6;[5] and the stole of this perseverance, which alone will be crowned, must extend down to the feet of the affections. And its joining with the girdle signifies the chaining together of perpetual chastity with the other virtues of the priest.

¶2 288.8–289.6
289.1 *It signifies for deacons what the chasuble does for priests.*
289.13 *Signification of the tonsure,*
289.22 *too often falsely signified.*

[288]Sed sexto induit casulam vel planetam ad denotandum quod eminenciori via incedit presbiter christianus, dum habet caritatem ad singulos. Unde ad denotandum perfeccionem rotunditatis et evacuacionem sordium angulorum declinat hec casula a quadratura superhumeralis in veteri testamento ad rotunditatem et simplicitatem. Non enim est lex Christi tam aspera in angulis ut lex vetus, cum nec apostoli nec patres eorum ipsam portare poterant, ut dicit Petrus Act. XV, 10 sed quibusdam circulis et catenulis fuerant a lateribus colligata. Nos autem sub tali concathenacione portamus suavem et levem casulam a dextris et sinistris. Caritas enim operatur magis, si est; et licet careat multitudine figurarum superhumeralis veteris testamenti propter unitatem simplicem capitis nostri Christi, debet tamen sacerdos esse planeta in populo, ut videant opera eius bona. Sic enim docet Christus Matth. V, quod luceat lux vestra coram hominibus. Et est aliud ornamentum in novo testamento, competens diacono vel levite, quod vocatur dalmatica, cuius nomen est sumptum a regione, ubi primo creditur institutum. Forma vero creditur capta a collobiis, quibus usi fuerunt apostoli. Quidam enim apostolorum successores adiectis [289]manicis usi fuerunt huiusmodi indumentis; et eundem sensum misticum, quem habet casula in presbiteris, habet dalmatica in levitis; ipsi enim paracius et asperius debent caritative proficere tamquam alter Laurencius quam presbiteri etatis et corporis gravioris.

But, sixth, he puts on the chasuble or planeta, to denote that the Christian presbyter walks a more eminent way, while he has charity toward each one. Hence, to denote the perfection of roundness and the emptying out of the filth of corners, this chasuble departs from the squareness of the superhumeral in the old testament to roundness and simplicity. For the law of Christ is not so rough in its corners as the old law, since neither the apostles nor their fathers could bear that, as Peter says in Acts 15:10; but they[6] had been bound together at the sides with certain rings and little chains. But we, under such a chaining together, carry a sweet and light chasuble on the right and on the left. For charity works more, if it is;[7] and although it lacks the multitude of figures of the superhumeral of the old testament, because of the simple unity of our head, Christ, yet the priest ought to be a planet among the people, that they may see his good works.[8] For so Christ teaches in Matthew 5, that "your light shine before men". And there is another ornament in the new testament, proper to a deacon or levite, which is called the dalmatic, whose name is taken from the region where it is believed first to have been instituted. And its form is believed to have been taken from the colobia which the apostles used. For certain successors of the apostles, adding [289]sleeves, used garments of this kind; and the dalmatic has in levites the same mystical sense that the chasuble has in presbyters; for they ought to advance in charity more readily and more roughly, like another Lawrence, than presbyters of graver age and body.[9]

¶3 289.7–290.19
290.1 *attention to rites and vestments.*
290.20 *Now the significance of all the bishop's ornaments is changed to evil.*

[289]Quotlibet sunt talia signa sanctitatis presbiteri et peroracionis virtutum in anima; et utinam hodie non sint falsa. Interdicitur enim sacerdotibus tam rubor vestium quam viredo cum aliis novitatibus mundanis, ad denotandum quod crudelitas lasciva et secularitas sunt in clericis suspendenda. Latitudo vero corone signat per abrasionem temporalium denudacionem intellectus et affectus ad bona que

Such signs of the presbyter's holiness and of the peroration of virtues in the soul are as many as you please;[10] and would that today they were not false. For redness of garments, and greenness, are forbidden to priests along with other worldly novelties, to denote that wanton cruelty[11] and worldliness are to be suspended in clerics. And the breadth of the crown signifies, by the shaving away of temporal things, the laying bare of

sursum sunt. Abrasio vero pilorum in circulo sensuum specialiter in religiosis signat subtraccionem temporalium, per que sensus secularium suffocantur; et corona iusticie expectatur in eis, cum ad imitacionem Apostoli castigant corpus suum et in servitutem redigunt stricte contenti presentibus. Et sic videtur michi quod omne genus viancium a Christo per peccatum adulterans est saccus plenus mendacio, sic quod ad omnem punctum nostri est mendacium cum peccato, sic quod deserentibus Christus et necessariora bona mundo abscondita potest verificari dictum Christi Matth. XII, 39 Generacio prava et adultera signum querit. Cum enim sensibilibus et mundanis afficimur, de illis loquimur, illa prosequimur et in illis affectu delectato postpositis spiritualibus quietamur. Unde signum huius est quod nos cleri, dimisso signato, [290] tamquam layci legentes literas quarum sensum nescimus, nimis appreciamur cerimonias et sensibilia humanitus instituta ut plus ponderamus quod alba sacerdotis anglici habeat in sinistris humeris biffurcatam varietatem, superinfictam secundum formam humanitus adinventam, quam appreciamur primum mandatum decalogi. Illa enim signat divisionem Anglorum a fide post Britones usque ad tempus Gregorii, quo per eius discipulos sunt conversi. Et revera iste ritus debet generaliter in omnibus christianis trahi in communem: alie naciones usque ad Romanum pontificem debent instar ribaldi vestimenta christianitatis gerere cum labello, ut si iste papa haberet tot commissuras in vestibus, quociens aliquis papa a fide ceciderit ipse forte gereret tunicam pictaciis consutam et non tunicam inconsutilem Ihesu nostri. Et sic patet falsitas in signis episcopalibus introductis.

intellect and affection toward the goods that are above. And the shaving of the hair in the circle of the senses, especially in the religious, signifies the withdrawal of temporal things, by which the senses of seculars are stifled; and the crown of justice is awaited in them, since in imitation of the Apostle they chastise their body and bring it into subjection, strictly content with present things.[12] And so it seems to me that every kind of wayfarer that commits adultery away from Christ through sin is a sack full of lies,[13] so that at every point of ours there is a lie along with sin; so that of those who desert Christ and the more necessary goods hidden from the world[14] Christ's saying in Matthew 12:39 can be verified: "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh a sign." For when we are affected by perceptible and worldly things, we speak of them, pursue them, and rest in them with delighted affection, spiritual things set aside. Hence a sign of this is that we of the clergy, having let go the thing signified, [290] like laymen reading letters whose sense we do not know, prize too highly ceremonies and perceptible things instituted by men, so that we weigh it more that the alb of an English priest should have on its left shoulders a forked patch of another colour, sewn on above after a form devised by men,[15] than we prize the first commandment of the decalogue. For that signifies the division of the English from the faith after the Britons, until the time of Gregory, when they were converted by his disciples. And truly this rite ought to be drawn generally into common [use] among all Christians:[16] the other nations, up to the Roman pontiff, ought like a ribald to wear the vestments of Christianity with a patch, so that if this pope had as many seams in his vestments as there are times that some pope has fallen from the faith, he would perhaps wear a tunic sewn of patches, and not the seamless tunic of our Jesus. And so the falsity in the episcopal signs that have been introduced is clear.

¶4 290.20–290.27

[290] Unde baculus signat pastoris officium ad minandum et conprehendendum oves morbidas, ut sanentur, sed postquam corona baculi versa est in aurum preciosum et frigidum formasset in figuram artificiosam adinvencionis humane, dedignatur pastor cesareus refrigescente caritate curam apostolicam ovibus Christi impendere, sed in subtilitate secularis officii sigillatur.

Hence the staff signifies the shepherd's office of driving and catching the diseased sheep, that they may be healed; but after the crown of the staff was turned into precious gold and, cold, had been formed into an artful figure of human invention,[17] the caesarean shepherd, his charity growing cold, disdains to spend apostolic care on the sheep of Christ, but is sealed up in the subtlety of secular office.[18]

Notes

1. ***Summus pontifex***, here the high priest of the old law ("high priest", as the glossary *summi pontifices* for the Jewish priesthood); it is the phrase Wyclif uses of the pope ("highest pontiff"), and the parallel is his point. Loserth refers to Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis* II, p. 4, c. 9 ff. (PL 176, 437–438; stole, chasuble, maniple, dalmatic), for the vestments that follow.

2. The girdle, third in the list, receives no exposition: after the alb the text passes to the maniple as "fourth". A's margin at 287.11: *Estimo quod scriptor omisit misticacionem de zona*, "I think the scribe left out the mystical reading of the girdle."
3. Rom. 8:15 ("the spirit of bondage", DR) and Gal. 4:31 ("by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free", DR).
4. *Longenimitatis* (B *longanimitas*) is taken as a genitive of manner with *sufferendum*; it could also go with *Domini*, "the yoke of the Lord of long-suffering". Matt. 11:29: "Take up my yoke upon you" (DR).
5. 2 Cor. 6:7 (DR). The taking up of the cross is Luke 9:23, not Luke 4; the print's "IV" may be a misreading of IX. At 288.3 the manuscripts read *debent*, which Loserth corrects to *debet*.
6. *Fuerant ... colligata* has no expressed subject: the parts of the old vestments, which Exodus fastens with rings and little chains (Exod. 28:13–14, 22–28).
7. Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* 30.2 (PL 76, 1221B): *Operatur etenim magna, si est* ("for it works great things, if it is"), said of the love of God. The print's *magis* is translated; *magna* may be the reading.
8. *Planeta* is both the chasuble (288.8) and a planet, a light in the sky. Loserth refers here to John 1:5; the words Wyclif gives are Matt. 5:16, "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works" (DR).
9. *Asperius* answers the "rough" corners of the old law above: the deacon's charity is to be more strenuous. Lawrence, the Roman deacon and martyr.
10. *Quotlibet* is Loserth's correction (codd. *Quolibet*). For *peroracionis* he suggests *preparacionis*; *perornacionis*, "adornment", would also suit. The print is translated.
11. Perhaps *crudelitas, lascivia*, "cruelty, wantonness", one for each colour; the print's *crudelitas lasciva* is translated.
12. Col. 3:1–2 ("the things that are above"), 2 Tim. 4:8 ("a crown of justice"), 1 Cor. 9:27 ("I chastise my body and bring it into subjection", DR). The margin of both manuscripts at 289.22: *Saccus plenus mendacio*.
13. *Viancium*, from *viare*, are wayfarers (*viatores*), those still on the way. *Adulterans ... a Christo* is spiritual adultery, answering "adulterous generation" in the text that follows.
14. The print's *Christus* is nominative and does not construe with *deserentibus*; it is translated as *Christum*. Matt. 12:39 in Wyclif's form (*prava*); the Vulgate has *mala*, DR "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign". The manuscripts' margin at 289.28: *Signorum cultus est generacio prava*, "the worship of signs is a wicked generation".
15. *Varietas* is a piece of a different colour, the apparel set on the alb; *superinfictam* is not attested and is taken as "fixed on above" (*superinfixam*?).
16. *Communem* is Loserth's correction of the manuscripts' *comunam*. The proposal is ironic: if each nation wore its own lapse on its vestments, the pope would wear nothing but patches.
17. *Formasset* has no subject or object that construes; it is translated as if passive (*formatum esset*). The gold is "cold": charity grows cold beside it, as in Matt. 24:12, "the charity of many shall grow cold" (DR).
18. *Pastor cesareus*, "caesarean shepherd", belongs with *papa cesareus*. *Sigillatur*, "is sealed up", is obscure: shut up in secular business as under a seal.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 287: *manipulam* [NW]
  - 287: *misse*
  - 287: *ne*
  - 287: *adulterinis*
  - 287: *sensacionibus*
  - 287: *temptet*
  - 287: *mentem*
  - 287: *nec*
  - 287: *stricta*
  - 288: *10* (old-style arabic 10 (Act. XV, 10))
  - 288: *por* (word split by the folio bar (por | tamus, 233a); printed first part) [NW]
  - 288: *tamus* (word split by the folio bar (por | tamus); printed second part) [NW]
  - 288: *a* (print "casulam a | dextris"; the main scan lost a (end of the line above the box))
  - 288: *planeta* [NW]
  - 288: *Et* (main "daimatic" is the English side-note "Dalmatic."; the print line opens "Et est aliud")
  - 288: *levite* [NW]
  - 289: *habet*
  - 289: *levitis* [NW]
  - 289: ∅ (the inserted i is the folio bar (233b) before quod)
  - 289: *illa* (30 is the line number)
  - 290: *layci*
  - 290: *legentes*
  - 290: *cerimonias* [NW]
  - 290: *humanitus*
  - 290: *caritate*
  - 287: *longenimitatis* (LEFT-nw: hyphenated longe-|nimitatis)

Part 8: The prelates' ornaments perverted; the third argument, from order

Loserth pp. 290.28–294.2

¶1 290.28–291.32
290.28 *The Cross.*
290.32 *The Ring.*
291.1 *The Sandals.*
291.7 *The Mitre.*
291.12 *The Gloves.*
291.15 *The Pall.*
291.23 *Since we neglect the thing signified we should be better without the sign.*

[290]**Et sic sentitur de cruce, per quam sequela Christi in passione saltem carnis crucifixionis notatur, prepositis cesareis auream crucem habentibus, laucius, sumptuosius et studiosius carne pastis. Preciositas vero anuli aurei ingemmata non signat vere desponsacionem prelati cum sponso ecclesie aut Christi ovibus, sed affidacionem cum** [291]**seculo et lana ac funo balancium. Nec sandalia, que in missis prelatus induit, signant precellenter preparacionem affeccionum in evangelium pacis, ut grex ordinatus sequatur eum faciendo similiter. Sed propter linicionem cesaream sopitur affeccio, quo ad illud officium et duabus viis in volucione serpentina titubando proceditur. Mitra vero gemmata non signat vere utriusque testamenti secundum duos semicirculos perfectam noticiam pastoralem, sed mundanam prudenciam, que est terrena, animalis et dyabolica ad fraudandum tam priores, preteritos quam sequentes. Cyrotece vero que signarent operacionis mundiciam signant potestatis velacionem et sanguinosa opera prelatorum. Pallium vero archiepiscopo novello adiectum, non signat plenitudinem fortitudinis et potestatis cum sciencia, cum vite asperitate atque prudencia ad regendum, sed econtra fortitudinem humane prudencie, ad tribulaciones pro temporalibus sufferendum et ut cingulum equinum ad onus equi et mulicum prudencia seculi supportandum. Et utinam decretales epistole, de quibus primo decretalium: De autoritate et usu pallii. Ex tenore cum locis similibus rectificarent usum spiritualis pallii, dimisso venali pallio corporali. Sic enim pervertuntur mendaciter signa generacionis adultere, quod minus accusabile nobis foret tantum committere et omittere de signato sine accusacione mendacii, quam quod tantum mendacii sit in signis. Est enim perversio prelatorum simpliciter signis contraria, ut contingit in isto metrico:**

And the same is to be thought of the cross, by which the following[1] of Christ in his passion, at least the crucifixion of the flesh, is signified, while caesarean superiors have a golden cross and are fed on flesh more lavishly, more sumptuously and more studiously. And the costliness of the golden ring set with gems does not truly signify the espousal of the prelate with the bridegroom of the church or with Christ's sheep, but his affiance with the [291]**world and with the wool and the *funo* of the bleating flock.[2] Nor do the sandals which the prelate puts on at masses pre-excellently signify the preparation of the affections for "the gospel of peace", so that the flock, set in order, may follow him by doing likewise.[3] But because of the caesarean anointing, affection is lulled to sleep as regards that office, and one goes forward tottering on "two ways" in a serpent's winding.[4] And the jewelled mitre does not truly signify, by its two half-circles, the shepherd's perfect knowledge of both testaments, but worldly prudence, which is "earthly, sensual, and devilish",[5] for defrauding those going before, those past, as well as those following. And the gloves, which should signify cleanness of working, signify the veiling of power and the bloody works of prelates. And the pall conferred on a new archbishop does not signify fullness of strength and power, with knowledge, with harshness of life and prudence for ruling, but on the contrary the strength of human prudence, for suffering tribulations for the sake of temporal goods, and, like a horse's girth, for bearing the load of horse and mule[6] with the prudence of the world. And would that the decretal letters dealt with in the first book of the Decretals, *On the authority and use of the pall*, *Ex tenore*, with similar places, would correct the use of the spiritual pall, the saleable bodily pall being set aside.[7] For the signs of "an adulterous generation" are so lyingly perverted that it would be less blameworthy for us to commit and omit so much regarding the thing signified, without the charge of a lie, than that there should be so much lying in the signs.[8] For the perversion of the prelates is without qualification contrary to the signs, as happens in this metrical verse:**

¶2 292.1–292.1
292.13 *Absurd and fanciful symbolizing.*
292.29 *3rd argument: But for the powers of pope and*

[292]**Sacramentum pingue dabo**

[292]**A fat sacrament I will give,**

prelates order would perish.

¶3 292.2–292.2

[292] **Non macrum sacrificabo.**

A lean one I will not sacrifice.[9]

¶4 292.3–292.28

[292] **Cum autem signa ista non sint nisi gracia signatorum, signata per se sufficiunt sine signis, sed signa sine signatorum correspondencia sunt venenum; nec morarer circa hec signa in novo testamento ad onus ecclesie introducta nisi ad detegendum sensum misticum ornamentorum sacerdotalium legis veteris, quibus omnia in figura contigerant ad ostendendum sensum, quem nos utentes talibus signis debemus preponderanter attendere et ad convincendum mendacium philosophice signa ista gerencium. Ad tantum enim quidam in istis vane subtiliant, quod totum officium misse et sacerdotalis officii cum signis suis ac eciam partes basilice cum suis accidentibus mistice moralizant, ut ventilogium in summitate campanilis ecclesie dicunt signare curatum illius ecclesie, qui debet esse in conversacione superior, contemplacione celesti ecclesie triumphanti propinquior et contra omnes ventos temptacionum ecclesie tamquam gallus ad predicandum paracior. Sed Antichristus cum magistro suo Lucifero habet sensum contrarium in hiis signis, ut quod prelatus in fastu sit alcior, ad omnem ventum temptacionis vertibilior et tamquam canis mutus non valens latrare, ymo ut nuda galli statua ad fallendum subiectos mendacior.**

And since these signs exist only for the sake of the things signified, the things signified suffice by themselves without the signs, but signs without the correspondence of the things signified are poison; nor would I dwell on these signs, introduced in the new testament to the burden of the church, except to expose the mystical sense of the priestly ornaments of the old law, to whom "all things happened in figure",[10] **in order to show the sense to which we who use such signs ought to attend preponderantly, and to convict philosophically of lying those who wear these signs. For some refine so vainly on these things that they moralize mystically the whole office of the mass and of the priestly office with its signs, and even the parts of the church building with their accidents: thus they say that the weathervane at the top of the church's bell-tower signifies the curate of that church, who ought to be higher in manner of life, nearer in heavenly contemplation to the church triumphant, and, like a cock, readier to preach against all the winds of the church's temptations.**[11] **But Antichrist with his master Lucifer has the contrary sense in these signs: that the prelate is higher in pride, more apt to turn with every wind of temptation, and like "a dumb dog not able to bark",**[12] **indeed, like the bare statue of a cock, more lying for deceiving his subjects.**

¶5 292.29–293.11
293.12 *Answer. It may be well to have a pope but not such as we moderns have.*
293.24 *Peter claimed no such authority over his followers.*
293.29 *Why pretend that this monster is the head of Christ's body.*

[292] **Tercio principaliter arguitur per hoc quod nisi papa haberet plenitudinem potestatis et alii episcopi gradatim, ut in ecclesia ordinantur, periret ordo confessionis et timor committendi peccata, ymo per idem non observaretur ritus vel usus alicuius ecclesie, nisi qui foret expresse fundabilis** [293] **in scriptura, et per consequens nemo observaret aliquem modum in serviendo Deo, sed longe evidencius tolleretur ordo secularium dominorum, sic quod non oportet esse cesarem, cum necessarius foret quod esset dignitas et distinccio clericalis. Ad hec igitur oportet elecciones procedere, sicut dictant leges et usus ecclesie. Non igitur sequitur: Christus et apostoli sic sequuntur, ergo non licet nobis sequentibus facere contrarium, cum pro variacione loci et temporis diversimode est agendum.**

Thirdly and principally, it is argued by appeal to this: that unless the pope had plenitude of power, and the other bishops by degrees, as they are ordered in the church, the order of confession would perish, and the fear of committing sins; indeed, by the same token, no rite or usage of any church would be observed except one that could be expressly founded [293] **in scripture, and consequently no one would observe any mode in serving God; but far more evidently the order of secular lords would be done away, so that there need be no Caesar, since it would be more necessary that there be clerical dignity and distinction.**[13] **To these ends, therefore, elections must proceed as the laws and usages of the church dictate. Therefore it does not follow: "Christ and the apostles proceed in this way, therefore it is not lawful for us who follow them to do the contrary", since one must act in different ways according to the variation of place and time.**[14]

¶6 293.12–294.2

[293]Quantum ad illud patet quod est expediens quod sit papa, sed ad aggravandum difficultatem loquamur limitate de papa cesareo. Et tunc videtur michi quod multum officit esse talem, ut patet inferius. Diceret autem logicus quod quilibet apostolus et quilibet sacerdos apostolorum vicarius habet in gradu suo plenitudinem potestatis. Sed decretiste videntur intelligere quod quilibet papa habet in infinitum maiorem potestatem iurisdicionis sive regiminis quam aliquis alius episcopus non Romanus, quia (ut sepe dictum est) cum sit infundabile mendacium in materia fidei est nimis hereticum. Petrus enim non habuit tantum aut talem excessum super alios apostolos sibi consocios; nec imperatoris est talem potestatem concedere. Quomodo igitur foret utile tale mendax et monstruosum ydolum ducem tocius corporis Christi fingere? Nec periret ex defectu talis monstri ordo confitendi, ordo regiminis vel alterius boni ecclesie, quia sicut in primitiva ecclesia regulabatur sine tali graduacione dominii in clero ex communi sacerdotum officio, qui omnes erant episcopi, quod exemplatum est [294]in ecclesia apostolica, et tunc crevit ecclesia, sic posset esse hodie ad maiorem utilitatem ecclesie.

As to that, it is clear that it is expedient that there be a pope; but, to make the difficulty heavier, let us speak restrictedly of the caesarean pope. And then it seems to me that it does much harm that there be such a one, as is clear below. And a logician would say that every apostle, and every priest who is a vicar of the apostles, has in his degree plenitude of power. But the decretists seem to understand that every pope has infinitely greater power of jurisdiction or of rule than any other bishop not Roman; for (as has often been said), since this is a lie without foundation in a matter of faith, it is exceedingly heretical.[15] For Peter did not have so great or such an excess over the other apostles, his fellows; nor is it the emperor's part to grant such power. How then would it be useful to feign such a lying and monstrous idol as leader of the whole body of Christ? Nor would the order of confessing, the order of rule, or that of any other good of the church perish for want of such a monster; for as in the primitive church it was regulated without such a gradation of lordship in the clergy, by the common office of priests, who were all bishops (which was exemplified [294]in the apostolic church, and then the church grew), so it could be today, to the greater benefit of the church.[16]

Notes

1. ***Sequela*** in its second sense, the following of Christ (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL). The sentence plays on ***carnis*** and ***carne***: the cross signifies the crucifixion of the flesh, while those who carry it are fed on flesh (meat).
2. ***Funo*** (291.1) is not a Latin form, and the plate confirms the print. Loserth marks the place "Hic locus corruptus esse videtur" (apparently corrupt). ***Fumo*** "smoke" or ***fimo*** "dung" would construe; cf. Ezek. 34:3, the shepherds who eat the milk and are clothed with the wool. Left untranslated.
3. Eph. 6:15, "your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace", applied to the bishop's sandals.
4. ***Linicio*** is read as "anointing" (from ***linire***, smear); ***lenicio*** "soothing" is possible, and ***sopitur*** would suit either. S. "Two ways": Ecclus. 2:14, "the sinner that goeth on the earth two ways".
5. Jas. 3:15, said there of wisdom (***sapientia***); Wyclif applies it to worldly prudence.
6. The print has ***mulicum*** (291.21; the plate confirms it), not a Latin word; we read ***muli cum*** "of the mule, with" (our emendation).
7. ***Decretales*** 1.8 (***De auctoritate et usu pallii***); Loserth gives cap. 5, whose incipit is ***Ex tuarum tenore*** (Innocent III to the archbishop of Compostela); Wyclif shortens it to ***Ex tenore*** (modern form ours).
8. Matt. 12:39, "an evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign"; Wyclif plays on ***signum***.
9. A retrograde verse: read word by word backwards it gives the contrary, ***Sacrificabo macrum, non dabo pingue sacramentum*** ("I will sacrifice a lean one, I will not give a fat sacrament"). It illustrates ***perversio*** as a turning of the signs backwards. Loserth prints the two lines in italic as verse.
10. 1 Cor. 10:11, "all these things happened to them in figure"; Wyclif's ***quibus*** takes the place of ***illis***, referring to the men of the old law.
11. The weathercock as the preacher belongs to the allegories of the church building of the kind collected in Durandus, ***Rationale divinorum officiorum*** 1.1.22 (***Gallus supra ecclesiam positus praedicatores designat***; the cock turns against the wind as the preacher withstands the rebellious).
12. Isa. 56:10, "dumb dogs not able to bark"; Wyclif puts the plural into the singular.
13. ***Necessarius*** is read as the neuter comparative ("more necessary"); cf. ***necessarior*** at 299.13. The objector's point is that if gradation in the clergy fell, gradation among secular lords would fall still more surely.
14. ***Sic sequuntur*** is read "proceed in this way" (the manner of choosing ministers in the gospel); the verb may equally echo ***sequentibus*** ("follow"), as the next words do.
15. ***Quia*** does not give a cause here; it introduces Wyclif's verdict on the decretists' view and may stand for ***quod*** ("which, as has often been said, ... is exceedingly heretical").
16. "Gradation" renders ***graduacio***, which the glossary gives as academic "graduation"; here it is rank among lords.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **290: *carne***
  - **290: *ingemmata* (print has double m) [NW]**
  - **291: *funo* (print has n (funo), kept as printed) [NW]**
  - **291: *novello***
  - **292: *omnia in* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **292: *ordo***
  - **293: *Quantum***
  - **293: *talis* (30 is the line number)**
  - **291: *quibus primo* (two words)**

Part 9: Custom, human tradition and the law of God; no secular gradation in the clergy

Loserth pp. 294.3–299.5

¶1 294.3–299.5

294.7 *It is well to keep good customs, but those are of most importance which are expressly enjoined in Scripture.*
295.18 *How our pharisees oppress the Church,*
296.5 *and give no good reasons for their traditions.*
296.24 *We should pay little attention to them and depend on the law of God.*
297.7 *The government of the Church should not be modelled on thet of the State.*
297.30 *Scripture authorizes secular rule.*
298.5 *False claims set up by the papal law.*
298.29 *Some say: Endowment replaces the power of working miracles.*
299.1 *Miracles like St. John's would please them.*

[294] **Conceditur tamen, quod ex illo, sicut ex quolibet malo quedam propria utilitas succedit ecclesie. Sed (ut utar verbis Apostoli) absit ut illa mala sint propterea facienda. Ulterius conceditur quod observanda est laudabilis consuetudo ecclesie, licet non sit explicita sed implicita in scriptura, quia minus diffusa et onerosa foret lex Christi, si omnes tales ritus, usus vel consuetudines forent in ea expresse. Ideo credendum est quod Spiritus Sanctus necessariora ecclesie expressit, et leviora sub quodam confuso involucro simul texit, ut patet prima Cor. XIV 40; dicit spiritus per suum Apostolum: Omnia honeste et secundum ordinem fiant. In quo includuntur omnes usus ecclesie in dicendo servicium, omnes ritus ordinum privatorum, et breviter omnis consuetudo clericalis vel laycalis laudabilis. Et in isto puncto surrepit maior irreligiositas populi christiani, quod postponendo preponderanciora expressa in lege Domini, preponderantur tradiciones et adinvenciones humane, quedam heretice et quedam in suo ordine observande. Sicut enim scriptura docet nos ista preponderanter cognoscere, sic minimum expressum in lege Domini observare sub incursu maioris pene quam aliquid quod est expressum singulariter in usu sacrum vel ritus aliquos eciam ordinate in religiosis vel laicis preter fidem Christi expressam noviter introductos. Et in isto cecatur ac oneratur ecclesia ultra modum, quia vel introducuntur irracionalia vel racionalia sunt nimium ponderata. Unde decretum XII distinccione sub** [295] **auctoritate Augustini ad inquisiciones Januarii sic loquitur (ut sepe repecii): Omnia talia que neque scripturarum sanctarum auctoritatibus continentur nec in consiliis episcoporum statuta inveniuntur nec consuetudine universalis ecclesie roborata sunt, sed diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliter variantur, ita ut vix aut nunquam inveniri possunt cause, quas in eis constituendis**

Yet it is granted that from that, as from any evil, a certain proper benefit accrues to the church. But (to use the Apostle's words) God forbid that those evils should therefore be done.[1] Further, it is granted that the praiseworthy custom of the church is to be observed, although it is not explicit but implicit in scripture; for the law of Christ would be too diffuse and burdensome if all such rites, usages or customs were expressly in it.[2] Therefore it is to be believed that the Holy Spirit expressed the things more necessary to the church, and covered the lighter things together under a certain indistinct wrapping, as is clear in 1 Cor. 14:40; the Spirit says through his Apostle: "Let all things be done decently and according to order." In this are included all the usages of the church in saying service, all the rites of the private orders, and, in brief, every praiseworthy custom, clerical or lay. And at this point the greater irreligion of the Christian people creeps in: that, setting aside the more preponderant things expressed in the law of the Lord, human traditions and inventions are made to preponderate, some of them heretical and some to be observed in their order. For as scripture teaches us to know these things preponderantly, so [it teaches us] to observe the least thing expressed in the law of the Lord on pain of incurring a greater penalty than anything sacred that is expressed singly in usage, or any rites, even introduced in orderly fashion among the religious or lay people, newly, beyond the expressed faith of Christ.[3] And in this the church is blinded and burdened beyond measure, because either irrational things are introduced or rational things are weighted too much. Hence the Decretum, in distinction 12, under the [295] **authority of Augustine, *To the Inquiries of Januarius*, speaks thus (as I have often repeated): "All such things as are neither contained in the**

homines secuti sunt, ubi facultas tribuitur sine aliqua dubitacione resecanda estimo. Quamvis enim hoc non inveniri possit, quomodo contra fidem sint, ipsam tamen religionem quam paucissimis et manifestissimis celebracionum sacramentis misericordia Domini voluit esse liberam, servilibus oneribus adeo premunt, ut tollerabilior sit condicio Iudeorum, qui etsi tempus libertatis non cogno verunt, legalibus tamen sacramentis, non humanis presumcionibus subiciuntur. Ex istis videtur, primo quod infidelius nostri pharisei premunt ecclesiam tradicionibus, sectis et exaccionibus quam fecerant pharisei legis veteris. Ipsi enim undique parcius onerarunt; moralia legis preponderarunt et veniente figurato viderunt quod figure cessarunt. Nostri autem pontifices, scribe et pharisei magnificant infideles tradiciones hominum, eciam ultra tradiciones quas Deus instituit, cum illas dicunt oportere cessare, si onus sapiunt et non lucrum; tradiciones vero suas, que honorem vel lucrum temporalem sapiunt, dicunt non posse cessare, licet sint tradicionibus et vite Christi contrarie; cum per illas consecrantur res, a qua consecracione non licet recedere; deminuere autem libertatem, que est verum privilegium ecclesie, per [296] falsos dico non clericos sed idiotas, vocem propriam ignorantes, foret nota infidelitatis discipulo Antichristi. Quando enim queritur ab eis racio facti, vel balbuciunt, dicentes machometice quod non debet dari vel disputari racio sue tradicionis, cum per se sufficit voluntas capitis, vel arguunt ex insufficienti similitudine de lege veteri, vel allegant infundabiliter leges hominis, ut quod iurisconsultus vel satrapa sic diffinit, nec licet (ut inquiunt) racionem querere ut in lege Dei sed ad ipsos ut primum principium est sistendum. Seculares autem provident quod leges eorum consonent legi Dei, quia utilitati et racioni, cum profitentur catholice quod omnis lex vel ritus hominis que non habet ab ipsa principium est heretica et fugibilis ut venenum. Ex quo patet quod lex Dei debet primo disci a quocumque catholico. Quid inquam fideli de lege alia? Unde lex Dei cum tradicionibus humanis sophistice est commixta; scilicet ut tradicio pallietur et coloracius observetur. Observet igitur fidelis iusticiam legis et paret se ad sufferendum iniurias et penas pro omissione legum hominum. Hoc enim directe accelerat viatorem ad terminum et oppositum deviat vel retardat. Conceditur igitur quod ritus et leges honeste ex lege Domini eliquate sunt in suo ordine observande. Sed caveat christianus de nimietate studii eorum et observancie; suspensus itaque in lege Dei sine ulteriori sollicitudine sit contentus de flatu spiritus sine istis extravagantibus dirigentis. Quid queso fideli de gentili ritu vel phariseico nisi de quanto modeste facilitat ad observanciam legis Dei? Unde graviter peccarunt,

authorities of the holy scriptures, nor found established in the councils of bishops, nor strengthened by the custom of the universal church, but vary innumerably according to the diverse manners of diverse places, so that the causes which men followed in establishing them can scarcely or never be found — where the opportunity is given, I judge that they are to be cut off without any hesitation. For although it cannot be found how they are against the faith, yet they so weigh down with servile burdens religion itself, which the mercy of the Lord willed to be free, with very few and most manifest sacraments of celebration, that the condition of the Jews is more tolerable: for they, even though they did not know the time of liberty, are yet subject to the sacraments of the law, not to human presumptions."[4] From these things it seems, first, that our pharisees weigh down the church with traditions, sects and exactions more unbelievingly than the pharisees of the old law had done. For they burdened more sparingly on every side; they gave preponderance to the moral precepts of the law, and when the thing figured came they saw that the figures ceased. But our pontiffs, scribes and pharisees magnify unbelieving traditions of men even beyond the traditions which God instituted, since they say that these must cease if they savour of burden and not of gain; but their own traditions, which savour of honour or temporal gain, they say cannot cease, although they are contrary to the traditions and to the life of Christ, since by them things are consecrated, and from that consecration it is not lawful to withdraw; but to diminish the liberty which is the true privilege of the church, through false men — I say, not clerics but unlearned men, ignorant of their own word — [296] would be a mark of unbelief in a disciple of Antichrist.[5] For when the reason for the deed is asked of them, either they stammer, saying in Mahomet's manner that the reason for their tradition ought not to be given or disputed, since the will of the head suffices by itself;[6] or they argue from an insufficient likeness to the old law; or they allege without foundation the laws of man, as that a jurisconsult or a satrap so defines; and (as they say) it is not lawful to seek a reason, as in God's law, but one must stop at them as at a first principle. But the seculars see to it that their laws accord with God's law, because [they accord] with utility and reason, since they profess in catholic fashion that every law or rite of man which does not have its beginning from it is heretical and to be fled like poison.[7] From which it is clear that God's law ought to be learned first by every catholic. What, I say, is another law to the faithful man? Hence God's law has been sophistically mixed with human traditions, namely

qui introduxerunt [297]sectas et distincciones legum ecclesie, per quas diminuitur meditacio legis Dei, cum melius esset quod pure observaretur vita apostolica, et dimissa difformitate tenderetur ad uniformitatem status innocencie, licet graduacio in seculari dominio sit licita ac necessaria peccato supposito. Unde nichil infidelius quam ex graduacione secularis dominii concludere graduacionem dominacionis et honoris secularis in clericis. Cum enim status ille sit alcior, statui Christi et sanctorum conformior, oportet quod tendat ad maiorem unitatem, regulans statum laycalem et non sit a statu tam difformi quem regulat exemplatus. Conceditur tamen quod sunt gradus in illo statu apostolico; sed contrarie ad statum secularem; nam hic maior est pauperior, servitivior et ad currendum per peregrinacionem cum paucioribus temporalibus sufficiencior. Unde omnes presbiteri debent esse socii, ut docet Apostolus cum decreto de ipso et Petro, verumtamen servus ex maiori humilitate fit alcior. Unde (ut sepe dixi) pars laycalis dividitur in popularem et partem secularem illi prepositam quarum prior est bona et secunda melior. Sed pars clericalis propter socialem uniformitatem remanet indivisa et optima, quam elegit Maria; unde periculose balbuciunt, qui dicunt quod reges non sunt domini regnorum, sed nudi defensores, vel aliter (ut inquiunt) oportet dare in clericis gradus talis dominii. Scrutentur isti scripturas et videre possunt, quam spissim autor scripture tam verbo quam opere concedit illis de medio statu dominium, cum ipse obedienter dedit tributum cesari, a se ipso autem ac suis apostolis et eorum successoribus [298]exclusit dominium, ut patet superius. Iudicent igitur inter evidencias; Deus interdicit sacerdoti Christi dominium et dat seculari dominium, igitur sic debet esse. Et cesar vel lex papalis negat seculari adesse dominium et dicit quod pape ac episcopis debet adesse quodcumque seculare dominium, igitur verum. Et sic de istis locis a simili: Christus exclusit se et suos apostolos a seculari dominio, igitur per idem hoc debet a suis vicariis observari, et seculares domini ac prelati vendicant sibi dominacionem civilem, primi legittime et secundi falsa usurpacione, igitur per idem omnes clerici debent taliter dominari. In tales argucias arundineas prorumpunt qui siciunt seculare dominium; et necesse est ut multiplicetur in clero Christi, sicut in parte multiplicabatur in clero legis veteris, talis confusio, quousque Antichristus destruxerat membra sua. Ideo cum secundum variacionem loci et temporis agendum est; ut congruit, patet quod regnante cupiditatis malicia sequenda est nobis via Christi sollercius, nam imminente maiori periculo debet periclitans magis inniti suffragio. Sic enim fecit sacerdos Christus veniens in summo gradu expropriacionis, quando

so that the tradition may be cloaked and observed more colourably. Let the faithful man, therefore, observe the justice of the law, and prepare himself to suffer wrongs and penalties for the omission of the laws of men. For this speeds the wayfarer directly to his end, and the opposite leads him astray or delays him. It is granted, therefore, that rites and laws decently drawn off from the law of the Lord are to be observed in their order. But let the Christian beware of excess in the study and observance of them; suspended, then, on the law of God, without further anxiety, let him be content with the breath of the Spirit, which directs without these extravagants.[8] What, I ask, is a gentile or pharisaic rite to the faithful man, except in so far as it modestly makes easier the observance of God's law? Hence those sinned gravely who introduced [297] sects and distinctions of the laws of the church, by which the meditation of God's law is diminished; since it would be better that the apostolic life were purely observed, and that, difformity set aside, men tended to the uniformity of the state of innocence, although gradation in secular lordship is lawful and necessary, sin being supposed.[9] Hence nothing is more unbelieving than to infer from the gradation of secular lordship a gradation of secular exercise of lordship and honour among clerics. For since that state is higher, more conformed to the state of Christ and of the saints, it must tend to greater unity, ruling the lay state, and not be modelled on a state so difform as the one it rules. Yet it is granted that there are degrees in that apostolic state, but contrary to the secular state; for here the greater is the poorer, the more serviceable, and the better fitted to run on pilgrimage with fewer temporal goods. Hence all presbyters ought to be fellows, as the Apostle teaches, together with the decree, concerning himself and Peter; nevertheless the servant becomes higher out of greater humility.[10] Hence (as I have often said) the lay part is divided into the popular part and the secular part set over it, of which the first is good and the second better. But the clerical part, because of its fellowly uniformity, remains undivided and the best, which "Mary hath chosen";[11] hence those stammer dangerously who say that kings are not lords of their kingdoms but bare defenders, or otherwise (as they say) one would have to grant degrees of such lordship among clerics. Let these men search the scriptures, and they can see how often the author of scripture, by word as well as by deed, grants lordship to those of the middle state, since he himself obediently gave tribute to Caesar, but excluded lordship from himself and his apostles and their successors, [298]as is clear above.[12] Let them judge, therefore, between the evidences: "God forbids lordship

summe regnavit cupiditas sacerdotum. Et hec est causa apostoli, ut prius exposui. Redimentes, inquit, tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt, unde nimis blasfemant degeneres qui dicunt quod tam utile et tam conveniens est statui cleri modo ditari amplius quam necessaria fuit potestas faciendi miracula in ecclesia primitiva. Revera tunc nec clerus possessionatus nec laycus daret corporalem elemosinam mendicanti, sicut apostoli non diminuerent de potestate faciendi [299]miracula, ymo potestas, quam Evangelista habuit ad mutandum littoria saxorum fragmenta in gemmas et silvestres frondes in aurum, foret mundo utilior quam quantacumque temporalis possessio, sicut testaretur eciam Symon magus.

to the priest of Christ and gives lordship to the secular; therefore so it ought to be." And: "Caesar, or the papal law, denies that lordship belongs to the secular, and says that any secular lordship whatever ought to belong to the pope and the bishops; therefore it is true."[13] And so with these arguments from likeness: "Christ excluded himself and his apostles from secular lordship; therefore by the same token this ought to be observed by his vicars"; and "Secular lords and prelates claim civil exercise of lordship for themselves, the first lawfully and the second by false usurpation; therefore by the same token all clerics ought to exercise lordship in this way." Into such reedy quibbles break out those who thirst for secular lordship; and such confusion must be multiplied in Christ's clergy, as it was in part multiplied in the clergy of the old law, until Antichrist has destroyed his members.[14] Therefore, since one must act as is fitting according to the variation of place and time, it is clear that while the malice of covetousness reigns we must follow Christ's way the more diligently; for when a greater danger threatens, the one in peril ought to lean the more on aid. For so did Christ the priest, coming in the highest degree of renunciation of property, when the covetousness of the priests reigned most. And this is the Apostle's reason, as I expounded before: "Redeeming," he says, "the time, because the days are evil."[15] Hence the degenerate blaspheme exceedingly who say that it is as useful and as fitting for the state of the clergy now to be enriched further as the power of working miracles was necessary in the primitive church. In truth, then, neither the possessioned clergy nor a layman would give bodily alms to a beggar, just as the apostles would not diminish anything of the power of working [299]miracles; indeed, the power which the Evangelist had "to change fragments of the stones of the shore into gems and the leaves of the woods into gold" would be more useful to the world than any temporal possession whatever, as even Simon Magus would testify.[16]

Notes

1. Allusion to Rom. 3:8 ("let us do evil that there may come good? Whose damnation is just"), not a quotation; ***absit*** is Paul's formula ("God forbid", e.g. Rom. 6:2).
2. The argument requires "too diffuse and burdensome" (***nimis***); the print (plate-confirmed) has ***minus*** "less", which inverts the argument; we read ***nimis*** (our emendation; Loserth gives no variant).
3. At 294.26 Loserth marks ***sacrum*** "ita cod." (so the manuscript): he doubted the word but printed it. C. ***Sacrum*** is neuter and agrees with ***aliquid*** (***usu sacro*** would be needed for "sacred usage"); Loserth marks it ***ita cod.***. Anything sacred that has come in by usage is set against the least thing expressed in the law of the Lord.
4. Decretum D.12 c.12 (***Omnia talia***), from Augustine, ***Ep.*** 55.19.35 to Januarius; the identification is ours; Wyclif's ***legalibus tamen sacramentis*** follows Gratian's text, where Augustine has ***sarcinis***. Loserth's italics bound the quotation, as here.

5. The clause ***deminuere autem libertatem … foret nota infidelitatis discipulo Antichristi*** is taken as Wyclif's own judgement: to diminish the church's true liberty (Augustine's "free" religion) marks a disciple of Antichrist. It could also continue the pharisees' reasoning ("it would be, they say, a mark of unbelief"). ***Vocem propriam ignorantes***: they do not know what their own name (***clericus***) means; perhaps "their own language".
6. ***Machometice***, "in Mahomet's manner": Wyclif's charge that Islam forbids its law to be disputed. ***Voluntas capitis***: the head is the pope.
7. ***Seculares*** are here the secular lords and their lawmakers (glossary: ***secularis***: the referent matters). ***Ab ipsa*** refers to ***lex Dei***.
8. ***Extravagantibus*** plays on the ***Extravagantes***, the papal decretals "wandering outside" the collections. ***Suspensus*** is "hanging on" the law of God, intent on it.
9. ***Distincciones*** may glance at the distinctions of the Decretum. ***Graduacio*** is CONTEXTUAL (the glossary): of rank and lordship here, "gradation", not academic "graduation"; ***difformitas, difformis*** "difformity, difform", the want of uniformity, against ***uniformitas***.
10. Paul on himself and Peter: Gal. 2:9–11 (the right hands of fellowship; Paul's resistance to Peter); the decree is not named; it is probably Decretum C.2 q.7 c.33 (Jerome: Paul rebuked Peter, knowing himself 'not unequal'; greater and less 'not by dignity but by life'), with c.37 (Peter and Paul equal in merit though different in rank). "The servant … higher": cf. Matt. 23:11.
11. Luke 10:42, "Mary hath chosen the best part".
12. Tribute to Caesar: Matt. 17:26 and 22:21. ***Medius status***: the secular lords, between the clergy and the commons.
13. The two arguments are set side by side for judgement; the second is ironic (***igitur verum***).
14. ***Locis a simili***: the topical place "from likeness". ***Destruxerat*** is pluperfect where a future perfect is meant; ***membra sua*** are Antichrist's own members.
15. Eph. 5:16; Loserth's reference reads "Eph. V, 10" in the OCR of the page foot.
16. The Evangelist is John: the legend that he turned rods of the woods into gold and pebbles of the shore into gems (Isidore, ***De ortu et obitu patrum*** 72, PL 83, 151C, quoted in the ***Legenda aurea*** c. 9); Loserth's italics bound the phrase as a quotation, and he refers to ***De ecclesia*** p. 189 and p. 81 above. Simon Magus: Acts 8:18, who offered money for the apostles' power.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 294: ***illa***
  - 295: ***in***
  - 295: ***tribuitur*** (italic t) [NW]
  - 295: ***verunt*** (cogno | verunt split by folio bar (234[d] in margin), not a hyphen; this line's part) [NW]
  - 296: ***et*** (20 is the line number)
  - 296: ***eliquate*** [NW]
  - 297: ***unitatem***
  - 297: ***socialem*** (hyphenated socia-|lem (25 line number); main token holds the whole word)
  - 298: ***mali***
  - 295: ***oneribus*** (LEFT-nw: hyphenated one-|ribus)
  - 295: ***licet*** (line number 30 glued (read as so))

Part 10: Clerical dignity in poverty; Gregory refuses the name "universal"; an argument for the caesarean order

Loserth pp. 299.6–302.33

¶1 299.6–300.26
299.12 *The dignity of the clergy consists in poverty and Christlike life.*
300.19 *Christendom should unite to destroy the errors of the popes.*

[299]**Ista autem sentencia placeret quibusdam episcopis qui, licet debeant habere omnia cum fratribus in communi, tamen stante ista sentencia pro conservandis suis privilegiis non tribuerent eis temporalia plus vel minus. Et multo evidencius nec aliquis secularis. Dignitas itaque clericalis est dignitate seculari necessarior, sed oportet quod sit illa dignitas paupertatis et moris quam Christus instituit, quia secularis dignitas cleri utramque partem matris nostre intoxicat. Christus enim in cunabulis satis pauperibus adoratus fuit a regibus, ut patet Matth. II. Sed indutus vestem purpuream fuit flagellatus a militibus, ut patet Mar. XV. Unde premittit exoneracionem et excussionem festuce fedantis ecclesiam, et sic tamquam formam ultimam vie inducit apostolicam dignitatem, ut patet Matth. XIX. Et ibidem dicitur: Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende omnia que**

And this teaching[1] would please certain bishops who, although they ought to have all things in common with their brethren, yet, while this teaching stands, would not, for the preserving of their privileges, give them temporal goods, more or less.[2] And much more evidently, neither would any secular. Clerical dignity, then, is more necessary than secular dignity; but it must be that dignity of poverty and of conduct which Christ instituted, because secular dignity in the clergy poisons both parts of our mother. For Christ, in a cradle poor enough, was adored by kings, as is clear in Matt. 2. But clothed in a purple garment he was scourged by soldiers, as is clear in Mark 15.[3] Hence he puts first the unburdening and the shaking off of the mote that fouls the church, and so, as the last form of the way, brings in the apostolic dignity, as is clear in Matt. 19. And

habes, et da pauperibus, et veni, sequere me. Christus enim noluit suos apostolos occupari circa tam contemptibile officium, cuiusmodi est civilis distribucio elemosine corporalis; hoc enim est laycale officium, quod sacerdotes debent postponere. Tercium vero exemplum periculi est quod Apostolo ferenti benediccionem vel elemosinam sanctis Jerusalem opposite fuerunt insidie, ut innuitur Act. XX. Non obstante autem multiplici evidencia fideli, nonnulli, qui gustaverunt altissime paupertatis dulcedinem, habent ex religione omnia [300] in communi, apostatant plus quam Ananyas et Saphira, palliantes dignitatem episcopalem et bona pauperum non cum fratribus, sed nimis seculariter et proprietarie consumentes; unde videtur ut supra, quod fratres sui qui multipliciter apostasie tam gravi consenciunt, carerent benediccione populi dicentis quod capiant de bonis suis, quibus habundant populo copiosius in se et suo episcopo. Nec dubium fideli quin fratres qui propter personale commodum vel honorem ordinis vel aliunde omittendo talem corripere culpe sue consenciunt, et sic indignificant se ad recipiendum elemosinam pauperum laycorum. Nam debet esse per se notum fidelibus quod propter peccatum personale est communitas punienda, ut propter peccatum primi hominis totum genus humanum patitur, ut propter errorem archipreposi inferiores prepositi et tota communitas paciuntur. Ideo (ut dixi alias) ad destruendum errorem paparum totus christianismus et specialiter episcopi debent consurgere. Blasfemant enim in Deum, dicentes quod ipsi habent infinitum maiorem potestatem quam aliquis episcopus citra ipsos, quia infinitum ampliores indulgencias, dispensaciones et cetera privilegia possunt concedere quam aliquis episcopus citra ipsos.

it is said in the same place: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, follow me."[4] For Christ did not want his apostles to be occupied with so contemptible an office as is the civil distribution of bodily alms; for this is a lay office, which priests ought to put second.[5] And the third example of danger is that ambushes were laid against the Apostle as he was bringing a blessing or alms to the saints of Jerusalem, as is suggested in Acts 20.[6] But notwithstanding the manifold faithful evidence, some who have tasted the sweetness of the highest poverty, [and] have all things [300] in common by their religion, apostatize more than Ananias and Sapphira, cloaking themselves in the episcopal dignity, and consuming the goods of the poor not with their brethren but too secularly and proprietarily;[7] hence it seems, as above, that their brethren, who in many ways consent to so grave an apostasy, should go without the blessing of the people, who say that they should take from their own goods, in which, in themselves and in their bishop, they abound more copiously than the people.[8] Nor is it doubtful to the faithful man that the brethren who, for personal advantage or the honour of the order or from some other cause, omit to reprove such a one, consent to his fault, and so make themselves unworthy to receive the alms of poor lay people. For it ought to be self-evident to the faithful that for a personal sin the community is to be punished, as for the sin of the first man the whole human race suffers, as for the error of the arch-superior the lower superiors and the whole community suffer.[9] Therefore (as I have said elsewhere) the whole of Christendom, and especially the bishops, ought to rise up together to destroy the error of the popes. For they blaspheme against God, saying that they have infinitely greater power than any bishop below them, because they can grant infinitely ampler indulgences, dispensations and other privileges than any bishop below them.

¶2 300.27–302.22
301.5 *Example of St. Gregory, who would not be called universal pope.*
302.1 *Danger of using such titles.*
302.16 *It is said that the hierarchy is to the honour of the Church.*

[300] Et hoc indubie sonat in scandalum toti ecclesie propter multa: primo quia blasfemia facta in Christum caput, qua innuitur quod papa sit maioris potestatis date a cesare quam Christus habuit, facit subtraccionem capitalis suffragii; secundo quia papa habente solum finitam potestatem quilibet illorum prelatorum non haberet potestatem sub aliquo gradu signabili, et tercio quia propter subtraccionem minoris boni quam [301] foret subsidium, quod papa subtrahit populus licite et laboriose prosequitur. Quare igitur non prosequitur contra papam correptibilem fratrem nostrum? Et ista videtur sentencia beati Gregorii posita XCIX distinccione: Ecce, ubi precepit Eulogio patriarche Alexandrino quod non vocet eum

And this without doubt sounds to the scandal of the whole church, for many reasons: first, because the blasphemy done against Christ the head, by which it is implied that the pope is of greater power, given by Caesar, than Christ had, brings about the withdrawal of the head's aid;[10] secondly, because, if the pope had only finite power, each of those prelates would have power at no assignable degree;[11] and thirdly, because for the withdrawal of a lesser good than [301] would be the subsidy which the pope withdraws, the people lawfully and laboriously go to law. Why then do they not proceed against the pope, our brother, who is open to reproof? And this seems to be the teaching of blessed Gregory set

amplius papam universalem: Vobis, inquit, subtrahitur quod alteri plus quam racio exigit prebetur, ego vero non verbis quero prosperari sed moribus, nec honorem esse deputo in quo fratres nostros honorem suum perdere cognosco. Meus namque est honor universalis ecclesie, meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor; tunc ego honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur. Si me enim universalem papam vestra sanctitas dicit, negat se esse hoc, quod me fatetur, universum, sed absit hoc, recedant verba, que unitatem inflant et caritatem vulnerant. Unde Pellagius papa: Nullus patriarcharum universalitatis vocabulo umquam utatur, quia si unus eorum universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. Sed absit a fidelibus hoc sibi quempiam nomen velle arripere, unde honorem fratrum suorum ex quantidacumque parte minuere videatur; quapropter caritas vestra neminem umquam in suis epistolis universalem nominet, ne sibi debitum subtrahat, dum alteri honorem offert indebitum. Ideo ex generali concilio decretum est, quod prime sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum aut summus sacerdos aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed tantum prime sedis episcopus. Universalis autem nec eciam romanus pontifex appelletur. [302] Licet enim possent hec nomina sane intelligi, mirum est tamen quomodo posteriores, peiores prioribus, tale nomen singulariter sibi vendicant sine fructu; etenim onus nimium, licet omnes tales episcopi comportent et regulent ecclesiam communi concilio sicut olim. Et patet, quod nuda est ista argucia, Gregorius vel alius sanctus Romanus episcopus fuit precellens pre aliis, igitur per idem et quilibet Romanus pontifex. Variatur enim stulta affeccio dignitatis. Stultum quidem est assumere nomen Christi, ut Bernhardus, Lyncolniensis et Jeronymus describunt sine possibili correspondencia dignitatis. Idem enim est hoc facere et symeam ad summum repere ut profundius et gravius preceps ruat. Sed contra ista arguitur per hoc, quod totus iste ordo cesareus videtur esse ad honorem et utilitatem ecclesie matris sancte, non igitur destruendum est tam utile et tantum faciens ad honorem ecclesie, potissime cum nescitur quibus prodesset eius destruccio, et nulla persona ecclesie est improvide punienda.

down in distinction 99, *Ecce*, where he commanded Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, not to call him universal pope any more: "To you," he says, "is withdrawn what is offered to another beyond what reason requires. I, however, seek to prosper not in words but in conduct; nor do I count that an honour in which I know my brethren lose their honour. For my honour is the honour of the universal church; my honour is the solid strength of my brethren; then am I honoured, when the honour due is not denied to each and every one. For if your holiness calls me universal pope, you deny yourself to be what you confess me to be, universal. But far be this; away with words that puff up vanity and wound charity."[12] Hence Pope Pelagius: "Let none of the patriarchs ever use the word of universality, for if one of them is called universal, the name of patriarch is taken from the rest. But far be it from the faithful that anyone should wish to snatch this name for himself, whereby he might seem to diminish the honour of his brethren in however small a part; wherefore let your charity never name anyone universal in your letters, lest you withdraw from yourself what is due, while you offer undue honour to another."[13] Therefore it was decreed by a general council "that the bishop of the first see should not be called prince of priests or high priest or anything of the kind, but only bishop of the first see. And not even the Roman pontiff is to be called universal."[14] [302] For although these names could be soundly understood, yet it is a wonder how later men, worse than the earlier, claim such a name singly for themselves without fruit; for [it is] too great a burden, even though all such bishops should carry it together and rule the church by common counsel, as of old.[15] And it is clear that this quibble is bare: "Gregory, or another holy Roman bishop, was pre-excellent above the others; therefore by the same token so is every Roman pontiff." For the foolish affection for dignity varies. It is indeed foolish to assume the name of Christ, as Bernard, Lincoln and Jerome describe, without a possible correspondence of dignity.[16] For to do this is the same as for an ape to creep to the top, so that it may fall headlong the more deeply and heavily. But against these things it is argued by appeal to this: that this whole caesarean order seems to be for the honour and benefit of the church, our holy mother; therefore a thing so useful, and doing so much for the honour of the church, is not to be destroyed, especially since it is not known whom its destruction would profit, and no person of the church is to be punished improvidently.

¶3 302.23–302.33

[302] **Assumptum videtur ex hoc quod, etsi omnes dotati forent dampnandi ex dotacione, adhuc dotacio foret ad honorem et utilitatem ecclesie, igitur multo magis multis personis hinc altrinsecus merentibus et salvatis. Assumptum patet ex hoc, quod totus prescitorum numerus sicut et omnis culpa proderit per accidens et honorabit numerum salvandorum, nam dampnati exercitabunt predestinatos, glorificabunt eorum victorias et cedent eis ad augmentum et racionem beatitudinis ut hic supponitur.**

The assumption seems [clear] from this: that even if all the endowed were to be damned by reason of the endowment, the endowment would still be for the honour and benefit of the church; therefore much more so, when many persons on either side merit by it and are saved.[17] The assumption is clear from this: that the whole number of the foreknown, as also every fault, will profit by accident and will honour the number of those to be saved; for the damned will exercise the predestinate, will glorify their victories, and will turn to their increase and to the ground of their blessedness, as is here supposed.[18]

Notes

1. ***Sentencia*** in its sense "teaching" (the glossary, CONTEXTUAL): the opinion just answered, that endowment serves the church as miracles once did.
2. These are bishops taken from the orders, who by their profession should hold all in common with their ***fratres***, the brethren (friars) of their order. ***Plus vel minus***: "at all".
3. Matt. 2:11; Mark 15:15–17, where Christ is scourged and then clothed in purple by the soldiers. ***Milites*** here are the Roman soldiers, not the estate of knights.
4. Matt. 19:21. Wyclif reads ***vade et vende omnia que habes*** for the Vulgate's ***vade, vende quae habes***, and omits "and thou shalt have treasure in heaven"; his Latin is translated.
5. Cf. Acts 6:2, "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables."
6. Acts 20:3, "the Jews laid wait for him"; the collection for the saints at Jerusalem is Rom. 15:25–26. ***Tercium exemplum*** follows the two examples of Matt. 2 and Mark 15.
7. ***Habent*** stands without a connective after the relative clause; it is read as a second clause of the same relative ("[and] have"). ***Palliantes dignitatem episcopalem*** may also mean "using the episcopal dignity as a cloak" (for consuming the goods of the poor). S. Ananias and Sapphira: Acts 5:1–10.
8. ***Carerent benediccione populi***: the people's "blessing" is their alms (as ***benediccio*** for the collection in the previous sentence); the people's answer is reported indirectly.
9. ***Archiprepositus*** "arch-superior" is formed on ***prepositi*** "superiors"; no row yet.
10. ***Capitalis suffragii***: the aid that comes from Christ as head (***caput***), not the glossary's ***capitalis*** "capital" (of Rome).
11. If the pope's power is finite and yet infinitely greater than any bishop's, the bishop's power falls below every degree that can be named, that is, it would be nothing. ***Signabilis***: CONTEXTUAL, "assignable" (any one could name); cf. the logical noun "signifiable".
12. Decretum D.99 c.5 (***Ecce***), from Gregory the Great's letter to Eulogius of Alexandria (***Reg.*** 8.29); the canon is Loserth's (modern form ours), the letter's place ours (PL 77, 933C, numbered there 8.30). T. The print reads ***unitatem*** "unity" (so on the plate); Gregory's text (PL 77, 933C) and Gratian's (PL 187, 474A) both read ***vanitatem***, and the English follows them: "puff up vanity" (our emendation).
13. Decretum D.99 c.4 (***Nullus patriarcharum***), under the name of Pope Pelagius (II); Loserth's reference, modern form ours.
14. Decretum D.99 c.3 (***Prime sedis***), a canon of an African council (Carthage) that Wyclif calls "general"; Loserth's reference, modern form ours; Gratian's rubric ***ex Concilio Africano***; it is Carthage III (397) c. 26 (PL 84, 192C). Loserth's italics give the canon as a quotation; its last sentence (***Universalis autem ...***) is Gratian's dictum introducing c.4, not part of the canon.
15. ***Etenim onus nimium*** has no verb: "[it is] too great a burden", the burden of the name's office, which even all bishops together would carry only with difficulty. At 302.4 Loserth's page foot reports a reading with ***fructum*** ("sive fructum"); the OCR is too rough to say which witness, and the print's ***sine fructu*** construes.
16. Bernard, Grosseteste (***Lincolniensis***, "Lincoln") and Jerome on assuming Christ's name without his dignity: no passage given by Loserth. For Bernard cf. ***De consideratione*** 2.7.14–15 (***Simia in tecto, rex fatuus in solio ... Monstruosa res gradus summus et animus infimus***), which the ape image here echoes and which Wyclif quotes in ***De officio regis***; the Grosseteste and Jerome passages are untraced.
17. ***Hinc altrinsecus***: "on either side" of the endowment, the givers and the receivers. ***Assumptum videtur*** lacks a predicate; "seems [clear]" is supplied from the next sentence's ***patet***.
18. The second ***Assumptum*** is the premiss of the sub-argument just given (that even the damned endowed serve the church). ***Ut hic supponitur*** marks this as the objector's supposition; Wyclif answers in the next part. ***Racionem beatitudinis***: the ground or measure of their blessedness.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 299: ***illa***
  - 299: ***habes*** (italic e with a faint, broken eye (not c); damaged letter) [NW]
  - 300: ∅ (folio bar before sub (236^{b} in margin) read as i)
  - 300: ***tercio*** (236^{b} is the folio mark)
  - 301: ***nec***
  - 301: ***honorem***

- **301: *meus***
- **301: *recedant***
- **301: ∅ (25 is the line number)**
- **301: ∅ (folio bar before sed (236ᶜ in margin) read as i)**
- **302: ∅ (that is the English side note (It is said that ...))**
- **302: *utilitatem* [NW]**
- **301: *Eulogio* (print = Eulogio)**

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Danger of using sucli . . tities. (302.1).**

Part 11: Sin profits the church by accident; simple priests supply when prelates fail

Loserth pp. 303.1–307.28

¶1 303.1–304.3
303.1 *All things, even evil, profit the Church accidentally.*
304.19 *Sin is not to be committed for its accidental benefits.*

[303]**Hic videtur michi quod prima conclusio concedi debeat, cum totus numerus prescitorum, ymo omne peccatum, prosit per accidens sancte ecclesie. Nam Rom. VIII, 28 dicitur: Scimus quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum. Unde solet esse distinccio quomodo aliqua prosunt per se directe et occasione data ad beatitudinem sanctorum, sicut bona virtutis et gracie, aliqua autem prosunt per accidens indirecte vel occasione ex gracia Dei accepta, cuiusmodi sunt peccata; et sic loquitur beatus Gregorius vocans felicem culpam, ymo Augustinus dicit quod expedit multos incidisse in multa peccata enormia, ut exemplificat de Petro. Et patet quod non est color quod si res prosit ecclesie tunc non est destruenda; oportet enim peccatum prodesse ecclesie, sed talia per accidens prosunt, sic quod illis ablatis non minus aliunde insurgeret profectus ecclesie, quia aliter quilibet foveret peccatum, ymo ageret, ut dampnetur, quia tunc Deus preter istos dampnatos produceret tantam ecclesiam quantam eternaliter diffinivit, cum nullum peccatum potest mutare divinum propositum vel tollere gloriam spirituum beatorum; et isti dampnati cederent beatis ad gaudium, quo aliter caruissent, ut deductum est in materia de necessitate futurorum. Ymo videtur quod omne peccatum tantum prodest ad salutem ecclesie, sicut totum meritum Christi, quia omne peccatum facit unite totum profectum ecclesie, cum aliter passio Christi infinitum plus prodesset ecclesie quam peccatum vel meritum membri Christi, et cum** [304]**meritum Christi tantum finite prodest ecclesie, videtur quod omne aliud meritum proderit sub non gradu.**

Here it seems to me that the first conclusion ought to be granted, since the whole number of the foreknown, indeed every sin, profits holy church by accident. For in Rom. 8:28 it is said: "We know that to them that love God all things work together unto good."[1] Hence there is a customary distinction, how some things profit of themselves, directly and by occasion given, toward the blessedness of the saints, as the goods of virtue and of grace, while others profit by accident, indirectly or by occasion taken from the grace of God, of which kind are sins; and so blessed Gregory speaks when he calls it a "happy fault"; indeed Augustine says that "it was expedient for many to have fallen into many enormous sins, as he exemplifies in Peter."[2] And it is clear that there is no colour [for arguing] that if a thing profits the church, then it is not to be destroyed;[3] for sin must profit the church, but such things profit by accident, so that, were they taken away, the advancement of the church would arise no less from elsewhere; for otherwise anyone would foster sin, indeed would act so as to be damned; for then God, besides those damned, would produce as great a church as He has eternally defined, since no sin can change the divine purpose or take away the glory of the blessed spirits; and those damned would yield to the blessed a joy which they would otherwise have lacked, as has been deduced in the matter of the necessity of future things.[4] Indeed it seems that every sin profits as much toward the salvation of the church as the whole merit of Christ, since every sin makes, as one, the whole advancement of the church; since otherwise the passion of Christ would profit the church infinitely more than a sin or the merit of a member of Christ; and since [4]**the merit of Christ profits the church only finitely, it seems that every other merit will profit under no degree.[5]**

¶2 304.4–304.18

[304]Et ex istis videtur quod dicentes omnem hominem sumi de corpore pro tempore quo magis prodesset ecclesie, periculose sompniant, quia vel posset universalis ecclesia esse perfeccior quam ista erit de facto vel non. Si sic, concedendum foret consequenter quod mors cuiuscumque presciti posset plus prodesse ecclesie et per consequens non; si alias vel aliter fuisset mortuus; minus prodesset ecclesie, quia sic omne factum bonum vel malum actum esset ad maturiorem profectum ecclesie. Si non; tunc consequenter concedendum foret quod omnia que evenient absolute necessario evenirent, cum contingencia, si ponatur, eque respicit omne opus Dei vel aliquod quo ad ipsum.

And from these it seems that those who say that every man is taken from the body at the time at which he would most profit the church are dreaming dangerously; for either the universal church could be more perfect than it will in fact be, or not. If so, it would consequently have to be granted that the death of any foreknown man could profit the church more, and consequently it is not [true that], if he had died at another time or in another way, it would profit the church less, because so every deed, good or evil, done would be for the riper advancement of the church.[6] If not, then it would consequently have to be granted that "all things that will come about would come about absolutely of necessity", since contingency, if it is posited, bears equally on every work of God, or on any one, as regards Him.

¶3 304.19–305.6
305.7 *Three ways of profiting the Church.*
305.19 *We may not know who will profit by disendowment, it is enough that it is done in God's honour,*

[304]Dimissis autem istis stulticiis conceditur quod omne peccatum facit ad utilitatem et honorem ecclesie, non tamen est propterea faciendum, quia cum caritas incipit a se ipsa; nemo faceret aliquid nisi quod sibi proderit et sancte ecclesie. Sed quid prodest homini, quod sic peccat? Non enim sequitur: Hoc peccatum per accidens infert bonum homini, quia penam et alia; igitur sibi prodest; quia illo subducto et quocumque tam malo sequitur quod melius sibi esset. Ideo oportet concedere quod omne peccatum presciti obest sibi; et non prodest; licet prosit ecclesie. Nec oportet, si homo debet velle in casu damnacionem suam ad profectum ecclesie, quod propterea debet velle peccare, ut patet alibi. Unde videtur quod omnia tantum et ad tantum [305]prosunt ecclesie ut aliud, licet dispariter. Deus enim utitur qualibet creatura ut organo ad profectum ecclesie, eciam ad proficiendum omnibus et singulis membris ecclesie, in quocumque profectu signabili, sicut multitudo trahencium trahit navem.

And, these follies set aside, it is granted that every sin makes for the usefulness and honour of the church; yet it is not on that account to be done, because, since charity begins from itself, no one should do anything except what will profit himself and holy church. But what does it profit a man that he sins so? For it does not follow: "This sin by accident brings good to the man, because punishment and other things; therefore it profits him"; because, that [sin] withdrawn, and whatever is as evil, it follows that it would be better for him.[7] Therefore one must grant that every sin of a foreknown man harms him and does not profit him, although it profits the church. Nor, if a man ought in a [given] case to will his own damnation for the advancement of the church, must he on that account will to sin, as is clear elsewhere. Hence it seems that all things profit the church as much and toward as much [5]as any other, although unequally. For God uses every creature as an instrument for the advancement of the church, even for profiting all and each of the members of the church, in every assignable advancement,[8] as a multitude of men hauling hauls a ship.

¶4 305.7–305.18

[305]Tres autem gradus sunt notabiles habentes modos disparis racionis. Christus enim prodest fontaliter, predestinati directe parcialiter et peccata indirecte occasionaliter. Et patet quod multi heretici prosunt multum ecclesie et tamen propter sua opera sunt culpandi, ut proponens in casu intoxicare hominem infert sibi per accidens sanitatem. Ideo docet Magister quod in merito est simplicitas oculi principaliter attendenda. Et tota laus est architectonice autori

And there are three notable degrees, having modes of unlike kind. For Christ profits as the fount, the predestinate directly and in part, and sins indirectly, by occasion. And it is clear that many heretics profit the church much and yet are to be blamed for their works, as one who purposes in some case to poison a man brings him health by accident. Therefore the Master teaches that in merit the singleness of the eye is chiefly to be

omnium attribuenda. Ipse enim necessitat peccatum ad proficiendum ecclesie.

looked to.[9] And all praise is to be attributed to the author of all, as master builder. For He necessitates sin to profit the church.

¶5 305.19–306.18

306.7 *We must obey Scripture even though to the hurt of some, but we must not go beyond our authority.*

306.19 *Lacking prelates, simple priests may administer any sacrament,*

[305] Ulterius dicitur quod non est color, si nescitur quibus prodesset dotacionis vel peccati destruccio, igitur non debet intendi, cum sufficit pro natura intencio honoris Dei. Et prudens reputacio utilitatis Christi quod de facili contingeret de ablacione temporalium, non intencione puniendi vel deteriorandi ecclesiam vel aliquod eius membrum, sed intencione exonerandi vel prodessendi mundo oppressis et perfeccionem status, quem Christus instituit renovandi. Hoc enim debet facere in lege veteri eciam extrahendo iumentum de puteo et exemplificat Augustinus, ut recitatur V questio V: Non omnis, quomodo ex caritate freneticus privandus est gladio et litargicus excitandus a sompno, et si expectaremus in istis revelacionem [306] vel demonstracionem gignentem scienciam, raro vel nunquam faceremus bonum opus extrinsecum, ut recitat decretum ex declaracione Augustini XXIII questio V: De occidendis. Et sic nec medicus corporalis nec medicus spiritualis umquam apponeret medicinam. In talibus igitur innitendum est arti scripture, et tunc Dominus nedum habebit nos excusatos, sed subducta invidia premiatos, eciam licet dampnum multis eveniat, sicut sepe contigit ex predicacione Christi. Nec sequitur ex isto, quod quilibet debet spoliare proximum occupantem superflua, quia aliis ut sacerdotibus limitatur sermo sancte exhortacionis, aliis ut secularibus dominis limitatur sermo severe monicionis, et aliis ut stulte dotantibus limitatur in aliorum defectu operacio prudentis ablacionis; nam omnis homo debet modo suo prodesse ecclesie.

Further, the answer is that there is no colour [in this]: "If it is not known whom the destruction of the endowment or of sin would profit, therefore it ought not to be intended"; since for [our] nature the intention of God's honour suffices.[10] And [there suffices] a prudent estimation of the advantage of Christ which would easily come about from the taking-away of temporal goods, not with the intention of punishing or worsening the church or any member of it, but with the intention of relieving or profiting those oppressed by the world, and of renewing the perfection of the state which Christ instituted. For one ought to do this, as even in the old law by drawing a beast out of a pit;[11] and Augustine gives the example, as is recited in [C.] 5 q. 5 [c.] *Non omnis*, how out of charity "a frenzied man is to be deprived of his sword and a lethargic man roused from sleep";[12] and if in these matters we waited for a revelation [6] or a demonstration begetting knowledge, rarely or never would we do any good outward work, as the decree recites from Augustine's declaration, [C.] 23 q. 5 [c.] *De occidendis*.[13] And so neither the bodily physician nor the spiritual physician would ever apply medicine. In such matters, therefore, one must rely on the art of scripture, and then the Lord will hold us not only excused but, ill will set aside, rewarded, even though harm befall many, as often happened from the preaching of Christ. Nor does it follow from this that anyone ought to despoil a neighbour who occupies superfluous goods; for to some, as to priests, is assigned the word of holy exhortation; to others, as to secular lords, is assigned the word of stern admonition; and to others, as to those who foolishly endow, is assigned, where the others fail, the work of prudent taking-away; for every man ought in his own way to profit the church.

¶6 306.19–306.25

[306] Ulterius notandum finaliter quod deficiente quocumque papa cesareo vel quocumque alio eius prelato usque ad simplicem sacerdotem ipse sufficeret ministrare qualiacumque sacramenta in scriptura sacra fundabilia, vel eciam sacramentalia que post dotacionem ecclesie licite sunt adiecta.

Further, it is to be noted finally that, failing any caesarean pope whatever, or any other prelate of his whatever down to the simple priest, he [the simple priest] would suffice to minister any sacraments whatever that can be founded in holy scripture, or even the sacramentals that were lawfully added after the endowment of the church.[14]

¶7 306.26–306.33

[306] Probatur primo ex hoc quod sacramenta et ritus, quos Deus singulariter summo sacerdoti instituit, potuit et debuit inferior sacerdos in defectu summi sacerdotis perficere, ut patet ex dictis. Sed

It is proved first from this, that the sacraments and rites which God instituted singularly for the high priest, a lower priest could and ought to perform in default of the high priest, as is clear from what has been said.[15]

longe minoris auctoritatis sunt tradiciones humane post dotacionem in istis adiecte, igitur multo magis ipsas sufficit supplere inferior sacerdos.

Now the human traditions added in these matters after the endowment are of far lesser authority; therefore much more does a lower priest suffice to supply them.

¶8 307.1–307.10
307.1 *All orders confer essentially the same powers.*
307.11 *Christ will not forbid a priest to fulfil the duties which he himself laid on the clergy.*

[307] Item, ut patet ex dictis et testimonio domini Ardmacani, omnes potestates ordinis sunt equales. nec minuitur eciam potestatis iurisdicionis execucio, nisi de quanto racionabiliter est restricta. Sed deficiente quocumque superiori pontifice et imminente necessitate ad aliquod necessarium sacerdotale ministerium, non superesset, qui racionabiliter ita restringeret, ergo de communi lege Dei liceret inferiori presbitero in casu posito perficere ministerium assignatum.

Again, as is clear from what has been said and from the testimony of the lord of Armagh, all powers of order are equal;[16] nor is even the execution of the power of jurisdiction diminished, except so far as it is reasonably restricted. Now, failing any superior pontiff whatever, and with necessity pressing for some needed priestly ministry, there would remain no one who could reasonably so restrict it; therefore by the common law of God it would be lawful for a lower presbyter in the case posited to perform the ministry assigned.

¶9 307.11–307.28

[307] Confirmatur tercio per hoc quod ex fide scripture Christus assisteret sue ecclesie usque ad finem seculi, sed irracionalis et increpandus foret; si exigeret a clero suo officium et assistente potestate presbiteri ad faciendum hoc impediret ipsum presbiterum; ad supplendum igitur ex plenitudine potestatis Christi simplex sacerdos in tali casu haberet potenciam ac sufficienciam ad ministerium tam necessarium dispensandum. Sic enim propter necessitatem baptismi sufficit laycus in defectu cleri baptizare. Sic eciam sufficit quicumque sacerdos simplex eque plene cum papa absolvere in mortis articulo, quare igitur non eque sufficit deficiente superiori prelato ineque necessario sacramento? Leges enim vel constituciones humane non obviant legi Dei nec sunt credende nisi de quanto consonant racioni.

It is confirmed thirdly by this, that from the faith of scripture Christ would stand by His church until the end of the world;[17] now He would be unreasonable and to be rebuked if He required the office from His clergy and, while the power of the presbyter stood by to do this, hindered that presbyter himself; therefore, to supply [the want], out of the plenitude of power of Christ, a simple priest in such a case would have the power and sufficiency to dispense so necessary a ministry.[18] For so, because of the necessity of baptism, a layman suffices to baptize in default of the clergy. So also any simple priest whatever suffices, as fully as the pope, to absolve at the point of death; why then does he not equally suffice, the superior prelate failing, for a sacrament not equally necessary?[19] For human laws or constitutions do not oppose the law of God, nor are they to be believed except so far as they accord with reason.

Notes

1. Rom. 8:28. Wyclif omits the Vulgate's *autem* ("And we know"); the rest is the Douay wording. Both manuscripts note in the margin here (303.4) *Prodesse dupliciter capitur*, "to profit is taken in two ways", and at 303.16 *Peccatum prodest ecclesie multum*.
2. "Happy fault" (*felix culpa*) is the Easter *Exsultet*, which Wyclif ascribes to Gregory; Augustine's saying on Peter's fall is *De civitate Dei* 14.13 ("I dare say that it is useful for the proud to fall into some open and manifest sin ... Peter was more wholesomely displeased with himself when he wept than pleased with himself when he presumed"), here paraphrased; Wyclif quotes it in full in *De ecclesia* p. 164. Loserth compares Wyclif's own *De ecclesia* p. 164, *Sermones* II 152 and *Opus evangelicum* III 198. The quotation bounds follow Loserth's italics, which run on through *ut exemplificat de Petro*.
3. *Color*: a plausible ground for an argument, as in "colour of title". The argument rejected is the defence of the endowment: if it profits the church, it may not be taken away.
4. The second *quia tunc* ("for then God ...") gives the reason why sins profit only by accident: without them God would still bring His church to its full predestined number. It could also be read as the absurd consequence of the preceding *quia aliter*. "The necessity of future things" is the scholastic topic of future contingents; Wyclif treats it at length in *De dominio divino* I.14–19, and a tract *De necessitate futurorum* is listed among his lost works; the place of this deduction has not been found. T. For *deductum* (303.26) the manuscripts read *reductum*; we translate the print.
5. *Sub non gradu*, "under no degree": every other merit profits the church not by a lesser degree than Christ's, since Christ's own profits it only finitely. The phrase is compressed and the construal is ours.

6. The semicolons are the print's. *Non* is taken to govern the conditional: the opponents' claim (another death would profit less) is denied, and *quia sic ...* gives the absurdity it entails. Alternatively *non* is elliptical ("not [taken at the time of most profit]"), with *si alias ... ecclesie* the opponents' claim restated. The italics at 304.16 ("all things that will come about ...") mark a stock formula of the debate on necessity.
7. *Quia penam et alia*, "because [it brings] punishment and other things": the sin brings the man a good (just punishment) by accident. *Quocumque tam malo*: "and any other thing as evil" withdrawn with it.
8. *signabilis*: CONTEXTUAL, "assignable" (any one could name); cf. the logical noun "signifiable".
9. The Master of the *Sentences*, Peter Lombard, on intention in merit (*Sent.* II d. 38–40, chiefly d. 40 c. 1: acts are good "which accompany a good cause and intention"); the image of the single eye is Wyclif's, not Lombard's; "singleness of the eye" is Matt. 6:22 (DR "If thy eye be single").
10. *Pro natura*: "for [human] nature", as much as a creature can do; the opposed view would require knowing the outcome. The colon marks the rejected argument as a quotation; Loserth does not italicise it. R. Loserth's side-note reads the passage as about disendowment.
11. No quotation: cf. Deut. 22:4 (the fallen ass or ox) and Luke 14:5 (DR "fall into a pit and will not immediately draw him out").
12. *Decretum* C. 5 q. 5 c. 2 *Non omnis* (form ours), from Augustine's letter to Vincentius (Ep. 93.2.4). Loserth gives no reference here. The canon reads "he who binds the frenzied and he who rouses the lethargic, troublesome to both, loves both"; the sword is Wyclif's paraphrase.
13. *Decretum* C. 23 q. 5 c. 8 *De occidendis* (Loserth "Cap. VIII", 306.4; modern form ours), from Augustine's letter to Publicola (Ep. 47.5): what we do for a good and lawful end is not imputed to us if harm follows against our will.
14. Both manuscripts note in the margin (306.19–23): *Sacerdos simplex deficiente papa cesario vel alio prelato*; B alone adds *potest sufficienter ministrare omnia sacramenta*, "can sufficiently minister all the sacraments".
15. The "high priest" (*summus sacerdos*) is the Aaronic priest of the old law, treated earlier in this chapter: at 275.1–276.23 Wyclif argues that the lower priest supplied the high priest's ministry when he was ill or unclean (cf. 265.18 ff.).
16. FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum*, XI.6 (Paris 1512; the passage Wyclif cited at 275.1 as 'end of ch. 5'), on the equality of the powers of order: every priest at ordination receives the whole sacramental power or none, and in the old law the power of order was equal in the high priest and the others; Loserth gives no place.
17. Matt. 28:20, not quoted: DR "behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world".
18. *Potencia* here is ordinary power (CONTEXTUAL row), set beside *potestas* in the same sentence; Wyclif does not distinguish them. The *si*-clause is compressed: Christ would be unreasonable to demand the office and hinder the priest whose power is there to perform it.
19. For *sufficit* (307.21–22) B reads *sufficiat*, without change of sense. Both manuscripts note here *Ministrare sacramenta deficiente papa quis potest*. *Ineque necessario*: "not equally necessary", that is, less necessary than absolution at death.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 303: *facit* (30 is the line number)
  - 304: ∅ (folio bar after Et (237ª in margin) read as i)
  - 304: *infert* (25 is the line number)
  - 306: ∅ (even is the English side note (We must obey Scripture even ...))
  - 306: *In*
  - 306: *et*
  - 306: *sed*
  - 306: *alio* (20 is the line number)
  - 307: *potestate* (15 is the line number)
  - 305: *fontaliter,* (one word, italic)
  - 307: *iurisdicionis* (one word)

Part 12: Lay baptism, the woman pope, and confession beyond necessity

Loserth pp. 307.29–311.33

¶1 307.29–308.14
308.2 *Wyclif refuses to follow opponents into the conclusions they draw from this.*
308.15 *Lay baptism is allowed because of its*

[307]Contra ista arguitur per hoc, quod iuxta hanc viam, sicut laycus sufficit baptizare sic et confirmare, conficere ac sacramenta quecumque alia ministrare. Quis igitur pro absolucione de percuciendo aut occidendo clericum adiret Romanum pontificem? Ad illud dictum est quod non sequitur. [308]cum racio diversitatis

Against these things it is argued, by appeal to this, that according to this way, just as a layman suffices to baptize, so also to confirm, to consecrate and to minister any other sacraments whatever. Who then, for absolution from striking or killing a cleric, would go to the Roman

necessity; other sacraments are less necessary.

sit necessarioritas baptismi supra alia sacramenta. Verumtamen subtiliantes in Dei potencia absoluta dicunt quod sicut Deus potest communicare nedum layco sed femine ac alii irracionali potenciam conficiendi ac ministrandi quelibet sacramenta, sic et ipsum potest ministrare huiusmodi sacramenta. Nec credo quod aliquis impugnabit illum articulum, quia cum multa absolute sunt necessaria, que est inefficax populo predicare; et grosse procedo in ista materia limitate loquendo de posse legali et Dei potencia ordinata, ideo dimitto scrutinium talium conclusionum detegens sentencias catholicas, quas credo prodesse ecclesie.

pontiff? To that the answer has been given that it does not follow, [8] since the reason for the difference is the greater necessity of baptism over the other sacraments.[1] Nevertheless those who refine upon God's absolute power say that, just as God can communicate, not only to a layman but to a woman and to another, irrational [creature], the power of consecrating and ministering any sacraments whatever, so it too can minister such sacraments.[2] Nor do I believe that anyone will impugn that article; because, since many things are absolutely necessary which it is ineffective to preach to the people, and I proceed coarsely in this matter, speaking within limits of legal possibility and of God's ordained power, I therefore leave aside the scrutiny of such conclusions, exposing the catholic teachings which I believe profit the church.[3]

¶2 308.15–309.27

309.8 *Story of pope Joan.*

[308] Videtur igitur michi quod licet et expedit in casu layco baptizare, et cum non sit de necessitate salutis cuiuscumque predestinati recipere corporaliter alia sacramenta, videtur michi quod non debet presumere ministrare alia sacramenta, et sic reservacio ac restriccio potestatis potest tam bene quam male fieri, sicut reus potest tam stulte quam pie adire Romanum pontificem pro absolucionis beneficio obtinendo. Et debet supponi, quod utrobique bene, nisi sit patens evidencia contradicens et specialiter superbia ac avaricia prelati et omnino utrimque preponderancia sacramenti. Videtur enim quod plus obesset monstruositas peccati in prescito masculo ad recipiendum vel ministrandum legittime quelibet sacramenta quam foret quantumcumque corporalis monstruositas vel distinccio sexus in femina predestinata et virtutibus perornata, sive ad recipiendum sive ministrandum quelibet sacramenta, et tamen in penam peccati multi de [309] generacione adultera sic phariseice seducuntur, quod preponderant signum visibile humanitus institutum signato invisibili quod Deus preponderat, ut in casu et facto Romane ecclesie, quod narrat Cestrensis cap. Ill libri V scilicet quod quedam femina sedit in papatu duobus annis et quinque mensibus post Leonem. Hec dicitur fuisse puella Agnes vocata nacione Moguntina, a suo amasio Athenis in habitu virili adducta, et Johannes Anglicus nominata que in diversis scienciis sic profecit, quod Romam veniens magnos magistros habens auditores trivium legit, demum in papam electa, per suum amasium impregnatur, et dum Lateranensem ecclesiam ab ecclesia Petri pergeret, angustiata pariendi doloribus, inter Collosseum et sanctum Clementem peperit, et postmodum ibi fuit mortua et sepulta. Et hinc dicitur papam hanc viam communiter obliquare, unde non ponitur in cathalogo paparum. In isto casu saltem possibili dicunt

It seems to me, therefore, that it is lawful and expedient for a layman to baptize in a [given] case; and since it is not of necessity of salvation for any predestinate [person] to receive the other sacraments bodily, it seems to me that he ought not to presume to minister the other sacraments.[4] And so the reservation and restriction of power can be done as well as badly, just as a guilty man can go to the Roman pontiff as foolishly as piously to obtain the benefit of absolution. And it ought to be supposed that [it is done] well on both sides, unless there is patent evidence to the contrary, and especially the pride and avarice of the prelate, and, on each side, the preponderance of the sacrament in every respect.[5] For it seems that the monstrousness of sin in a foreknown male would be more of an obstacle to receiving or ministering lawfully any sacraments whatever than would be any bodily monstrousness however great, or the distinction of sex in a predestinate woman adorned with virtues, whether for receiving or for ministering any sacraments whatever.[6] And yet, in punishment of sin, many of [9] an adulterous generation are so pharisaically led astray that they set the visible sign humanly instituted above the invisible thing signified, which God sets above it,[7] as in the case and deed of the Roman church which the Chester chronicler narrates in ch. 3 of book 5, namely that a certain woman sat in the papacy two years and five months after Leo.[8] She is said to have been a girl called Agnes, "of Mainz by nation, brought to Athens by her lover in man's dress, and named John the Englishman, who so advanced in diverse sciences that, coming to Rome and having great masters for her hearers, she lectured on the trivium; at length, elected pope, she is made pregnant by her lover, and while she was going from the church of Peter to the Lateran church, gripped by

leges hominum ipsam non fecisse actus papales nec fuisse electam legittime propter indisposicionem corporis, licet fuerit iam beata. Sed grave est hoc fundare vel fugere, quin generaliter desit eleccio quando eligitur inhabilis quoad Deum; unde angustiatur institucio humana describere verum papam.

the pains of childbirth, she gave birth between the Colosseum and Saint Clement's, and afterwards died there and was buried. And hence the pope is said commonly to turn aside from this road; and so she is not placed in the catalogue of popes."[9] In this case, possible at least, the laws of men say that she did not perform papal acts and was not lawfully elected, because of the unfitness of her body, even though she were already blessed. But it is hard to ground this, or to escape [the consequence] that election generally fails whenever one unqualified as regards God is elected; hence human institution is hard put to define the true pope.[10]

¶3 309.28–310.6
310.7 *Distinction between baptism and other sacraments.*
310.16 *Penitence.*
310.27 *Verbal confession not absolutely necessary.*

[309]Sed secundo obicitur per hoc, quod tam necessarium est sacramentum penitencie quam necessarium est sacramentum baptismi, sicut sacramentum ordinis est tam dignum vel dignius [310] utrobique; igitur sicut licet layco propter necessitatem sacramenti ministrare baptismum, sic et in casu necessitatis licet sibi ministrare alia sacramenta. Antecedens videtur ex hoc, quod nullum istorum sacramentorum est necessarium ad salutem nisi necessitate ex supposicione.

But secondly it is objected, by appeal to this, that the sacrament of penance is as necessary as the sacrament of baptism, just as the sacrament of order is as worthy or worthier [10] on both counts; therefore, just as it is lawful for a layman, because of the necessity of the sacrament, to minister baptism, so also in a case of necessity it is lawful for him to minister the other sacraments. The antecedent appears from this, that none of these sacraments is necessary to salvation except by necessity on supposition.

¶4 310.7–311.2
311.3 *Mischief of reserved absolution,*
311.19 *which is not made up for by accidental benefits.*

[310]Hic dicitur quod materia ista requirit fundabilem declaracionem sacramentorum cum suis passionibus. Ideo opportet leviter et breviter in istis transcurrere. Videtur enim quod baptismus habet maiorem auctoritatem scripture quam nostra penitencia humanitus circumstancionata. Unde videtur michi, quod sicut non est possibile peccatorem salvari nisi baptizetur baptismo flaminis, sic nec est possibile peccatorem salvari nisi mente peniteat; verumtamen videtur quod nulla scriptura obviat sed consonat, quod quantumcumque gravis peccator in fine contritus fuerit, et si nullum sacerdotem secum conversantem consuluerit aut peccata sua auriculariter ei ostenderit et dicendo verba humanitus inventa manum super caput penitentis imposuerit, non eo minus per absolucionem Christi quem opportet prius absolvere est vere de numero salvandorum, quia communiter in contricione precedenti peccatum deletur a Domino. Verumtamen meritorium atque legittimum est confiteri secundum formam iam currentem presbitero, sed preternecessarium quoad salvacionem, et licet posterius sufficiens et negligens confiteri proprio sacerdoti incurrit offensam Domini, tamen illa offensa per contricionem anime potest tolli, unde officium prelati foret ostendere libertatem Christi ecclesie et non [311]propter fastum aut questum subditos infundabiliter in servitutem redigere.

Here the answer is that this matter requires a well-founded declaration of the sacraments with their attributes. Therefore one must run over these things lightly and briefly. For it seems that baptism has greater authority of scripture than our penance with its humanly devised circumstances. Hence it seems to me that, just as it is not possible for a sinner to be saved unless he is baptized with the baptism of the Spirit, so neither is it possible for a sinner to be saved unless he repents in mind;[11] nevertheless it seems that no scripture opposes, but accords with this: that however grave a sinner, if he is contrite at the end, even if he has not consulted any priest living with him, nor shown him his sins in the ear, nor has [the priest], saying words humanly invented, laid his hand upon the head of the penitent, he is none the less, through the absolution of Christ, who must absolve first, truly of the number of those to be saved; for commonly in the preceding contrition the sin is blotted out by the Lord.[12] Nevertheless it is meritorious and lawful to confess to a presbyter according to the form now current, but beyond necessity as regards salvation; and although one who is afterwards able, and neglects to confess to his own priest, incurs the Lord's offence, yet that offence can be removed by contrition of soul;[13] hence the office of the prelate would

be to show the church the freedom of Christ, and not, [11]for pomp or gain, to reduce subjects without foundation into servitude.

¶5 311.3–311.33

[311]Unde soleo dicere frequenter in ista materia, quod talia possunt bene fieri, sed si bene fiunt, trepido vel non dico. Et quando queritur si oportet sic fieri, detego libertates ecclesie. Unde credunt multi quod reservantes absoluciones ab excomunicacione, ab alio crimine vel alia censura imposita stulte sepe imponitur ad gravamen ecclesie, ut licet homo possit meritorie petere Romanam curiam, et talis ordinacio per accidens prosit multis, faciens eos timidos ad peccandum, verumtamen communius sapit peccatum in prelato et sollicitudinem preternecessariam in subdito. Sic quod melius foret multis domi satisfaciendo conteri, et quicumque dixerit quod cum hoc non potest salvari propter obedienciam faciendam ordinacioni prepositi, negando libertatem ecclesie transgreditur legem Dei. In votis quidem et obligacionibus stulte factis oportet penitere de stulticia et spiritum consilii flagitare. Unde videtur illis quod non est color concludere quod tale decretum reservandi est licitum, si subiectis timorem incutit ad peccandum; omne enim malum per accidens facit bonum, unde timor filialis debet incuti per sanctam predicacionem prelati, et non timor servilis iudicii per exaccionem prelati cesarei. Et sic videtur michi, quod in quocumque casu christianus non debet accipere dicta sacramenta a layco, cum hoc foret christianismum serviliter altrinsecus onerare. Dignitas autem sacramentorum pensanda consistit in dignitate rei, sacramenti et sua efficacia.

Hence I am accustomed to say often in this matter that such things can be done well; but whether they are done well, I tremble, or do not say. And when it is asked whether it must be done so, I expose the liberties of the church. Hence many believe that those reserving absolutions from excommunication, from another crime or from another censure imposed, often impose it foolishly, to the burden of the church;[14] so that, although a man may meritoriously make for the Roman curia, and such an ordinance may by accident profit many, making them fearful of sinning, nevertheless it more commonly savours of sin in the prelate and of a care beyond necessity in the subject. So that it would be better for many to be contrite at home, making satisfaction; and whoever says that with this he cannot be saved, because of the obedience to be paid to the ordinance of a superior, by denying the liberty of the church transgresses the law of God.[15] In vows indeed and obligations foolishly made, one must repent of the folly and beg for the spirit of counsel. Hence it seems to them that there is no colour for inferring that such a decree of reservation is lawful if it strikes fear of sinning into the subjects; for every evil makes good by accident;[16] hence filial fear ought to be struck by the holy preaching of the prelate, and not the servile fear of judgement by the exaction of a caesarean prelate.[17] And so it seems to me that in no case whatever ought a Christian to receive the said sacraments from a layman, since this would be to burden Christianity servilely from the other side. And the dignity of the sacraments, as it is to be weighed, consists in the dignity of the reality, of the sacrament, and its efficacy.[18]

Notes

1. *Necessarioritas*, a non-classical comparative abstract: "greater necessity". The print's full stop after *sequitur* (307.33) interrupts a single sentence; we run it on.
2. *Ipsum* we take as the irrational creature (*alii irracionali*): it too could then minister. It could also be read as God Himself ministering the sacraments, but *et ipsum* answers to the creature just named. G. *Subtiliare*: "refine", argue subtly (CONTEXTUAL row).
3. The *quia cum* clause governs both members (*multa ... predicare* and *grosse procedo ...*), and *ideo dimitto* is its main verb. "God's ordained power" (*potencia ordinata*) is the scholastic pair of *potencia absoluta*. The marginal note in B at 308.13, *Baptizare si potest laicus*, marks the question.
4. The subject of *non debet presumere* is the layman of the preceding clause.
5. The final member (*et omnino utrimque preponderancia sacramenti*) is loosely attached; we take it as a further thing that may tell against the presumption of right dealing on either side: the sacrament overweighted. The construal is uncertain.
6. A notes in the margin at 308.27 *Cave heresim*, "beware heresy": the A copyist's reader objects to the claim about a predestinate woman.
7. "Adulterous generation" echoes Matt. 12:39 (DR "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign"), not quoted.
8. Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon*; Loserth refers the story to vol. 6, pp. 330–352 (so printed; the Rolls Series edition, where the tale stands at V, 32, pp. 330–32; cf. 11-c n3). The A margin corrects the chapter: "it is not ch. 3 but 32", rightly (V, 32).

9. The quotation bounds follow Loserth's italics, which begin at "of Mainz by nation" and run to "the catalogue of popes", the clause on the pope's detour included. R. Hus took this story from *De potestate pape* (Loserth: Hus, *Opera* I, 220a). A notes in the margin at 309.5 that Wyclif "here contradicts himself", having spoken otherwise of this woman earlier in the chapter; both manuscripts note at 309.8 *Mulier papa Agnes*.
10. *Hoc fundare vel fugere, quin ...*: "to ground this [legal position], or to avoid [admitting] that ...". If bodily unfitness voids the election, so should unfitness before God, and then human law cannot say who the true pope is. T. For *fuerit* (309.23) B reads *fuit*; no change of sense.
11. Both manuscripts note at 310.12 *Baptismus flaminis est necessarius ad salutem*. T. For *mente* (310.16) B reads *mentem*; we translate the print.
12. *Et si* is concessive ("even if"); the three negated acts are consultation, auricular confession, and the priest's laying-on of hands with the formula. *Quem opportet prius absolvere*: Christ must absolve before any priest can.
13. *Posterius sufficiens*: one who afterwards has the means or opportunity to confess. R. Both manuscripts note at 310.26 *Confessio auricularis est meritoria*.
14. The Latin does not construe as printed: *reservantes* (plural participle) has no verb, and *imponitur* has no expressed subject. We take the sense to be that the reserving prelates impose the reservation foolishly. See also the next note.
15. Loserth's foot at 311.18 reads *Recte: et negando* (plate): "and denying". The sense is the same either way, and we translate the print. Both manuscripts note at 311.11 *Romam adire pro peccato*, and at 311.19 *Votum stulte factum deletur per penitenciam*.
16. The sentence turns the reserving prelates' argument: that fear of sinning is a good proves nothing, since any evil produces some good by accident (cf. 11-k).
17. For *iudicii* (311.27) the manuscripts read *iudici*, "of the judge"; we translate the print, "servile fear of judgement".
18. *Rei, sacramenti* may be the single phrase *res sacramenti*, "the reality of the sacrament", with the print's comma dividing it; we keep the comma and render three items.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 308: *conficiendi* (5 is the line number)
  - 308: *Nec*
  - 308: *illum*
  - 309: *Collosseum* (hyphenated Col-|losseum (italic); main token holds the whole word)
  - 310: *illa*

Part 13: All the holy are priests; the two orders of the apostles

Loserth pp. 312.1–316.23

¶1 312.1–312.7
312.1 *It is objected that orders would be done away with.*
312.8 *This we deny.*
312.23 *It is not proved that Joan's acts as pope were invalid,*

[312] Tercio obicitur per hoc, quod iuxta hic dicta nec oportet esse sacerdotes, nec oportet sacramentum ordinis iterari factum per unum non episcopum sed simplicem sacerdotem; et sic peccarent sacerdotes benedicendo aliquem, clericorum ordinem omittendo et subiectos ultra debitum onerando.

Thirdly it is objected, by appeal to this, that according to what is said here there need be no priests, nor need the sacrament of order be repeated when it is conferred by one who is not a bishop but a simple priest; and so priests would sin in blessing anyone, omitting the order of clerics and burdening subjects beyond what is owed.[1]

¶2 312.8–312.21

[312] Hic dicitur negando primam consequenciam, cum oportet esse Christum et suos apostolos, ymo omnes sacerdotes sacramentales et devotum populum. Scribit enim Augustinus XX de civitate Dei, capitulo XII super illo, quod dicit propheta Apoc. XX 4: Sederunt sacerdotes Dei et Christi et regnabunt cum ipso mille annis; non utique de solis episcopis et presbiteris dictum est, qui proprie iam vocantur in ecclesia sacerdotes, sed sicut omnes christianos dicimus propter misticum carisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, quoniam membra sunt unius sacerdotis, de quibus apostolus Petrus ait: Plebs sancta, regale sacerdocium. Et idem dicit Crysostomus Omelia XL in Imperfecto.

Here the answer is by denying the first inference, since there must be Christ and His apostles, indeed all sacramental priests and the devout people. For Augustine writes in book 20 of *The City of God*, chapter 12, on what the prophet says in Apoc. 20:4: "'Priests of God and of Christ sat, and they shall reign with him a thousand years': this is surely not said of bishops and presbyters alone, who are now properly called priests in the church; but as we call all [men] Christians because of the mystical chrism, so [we call] all priests, since they are members of the one priest; of whom the apostle Peter says: 'A holy people, a kingly priesthood.'"[2] And Chrysostom says the same in the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 40.[3]

¶3 312.23–312.26

[312]**Ex istis patet, primo quod femina est sacerdos, et (sic ut dictum est) non probabitur ex iure canonico vel civili quod supradicta femina non sit papa vel quod non valeant opera eius papalia.**

From these it is clear, first, that a woman is a priest; and (thus, as has been said) it will not be proved from canon or civil law that the woman mentioned above is not pope, or that her papal works are not valid.[4]

¶4 312.27–314.29
313.9 *The sacraments would remain if there were no pope.*
313.19 *It would be good to get rid of the many bishops of Nowhere.*
313.26 *Sham priests and bishops.*
314.14 *Ordination by a simple priest may be sufficient.*

[312]**Patet secundo ex dictis quod sicut omnes sancti viri et femine membra Christi sunt sacerdotes, quia sacramentum dantes ex vi communionis sanctorum, sic solum predestinati sunt membra Christi vel pars sancte matris ecclesie et** [313]**proprie christiani, ut pulcre docet Crysostomus in Imperfecto Omelia XIX: Solum enim continuatos corpori Christi dicit esse christianos; cum itaque omnia que evenient de necessitate evenient, patet quod necesse est esse hos sacerdotes triplices eciam sacerdotes Baal. Sed quantum ad intentum conceditur quod sine quocumque sacerdote cesareo ecclesia posset viare prosperius quam nunc viat. Ideo non credamus eis, qui iurant quod nisi iste episcopus foret papa, perirent omnia ecclesiastica sacramenta; starent enim melius quam modo, licet non foret aliquis papa cesareus, cum post diem iudicii manebit corpus Christi, et sic sacramentum et res sacramenti, cessantibus aliis onerosis ritibus cum istis viancium sacramentis. Quantum ad secundam difficultatem, credo quod sepe peccant tam ordinantes clericos quam ipsi clerici, quam eciam populares; qui enim vadunt ad curiam Romanam, ut sint episcopi eciam Nullatenses, sed vivendo vitam suffraganeam prelati cesarei, ordinant clericos, benedicunt ecclesias et vivunt seorsum vitam lautam, laborantes propter commodum temporale, peccant graviter et sunt multi apostate. Sed gravius peccant, qui prava intencione menciuntur se esse a papa ad hoc officium deputatos. Gravissime autem qui prava intencione menciuntur in talia, dum tamen non sint infra sacros ordines ecclesiastice constituti. Et correspondenter peccant clerici ordinati, dum tamen manserint in eis; apud Deum humilitas non obest, sed consonat quod per simplices sacerdotes presumentes et sic ordinando peccantes sint legittime ordinati.** [314]**Unde notando peccata sic ordinancium et dicta sanctorum de symonia episcopi ordinantis pauci vel nulli forent clerici a prelato cesareo ordinati. Ideo non debemus timere de talibus, dum secundum puram conscienciam de iustis operibus observamus ordinem clericalem, quia tunc Deus supplet vicem episcopi et omnia que sequuntur ex istis sunt intrepide concedenda, ut confessum in gravi infirmitate de peccato pro quo sedes apostolica foret petenda, dum contritus fuerit et satisfaciens convalescens non oportet petere Romanam curiam vel prelatum supra simplicem sacerdotem. Et iterum ordinatum per unum sacerdotem simplicem non oportet timere de presbiteratu**

It is clear, secondly, from what has been said, that just as all holy men and women, members of Christ, are priests, because they give a sacrament by virtue of the communion of saints, so only the predestinate are members of Christ, or part of holy mother church, and [13]**properly Christians, as Chrysostom finely teaches in the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 19: for he says that "only those joined to the body of Christ are Christians".**[5] **Since, then, all things that will come about will come about of necessity, it is clear that these threefold priests must exist, even priests of Baal.**[6] **But as to the point at issue, it is granted that without any caesarean priest whatever the church could be a wayfarer more prosperously than it now is.**[7] **Therefore let us not believe those who swear that unless this bishop were pope all the ecclesiastical sacraments would perish; for they would stand better than now, even if there were no caesarean pope, since after the day of judgement the body of Christ will remain, and so the sacrament and the reality of the sacrament, the other burdensome rites ceasing together with these sacraments of those on the road.**[8] **As to the second difficulty, I believe that often both those who ordain clerics sin, and the clerics themselves, and the people as well; for those who go to the Roman curia so as to be bishops, even bishops "of Nowhere", but, living the suffragan life of a caesarean prelate, ordain clerics, bless churches, and live apart a luxurious life, labouring for temporal advantage, sin gravely, and many are apostates.**[9] **But they sin more gravely who with wicked intention lie that they have been deputed by the pope to this office. And most gravely those who with wicked intention falsely take on such things, while they are not established within the holy orders of the church. And correspondingly the clerics so ordained sin, while they remain in them; with God humility does no harm, but it accords [with reason] that those [ordained] by simple priests who presume, and so sin in ordaining, are lawfully ordained.**[10] [14]**Hence, noting the sins of those who so ordain, and the sayings of the saints on the simony of the ordaining bishop, few or no clerics would be ordained by a caesarean prelate.**[11] **Therefore we ought not to fear about such things, so long as, according to a pure conscience about just works, we keep the clerical order; for then God supplies the place of the bishop, and all things that follow from these are to be granted**

vel alias ordinari, dum tamen rite fecerit officium clericale, quia sufficit prudens reputacio cum diligenti officio. Deus enim tunc supplet, quia aliter quilibet recipiens sacramentum de suo preposito fluctuaret. Nec convenit aliquem presumere quod immediate recipit ordinem sacerdotalem a Deo, sicut fecerunt Moyses et apostoli, licet concedi debeat, quod taliter potest esse, quia sine revelacione sic presumere foret stulticia scandalosa; ymo videtur quod homo pocius pateretur symoniam prepositi, dicens tamen ordinanti periculum qui sic mercatur cum ministerio sacramenti, quam temere confideret in insensibili Dei ordinacione mundo abscondita.

fearlessly: as that one who has confessed in grave infirmity a sin for which the apostolic see would have to be sought, provided he was contrite and making satisfaction, need not, on recovering, seek the Roman curia or a prelate above a simple priest. And again, one ordained by a single simple priest need not fear about his presbyterate, or be ordained otherwise, provided he has duly performed the clerical office, for prudent estimation with diligent office suffices. For God then supplies, because otherwise anyone receiving a sacrament would be wavering about his superior. Nor is it fitting for anyone to presume that he receives the priestly order immediately from God, as Moses and the apostles did, although it must be granted that it can be so; for without revelation so to presume would be a scandalous folly; indeed it seems that a man should rather suffer the simony of the superior, telling the ordainer, however, the danger [to one] who so trades with the ministry of a sacrament, than rashly trust in an imperceptible ordination of God hidden from the world.[12]

¶5 314.30–315.5
315.1 *In apostolic times there were only two orders: priests and deacons.*
315.9 *A good christian has all orders.*
315.28 *Friars get bishoprics with bad results.*

[314] In istis tamen illusionibus prelatorum propter manifestam et onerosam multitudinem inconveniencium oportet divinam iusticiam ipsas detegere et errores modo absconditos tempore suo destruere. Modo enim servatur ut evangelium, [315] quod sint quinque ordines celebrati; in tempore autem apostoli non erant nisi duo ordines ad ordinacionem ecclesie, scilicet dyaconus et sacerdos, ut patet legenti epistolas Pauli, et meminit archidyaconus cum sanctis doctoribus.

Yet in these illusions of prelates, because of the manifest and burdensome multitude of ill consequences, divine justice must expose them and in its time destroy the errors now hidden.[13] For now it is kept as gospel [15] that there are five orders celebrated; but in the time of the apostle there were only two orders for the ordinance of the church, namely deacon and priest, as is clear to one who reads the epistles of Paul, and the Archdeacon recalls it, with the holy doctors.[14]

¶6 315.6–315.27

[315] Ex veteri vero et novo testamento debent esse septem ordines, ideo eleccio quinarii medii videtur figurare fidelibus quod primus numerus superbus scilicet quinarius facit nostros prepositos taliter variare. Sicut enim omnis christianus et specialiter bonus presbiter est sacerdos, sic est spiritualiter hostiarius, ceroferarius, lector, exorcista, subdyaconus, dyaconus et sacerdos, ut alias diffuse exposui. Et sic videtur quod ecclesia posset viare facilius, contenta de duobus ordinibus, in quibus residua spiritualiter includuntur. Nec obest, quod Augustinus dicit in libello suo De Heresibus, quod Heriani ab Herio quodam sunt dicti, qui, cum esset presbiter, doluit fortiter quod episcopus non potuit ordinari, et in Arrianorum heresim lapsus propria queque doctrinata addidisse, nonnulla dicens offerri pro dormientibus non oportere, nec statuta sollempniter celebranda esse ieiunia, sed cum quibus voluerit esse ieiunandum, ne videatur esse sub lege. Dicebat eciam presbiterum ab episcopo nulla differencia debere discerni.

But from the old and new testament there ought to be seven orders; therefore the choice of the middle five seems to signify to the faithful that the first proud number, namely five, makes our superiors vary in this way.[15] For just as every Christian, and especially a good presbyter, is a priest, so he is spiritually doorkeeper, taper-bearer, lector, exorcist, subdeacon, deacon and priest, as I have expounded at length elsewhere.[16] And so it seems that the church could journey more easily, content with two orders, in which the rest are spiritually included. Nor is it an obstacle that Augustine says in his little book *On Heresies* that "the Herians are named from a certain Herius, who, when he was a presbyter, grieved greatly that he could not be ordained bishop, and, having fallen into the heresy of the Arians, [is said] to have added certain doctrines of his own, saying that one ought not to offer for the sleeping, nor that the appointed fasts should be solemnly kept, but that one should fast whenever one will,

¶7 315.28–316.23
316.16 *Jerome's witness that bishop and priest were the same.*

[315]In capitulo Herrii videntur michi esse Fratres, qui sumptuose, laboriose et periculose aquirunt episcopatus officia, ut seculariter voluptuose et ociose dimissa prius commendata obediencia conversentur. Non enim sonat directe ad utilitatem ecclesie vel religionis augmentum quod sic vivunt, quia per idem quilibet frater aptus ad regimen [316]sic dissolveret claustrale vinculum. Sed iuxta principia fidei dimitteret dotacionem et conversacionem cesaream proficiendo subiectis episcopaliter, sicut fecerunt apostoli. Hoc enim plus congrueret professioni sue primeve. Sed iste sanctus dicit quod Herius doluit, quod episcopus non potuit ordinari, quia noluit esse sub lege; et sic incidit in istum errorem, quod presbiterum simplicem et episcopum non oportet discrimen per potestatem iurisdicionis atque scienciam, quia tunc iste Herius propter inhabilitatem ad officium episcopale pateretur repulsam. Sed absit logicum istud credere illud dictum Augustini repugnare decreto Jeronymi: Quod olim idem fuit episcopus et sacerdos, olim enim erant pauci episcopi atque ydonei, qui seclusi a seculo non propter mundum, sed propter Deum et amorem ecclesie curam pastoralis officii perfecerunt; et sic error esset hodie negare presbiterum ab episcopo nulla differencia discerni, cum multi presbiteri instructi in lege Domini vivunt sancte, et multi episcopi ignari legis Dei vivunt contrarie. Ideo necesse est esse differenciam sacerdotum.

lest one seem to be under the law. He said also that a presbyter ought to be distinguished from a bishop by no difference."[17]

Under the heading of Herius, it seems to me, are the friars, who sumptuously, laboriously and dangerously acquire the offices of bishoprics, so that, having first abandoned the obedience committed to them, they may live in a worldly, voluptuous and idle way.[18] For that they live so does not tend directly to the usefulness of the church or the increase of religion; for by the same token any friar fit for rule [16] would so dissolve the cloistral bond. But according to the principles of faith he would give up the endowment and the caesarean manner of life, profiting his subjects in the manner of a bishop, as the apostles did. For this would better suit his first profession. But that saint says that Herius grieved that he could not be ordained bishop, because he would not be under the law; and so he fell into this error, that a simple presbyter and a bishop need not be distinguished by the power of jurisdiction and by knowledge; for then this Herius, because of his lack of qualification for the episcopal office, would suffer rejection.[19] But far be it from a logician to believe that saying of Augustine to be incompatible with the decree of Jerome, "that once bishop and priest were the same";[20] for once there were few bishops, and suitable ones, who, secluded from the world, not for the world's sake but for God's and for love of the church, carried out the care of the pastoral office; and so it would be an error today to deny that a presbyter is distinguished from a bishop by no difference, since many presbyters instructed in the law of the Lord live holily, and many bishops ignorant of the law of God live the contrary way.[21] Therefore there must be a difference among priests.

Notes

1. The objection draws three consequences from the lay-baptism argument of 11-k and 11-l: priests are unnecessary; an ordination by a simple priest need not be repeated; and priests who bless (ordain) under the present rite sin by burdening their subjects. *Benedicendo aliquem*: blessing anyone into orders. A notes in the margin *Tercio arguitur*.
2. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 20.10; Wyclif says ch. 12, Loserth gives ch. 10 (Opp. VII, 588; PL 41, 676), rightly. The verse is Augustine's form: the Vulgate has "sat upon them" at Apoc. 20:4 and "they shall be priests of God and of Christ: and shall reign with him a thousand years" at 20:6 (DR). Peter's words are 1 Pet. 2:9 in Augustine's wording (DR "a kingly priesthood, a holy nation"). T. *Carisma* (312.16) is the print's spelling; Augustine's word is *chrisma*, chrism, on which the name "Christians" turns, so we render "chrism".
3. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 40, on the two sons (Matt. 21:28–32), PG 56, 852: the penitent layman "on the day of judgement will receive the priestly stole and be anointed by God with chrism into the priesthood, but the sinful priest will be stripped of the dignity of the priesthood" (*laicus ... in die judicii stolam sacerdotalem accipiet, et a Deo chrismate ungetur in sacerdotium*). Loserth cites Chrysostom, Opp. VI, 856.
4. "The woman mentioned above" is the woman pope of 11-l (309). R. Both manuscripts note at 312.23 *Femina sacerdos papa*. The OCR's *lure* (312.24) is the print's *iure*.
5. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum*, hom. 19; Loserth "pag. 706 seqq." (313.2); PG 56, 739–40, where only those who hold Christ's truth, not merely his name, are true Christians; Wyclif summarises. The quotation bounds follow Loserth's italics, which leave *Solum enim* outside. Both manuscripts note at 312.8 *Omnes sancti christiani sunt sacerdotes*.

6. ***Hos sacerdotes triplices***: we take the three kinds as the sacramental priests, the holy who are priests as members of Christ, and the priests of Baal (the reprobate clergy); the text does not enumerate them.
7. ***Viare*** "to be a wayfarer" (the verb of ***viator***); at 315.13 the same verb is "journey" where "be a wayfarer more easily" would not read. C. ***Sacerdos cesareus***: "caesarean priest", of the endowed clergy (glossary: ***prelatus / sacerdos cesarius***).
8. ***Iste episcopus***: "this bishop", one particular claimant to the papacy, unnamed. The sacrament that remains after judgement is the body of Christ as ***res sacramenti***, the reality, the church itself; the sacraments of those on the road cease with the other rites.
9. B notes in the margin at 313.31 ***Vadentes curiam Romanam pro sacerdocio***; A at 313.32 ***Cave***, "beware", and both at 313.29 ***Nota hic***.
10. The print's semicolon after ***in eis*** divides the clause; ***in eis*** may refer to the orders or to the sins. ***Consonat***: we supply "with reason". ***Menciuntur in talia***: "lie [their way] into such things", that is, falsely take on episcopal acts.
11. The sense: if the simony of ordaining bishops voided orders, hardly any cleric ordained by a caesarean prelate would be ordained at all. R. A notes at 314.4 ***Cave foveam***, "beware the pit".
12. ***Pateretur symoniam prepositi***: a man should rather submit to the simoniac superior's ordination, warning him of his danger, than claim an ordination direct from God. ***Dicens tamen ordinanti periculum qui sic mercatur***: "telling the ordainer the danger [of one] who so trades"; the relative ***qui*** refers to the ordainer.
13. ***Inconveniencia*** (CONTEXTUAL): here the burdensome ill consequences in the church's affairs, not absurdities in argument.
14. The Archdeacon is Guido de Baysio, the canonist (***Rosarium*** on the ***Decretum***); Wyclif gives no place. The likeliest is the ***Rosarium*** on D. 93 c. 24 ***Legimus*** (Venice 1481, fol. image 222), where bishop and presbyter are one order in the early church: after Huguccio, "from the beginning there was a difference ... but as to the name there was none", and after Laurentius, ***ante enim episcopus et presbyter idem erant etiam quo ad sacra***, "for before, bishop and presbyter were the same even as to the sacred [rites]". His gloss on D. 60 c. 4 (Urban II on the two sacred orders) says nothing to the point. R. B notes at 314.34 ***Ordines clericorum quinque***.
15. ***Quinarius medius***: the five middle orders between the two extreme ones, taking seven in all. ***Primus numerus superbus***: five, perhaps as the first "proud" (abundant?) number; the arithmetic sense is uncertain, and the construal is ours.
16. "Elsewhere": a reference to Wyclif's own works, not identified; cf. ***De ecclesia*** c. 21 (p. 510), on the seven orders, and ***De civili dominio*** II.8 (pp. 73–74), on Christ exercising each of them. R. A notes at 315.18 ***Nota et tene***.
17. Augustine, ***De haeresibus*** 53, on Aerius; Loserth: "Aeriani ab Aerio etc. Aug. Opp. tom. VIII, 18" (PL 42, 39–40). Wyclif spells the name ***Herius***; we keep his spelling. T. Augustine's text reads ***doluisse fertur ... addidisse***: the print's ***doluit fortiter*** leaves ***addidisse*** without a governing verb, so we supply "[is said]". ***Doctrinata*** stands for Augustine's ***dogmata***; the print's ***cum quibus voluerit*** ("with those with whom one will") is a corruption of Augustine's ***cum quisque voluerit***, and the English follows Augustine: "whenever one will" (our emendation). "The sleeping" (***dormientibus***) are the dead.
18. ***In capitulo Herrii***: "under the heading of Herius", the friar-bishops belong to the same class as Aerius, who sought a bishopric. ***Commendata obediencia***: the obedience of the order committed to them.
19. ***Quia noluit esse sub lege*** is Wyclif's gloss on Augustine's "lest he seem to be under the law". ***Non oportet discrimen***: there need be no difference between presbyter and bishop. The ***quia tunc*** clause gives Aerius's motive: if there were such a difference, his unfitness would have barred him. T. At 316.16 Loserth's apparatus reports a variant ***qui*** / B ***quia***; its place in the line is unclear.
20. ***Decretum*** D. 95 c. 5 (Loserth "Decreti Prima Pars, Dist. XCV, cap. V"; form ours), from Jerome on Titus 1; the canon begins ***Olim idem erat presbyter, qui et episcopus***.
21. The double negative is the print's: to deny that there is no difference between presbyter and bishop would be an error today, because now the difference often runs in the presbyter's favour. Wyclif turns Aerius's thesis on its head rather than adopting it.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 312: ***Hic***
  - 312: ***Et*** (20 is the line number)
  - 313: ***intencione*** [NW]
  - 314: ***prelato***
  - 314: ∅ (by is the English side note (Ordination by a simple priest))
  - 314: ***Et***
  - 315: ***esse*** (25 is the line number)
  - 315: ***videatur***
  - 316: ***claustrale***
  - 313: ***eis,*** (print = printed; side-note word adjacent)
  - 315: ***specialiter*** (box misplaced on variare; word is speci-|aliter with folio bar)
  - 315: ***doctrinata*** (LEFT-nw: hyphenated doctri-|nata)
  - 316: ***Herius*** (capital H, italic)
  - 316: ***Herius*** (LEFT-nw: capital H)

Chapter 12

Part 1: The church can do without a caesarean pope

Loserth pp. 316.25–320.21

¶1 316.25–317.3
316.25 *Extravagant notions as to the need for an endowed pope.*
317.1 *It is said that without one secular government would fall,*
317.11 *Both church and state, would be the better,*
317.17 *and more conformed to the law of God,*
317.25 *of the Church.*

[316] **Adhuc restat dubitandum quomodo posset deesse papa cesareus, cum necesse sit esse unum caput ad causas ecclesiasticas terminandum, ad beneficia ecclesiastica parciendum et ad privilegia concedendum; unde ad tantum cecati sunt seculares valde subtiles in ista argucia, quod** [317] **putant cum clero infatuante dominos, quod non staret sine ordine huius cleri cesarei dominium seculare.**

It still remains to be doubted how a caesarean pope could be lacking, since there must be one head for determining ecclesiastical cases, for distributing ecclesiastical benefices and for granting privileges; hence the seculars, very subtle in this quibble, are blinded to such a degree that [317] **they think, with the clergy who make fools of the lords, that secular lordship would not stand without the order of this caesarean clergy.**[1]

¶2 317.4–317.16

[317] **Sed ambos istos simul convinco tripliciter, primo in hoc quod perfecte stetit ecclesia cum seculari dominio trecentis annis post ascensionem Christi et amplius, quando non fuit talis ceca et venenosa dotacio. Si igitur tunc crevit utrumque istorum membrorum ecclesie, et post decrevit, eciam quousque utrumque istorum capitum reliquum destruxerit ad non gradum, quomodo non est evidens, quod utramque istarum parcium foret viare plus prospere quoad Deum et homines reducta ad ordinem ecclesie quem Christus instituit, quam sit irreligiose commixta in ritibus ex auctoritate cesarea.**

But I refute both of these together in three ways: first, in that the church stood perfectly, together with secular lordship, for three hundred years and more after Christ's ascension, when there was no such blind and poisonous endowment. If, then, each of these members of the church grew at that time, and afterwards declined, even until each of these heads should destroy the other to the point of nothing, how is it not evident that each of these parts would fare on its way more prosperously, as regards God and men, brought back to the order of the church which Christ instituted, than it does now, irreligiously mingled in rites by caesarean authority.[2]

¶3 317.17–317.22

[317] **Quod potest confirmari ex lege Dei, ex lege ecclesie et lege cesarea. Ex lege Dei, quia tunc viveret clerus uterque lege Dei placencius, sibi utilius, Christo ac apostolis suis conformius. Quomodo igitur non haberet Deum exinde magis propicium?**

This can be confirmed from the law of God, from the law of the church, and from caesarean law. From the law of God, because then the clergy on either side would live more pleasingly by the law of God, more profitably to itself, more conformably to Christ and his apostles.[3] **How, then, would it not have God more favourable to it on that account?**

¶4 317.23–317.34

[317] **Ex lege ecclesie patet idem cum distinccione XCV: Olim ex decreto Jeronymi docentur quomodo ecclesia regulabatur ante dotacionem, eciam in tempore apostolorum communi consilio sacerdotum, et postmodum instigacione dyaboli facta est divisio constituendo capitaneos secundum dignitatem mundanam, captam fallaciter ex preeminencia apostolorum, a quibus instrumentaliter sunt conversi,**

From the law of the church the same is clear, with distinction 95, *Olim*: from the decree of Jerome men are taught how the church was ruled before the endowment, even in the time of the apostles, by the common counsel of the priests, and how afterwards, at the instigation of the devil, a division was made by setting up captains according to worldly dignity,

ut tangit Apostolus prima Cor. I et III. Quare igitur non foret perfeccius stare in statu primevo, quem Christus instituit quam in statu extraneo qui instinctu dyaboli inolevit?

taken fallaciously from the preeminence of the apostles, by whom, as instruments, they had been converted, as the Apostle touches on in 1 Corinthians 1 and 3.[4] Why, then, would it not be more perfect to stand in the first state, which Christ instituted, than in a foreign state which grew up at the devil's prompting?

¶5 318.1–318.26
318.2 *and civil law.*
318.9 *Civil rule existed before the popes were endowed,*
318.31 *We must distinguish between Caesarean prelates*

[318] Et quantum ad legem civilem, patet quod imperator sicut et quilibet civilis dominus tenetur defendere suum dominium seculare vel mutare in melius, sed in solucione ordinis cleri Christo deterioratur utraque pars saltem in spiritualibus quoad Deum, igitur repugnat principiis legis humane talis prepositi spiritualis mundana dotacio. Item, prius tempore et natura est secularis dominacio quam talis cleri dotacio, ut docet Crysostomus In Imperfecto Omelia XXXIV, sed omne sic prius potest esse tali posteriori subducto, igitur possibile est ecclesiam viare prospere sine tali capitaneo. Mirum itaque foret, quod ita fuit de facto ex ordinacione divina, et cum modo non potest sic esse propter ordinacionem cesaream, sic quod ordinacionem Christi licet extinguere, sed ordinacio cesaris non potest deficere stante prosperitate ecclesie. Inconsequenter igitur loquuntur qui dicunt quod ecclesia potest prospere procedere sine Romano imperio adiuvante, ut patuit in primitiva ecclesia, et patet hodie de multis christianis, exemtis ab illo imperio infirmato, sed non potest stare sine suo episcopo vel ab eo collato privilegio. Numquid fumus est maioris constancie quam ignis?

And as to the civil law, it is clear that the emperor, like any civil lord, is bound to defend his secular lordship or to change it for the better; now in the loosening of the clergy's order to Christ each part is made worse, at least in spiritual things as regards God; therefore such worldly endowment of a spiritual superior is incompatible with the principles of human law.[5] Again, the secular exercise of lordship is prior in time and nature to such endowment of the clergy, as Chrysostom teaches in the *Opus imperfectum*, homily 34;[6] now everything so prior can exist with such a posterior thing withdrawn; therefore it is possible for the church to fare prosperously on its way without such a captain. It would therefore be a wonder that it was so in fact by divine ordinance, while now it cannot be so because of the caesarean ordinance, so that it is lawful to extinguish Christ's ordinance, but Caesar's ordinance cannot fail while the church's prosperity stands. Those, therefore, speak inconsistently who say that the church can go forward prosperously without the help of the Roman empire, as was clear in the primitive church and is clear today of many Christians exempt from that weakened empire, but cannot stand without its bishop or the privilege conferred by it. Is smoke, then, of greater constancy than fire?[7]

¶6 318.27–318.30

[318] Nec valet ficticia qua dicitur, quod ordinacio pape processit immediate a Christo, ut patet de Petro, ordinacio autem imperatoris processit ab homine.

Nor is the fiction valid by which it is said that the pope's ordinance proceeded immediately from Christ, as is clear of Peter, but the emperor's ordinance proceeded from man.[8]

¶7 318.31–319.34
319.1 *and simple christian ministers.*
319.16 *Neither Peter nor any of the apostles claimed such rule over the Church and it was presumptuous of the Emperor to appoint precedence in his bishop.*

[318] In ista autem materia necesse foret utramque partem cognoscere conclusiones ad confutandum cautelas dyaboli. Necesse est secundo distinguere inter papam, vel episcopum cesareum et ministrum [319] simplicem christianum; nam iuxta dicta talis cesareus innititur privilegiis humanis tamquam principiis per se constituentibus servum talem. Minister autem pure christianus irridet hec privilegia ut superflua vel nociva. Et patet tercio defectus argucie, quando sic arguitur: Ordinacio pape immediate processit a Christo, ut patet de Petro, igitur ordinacio pape cesarei sic processit ex ordinacione

And in this matter it would be necessary for each party to know the conclusions, in order to confute the devil's wiles. It is necessary, secondly, to distinguish between the pope, or caesarean bishop, and the [319] simple Christian minister; for, according to what has been said, such a caesarean leans on human privileges as on principles that of themselves constitute such a servant. But the purely Christian minister laughs at these privileges as superfluous or harmful. And, thirdly, the defect of the quibble is clear when it is argued thus: "The pope's ordinance proceeded immediately from Christ, as is clear of Peter; therefore the ordinance of

Christi. Per papam Petrum et suos socios adiutores regebatur ecclesia, ergo per idem ex ordinacione Constantini oportet quod per gradus prelatorum cesareos regatur ecclesia; Christus indubie docens Matth. XX et Luce XXII maioritatem, quam sui debent attendere, negat istam arguciam. Si igitur Christus per se constituit capitaneum tocius militantis ecclesie, nec Petrus vel alius apostolus audebat talem capitaneum constituere vel se ipsum huiusmodi vendicare, sed constituerunt per loca episcopos, quanta irreligiosa presumpcio in cesare statuere, quod generaliter suus episcopus foret caput tocius ecclesie aut quod maioritatem civilem sub pallio privilegii contra decretum Christi in ecclesiam suam induceret? Ordinacio autem regis longe ante hec tempora processit a Deo, ut patet II De Civitate Dei XII, sic quod, licet Christus tempore legis veteris approbavit dominium seculare divinitus, et tempore legis nove approbavit multipliciter imperatorem, regem et dominum secularem humanitus, tamen nedum layci sed professores scripture verecunde proclamant, quando deficiunt argumenta, quod per idem vel forcius deficeret in ecclesia quodcumque dominium seculare.

the caesarean pope so proceeded from Christ's ordinance. The church was ruled by Pope Peter and his companions and helpers; therefore, by the same token, by Constantine's ordinance the church must be ruled through the caesarean grades of prelates." Christ, who undoubtedly teaches in Matthew 20 and Luke 22 the greatness his own ought to attend to, denies this quibble.[9] If, then, Christ himself set up the captain of the whole church militant, and neither Peter nor any other apostle dared to set up such a captain or to claim himself to be such, but they set up bishops place by place, how great an irreligious presumption [was it] in Caesar to decree that his bishop should be, in general, head of the whole church, or to bring civil greatness into his church under the cloak of privilege against Christ's decree? But the ordinance of a king proceeded from God long before these times, as is clear from *De civitate Dei* II.12,[10] so that, although Christ in the time of the old law approved secular lordship divinely, and in the time of the new law approved in many ways emperor, king and secular lord humanly, yet not only laymen but professors of scripture shamefacedly proclaim, when arguments fail them, that by the same token or more strongly any secular lordship whatever would fail in the church.[11]

¶8 320.1–320.21

320.*9 Any pope ordained by Christ should be gladly received, but such would be marked out by holiness not by human election.*

[320]Sed ista deduccio non habet fundamentum, nisi ut ironice loquar, quod autor scripture crebro ponit secularem primatum et sacerdotalem primatum cesareum interdicit. Et ideo dicit Crysostomus ut supra, quod in acceptando primatum ecclesiasticum neque est racio neque utilitas, quia tempore suo saltem in gente sua non fuit adiuncta primatui ecclesiastico, ut modo, pinguedo commodi temporalis. Si igitur signetur quicumque papa, cuius ordinacio immediate processit a Christo, videtur michi quod hoc docto totus populus debet eum venerabiliter amplecti. Sed nimis aliena est ab ista doctrina humana eleccio vel institucio. Ideo oportet quod illud doceatur ex vite et operum sanctitate; non ex aspiracione ad seculi commodum vel honorem. Nec ex fulminacione ficte censure ad ostendendum dominacionem nec ex tonsione gregis subiecti per fraudulentam temporalium subtraccionem, sed per condiciones apostolorum istis oppositas; et talis papa non foret alicui fidelium onerosus sed procurans undique pro lucro anime et profectu.

But this deduction has no foundation, unless, to speak ironically, that the author of scripture often sets down a secular primacy and forbids a caesarean priestly primacy. And so Chrysostom says, as above, that in accepting ecclesiastical primacy there is neither reason nor profit, because in his time, at least in his nation, the fatness of temporal advantage was not joined to ecclesiastical primacy, as it is now.[12] If, then, any pope whatever be pointed out whose ordinance proceeded immediately from Christ, it seems to me that, this being shown, the whole people ought to embrace him with reverence. Now human election or institution is exceedingly foreign to this doctrine.[13] Therefore it must be shown from the holiness of life and works, not from aspiring to the world's advantage or honour; nor from the thundering of a feigned censure to display the exercise of lordship, nor from the shearing of the subject flock by a fraudulent withdrawal of temporal goods, but by the conditions of the apostles that are opposed to these; and such a pope would be burdensome to none of the faithful, but would make provision everywhere for the gain and progress of the soul.

Notes

1. At 316.25 both manuscripts note in the margin: *Papa cesarius si deest ecclesia sancta melius staret*, "if the caesarean pope is lacking, holy church would stand better". C. *Cum clero infatuante dominos*: the clergy who make the lords fools, not clergy who are themselves foolish.
2. *Utrumque istorum membrorum / capitum*: the two parts are the clergy and secular lordship, each called a member of the church and then a head. *Ad non gradum*, literally "to no degree", that is, to nothing. *Utramque ... foret viare ... reducta*: an accusative with *foret* and the infinitive; we take *reducta* and *commixta* with *utramque*, and supply "now" for *sit*.
3. *Clerus uterque*: "the clergy on either side", taken as the clergy of both kinds the chapter sets against each other (caesarean and purely Christian, 318.31–319.3). The singular *clerus* with *uterque* is odd, and a word may be lost (e.g. *clerus [et populus] uterque*, clergy and people, the two parts of ¶2).
4. Decretum, D. 95 c. 5 (*Olim*), Jerome on presbyters and bishops; Loserth's reference, cited in modern form by us. The canon (PL 187, 448C) has *communi presbyterorum consilio* and *diaboli instinctu*; Wyclif writes *sacerdotum* here, as he does elsewhere when he cites this canon, and paraphrases the rest. The Apostle: 1 Cor. 1:12 and 3:4, "I indeed am of Paul; and I am of Apollo."
5. *Legis humane* is Loserth's correction; both manuscripts read *humanis* (318.7). C. *In solucione ordinis cleri Christo*: the dissolving of the order that binds the clergy to Christ; *Christo* could also go with *deterioratur* ("each part is made worse for Christ").
6. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 34; Loserth gives "Opp. tom. VI, 816" (PG 56, 816 ff.). The homily does not say this in so many words; cf. col. 818, where the darkness of sin falls first on seculars and laymen and then on priests, and hom. 35 (col. 830), cited at 320.3.
7. *Ab eo collato privilegio*: "conferred by it", the empire; it may also be "by him", the bishop. The figure: the empire is the fire, the privilege drawn from it the smoke, which on the opponents' view outlasts the fire.
8. A notes in the margin at 318.27: *Argumentum pro papa*, "an argument for the pope". C. *Ordinacio pape*: the ordinance by which a pope is set up, not the sacrament of ordination (glossary: *ordinacio*).
9. Matt. 20:25–26 and Luke 22:25–26: "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them ... But you not so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger."
10. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* II.12 as Wyclif gives it; no reference at the page foot. II.12 is on the Roman poets; the sense is that of V.21 ("let us ascribe the power of giving kingdom and empire only to the true God"). Cf. 324.8, where Loserth corrects another "II" to XX.
11. B reads *negandum* for *nedum* (319.30), and *et* for *nec* at 319.17; the print is translated in both places. C. *Verecunde*: "shamefacedly", to their shame; the professors fall back on this claim when their arguments fail.
12. "As above": the *Opus imperfectum* (318.11). The saying is in hom. 35 (PG 56, 830): "to desire secular primacy, though there is no reason, there is yet a cause ... but to covet ecclesiastical primacy there is neither reason nor cause, for it is neither just nor useful". Wyclif quotes it in full at 211.25 ff..
13. *Sed* brings the minor premiss closed by *ideo*: hence "now". *Doctrina* here is the showing just named (*hoc docto*, "this being shown"): human election cannot show that a pope is from Christ.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 316: *posset de-* (one main token covers two printed words; de- is the first half of de-|esse (next line), 25 is the line number)
  - 316: ∅ (an is the English side note (the need for an endowed pope))
  - 316: *esse* (second half of de-|esse)
  - 316: *privilegia* (hyphenated privi-|legia; main token holds the whole word)
  - 317: *placencius* [NW]
  - 317: ∅ (folio bar before Christo (240^{b} in margin) read as i)
  - 318: *Numquid* (25 is the line number)
  - 319: ∅ (30 is the line number)
  - 320: *Si*
  - 320: *humana*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Neither Peter (319.16).

Part 2: The abomination of desolation in the holy place

Loserth pp. 320.23–324.6

¶1 320.23–321.10
320.23 *The defenders of the Pope should prove his authority from Scripture or the value of his influence — over the Church.*

[320]Item, magnificantes necessitatem huius sacramenti cesarei oportet docere ipsam ex testimonio scripture vel per racionem ostendere necessarium influxum papalis preeminencie, quia aliter fingi posset novella religio servatis eisdem nominibus vel mutatis omnino contraria ordini christiano. Constat autem, quod primum

Again, those who magnify the necessity of this caesarean sacrament must teach it from the testimony of scripture, or show by reason the necessary inflow of papal preeminence, because otherwise a new religion could be feigned, with the same names kept or changed, wholly contrary to the Christian order.[1] Now it is evident that the first is lacking in the whole

321.11 *Nor can he establish a relation between God and man.*
321.26 *The endowed pope is Antichrist.*

deest in toto corpore scripture. Et quantum ad secundum, patet quod oporteret illum influxum vel adiutorium esse spirituale, quia sine corporali preter adiutorium quod ecclesia habet de seculari brachio posset stare. Si autem sit spirituale vel est actus anime vel habitus. Cum autem actus anime sint nobis notissimi, perceptibilis foret tam talis actus quam eius absencia in morte, in divisione vel [321] omissione pape et in eius operacione apostolica; quando magis copiose et attente influeret? Sed nedum abest a nobis talis experimentalis noticia, sed propinquiores huic fonti sunt magis a Dei instinctibus alieni, ymo cum papa sit crebro infidelis vel expers donorum Dei quam eius subditi magis sancti, videtur quod non oportet regulariter hunc solem eclipsabilem sic in quoscumque lucidiores eciam plus tenebrosum influere.

body of scripture. And as to the second, it is clear that that inflow or help would have to be spiritual, because without bodily [help], beyond the help that the church has from the secular arm, it could stand. And if it is spiritual, it is either an act of the soul or a habit. Now since the acts of the soul are most known to us, both such an act and its absence would be perceptible at the death, the division or the [321] omission of a pope, and in his apostolic working: when would it flow in more copiously and attentively? But not only is such experiential knowledge absent from us, but those nearer to this fountain are even more estranged from the promptings of God; indeed, since the pope is often more an unbeliever, or more devoid of the gifts of God, than his more holy subjects, it seems that this eclipsable sun, even when more darkened, need not as a rule so flow into any who are brighter than it.[2]

¶2 321.11–321.25

[321] Nec valet dicere quod papa dat habitum, quia sic extolleretur super omne quod dicitur Deus, dans quantumcumque distanter eciam personis Deo indignis spiritualia dona Dei, quia quid blasphemius vel infidelius quam quod oportet Deum cum omni tali concurrere complendo quicquid promiserit. Unde si habitus vel donum spirituale Dei quiescat, sic quod ex influxu pape in animam subiecti quemque inclinaret ad opus, quod non experitur ecclesia, sed eius contrarium, tunc enim deesset Petro et aliis apostolis influencia illa cesarea, et cesare excedente Christum et eius vicarium correspondenter ad dotacionem vel ritus cesareos, cresceret vel decresceret potestas taliter influendi.

Nor is it valid to say that the pope gives the habit, because so he would be "lifted up above all that is called God", giving the spiritual gifts of God at however great a distance, even to persons unworthy of God; for what is more blasphemous or more unbelieving than that God must concur with every such [giving], fulfilling whatever he has promised? [3] Hence if a habit or spiritual gift of God should rest [in the soul], so that from the pope's inflow into the subject's soul it inclined each one to work (which the church does not experience, but its contrary), [the claim fails]; for then that caesarean influence would have been lacking to Peter and the other apostles, and, Caesar exceeding Christ and his vicar, the power of so flowing in would grow or decrease in correspondence with the endowment or the caesarean rites.[4]

¶3 321.26–322.17
322.18 *The pseudopope is the abomination of desolation.*

[321] Ex mille evidenciis patet quod nichil est infidelius isto porismate, quod post dotacionem ecclesia non potest rite procedere sine tali papa cesareo. Nichil enim plus accusaret dotacionem vel caput huiusmodi de condicionibus Antichristi, quod foret abhominacio desolacionis, stans in loco sancto, ut expositum est in fine noni capituli et concordat Crysostomus Omelia ultima Operis Imperfecti. Pro cuius sensus declaracione repeto, [322] quod Christus propheta summus prediceret pericula maiora ecclesie, quibus non est maius vel blasfemius quam cum vita yma, ut declarant Gregorius et Bernhardus, vendicare pompatice statum Christi. Cum igitur hoc sepe contingit de papa, ut patet ex cronicis allegatis, videtur quod Christus debuit periculum illud predicere. Sed ubi expressius, quam Matth. XXIV, 15 dicens: Cum videritis abhominacionem desolacionis, que dicta est a Daniele

From a thousand evidences it is clear that nothing is more unbelieving than this porism: that after the endowment the church cannot go forward rightly without such a caesarean pope. For nothing would more accuse the endowment, or a head of this kind, of the conditions of Antichrist, namely that it would be "the abomination of desolation, standing in the holy place", as has been expounded at the end of the ninth chapter; and Chrysostom agrees, in the last homily of the *Opus imperfectum*.[5] To make its sense plain I repeat [322] that Christ, the highest prophet, would foretell the greater dangers of the church, than which none is greater or more blasphemous than, with the lowest life, to claim boastfully the state of Christ, as Gregory and Bernard declare.[6] Since, then, this often happens with the pope, as is clear from the chronicles alleged, it seems

propheta stante in loco sancto, qui legit, intelligat. Daret autem fidelis operam ad intelligendum hunc textum propter tria, primo quia est textus viri desideriorum, ut patet Daniel IX, secundo quia est textus evangelicus a summa sapiencia repetitus, et tercio quia Christus ex magna causa precipit quod hoc legens ipsum intelligat.

that Christ ought to have foretold that danger. But where more expressly than in Matthew 24:15, saying: "When you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place: he that readeth let him understand"?[7] And the faithful man should take pains to understand this text for three reasons: first, because it is the text of "the man of desires", as is clear in Daniel 9; second, because it is a gospel text repeated by the highest wisdom; and third, because Christ for a great cause commands that whoever reads this should understand it.[8]

¶4 322.18–323.21
323.22 *It is argued that Antichrist sits in the temple and so cannot stand.*
323.31 *'There is no contradiction.*

[322]Expositores autem verificant illud de Antichristo concorditer. Sed alii verificant hoc de Adriano imperatore vel alio, qui posuit statuam imaginis sue in templo Domini. Et alii fingunt sensus extraneos. Michi autem videtur quod nichil plus concordat cum litera vel ebdomalibus Danielis quam exponendo hoc de pseudopapa, qui est potissimus Antichristus. In hoc enim est abhominacio desolacionis, ut supra exposui. Nam communitas abhominaretur sentire unum fingentem personam Christi in interludio estivo et super hec extra formam ludi facientem turpidinem vel loquentem, quanto magis, quando quis pretendit vivaciter tamquam spectaculum toti ecclesie, quod gerit personam Christi, et tamen committendo peccata turpissima vivit Christo summe contrarie. Hec, inquam, nedum est abhominacio ut in ludo sed desolacio, deficiente [323]capitali suffragio hoste Christi subdole introducto. Communis autem modus loquendi concordat, quod, papa stante in loco Petri vel papatu, per tantum aut tantum temporis ille locus debet esse sanctissimus, cum papa pretendit se stare in loco sancti sanctorum, in cuius signum consentit quod vocetur pater sanctissimus. Studeat igitur calumpniator huius sentencie de qua persona ecclesie pertinencius verificaretur dictum Christi ad literam, et cum de multis pseudopapis sit verum, quod sint abhominacio desolacionis stans in loco sancto, quid obest scripturam sacram gravidari ista sentencia, aut quid derogat profecie Christi, quod ipse predixit nobis illud periculum? Non enim videtur quod Christus locutus est de loco materiali, ut templo Jerusalem vel alio, quia nulla vel modica sanctitas nisi equivoce est in illo, sed loquitur de loco spirituali, qui est status sanctus, in quo succedit unus post alium et abhominacionem in tali loco necesse est fundari in clero.

And the expositors with one accord take it as true of Antichrist. But others take it as true of the emperor Hadrian, or of another, who set up a statue of his own image in the temple of the Lord. And others feign foreign senses.[9] But it seems to me that nothing agrees more with the letter, or with the weeks of Daniel, than expounding this of the pseudo-pope, who is the chief Antichrist. For in this lies the abomination of desolation, as I expounded above. For the community would feel abomination to perceive someone playing the person of Christ in a summer interlude and, over and above this, outside the form of the play, doing or speaking filth; how much more when someone claims in living earnest, as a spectacle to the whole church, that he bears the person of Christ, and yet, committing the foulest sins, lives in the highest degree contrary to Christ.[10] This, I say, is not only an abomination, as in a play, but a desolation, since the [323]aid of the head fails when the enemy of Christ has been craftily brought in. And the common manner of speaking agrees that, while the pope stands in Peter's place or papacy, for so much or so much time that place ought to be most holy, since the pope claims that he stands in the place of the holy of holies, in token of which he consents to be called "most holy father".[11] Let the challenger of this teaching, then, study of which person of the church Christ's saying would more pertinently be verified to the letter; and since it is true of many pseudo-popes that they are "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place", what hinders holy scripture from being pregnant with this teaching, or what does it take away from Christ's prophecy that he foretold that danger to us? For it does not seem that Christ spoke of a material place, such as the temple of Jerusalem or another, because there is no holiness in it, or little, except equivocally; but he speaks of a spiritual place, which is a holy state, in which one succeeds after another; and the abomination in such a place must be founded in the clergy.

¶5 323.22–324.6

[323]Sed contra illud arguitur per hoc, quod Apostolus II. Tessal., II, 4 de Antichristo loquens prophetat quod in templo Dei sedeat, non igitur stat in loco sancto, et per consequens Christus ibi non loquitur de Antichristo. Primo tollo instanciam detegens fallaciam, nam et stabit et sedebit. Stabit ad erigendum et magnificandum suam potenciam tamquam paratus ad temporalia rapiendum, nam sicut Stephanus vidit Ihesum stantem a dextris virtutis Dei Act. VII, paratum ad membra sua certancia relevandum, et sic utrobique loquitur scriptura de stacione spirituali, quia (ut creditur) Stephanus non vidit stacionem corporalem ad tantam distanciam oculo corporali, [324]ut notat Augustinus in De Cognicione Vere Vite prope finem. Nec phas est imponere in hoc militi Christi mendacium. Et ista maledicta stacio Antichristi implicat ipsum sedere, quia a ministerio Christi ad quod excellenter sed false se obligat ociantem. Et ista est mala sessio spiritualis.

But against this it is argued by appeal to the fact that the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians 2:4, speaking of Antichrist, prophesies that "he sitteth in the temple of God"; therefore he does not stand in the holy place, and consequently Christ is not speaking there of Antichrist.[12] First I dispose of the objection, exposing the fallacy: for he will both stand and sit. He will stand to raise up and magnify his power, as one ready to seize temporal goods; for as Stephen saw Jesus "standing on the right hand" of the power "of God" (Acts 7), ready to relieve his members in their struggle, so in both places scripture speaks of a spiritual standing; for (as is believed) Stephen did not see a bodily standing at so great a distance with the bodily eye, [324]as Augustine notes in *De cognitione verae vitae*, near the end.[13] Nor is it right in this to impute a lie to the soldier of Christ. And this accursed standing of Antichrist implies that he sits, because it shows him idling away from the ministry of Christ, to which he binds himself excellently but falsely.[14] And this is the evil spiritual sitting.

Notes

1. ***Sacramenti cesarei***: Wyclif's irony, the caesarean papacy spoken of as if it were a sacrament the church needs. ***Ipsam*** (the necessity) is the object of ***docere***.
2. Both manuscripts note in the margin ***Fons papa***, "the pope a fountain" (321.3), and ***Sol***, "sun" (321.7), against the two figures. C. ***Magis*** governs both ***infidelis*** and ***expers***, against ***subditi magis sancti***.
3. 2 Thess. 2:4, "Who ... is lifted up above all that is called God"; Wyclif's ***super*** for the Vulgate's ***supra***. C. ***Quicquid promiserit***: whatever the pope has promised, which God would be bound to make good.
4. The period breaks off: the ***si*** clause has no main clause, and ***tunc enim*** gives the reason why the supposition fails; we supply "[the claim fails]". ***Quiescat***, "should rest": the gift abiding in the soul as from the pope's inflow.
5. Matt. 24:15. The cross-reference is to the end of ch. 9 of this work (221.17–222.18), where the holy place is the holy state the pope claims; pseudo-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, "last homily" as Wyclif gives it; the passage is hom. 49 (PG 56, ~905–7), where the abomination is Antichrist's army holding the holy places of the church under the appearance of Christ. T. B reads ***et expositum est*** for ***ut expositum est*** (321.32); the print is translated.
6. Gregory and Bernard: no reference at the page foot; presumably Gregory, ***Regula pastoralis*** I.2 ("no one does more harm in the church than he who, acting perversely, has the name or order of holiness"; Gratian D. 83 c. 2), and Bernard, ***De consideratione*** II.7.15 ("the highest seat and the lowest life", ***sedes prima et vita ima***).
7. Matt. 24:15. Wyclif's Latin lacks the Vulgate's ***ergo*** ("therefore"), and reads ***stante*** where the Vulgate has ***stantem***: as printed, the participle could go with Daniel; we translate it with the abomination, as the Vulgate does.
8. Dan. 9:23, "thou art a man of desires"; the abomination of desolation, Dan. 9:27.
9. ***Verificant illud de***: "take it as true of". The ***autem*** of the first sentence is continuative; ***alii*** sets some interpreters against the common reading. S. Hadrian's statue in the temple: Jerome, ***In Matthaeum*** IV on 24:15 (PL 26, 177), who offers Antichrist, the image of Caesar set up by Pilate, or "the equestrian statue of Hadrian which has stood in the very holy of holies to this day".
10. ***Interludio estivo***: a summer interlude, a play acted in the summer season. ***Vivaciter***, "in living earnest", as against the play.
11. At 323.3 the manuscript reads ***stat*** where Loserth prints ***stante*** (the apparatus does not name the codex); the print is translated. C. ***Capitali suffragio*** (323.1): the aid that should come from the head of the church; ***capitalis*** here is the adjective of ***caput***. ***Sentencia*** (323.7, 323.12) is the teaching just set out, not a judicial sentence.
12. Both manuscripts note in the margin at 323.22: ***Antichristus quomodo ostenditur***, "how Antichrist is shown".
13. Acts 7:55, "Jesus standing on the right hand of God"; ***virtutis Dei*** ("the power of God") is Luke 22:69, not in the Vulgate of Acts. Pseudo-Augustine, ***De cognitione verae vitae***: Loserth gives ***Opp.*** VI, App., 182–183 (c. 42; PL 40, 1027–28: Stephen saw Christ not with the bodily eye but with the inner man's sight). C. ***Potenciam***: "power", the might Antichrist displays, not Aristotle's potency.
14. ***Ociantem*** agrees with ***ipsum***: the standing implies that Antichrist "sits", since he is idle from the ministry he professes.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):

- 320: ***Constat***
- 320: ∅ (main scan already holds Constat whole at pos 180)
- 320: ***illum***
- 321: ***in-*** (hyphenated in-|fluere; main token holds the first half, fluere follows)
- 321: ***blasphemius*** [NW]
- 321: ***illa***
- 321: ***infidelius*** (hyphenated in-|fidelius; main token holds the whole word)
- 321: ***tacionem*** (do | tacionem split by folio bar (241[b] in margin), not a hyphen; this part only) [NW]
- 322: ***blasfemius*** [NW]
- 321: ***dicitur*** (LEFT-nw: print = dicitur)

• Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Augustine's exposition. . . (324.8).

Part 3: Augustine on Antichrist; four degrees of belief

Loserth pp. 324.8–328.20

¶1 324.8–326.3
324.8 *Augustine's exposition.*
325.26 *The temple of God prophesied of is the Church.*
326.28 *How Antichrist is to lead men astray in temporal as in spiritual matters e. g. indulgences,*

[324]Secundo notandum quod Augustinus II De Civitate Dei quasi per totum exponens scripturam de Antichristo, specialiter Apokalipsim Iohannis et propheciam Danielis inter cetera capitulo II exponit textum predictum apostoli de Antichristo. Textus autem Apostoli, quem Augustinus dicit nullomodo pretereundum, in nostris codicibus ita iacet: Non terreamini, quasi instet dies Domini, quoniam, inquit, nisi venerit dissensio primum, et revelatus fuerit homo peccati filius perdicionis, qui adversatur et extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus, aut quod colitur, ita ut in templo Dei sedeat, ostendens se tamquam ipse sit Deus, supple nisi talis Antichristus prius venerit, non veniet dies iudicii; nulli dubium est, inquit Augustinus, eum de Antichristo isto dixisse, unde Apostolus videns abhominacionem desolacionis, pro dolore loquitur interrupte, sicut Christus videns peccatum Jerusalem flevit dicens, quia si cognovisses et tu; supple peccatum tuum et penam exinde tibi infligendam; tu fleres, ut ego te defleo. Unde Apostolus consequenter declarat Antichristi versucias in hec verba: Non retinetis, quod cum apud vos essem, hec dicebam vobis, et nunc quid detineat [325]scitis, ut reveletur in suo tempore; nam misterium iam operatur iniquitatis, tantum ut qui tenet nunc teneat, donec de medio fiat. Et tunc revelabitur ille iniquus, quem dominus Ihesus interficiet spiritu oris sui et destruet illustracione adventus sui eum, cuius est adventus secundum operacionem sathane in omni virtute et signis et prodigiis mendacibus et in omni seduccione iniquitatis hiis, qui pereunt, eo quod caritatem veritatis non receperunt, ut salvi fierent; ideo mittet illis Deus operacionem erroris, ut credant mendacio, ut iudicentur omnes, qui non crediderunt veritati, sed consenserunt iniquitati. Istum autem textum exposuit Augustinus secundum partem ex certa

Secondly, it is to be noted that Augustine, in *De civitate Dei* II, expounding scripture about Antichrist almost throughout, especially the Apocalypse of John and the prophecy of Daniel, among other things expounds in chapter 2 the aforesaid text of the Apostle about Antichrist.[1] And the Apostle's text, which Augustine says is by no means to be passed over, runs thus in our books: "Be not terrified, as if the day of the Lord were at hand," for, he says, "unless there come a dissension first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God";[2] supply: unless such an Antichrist come first, the day of judgment will not come. "No one doubts," says Augustine, "that he said this of Antichrist"; hence the Apostle, seeing the abomination of desolation, speaks brokenly for grief, as Christ, seeing the sin of Jerusalem, wept, saying: "If thou also hadst known" (supply: your sin and the punishment to be inflicted on you for it), you would weep, as I weep over you.[3] Hence the Apostle next declares Antichrist's cunning in these words: "Remember you not that, when I was with you, I told you these things? And now [325] you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh: only that he who now holdeth do hold, until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one shall be revealed: whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: him whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power and signs and lying wonders: and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish: because they receive not the charity of the truth, that they might be

sciencia et secundum aliam partem tamquam sensum probabilem; certus est enim quod Apostolus hic loquens de Antichristo vocat eum hominem peccati et filium perdicionis, qui extollitur super omne, quod dicitur Deus. Est iterum Augustinus sicut et pius theologus de hoc certus, quod cuicumque viatori iste condiciones conveniunt hic est Antichristus. Et est tercio iste sanctus certus quod Christus non veniet ad diem finalis iudicii, quem Apostolus vocat diem Domini, iudicaturus vivos et mortuos nisi prius venerit ad seducendum in anima mortuos eius adversarius Antichristus. Primo quod iste sit sensus textus Apostoli, quod Antichristus, quem vocat refugam, sedebit in templo Dei, hoc est in ecclesia, non, inquit, templum alicuius ydoli vel demonis templum Dei vocat apostolus intelligens per Antichristum non solum ipsum principem, sed multitudinem impiorum hominum qui sunt quodammodo corpus eius. Unde in greco dicitur, tamquam in templum [326]Dei sedeat, tamquam ipse sit templum Dei, quod est ecclesia. Sicut dicimus Petrum sedere in amicum id est velut amicus.

saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: that all may be judged who have not believed the truth but have consented to iniquity."[4] And Augustine expounded this text in part from certain knowledge and in another part as a probable sense; for he is certain that the Apostle, speaking here of Antichrist, calls him "the man of sin" and "the son of perdition", "who is lifted up above all that is called God". Again, Augustine, like any pious theologian, is certain of this: that whatever wayfarer these conditions fit, he is Antichrist. And, thirdly, this saint is certain that Christ will not come to the day of final judgment, which the Apostle calls the day of the Lord, to judge the living and the dead, unless his adversary Antichrist has first come to lead astray those dead in soul. First, that this is the sense of the Apostle's text: that Antichrist, whom he calls "the deserter", will sit in the temple of God, that is, in the church; "for the apostle does not," he says, "call the temple of some idol or demon the temple of God", understanding by Antichrist not only the prince himself but the multitude of impious men who are in a way his body.[5] Hence in the Greek it is said, "as if he sits into the temple [326]of God", as if he himself were the temple of God, which is the church; just as we say that Peter "sits into a friend", that is, as a friend.[6]

¶2 326.4–326.27

[326]Secundo vero exponit sequencia: Sed nunc quid detineat scitis, ne adhuc veniat ille magnus Antichristus, quia oportet ecclesiam parum profundari in fide, nec ad coronam eius Antichristus reveletur in suo tempore. Iam enim misterium iniquitatis operatur Antichristus tacite in suis membris, ut dicit evangelista, ut fidelis christianus habens iudicia sui exercitus, qui tenet fidem ecclesie, nunc teneat in principio illam fidem, donec fiat revelacio de medio sue malicie. Victoria enim in belli inicio confundit adversarios et animat expugnantes; in medio enim illius concertacionis veniet unus capitalis malignus, licet post et antea erunt mali eciam usque ad diem iudicii, ut patet Daniel IX. Unde quia sensus Apostoli est multum absconditus, non confunditur iste sanctus dicere: Ego prorsus quid dixerit me fateor ignorare. Et recitando tres opiniones dicit prima, quod Neronem vocavit Apostolus tacite Antichristum, secunda quam Augustinus approbat, dicit hunc esse sensum Apostoli, qui tenet imperium, teneat donec tollatur de medio, quia post dotacionem ecclesie revelabitur Antichristus. Et tercia sentencia est supradicta.

And secondly he expounds what follows: "But now you know what withholdeth", that is, that that great Antichrist may not yet come, because the church must be somewhat deepened in faith, nor Antichrist be revealed, to its crown, in his time.[7] "For already" Antichrist "worketh the mystery of iniquity" silently in his members, as the evangelist says, so that the faithful Christian, having the judgments of his army, he who holds the faith of the church, should now hold that faith in the beginning, until the revelation of his malice comes out of the midst.[8] For victory at the beginning of a war confounds the adversaries and gives heart to those who attack; for in the midst of that contest one chief evil one will come, although after and before there will be evil men, even up to the day of judgment, as is clear in Daniel 9. Hence, because the Apostle's sense is much hidden, this saint is not ashamed to say: "I confess that I am wholly ignorant of what he said." And, reciting three opinions, he says: the first, that the Apostle tacitly called Nero Antichrist; the second, which Augustine approves, says that this is the Apostle's sense: "he who holds the empire, let him hold until he be taken out of the midst", because after the endowment of the church Antichrist will be revealed.[9] And the third teaching is the one stated above.

¶3 326.28–327.15
327.2 *and claims to civil rule.*
327.10 *Antichrist is to come from the clergy.*
327.16 *Degrees of belief and disbelief,*
327.26 *Wyclif fully believes that Antichrist is described in the scriptures quoted;*

[326] **Tercio vero prosequitur, quomodo Antichristus seducet virtute dyaboli tam in causa temporali, quam spirituali, in qua pretendet se habere virtutem in signis et prodigiis mendacibus, per que quidam intelligunt bullas atque epistolas de plenitudine potestatis papalis, plenas mendacio, ut verificant de indulgenciis et prefeccione inhabilium, quos menciuntur per eos esse habiles,** [327] **cum divinum iudicium sit in multis contrarium. In temporalibus vero fingunt se super omnes seculares dominos dominari civiliter, et sic notato dicto Augustini, quod oportet Antichristum esse de Romano imperio, quod extinguet, ut dicit XXIV cap. et dicto beati Johannis quod Antichristi prenuncii magni Antichristi prodierunt ex apostolis et per consequens de clero, cum factis paparum Christo contrariis eliciunt quidam probabiliter quod ipsi perversi sunt pessimi Antichristi; Deus autem secundum Apostolum mittet tales contra suos apostolos vel seductos in operacionem erroris, ut credant mendacio in penam peccati. Quod ego credo ydolatriam in colendo signa ut Deum, sicut specialiter patet in ostia consecrata.**

And thirdly he goes on [to show] how Antichrist will lead astray by the devil's power, in a temporal cause as well as in a spiritual one, in which he will claim to have power "in signs and lying wonders"; by these some understand bulls and letters on the plenitude of papal power, full of lying, as they show true of indulgences and of the promotion of the unqualified, whom they falsely say are qualified through them, [327] **although God's judgment is in many cases the contrary.[10] And in temporal things they feign that they exercise lordship civilly over all secular lords; and so, noting Augustine's saying that Antichrist must be of the Roman empire, which he will extinguish, as he says in chapter 24,[11] and blessed John's saying that the antichrists, forerunners of the great Antichrist, went out from the apostles, and consequently from the clergy, some infer by probable argument from the deeds of the popes contrary to Christ that these perverse men are the worst antichrists.[12] And God, according to the Apostle, will send such men against his apostles, or [will send] the seduced into the operation of error, "to believe lying", as the punishment of sin.[13] This I believe to be idolatry, in worshipping signs as God, as is especially clear in the consecrated host.**

¶4 327.16–327.25

[327] **Recolligendo igitur dicta superius, videtur michi quod aliqua sunt ex fide simpliciter concedenda, alia vero ut omnia scripture sacre contraria simpliciter sunt neganda. In tercio vero gradu sunt quedam probabiliter asserenda ut illa que probabiliter creduntur esse in scriptura sacra implicita. In quarto vero gradu sunt aliqua credenda probabiliter esse falsa ut illa de quibus habemus probabiliter evidenciam quod sunt scripture sacre contraria.**

Gathering up, then, what was said above, it seems to me that some things are to be granted without qualification as faith teaches, and others, such as everything contrary to holy scripture, are to be denied without qualification. And in the third degree are some things to be asserted with probability, such as those which are believed with probability to be implicit in holy scripture. And in the fourth degree are some things to be believed with probability to be false, such as those of which we have probable evidence that they are contrary to holy scripture.[14]

¶5 327.26–328.6
328.1 *that there is one Chief-antichrist, who is the chief opponent of God's law and who will be damned.*
328.11 *He thinks it likely the pope is that Antichrist.*

[327] **In primis vero et secundo contrariis iacet fides expellens formidinem. In mediis vero cadit formido cum prestanciori via ad credendum, ut in gradu tercio aut cum prestanciori evidencia ad discredendum ut in gradu ultimo. Et ista quatuor apud theologum sunt notanda; tunc dico me credere in primo gradu quod Antichristus est in predictis scripturis descriptus.** [328] **Secundo quod licet omnes presciti sint unus magnus Antichristus, oportet tamen esse unum principalem et maximum Antichristum. Tercio vero sive papa sive cesar sive quicumque alius fuerit maximus adversarius legis Christi, ipse est potissimus Antichristus.**

And in the first and the second, which are contraries, lies faith that expels misgiving. But in the middle ones misgiving falls in, with the stronger way toward believing, as in the third degree, or with the stronger evidence toward disbelieving, as in the last degree. And these four are to be noted by the theologian; then I say that I believe in the first degree that Antichrist is described in the scriptures cited. [328] **Secondly, that although all the foreknown are one great Antichrist, yet there must be one principal and greatest Antichrist. And thirdly, that whether pope or Caesar or anyone else be the greatest adversary of the law of Christ, he is the chief Antichrist.**

¶6 328.7–328.13

[328]**Quarto credo quod dictus Antichristus cum omnibus suis complicibus damnabitur ex mendacio in die iudicii fugatis peccatorum tenebris et illucescente lumine veritatis. Ulterius dico tamquam michi probabile in gradu tercio quod papa sit ille Antichristus qui describitur in scriptura.**

Fourthly, I believe that the said Antichrist with all his accomplices will be damned for lying on the day of judgment, when the darkness of sins has been put to flight and the light of truth dawns. Further, I say, as probable to me in the third degree, that the pope is that Antichrist who is described in scripture.[15]

¶7 328.14–328.20

[328]**In istis autem mediis paratus sum cuicumque parti ad quam concepero quod evidencia est pocior consentire. Et sic dividitur diccio mea in fidem et opinionem. In fidem, concedendo vel negando, in opinionem, remisse credendo vel discredendo illa, quorum pura credulitas est mihi preternecessaria ad salutem.**

And in these middle [degrees] I am ready to consent to whichever side I perceive the evidence to be stronger for. And so my speech is divided into faith and opinion: into faith, by granting or denying; into opinion, by believing or disbelieving with slackened [assent] those things the bare credence of which is beyond what is necessary to me for salvation.[16]

Notes

1. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*: Loserth notes, rightly, that the book is not II but XX (*Opp.* VII, 687; PL 41, 685–87). The chapter Wyclif gives as "2" is printed so; Augustine's discussion of 2 Thess. 2 is XX.19. T. The manuscripts lack *Dei* at 324.9.
2. 2 Thess. 2:2–4. Wyclif's text runs together the end of v. 2 and v. 3, and reads *dissensio* ("dissension") where the Vulgate has *discessio* (DR "a revolt"); Augustine's own text has *refuga* (cf. 325.27, "the deserter"), hence "in our books". R. A notes in the margin at 324.15: *Antichristus quomodo ostenditur*, "how Antichrist is shown".
3. Luke 19:42 (with 19:41, "he wept over it"). Augustine's words are given in the print as a quotation; *nulli dubium est ... dixisse* is *De civitate Dei* XX.19.2 ("There is no doubt that he said these things of Antichrist"; Wyclif *isto* for *ista*).
4. 2 Thess. 2:5–11 (DR numbers the last sentence as v. 10). Wyclif's text lacks *adhuc* ("yet") in v. 5. *Caritatem* is kept as "charity" (the glossary), where DR has "the love of the truth".
5. The manuscripts place *primo quod* after *apostoli* (325.27); Loserth moves it, and the print is translated. S. Augustine on the temple of God as the church, and Antichrist as the prince with his body: XX.19.2 (PL 41, 685–86), where Augustine reports this as the view of "some" and leaves open which temple is meant; Loserth's "p. 597" at 325.29 is presumably a misprint for 687.
6. *In templum ... sedeat*: Augustine's rendering of the Greek *eis ton naon*, "into the temple", read as "for the temple", that is, as the temple; so *sedere in amicum*, "to sit as a friend". The English keeps the literal "into" to show the construction.
7. The sentence does not construe cleanly. *Nec ad coronam eius Antichristus reveletur*: we take it as a second purpose with *ne*, "nor [that] Antichrist be revealed, to its [the church's] crown, [before] his time". An *et* for *nec* would give "and that Antichrist may be revealed in his time, to its crown". S. 2 Thess. 2:6, where the Vulgate has *et nunc*, not *sed nunc*.
8. We take *Antichristus* as the subject of *operatur* and *misterium* as its object (2 Thess. 2:7). *Ut dicit evangelista*: John, presumably 1 John 2:18. *Habens iudicia sui exercitus* is obscure and is translated as printed; *sue malicie* refers to Antichrist.
9. Augustine (XX.19.3, PL 41, 686) reports the Nero opinion, which he finds a great presumption, and says that *qui tenet* is "not absurdly" taken of the Roman empire; Wyclif's "approves" overstates this. The clause on the endowment of the church is Wyclif's application, not Augustine's words. T. B reads *apostolicum* at 326.24; the word it replaces is not legible in the apparatus.
10. *Virtute dyaboli*, "by the devil's power": *virtus* as faculty, as in *in omni virtute*, 2 Thess. 2:9. *Ut verificant de*: "as they show [the text] true of". *Quos menciuntur per eos esse habiles*: *per eos* most likely refers to the bulls and letters.
11. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XX, "ch. 24" as Wyclif gives it; no reference at the page foot. Not found in Augustine: XX.24 is on the Psalms, and XX.19 says only that *qui tenet* may be the Roman empire; cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 121.11 ("Antichrist will not come unless the Roman empire is first destroyed") and the Pseudo-Augustinian *De Antichristo* of Adso.
12. 1 John 2:18–19: "even now there are become many Antichrists ... They went out from us." C. *Cum factis* is taken as "from the deeds", the ground of the inference (*eliciunt*).
13. 2 Thess. 2:11 (DR 2:10), "God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying". C. *Mittet tales contra suos apostolos vel seductos in operacionem erroris*: we take *seductos* as a second object ("the seduced into the operation of error"); *vel* may also join *apostolos* and *seductos* as both objects of *contra*.
14. The manuscripts note in the margin *Concedenda simpliciter, neganda simpliciter* (327.16), *Asserenda probabiliter* (327.20, as we read the apparatus), and *Antichristus quis est*, "who Antichrist is" (327.32).
15. *Papa* has no article in Latin: "the pope" (the office, or the present holder) or "a pope". Only the third degree is claimed: probable, not of faith.
16. *Remisse*, "with slackened [assent]": the weaker assent of opinion, against the firm granting or denying of faith (¶4–5).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 324: *scripturam* [NW]
  - 324: *filius*

- **324: *apud* (30 is the line number)**
- **326: *Petrum***
- **326: *Iam* [NW]**
- **326: *concertacionis* (hyphenated con-|certacionis (15 line number); main token holds the whole word)**
- **326: ∅ (main scan already holds concertacionis whole at pos 102)**
- **326: *est multum* (one main token covers two printed words)**
- **326: *post* (print "quia post" ends the line above dotacionem (25 line number); the main scan lost post)**
- **326: *spirituali* [NW]**
- **326: *prodigiis* [NW]**
- **327: *seductos in* (one main token covers two printed words)**
- **327: *illa***
- **327: *illa***
- **327: *prestanciori* [NW]**
- **328: *Antichristum***
- **328: ∅ (will is the English side note (and who will be damned))**
- **328: *Tercio* (main splits Tercio into 1 + ercio; whole word given here, next token ∅)**
- **328: ∅ (rest of Tercio, given whole at pos 19)**
- **328: *illa***
- **325: *aliam partem* (aliampartem -> aliam partem (two words run together))**
- **327: *tichristi;* (LEFT-nw: second half of An-|tichristi)**
- **328: *gradu* (LEFT-nw: print = gradu)**

• **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Augustine's exposition. . . (324.8).**

Part 4: Not every pope antichrist; canonization a matter of opinion

Loserth pp. 328.21–330.12

¶1 328.21–329.17

328.21 *Because one pope is Antichrist and does not follow that all popes are.*
329.3 *We need not believe all canonized to be Saints.*
329.18 *In such matters we must depend on evidence.*

[328]**Sed absit fidelem credere, si papa sit Antichristus, tunc omnis papa est Antichristus, ut magnus Antichristus fuit Cayfas, et tamen non omnis episcopus; magnus Antichristus fuit Nero et tamen non omnis secularis dominus; magnus Antichristus fuit Sergius et tamen non omnis monachus. Et ita in mediis opinabilibus stat duos meritorie credere expresse contraria et credulitatem fidelis propter evidencias variari, ut de sanctis canonizatis credo quosdam absque formidine quia sunt beati in celo, ut apostolos, martyres, confessores primitive ecclesie; qui non** [329]**sunt victi cum mundo, alios autem opinor vel reputo beatos, ut posteriores de quorum vita habeo ad hoc evidenciam, quia narracio sanccionis vocati miraculi vel canonizacio Romane curie est nimis tenuis ad fundandum fidem ut mortuus sit in cathalogo beatorum. Potest enim in talibus vocatis miraculis esse multiplex seduccio, et potest curia Romana esse veritatis ignara ex seduccione testium qui deponunt, ymo potest esse cecata propter pecuniam vel favorem. Ideo absit fidelem credere quod sit articulus fidei credendus quicquid papa in canonizacione, in absolucione vel bullari attestacione decreverit. Cum papa attestatur suam crebram decepcionem in talibus, et Deus non est auctor vel fautor mendacii, ideo absit ecclesiam premi serviliter tali fide.**

But God forbid that a believer should believe that, if a pope is Antichrist, then every pope is Antichrist: as Caiaphas was a great Antichrist, and yet not every bishop; Nero was a great Antichrist, and yet not every secular lord; Sergius was a great Antichrist, and yet not every monk.[1] And so in middle matters open to opinion it can stand that two persons meritoriously believe expressly contrary things, and that a believer's credence varies on account of the evidence:[2] as, of the canonized saints, I believe some without misgiving to be blessed in heaven, such as the apostles, martyrs and confessors of the primitive church, who were not [329]**overcome with the world; but others I opine or reckon blessed, such as later ones of whose life I have evidence to that end; for the narrative of the sanctioning of a so-called miracle, or the canonization of the Roman curia, is exceedingly slender to ground faith that a dead man is in the catalogue of the blessed. For in such so-called miracles there can be manifold deception, and the Roman curia can be ignorant of the truth through the deception of the witnesses who depose; indeed, it can be blinded by money or favour. Therefore God forbid that a believer should believe that whatever the pope has decreed in a canonization, in an**

absolution, or in an attestation by bull is an article of faith to be believed. Since the pope attests his own frequent deception in such matters, and God is not the author or abettor of a lie, therefore God forbid that the church be servilely weighed down with such a faith.[3]

¶2 329.18–329.32

[329]In istis igitur licet opinari vel reputare unam partem vel aliam, secundum quod evidencie variantur. Cavere tamen debemus ne racione peccati in evidenciis seducamur, nec quod nimis sollicitemur in talibus preter fidem. Multi enim seducuntur per evidencias captas a curia et multi dimittunt propter questum, affeccionem carnalem vel cecum favorem cognoscere et colere fidem Christi. Alii autem faciunt raciones topicas ad assenciendum quod pseudopapa sit potissimus Antichristus, primo per hoc quod quicumque homo est profundior in inferno, fit pro tempore vie profundior Antichristus, sed aliquis papa a probabili post dotacionem ecclesie meruit esse profundior Antichristus.

In these matters, therefore, one may opine or reckon one side or the other, according as the evidence varies. Yet we must beware lest by reason of sin we be led astray in the evidence, and that we be not over-anxious in such things beyond faith. For many are led astray by evidence taken from the curia, and many, for gain, carnal affection or blind favour, leave off knowing and cultivating the faith of Christ. And others make topical arguments for assenting that a pseudo-pope is the foremost Antichrist:[4] first by this, that whatever man is deeper in hell becomes, for the time of the way, a deeper Antichrist; now some pope, in all probability, since the endowment of the church, has deserved to be a deeper Antichrist.[5]

¶3 329.33–330.2
330.3 *The higher the degree the greater the sin.*
330.7 *A wicked pope is the worst of hypocrites.*

[329]Assumptum patet ex hoc, quod correspondenter ad peccati gravedinem est prescitus profundius in inferno; sed constat quod quanta est [330]gravedo peccati est ipsa contra veritatem, que est Christus.

The assumption is clear from this, that the foreknown man is deeper in hell in correspondence with the gravity of his sin; now it is evident that as great as is the [330]gravity of a sin, so far is it against the truth, which is Christ.[6]

¶4 330.3–330.6

[330]Quod confirmatur tripliciter, primo per hoc quod quanto gradus est alcior, ideo casu supposito secundum legem datam de Lucifero est gravior.

This is confirmed in three ways: first by this, that the higher the degree, by so much, the case being supposed, according to the law given concerning Lucifer, is [the sin] graver.[7]

¶5 330.7–330.12

[330]Similiter, omnis talis papa est mendacissimus et blasfemus ypocrita, quod prima Veritas summe odit; papa igitur talis ex gravedine obligacionis, ex superaddita blasfemia ypocrisi et ex ducatu innumerosi populi, quem ducit proditorie contra Christum, videtur esse gravius condempnandus.

Likewise, every such pope is a most lying and blasphemous hypocrite, which the first Truth supremely hates; such a pope, therefore, by reason of the gravity of his obligation, of the blasphemy added on top of hypocrisy, and of his leading of a numberless people, whom he leads treacherously against Christ, seems to deserve the heavier condemnation.[8]

Notes

1. Sergius: the monk whom medieval polemic made the teacher of Muhammad (the Bahira legend); so Wyclif himself below, 374.28–30, where Muhammad's two accomplices are a Jew learned in the Old Law and 'Sergius, a crafty Christian monk'. Each pair answers the inference from one to all: one wicked holder of an office does not make every holder of it wicked.
2. ***Stat*** with the infinitive is the schoolmen's "it can stand", i.e. it is consistent. ***Media opinabilia*** are matters between what faith requires and what it forbids.
3. ***Suam crebram decepcionem***: his being often deceived, not his deceiving. Probably the papal decretal ***A nobis*** (X 5.39.28, Innocent III): the church's judgement 'follows opinion, which often happens both to deceive and to be deceived'.
4. ***Potissimus***: "foremost", the superlative of ***potis***; the chapter's ***pocior Antichristus*** (331.12) is its comparative, "greater".
5. The minor premiss says "a deeper Antichrist" where the major's middle term ("deeper in hell") is expected; perhaps ***in inferno*** is understood, perhaps lost. We translate the print.
6. ***Quanta est gravedo peccati est ipsa contra veritatem***: the measure of a sin's gravity is how far it is against the truth; since the truth is Christ, the graver sinner is the more anti-Christ.

7. ***Quanto … ideo*: *ideo*** stands where ***tanto*** would answer ***quanto***. The "law given concerning Lucifer" is his fall from the highest degree (Isa. 14:12–15, by allusion); the other two confirmations follow at 330.7 and 330.13 (Pseudo-Augustine, Chrysostom) and 331.13 (Lincoln).
8. ***Superaddita blasfemia ypocrisi*: *ypocrisi*** taken as dative ("added on top of hypocrisy"); it could be a second ablative ("from added blasphemy, from hypocrisy").

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 329: ∅ (In of the English side note (In such matters ...))

Part 5: The wicked prelate worse than the devil; two heads, two clergies

Loserth pp. 330.13–333.5

¶1 330.13–333.5
331.1 *Worse than the*
332.8 *Falsity of the plea that the pope is needed to determine ecclesiastical causes.*

[330]Similiter, Augustinus cap. IX De Gradibus Abusionum: Sciat, inquit, rex sicut in regno hominum primus constitutus est, sic et in penis, si iusticiam non fecerit, primatum habiturus est. Omnes namque quoscumque peccatores sub se habuerit in presenti, supra se modo implacabili in pena futura habebit. Et idem est evidencius de papa, ut docet Crysostomus Omelia LI Operis Imperfecti et patet distinccione XL: Si papa. Quomodo sacerdos, inquit, super omnem populum glorificatur, si bene fecerit, non solum propter suam iusticiam sed propter omnium quia ipse causa est iusticie universorum, ita et peccans super omnes punitur non solum propter sua peccata, sed propter omnium, quia ipse causa fit omnibus ad peccandum. Unde efficax est testimonium Crysostomi ubi supra: Qui, inquit, fingunt se esse christianos, cum sint Antichristi, videntur esse in ecclesia et agunt ypocritice contra ecclesiam, ymo Omelia XLIV [331]dicit sanctus iste, quod homo malus est peior dyabolo, ymo malum pessimum, hoc est habet racionem supereminentis malicie super dyabolum, super feras et quamlibet aliam creaturam malam. Dyabolus, inquit, fugatur ex iusticia hominis et virtute, homo autem perversus crudelius talem persequitur; dyabolus non superat hominem nisi per hominem, Antichristus autem superat hominem per se ipsum. Ideo ubi non valet Meander dyaboli, ipse supplet temptacionem per hominem, a quo non prodest benedicere, qua arte fugatur dyabolus. Si igitur homo per censuras ecclesiasticas illudit populo veniens in nomine Christi, quis est pocior Antichristus? Tercio Lincolniensis in sermone ad papam declarat quod, sicut opus divinissimum viatoris est assimilare Deo animas peccato ab eo lapsas, sic opus summum sathane, Antichristi atque heretici est huic arti divine contrarie, quod faciunt presidentes huic curie. Si precipiunt aliquid mandatis Christi contrarium, si propter lucrum ordinant aliquid quod distrahat pastoris officium, aut si potestatem huius curie suspendunt, debilitant vel retardant; tunc, inquit, in ianuis est revelacio filii perdicionis. Si inquam papa ista perficiat et in

Likewise Augustine, *On the Degrees of Abuses*, chapter 9:[1] "Let the king know," he says, "that as he has been set first in the kingdom of men, so also in punishments, if he has not done justice, he will have the primacy. For all the sinners whatsoever whom he has had under him in the present he will have above him, implacably, in the punishment to come."[2] And the same holds more evidently of the pope, as Chrysostom teaches in Homily 51 of the *Opus imperfectum*, and as is clear in Distinction 40, *Si papa*:[3] "As a priest," he says, "is glorified above all the people if he has done well, not only for his own justice but for that of all, because he is the cause of the justice of all, so also, sinning, he is punished above all, not only for his own sins but for those of all, because he becomes the cause of sinning to all." Hence the testimony of Chrysostom in the same place is effective: "Those," he says, "who feign themselves to be Christians, though they are Antichrists, seem to be in the church and act hypocritically against the church"; indeed, in Homily 44 [331]this saint says that an evil man is "worse than the devil, indeed the worst evil", that is, he has the character of a malice surpassing the devil, the beasts and any other evil creature. "The devil," he says, "is put to flight by a man's justice and virtue, but a perverse man persecutes such a one more cruelly; the devil does not overcome a man except through a man, but Antichrist overcomes a man by himself." Therefore, where the devil's meander does not avail, he supplies the temptation through a man, against whom it profits nothing to bless oneself, the art by which the devil is put to flight.[4] If, then, a man mocks the people by ecclesiastical censures, coming in the name of Christ, who is a greater Antichrist?[5] Thirdly, Lincoln, in his sermon to the pope, declares that, as the most divine work of a wayfarer is to make like to God souls fallen from him by sin, so the highest work of Satan, of Antichrist and of a heretic runs contrary to this divine art, and this those who preside over this curia do.[6] If they command anything contrary to the commandments of Christ, if for gain they ordain anything that

eis constanter et finaliter perseverat, ipse est indubie Antichristus; ut, sicut sacerdotibus legis veteris successit Christus superaddendo interpretacionem laudabilem legi sue, sic episcopis cesareis succedet Antichristus, superaddendo obscuracionem culpabilem legi Christi. Et utrobique servabitur idem genus; [332]quod fit cece et male preficiendo ineptum prepositum, suspendendo boni prelati officium, et omnino negligendo se movere, prohibens exercicium Christi ad expugnandum dyabolum. Et declarat quod curia est causa multorum talium; quod potest discerni per hoc, quod discordat a triplici descripcione pape superius recitata. Sed quantum ad primum punctum de capite causas ecclesiasticas terminante patet quod Christus est caput sufficientissimum, sicut probavit per trecentos annos et amplius, quando prosperata fuit ecclesia, et lex sua est ad hoc efficacissima, cum Deus ipsam edidit ad hunc finem; sed forte necesse est post dotacionem ecclesie esse legislatorem extraneum, ut puta Antichristum, sed hoc est ad desolacionem ecclesie, ideo idem foret asserere quod oportet esse tale caput ecclesie ad causas ecclesiasticas terminandum et dicere quod oportet Christum et legem suam deserere et Antichristum cum legibus suis atque complicibus amplexari; indignum namque fuit Christi apostolos in talibus taliter occupari. Ideo oportet considerare sectam cleri duplicem, scilicet clerum Christi et clerum Antichristi priori contrarium; clerus Christi quietatur in ipso capite ac suis legibus, clerus vero Antichristi vel totaliter vel preponderanter innititur legibus Antichristi et tamen palliatur esse clerus Christi atque ecclesie, ut populus simulacius seducatur. Et ista tam contraria oportet inniti duobus contrariis capitibus cum suis legibus. Et evidencia facti docet descripciones membrorum. [333]Constat quidem quod clerus ecclesie claudicat in duas partes divisa, scilicet in partem Christi et partem cesaream. Ideo necesse est laycos supportatos per ipsos in opinione et vita tam dispares titubare.

draws away the office of the shepherd, or if they suspend, weaken or retard the power of this curia, then, he says, "the revelation of the son of perdition is at the doors".[7] If, I say, the pope accomplishes these things and perseveres in them constantly and finally, he is without doubt Antichrist; so that, as Christ succeeded the priests of the old law, adding to his law a praiseworthy interpretation, so Antichrist will succeed the caesarean bishops, adding to the law of Christ a culpable obscuring.[8] And on both sides the same kind will be kept; [332]which is done blindly and wickedly by setting over [the people] an unfit superior, by suspending the office of a good prelate, and by wholly neglecting to stir oneself, forbidding the exercise of Christ for overcoming the devil.[9] And he declares that the curia is the cause of many such things; which can be discerned by this, that it disagrees with the threefold definition of the pope recited above. But as to the first point, concerning a head that terminates ecclesiastical causes, it is clear that Christ is a most sufficient head, as he proved for three hundred years and more, when the church prospered; and his law is most effective for this, since God issued it to this end. But perhaps after the endowment of the church there must be a foreign lawgiver, say Antichrist; now this is to the desolation of the church; therefore it would be the same to assert that there must be such a head of the church for terminating ecclesiastical causes, and to say that one must desert Christ and his law and embrace Antichrist with his laws and accomplices; for it was unworthy that Christ's apostles should be occupied in such things in such a way. Therefore one must consider a twofold sect of the clergy, namely the clergy of Christ and the clergy of Antichrist, contrary to the former:[10] the clergy of Christ rests in that head and his laws, but the clergy of Antichrist leans either wholly or preponderantly on the laws of Antichrist, and yet is cloaked as being the clergy of Christ and of the church, so that the people may be the more deceitfully led astray. And these, being so contrary, must lean on two contrary heads with their laws. And the evidence of the fact teaches the definitions of the members. [333] It is evident, indeed, that the clergy of the church limps, divided into two parts, namely into the part of Christ and the caesarean part. Therefore the laity, supported by men so unlike in opinion and life, must needs stagger.[11]

Notes

1. ***De duodecim abusivis saeculi***, the ninth abuse (***rex iniquus***), transmitted under the names of Augustine and Cyprian; Loserth: Augustine, *Opera* (Maurist) VI, Appendix, p. 215 (= PL 40, 1086). Modern scholarship, since Hellmann's edition (1909), assigns it to an anonymous Irish author of the seventh century.

2. ***Modo implacabili***: so Loserth, from the source; the manuscripts read ***modo plagabili*** (330.18), which does not construe as well. We translate the print.
3. Pseudo-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 51; Loserth: Chrysostom, ***Opera*** VI, pp. 925–928. Decretum D.40 c.6 ***Si papa*** (Loserth "Cap. VI"; the modern form is ours). The second extract ("Those who feign ...") Loserth places at ***Op. imp.*** p. 928; "Homily 44" (331.1) he does not identify: the passage is hom. 24 in Migne (on Matthew 10:17), so XLIV is probably a slip for XXIV.
4. ***Meander***: the winding of the river Maeander, a common figure for tortuous wiles. ***Benedicere***: to bless oneself (with the sign of the cross), the art that puts the devil to flight, but which avails nothing against a man.
5. "Coming in the name of Christ" alludes to Matthew 24:5 ("many will come in my name"). ***Pocior*** is the comparative of ***potissimus*** (329.28).
6. Robert Grosseteste. The "sermon to the pope" is the memorandum Grosseteste read before Innocent IV at Lyons in 1250 (in Brown, ***Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*** II, 250–257), which has "in januis est revelatio Filii perditionis" and "the cause, fount and origin of this is this curia". Loserth's hesitant "seems to be" ***Epistolae*** no. 128, p. 432, shares some themes but not these words. C. ***Contrarie*** is taken as the adverb ("runs contrary").
7. 2 Thessalonians 2:3 ("the son of perdition") and Matthew 24:33 ("at the doors"), joined. C. ***Potestatem huius curie***: the curia's own (pastoral) power, which its presidents hamper; Grosseteste's context suggests ***cure***, the pastoral charge, a reading the apparatus does not give.
8. ***Legi sue***: "his law", the old law as Christ's own; ***sue*** could refer to the priests ("their law").
9. ***Prohibens***: a nominative participle left without a subject; it describes the one who sets over and suspends.
10. Loserth: Hus takes over the whole passage on the twofold clergy (***De ecclesia***, ch. 15; ***Opera***, p. 226). Both manuscripts note in the margin ***Clerus duplex Christi et Antichristi***.
11. "Limps ... into two parts" echoes 1 Kings 18:21 (DR 3 Kings 18:21), "How long do you halt between two sides?" C. ***Tam dispares*** is taken with ***ipsos***, the two parts of the clergy; it could go with ***laycos***, "the laity, so unlike in opinion and life".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 330: ***sicut***
  - 330: ***et***
  - 330: ***pena futura*** (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 330: ***habebit***
  - 330: ***XL***
  - 330: ***Si papa*** (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 330: ***Quomodo***
  - 330: ***non*** (25 is the line number)
  - 331: ***dyabolo***
  - 332: ***preficiendo*** [NW]
  - 332: ∅ (the is the English side note (Falsity of the plea that the ...))
  - 332: ***Sed***
  - 332: ∅ (folio bar after duobus (244ª in margin) read as i)

Part 6: The caesarean clergy, Judas's field, and Jesus as patron

Loserth pp. 333.6–338.8

¶1 333.6–338.8
333.20 *Heresy of maintaining that bishops should rule because qualified by wisdom.*
334.1 *In ruling they forsake their office for a lower one.*
335.14 *Our bishops found their practices on those of Iscariot, Ananias and Sapphira,*
336.17 *Christ's laws set aside for gainful traditions.*

[333]**Possunt autem iste due partes per hoc discerni potissime quod clerus cesareus instat attencius pro tradicionibus humanis et privilegiis que fastum et lucrum seculi sapiunt defendendis. Sed clerus Christi laborat assidue pro legibus Christi et eius privilegiis, quibus bonum spirituale acquiritur ostendendum; nec phas est fideli discredere quin ista pars sit recta et prior erronea, in tantum quod omnis innitens priori parti est infidelis hereticus, quia in affeccione preponderat bona temporalia bonis eternis, et cum pertinaciter defendit hunc errorem tamquam avarus, quod est ydolorum servitus, patet quod omnis talis sit hereticus infidelis. Et ex ista perfidia consurgit heresis, quod licet clericis et specialiter episcopis civiliter**

And these two parts can be told apart chiefly by this, that the caesarean clergy presses more earnestly for the defending of human traditions and privileges that savour of the pride and gain of the world.[1] But the clergy of Christ labours assiduously for the showing forth of the laws of Christ and his privileges, by which spiritual good is acquired; nor is it lawful for a believer to disbelieve that this part is right and the former erroneous, so much so that everyone who leans on the former part is an unbeliever, a heretic, because in his affection he weighs temporal goods above eternal goods; and since he obstinately defends this error as a covetous man, "which is a serving of idols", it is clear that every such man is a heretic,

337.9 *Instead of obeying Christ's teaching we follow modern saints canonized for payment.*
337.21 *We should make Jesus our patron and address all prayers to him.*

dominari, quod fulcitur ex hoc quod dominacio civilis est licita, licet difficilis; ille igitur qui haberet maiorem prudenciam ad cavendum periculum, ut habent episcopi, magis licite assumeret hanc vitam honorificam dominandi. Per hunc fucum concluditur quod convenientissimum est clericos bellare, uxorari et quemlibet statum periculosum assumere, cum virtus consistit circa difficile. Sed primo tollo istam versuciam; constat quidem quod multa sunt licita, que propter inferioritatem suam sunt Antichristi clericis aliena, sic quod ipsi peccarent graviter, dimissa operacione nobili, operacioni ignobili intendendo, et sic propter perfeccionem status foret turpissimum [334] ipsos in talibus occupari, ut patet de Christo qui nescivit taliter facere, cum tunc sciret degradare se ipsum ad statum et ordinem laycalem, et per consequens sciret male facere et peccare. Prudencia itaque cleri stat in declinacione talis operis imperfecti, sicut foret bonum in laycis pure intendentibus scole Christi. Notaremus itaque quod duodecim episcopis, quos Christus in scola sua nutriverat, solus Scarioth se ipsum amando post apostolatum proprietati intenderat, nam Act. primo 18 dicit Petrus de Scarioth: hic possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis. Nec phas est credere quod Petrus in hoc mentitus est, nec evangelium Matth. XXVI contradicit isti sentencie, quia cum Scarioth prius pro triginta argenteis vendidit pontificibus Salvatorem, assecuraturus de precio et credens verbis magistri, quod fuit in proximo moriturus, potuit providere sibi de redditu prope Jerusalem, ut frustratus a lucro quod videbatur habere ex furto communis pecunie, provideat sibi et suis possidendo illud proprietarie; nec repugnat quod accepit possessionem nuncupative dictam vel sessinam in predio, et post reportando pecuniam dandam pro agro, audiens magistrum condempnatum, infructuose penitens se suspendit. Judas enim non dormit, sed facit velociter facta sua, et consonabit quod illud maledictum commercium foret undique mendaciis pertractatum. Sic igitur secundum regulam, qua Augustinus concordat evangelia, credi debet tam Petri evangelio quam Matthei; nec caret misterio quod Yudas pontifex legis nove sic mercatus fuit abscondite cum pontificibus veteris testamenti, quia sic continuatur generacio eorum adultera; [335] et docetur quomodo pseudopontifices in lege gracie exsuperant malicia pontifices veteris testamenti. Illi enim emerunt agrum cum dicta pecunia secundum religionem fictam ad sepeliendum extraneos, quia precium sanguinis licet effusi licite exhorrebant. Sed dicitur nostros pontifices mittere in corbonam precium seminis, quod est preciosius, et effusum vilius ac culpabilius, in quo videntur superare cupidine veteres sacerdotes. Nec dubium quin symoniace vendendo spiritualia, et sic Christum,

an unbeliever.[2] And out of this faithlessness arises the heresy that it is lawful for clerics, and especially for bishops, to exercise civil lordship; which is propped up by this, that the civil exercise of lordship is lawful, though difficult; therefore he who had greater prudence for avoiding the danger, as bishops have, would the more lawfully take up this honourable life of exercising lordship. By this pretence it is inferred that it is most fitting for clerics to make war, to marry and to take up any dangerous state, since virtue is concerned with what is difficult.[3] But first I demolish this cunning. It is evident, indeed, that many things are lawful which, on account of their inferiority, are Antichrist's and foreign to clerics, so that they would sin gravely if, leaving noble work aside, they gave themselves to ignoble work; and so, on account of the perfection of their state, it would be most shameful [334] for them to be occupied in such things,[4] as is clear in Christ, who knew not how to act so, since then he would have known how to degrade himself to the lay state and order, and consequently would have known how to do evil and to sin. The prudence of the clergy, therefore, consists in declining such imperfect work, as it would be good in lay people who give themselves purely to the school of Christ. We should note, then, that of the twelve bishops whom Christ had nurtured in his school, Iscariot alone, loving himself, had given himself to property after the apostolate; for in Acts 1:18 Peter says of Iscariot: "this man hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity."[5] Nor is it lawful to believe that Peter lied in this, nor does the gospel, Matthew 26, contradict this teaching;[6] for since Iscariot had earlier sold the Saviour to the pontiffs for thirty pieces of silver, meaning to make sure of the price, and believing his master's words that he was soon to die, he could have provided himself with a revenue near Jerusalem, so that, cheated of the gain he seemed to have from the theft of the common purse, he might provide for himself and his own by possessing it as a proprietor; nor is it incompatible that he took a possession so called in name, or seisin in the estate, and afterwards, bringing back the money to be given for the field, on hearing that his master was condemned, repenting fruitlessly, hanged himself.[7] For Judas does not sleep but does his deeds quickly, and it will accord [with this] that that accursed trade was handled throughout with lies.[8] So then, according to the rule by which Augustine harmonizes the gospels, credence must be given to Peter's gospel as much as to Matthew's;[9] nor is it without mystery that Judas, a pontiff of the new law, thus traded in secret with the pontiffs of the old testament, for so their adulterous generation is continued; [335] and it is taught how the false pontiffs under

nostri pontifices peccarent gravius precium inbursantes, et sic (ni fallor) dominacio secularis in nostris episcopis non fundabitur in lege nova vel veteri, nisi forte in Scarioth, Anania et Zaphira, de quibus Act. V; sed omnes hii tres exinde divino iudicio sunt occisi. Quod autem vindicta nunc non capitur de nostris, ut in primitiva ecclesia de minus peccantibus, nostre culpe et signo maioris periculi possumus imputare; Deus enim quandoque ex amore predestinati peccantis hunc arguit et castigat, quemque autem ex amore populi, quem vult a toxico talis macule preservari, nunc autem signum est quod ex peccati participio deseruit ut desperatos tam populum quam peccantes. Et istud videtur michi esse tempus periculosum, quale non fuit a mundi inicio a Christo et apostolo prophetatum. Vix enim invenies unum presbiterum vel potentem laycum, qui non sit irretitus opere vel consensu episcoporum symonica heresi plus vel minus. Et patet quam horrenda est desercio securitatis cleri de sorte Domini et preeleccio securitatis mundane, in qua mundus blasfeme Deo preponitur. Nec valet [336] locus a simili captus a laycis, quia et hoc foret in seculari dampnabile, et mundana securitas Dei adiecta in ipso est licita et non sic in clerico legis Christi. Clericis enim legis veteris, quibus imponebatur sarcina intollerabilis, suffecit pars Domini de decimis, oblacionibus et privatis elemosinis, et tercia pars stricta suffecit Christo et suis apostolis. Nobis autem non sufficit decima pars Domini ampliata proditorie et iudaice vendicata. Sed terciam partem prediorum laycalium ex titulo possessionis Christi mendaciter vendicamus, et ex uno latere cum bonis pauperum quorum sumus nudi procuratores, non habentes a Domino ad hoc procuratorium, possessiones seculares incessanter perquirimus. Ex alio vero latere extendimus magnificantes tradiciones hominum que questum sapiunt, et ex hinc ad grave dampnum ecclesie est ipsa lex Dei nimium pretermissa. Dicimus enim quod nedum est licitum sed necessarium propter consilium cesaris postponere Christi consilia, sed necessario oportet quod fiat dispensacio cum illis tradicionibus onustatis quas Christus instituit, sed cum donacionibus hominum et ritibus sequentibus propter sacrilegium non licet Deo vel homini dispensare, in hoc indubie preponentes hominem vel verius mammonam Deo nostro. Consideraret itaque clerus, quomodo ad fornicandum spiritualiter cum bonis fortune est clerus proclivior, ad resipiscendum tardior, et omnino est dirupcio amoris Dei detestabilior. Ideo considerarent arguentes per locum de possibili ad periculum de inesse, quomodo quilibet claustralis in Anglia potest meritorie habere feminam in cubili et studio celatam, sic [337] valet quod non abutatur femina, igitur debet; fornicacio

the law of grace surpass in malice the pontiffs of the old testament. For they bought a field with the said money, according to a feigned religion, "to be a burying place for strangers", because they shrank from the "price of blood", though the blood was lawfully shed.[10] But it is said that our pontiffs "put into the corbona" the price of seed, which is more precious and is shed more vilely and more culpably; in which they seem to surpass the old priests in cupidity.[11] Nor is there doubt that, selling spiritual things, and so Christ, simoniacally, our pontiffs would sin more gravely in pocketing the price; and so (unless I am mistaken) secular exercise of lordship in our bishops will not be founded in the new law or the old, unless perhaps in Iscariot, Ananias and Sapphira, of whom Acts 5 speaks; but all these three were slain for it by divine judgement. And that vengeance is not now taken on ours, as it was in the primitive church on those who sinned less, we may impute to our fault and to a sign of greater danger. For God sometimes, out of love for a predestinate sinner, rebukes and chastises him, and sometimes out of love for the people, whom he wills to be preserved from the poison of such a stain; but now it is a sign that, by reason of participation in the sin, he has abandoned both the people and the sinners as desperate.[12] And this seems to me to be the perilous time, such as has not been from the beginning of the world, foretold by Christ and the apostle.[13] For you will scarcely find one presbyter or powerful layman who is not entangled, by deed or by consent, in the simoniacal heresy of the bishops, more or less.[14] And it is clear how horrible is the clergy's desertion of the security of the lot of the Lord, and the preferring of worldly security, in which the world is blasphemously set before God.[15] Nor does [336] the topic from likeness taken from the laity avail; for this too would be damnable in a secular, and worldly security added to God's is lawful in him, and not so in a cleric of the law of Christ. For to the clerics of the old law, on whom an intolerable burden was laid, the Lord's portion of tithes, oblations and private alms sufficed, and a strait third part sufficed Christ and his apostles.[16] But for us the Lord's tenth part does not suffice, enlarged treacherously and claimed in Jewish fashion. But we lyingly claim a third part of the lay estates by title of Christ's possession; and on the one side, with the goods of the poor, of whom we are mere proctors, not having from the Lord a proctor's mandate for this, we ceaselessly acquire secular possessions. And on the other side we extend, magnifying them, the traditions of men that savour of gain, and hence, to the grave harm of the church, the very law of God is exceedingly passed over. For we say that it is not

(inquam) corporalis non est tam assidua, cum oportet quod carnalis fornicacio, quando natura deficit et invalescit avaricia, sit extincta et per consequens tamquam innaturalior et difficilior est a Domino plus odita. Ideo dicit Matth. XI, 24: Dico vobis, quod terre Sodomorum remissius erit in die iudicii quam tibi. Neque enim saltamus cum filio hominis, nec plangimus cum Johanne Baptista, sed, omittentes doctrinam Christi nobis facilem quam expressit in vita et moribus et verbis, de vita paupere et exproprietaria, sequimur sanctos novellos quorum canonizacio fuit empta, licet pro maiori parte vite sue vixerunt mendaciter; et addimus in commendacionem nostre sentencie quod non legimus de patronorum nostrorum resipiscencia, igitur respondebam. Constitueremus, inquam, nobis Jhesum patronum et regulam, postponendo alios nec obediendo nisi de quanto sequuntur ipsum. In cuius confirmacionem oraciones nostras, quas habemus de sanctis, singulariter ad ipsum dirigimus. Non simulemus igitur maniace stulticiam auditorii in nostris sermonibus, quia ipsum percipit sophisticaciones nostras subtilius quam sufficimus palliare. Materiam (inquam) fidei, que opinionem excedit, magnificare debemus, quantum sufficimus, Sic igitur tollendo istas notas perfidie de plus credendis factis et dictis unius peccantis prepositi quam verbo vel operi Jhesu nostri, debemus singulariter doctrine sue intendere, quia revera est infidelis et mundo suspecta excusacio in peccatis capere thema nostrum de Christo, et dimissa doctrina sua inniti uni erranti preposito licet sancto, et specialiter in hiis mundialibus, in [338] quibus obliquant a Christo, addendo fallaciam; Ipsi sic sequuntur, igitur nos possumus licite ac meritorie sic viare. Et sequitur punctus fallacie, quando concluditur, igitur de facto nos servando naturam operis licet modo contrario nec iniuste facimus nec peccamus. Revera prevalente ista fallacia liceret cuilibet religioso qualibet seculari vita quomodolibet conversari.

only lawful but necessary, on account of Caesar's counsel, to set Christ's counsels after it; indeed, that a dispensation must necessarily be made in the case of those burdensome traditions which Christ instituted, but that in the case of the donations of men and the rites that follow them it is not lawful for God or man to dispense, on account of sacrilege; in this we without doubt set man, or more truly mammon, before our God.[17] Let the clergy consider, therefore, how with the goods of fortune the clergy is more prone to fornicate spiritually, slower to come to its senses, and how the bursting of the love of God is altogether more detestable. Therefore those who argue by the topic from the possible to the danger [taken] as a matter of fact should consider how [by that argument] any cloisterer in England can meritoriously have a woman hidden in his bed and study; [arguing] thus: [337] "he is able not to abuse the woman; therefore he ought [to have her]".[18] Bodily fornication (I say) is not so constant, since carnal fornication must be extinguished when nature fails and avarice grows strong; and consequently [spiritual fornication], as more unnatural and more difficult, is the more hated by the Lord.[19] Therefore it says in Matthew 11:24: "I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." For we neither dance with the Son of man nor mourn with John the Baptist,[20] but, leaving aside Christ's doctrine, easy for us, which he expressed in life, manners and words, of the poor and propertyless life, we follow new saints whose canonization was bought, although for the greater part of their life they lived lyingly; and we add, in commendation of our teaching, that we do not read of our patrons' repentance. I would therefore answer:[21] We should establish, I say, Jesus for ourselves as patron and rule, setting others after him and obeying them only in so far as they follow him. In confirmation of this we direct our prayers, those we have of the saints, singularly to him.[22] Let us not, therefore, madly feign the stupidity of our audience in our sermons, for it perceives our sophistries more subtly than we are able to cloak them. The matter of faith (I say), which exceeds opinion, we ought to magnify as far as we are able. So then, removing these marks of faithlessness, of giving more credence to the deeds and words of one sinning superior than to the word or work of our Jesus, we ought singularly to give ourselves to his doctrine; for truly it is an unbelieving excuse in sins, and suspect to the world, to take our theme from Christ and, his doctrine set aside, to lean on one erring superior, though a saint, and especially in these worldly matters, in [338] which they bend away from Christ, adding the fallacy: "They follow thus;

therefore we can lawfully and meritoriously journey as wayfarers thus."[23] And the point of the fallacy follows when it is inferred: "therefore in fact we, keeping the nature of the work, though in a contrary manner, neither act unjustly nor sin." Truly, if this fallacy prevailed, it would be lawful for any religious to live any secular life in any way whatever.

Notes

1. ***Defendendis***: Loserth's emendation; the manuscripts read ***defendendum*** (333.9). We translate the print. C. The clergy of Christ's ***ostendendum*** (333.12), left by Loserth, answers it: both are taken as "for the defending / showing forth of".
2. Ephesians 5:5. C. ***Infidelis hereticus*** and ***hereticus infidelis***: the two nouns in apposition, the order reversed in the second.
3. The maxim that virtue is concerned with the difficult is Aristotle's (***Nicomachean Ethics*** 2.3, 1105a9: "art and virtue are always concerned with what is harder").
4. ***Sunt Antichristi clericis aliena***: the print (confirmed on the plate) is construed "are Antichrist's [things] and foreign to clerics". The sense would run more smoothly with ***Christi clericis***, "foreign to the clerics of Christ"; we translate the print.
5. Acts 1:18; Wyclif omits the Vulgate's ***Et … quidem*** (DR "And he indeed").
6. ***Sentencia*** (CONTEXTUAL): the position stated, here Peter's word in Acts 1:18; "teaching", not a judicial sentence. S. The thirty pieces are Matthew 26:15; the purchase of the field by the chief priests is Matthew 27:3–8, which Wyclif cites as ch. 26.
7. ***Sessinam***: seisin, the feudal possession that perfects title (Loserth, after Matthew: "an English law term"). ***Se suspendit*** (Matthew 27:5) is "hanged himself"; here ***suspendere*** carries no pun. C. ***Possessionem nuncupative dictam***: possession in name only, before the price was paid. S. "The theft of the common purse": John 12:6.
8. "Does his deeds quickly" alludes to John 13:27, "That which thou dost, do quickly."
9. Augustine, ***De consensu evangelistarum***, whose rule is that one evangelist's omitting or telling otherwise what another says is no contradiction, so long as the truth of the facts is the same (e.g. II.19.47; III.17). Acts is called "Peter's gospel" because Peter speaks the verse.
10. Matthew 27:6–7 (DR). C. ***Licet effusi licite***: "though [the blood was] lawfully shed", their own judgement of Christ's death.
11. Matthew 27:6 ("to put them into the corbona"). C. ***Precium seminis***: the price of seed, i.e. money the bishops take on account of sins of the flesh, set against the "price of blood". What money is meant is not traced: fines or commuted penances for unchastity, or fees for reconciling a church polluted "by blood or seed" (Wyclif's own pairing, ***Sermones*** IV, 304).
12. ***Quemque*** as printed (plate checked); read ***quandoque***, answering ***quandoque*** at 335.20; our emendation.
13. 2 Timothy 3:1 ("dangerous times") and Matthew 24:21 ("such as hath not been from the beginning of the world"), by allusion.
14. ***Episcoporum*** is taken with ***heresi***: the presbyter or layman shares in the bishops' simony by his own deed or consent. The alternative takes it with ***opere vel consensu***: entangled by the bishops' deed or consent (e.g. a simoniacal ordination).
15. ***Sors Domini***: the clergy as the Lord's lot (***kleros***), whose portion is the Lord (Numbers 18:20; Deuteronomy 18:2); the derivation is Jerome's, ***Ep.*** 52.5.
16. ***Tercia pars stricta***: "a strait third part", i.e. a narrower portion still; the sense of "third" is not certain. It answers "a third part of the lay estates" below, the share claimed for the clergy.
17. ***Tradicionibus onustatis***: "burdensome traditions" (as if ***onustis***, "laden"), ironic: Christ's ordinances may be dispensed from, men's donations may not. The second ***sed*** corrects upward ("indeed"), so the English reads "indeed, that a dispensation must necessarily be made"; the third is adversative ("but").
18. The argument parodied is the bishops' at 333.22–26: one can avoid the danger, therefore one ought to take up the life. ***Valet*** is "is able" (= ***potest***): the premiss of the parodied inference, as the bishops' ***haberet maiorem prudenciam ad cavendum periculum***.
19. The subject of ***est … odita*** is not expressed; it is taken as spiritual fornication (avarice), contrasted with bodily fornication, which nature ends.
20. Matthew 11:17–19, by allusion ("We have piped to you, and you have not danced: we have lamented, and you have not mourned").
21. ***Igitur respondebam***: the epistolary imperfect, opening Wyclif's reply ("I would therefore answer"), which follows in ***Constitueremus***. The "commendation" is ironic: we cannot read that our bought saints ever repented.
22. The prayers of the saints' days end "through our Lord Jesus Christ"; ***dirigimus*** is taken as indicative, a fact that confirms the rule. Loserth's side-note reads it as an exhortation.
23. ***Ipsi sic sequuntur***: "they" are the erring saints, following their way. ***Viare***: to make one's way as a wayfarer.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 333: ***ydolorum***
  - 333: ***dominari***
  - 333: ***dominacio*** [NW]
  - 334: ***ipsos*** (follows folio bar (simum | ipsos, 244^{b}))
  - 334: ***in***
  - 335: ***hii***

- **335: *vindicta* [NW]**
- **336: *oportet* [NW]**
- **337: *odita* [NW]**
- **337: *omittentes doctrinam Christi* (one main token covers three printed words plus side-note letters)**
- **337: *Sodomorum* (Sodomornm -> Sodomorum (scans: sodomorum | sodomornm | sodomornm | sodomoriim))**
- **335: *irretitus* (LEFT-nw: line number 30 glued)**
- **337: *sophisticaciones* (LEFT-nw: hyphenated sophisti-|caciones)**
- **333: *Antichristi clericis* (333.32; print confirmed on the plate; see note 4)**

Part 7: The law of christ suffices for the church without men's laws

Loserth pp. 338.9–342.18

¶1 338.9–339.25
338.9 *What preaching should be.*
338.31 *No laws but Christ's needed.*
339.27 *Christ's law makes us at peace with God.*

[338]**Ideo talis evangelizans predicaret vitam et doctrinam Christi, in qua non est periculum. Secundo exponeret quomodo sanctus, cui innititur non in lege quam Christus instituit, declinavit, tercio consideraret si modum ita laudabilem sicut fecerunt patroni, quibus innitimur, observamus, quia cum Deus remunerator est adverbiorum, modus est maxime attendendus; quarto vero consideraremus in vitis patrum, si patres nostri ordinis spissius vixerunt et sanccius, quando viventes exproprietarie et nobis contrarie secuti sunt facilius et similius salvatorem. Modicus enim error, qui est insensibilis ex pravitate peccati, est ex continuo incremento sensibile et intolerabile peccatum, a tota ecclesia destruendum, sicut specialiter patet in dotacione ecclesie, que a nuda elemosina crevit in venenosum dominium. Sic igitur duplex illud morale principium, practizatum in via morum, retrocedere est illicitum et de duobus bonis est pocius et facilius eligendum, rectificaret totam ecclesiam; ideo sine excusacione debemus omnes effectualiter illud attendere. Sed redeundo quantum ad secundam sentenciam de necessitate legum ecclesie, patet ex sepe dictis, quod melius regeretur ecclesia pura** [339]**lege Domini quam per se vel cum adiectis legi domini legibus hominum adinventis. Patet ex hoc quod primo modo honori Dei conformius, ad serviendum sibi direccius et inducendum pacem ecclesie copiosius, regularetur ecclesia. Unde antichristiana heresis videtur quod lex Dei non est per se sufficiens nec eque sufficiens ut leges hominum extinguere iniurias in ecclesia germinantes, nam ad confundendum tales infidelitates de Antichristo dicitur Psalmo IX, 21: Constitue Domine legislatorem super eos, ut sciant gentes, quoniam homines sunt ad imaginem Dei, quibus creavit legem in reputacione sua completam condere; ideo debent secundum illam conversari ut homines et non ut bruta. Deus enim ex summa sapiencia legem condidit et dedit ecclesie ad hunc finem. Ideo si lex humana foret ad hoc lege Dei complecior, Antichristus in potencia, in sapiencia, et in providencia excederet**

Therefore such a preacher of the gospel would preach the life and doctrine of Christ, in which there is no danger. Second, he would expound how the saint on whom he relies, [where he relies on him] not in the law which Christ instituted, turned aside;[1] third, he would consider whether we observe a manner as praiseworthy as the patrons on whom we rely did, since, because God is a rewarder of adverbs, the manner is most of all to be attended to;[2] and fourth we would consider in the lives of the fathers whether the fathers of our order lived more closely and more holily when, living without property and contrary to us, they followed the saviour more easily and more like him.[3] For a small error, which is imperceptible by the depravity of sin, becomes by continual increase a perceptible and intolerable sin, to be destroyed by the whole church, as is especially clear in the endowment of the church, which grew from bare alms into poisonous lordship.[4] So, therefore, that twofold moral principle, put into practice in the way of conduct (to go backward is unlawful, and of two goods the better and the easier is to be chosen), would set right the whole church; therefore all of us, without excuse, must attend to it in effect. But, returning to the second teaching, on the necessity of the laws of the church, it is clear from what has often been said that the church would be better ruled by the pure [339]**law of the Lord than by [the laws of the church] by themselves, or with laws devised by men added to the law of the Lord.[5] This is clear from the fact that in the first way the church would be ruled more conformably to God's honour, more directly to serving him, and more abundantly to bringing in the peace of the church. Hence it seems an antichristian heresy that God's law is not sufficient by itself, nor as sufficient as men's laws, to extinguish the injuries sprouting in the church;[6] for to confound such unbeliefs it is said of Antichrist in Psalm 9:21: "Appoint, O Lord, a lawgiver over them: that the Gentiles**

Jhesum Christum; et tunc vera foret discipulorum eius sentencia, quod expedicius foret ecclesie quod legerentur in missis epistole decretales quam epistole apostolorum vel evangelium; nam secundum quod lex est necessarior et expedicior est magis venerabilis et plus meritorie commendanda.

may know themselves to be but men", men to the image of God, for whom he created [it] to establish a law complete in his reckoning; therefore they ought to live according to it as men and not as brute beasts.[7] For God out of his highest wisdom established the law and gave it to the church for this end. Therefore if human law were more complete for this than God's law, Antichrist would exceed Jesus Christ in power, in wisdom and in providence; and then the teaching of his disciples would be true, that it would be more expedient for the church that the decretal epistles were read at masses than the epistles of the apostles or the gospel; for the more necessary and more expedient a law is, the more it is to be venerated and the more meritoriously commended.

¶2 339.27–340.14
340.15 *Christ's law would breed more charity,*
340.27 *and God would provide for justice.*

[339]Item, lex Christi plus pacificat cum Deo et plus disponit ad salutem anime, quam tradicio humana, sed in quantum lex hec fecerit, est honorabilior ac necessarior, igitur lex Christi excellit proporcionabiliter tradicionem humanam. Et cum pax quam habet homo cum Deo infinitum excedit pacem aliam, sicut salus anime et spiritualis prosperitas infinitum excedunt bona alia, que [340]per leges hominum acquiruntur, patet quod lex Dei infinitum excedit leges hominum; et ex eodem sequitur quod sit infinitum prestancior ad placendum Deo et paciendum cum populo, nam per observanciam illius legis et non aliter placeretur, et per consequens pacificaretur homo cum Deo; sed nacta pace cum Deo, acquiritur pax cum qualibet creatura. Quomodo rogo, non obediret et proficeret quelibet creatura homini, cui videret Deum suum amicabiliter obedire, igitur etsi membra dyaboli tribulant amicos Christi, tamen prosunt illis, ut obedienciarii et amici; sic enim Scarioth fuit amicus Christo, Joh. XVIII, et procuravit licet invite serviens pacem Christi.

Again, the law of Christ does more to bring peace with God, and disposes more to the salvation of the soul, than human tradition; now, in so far as a law does this, it is more honourable and more necessary; therefore the law of Christ excels human tradition in proportion. And since the peace which a man has with God infinitely exceeds any other peace, just as the salvation of the soul and spiritual prosperity infinitely exceed the other goods which [340]are acquired through men's laws, it is clear that God's law infinitely exceeds men's laws; and from the same [premiss] it follows that it is infinitely more excellent for pleasing God and for suffering with the people;[8] for by the observance of that law, and not otherwise, would [God] be pleased, and consequently man would be at peace with God; now, once peace with God has been gained, peace is acquired with every creature. How, I ask, would every creature not obey and profit a man whom it saw its God obeying in friendship?[9] Therefore, even if the members of the devil trouble the friends of Christ, yet they profit them, as ones who obey and as friends; for so Iscariot was a friend to Christ (John 18), and, though serving unwillingly, procured the peace of Christ.[10]

¶3 340.15–340.26

[340]Item, lex Christi per se gigneret copiosius caritatem in populo quam leges hominum per se vel commixte legi Domini. Et patet conclusio corollaria. Assumptum patet ex hoc, quod lex Domini precipit quoad bona nature prebere percucienti maxillam sinistram Matth. V 39, 40, quoad bona fortune volenti auferre tunicam dare et pallium, ymo volenti tecum in iudicio contendere et tunicam tollere dare debitum; unde Luce VI, 30 dicitur: Qui aufert que tua sunt ne repetas. Et ista triplex paciencia per se induceret plenam pacem, extinguendo discordias.

Again, the law of Christ by itself would breed charity in the people more abundantly than men's laws by themselves or mingled with the law of the Lord. And the conclusion, a corollary, is clear. The assumption is clear from this, that the law of the Lord commands, as to the goods of nature, "to offer to the one who strikes the left cheek" (Matthew 5:39–40); as to the goods of fortune, to one "who wishes to take away the coat, to give the cloak as well"; indeed, to one "who wishes to contend with you in judgment and take away your coat", to give what is owed;[11] hence it is said in Luke 6:30: "Of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not

¶4 340.27–340.35

[340] **Nec valet infidelis obiectus, quo dicitur quod tunc extingueretur complementum iusticie, quia Deus foret necessitatus ad providendum sue ecclesie ex hinc ad melius, ymo sic accederet ad statum exproprietarium plus perfectum. Ideo idem foret sic dicere et blasfeme imponere Deo inpotenciam, negligenciam sive invidiam, et per consequens quod legifer nonnullus extollitur super omne, quod dicitur Deus.**

again." And this threefold patience would by itself bring in full peace, by extinguishing discords.

Nor does the unbelieving objection hold, by which it is said that then the fulfilment of justice would be extinguished; for God would be bound to provide for his church from then on for the better; indeed, so it would draw near to the more perfect propertyless state.[12] Therefore to say this would be the same as blasphemously to impute to God impotence, negligence or envy, and consequently [to say] that some lawgiver "is lifted up above all that is called God".[13]

¶5 341.1–342.7
341.1 *To advocate endowment Is a heresy.*
341.18 *God's word is the food of the soul.*
342.8 *Christ's law should be followed even as to its counsels.*

[341] **Unde consequenter profundantur in heresim, qui dicunt quod status dotacionis sit perfeccior quam status expropriacionis, et per consequens lex papalis qua stabilitur dotacio est perfeccior quam lex Christi, qua suadetur expropriacio; nam ut inquiunt iste due leges et isti duo status convertibiliter se sequuntur, quia aliter omnino superflueret lex humana et venenose pasceret populum postposito verbo vite. Oportet enim populum illum regi magis intendere, cuius legem preponderat; quia lex et status quem stabilit, se invicem consequuntur. Unde videtur michi nota infidelitatis et dolosa calliditas Antichristi, quod domini temporales statuunt sibi tales pastores et prophetas, qui et artem pascendi ignorent et preparent vel inordinate vel toxice cibum mentis. Constat autem ex fide scripture quod anima pascitur verbo Dei: verba autem alia sunt venenum anime; cum autem non sic ordinant pro coco et cibo corporis, et secundum Crysostomum prelati debent esse stomachus corporis ecclesie et cocus membrorum eius, patet quanta infidelitate laborant mundi principes, qui plus appreciantur atque preponderant cocum corporis coco mentis. Illi autem, quorum Deus venter est, non sunt filii pacis, cum pax prima cum Deo dissolvitur. Et in isto notabiliter deficit doctor fidei christiane. Oportet enim primo rectificare in ecclesia apostolos et prophetas et consequenter residuum corporis ecclesie erit sanum. Illi autem stabilirent hoc necessarium principium fidei modo discreditum propter excecacionem pulveris temporalium, quod quilibet christianus** [342] **debet infinitum plus amare virtutes quam honorem, voluptatem vel commodum temporale, sicut debet infinitum plus odire peccatum eciam veniale quam penam aliquam corporalem, et idem principium fidei per hoc quod, ut aliquid est peius vel melius, est ipsum fugiendum proporcionabiliter vel amandum.**

Hence those sink, as a consequence, deeper into heresy who say that the state of endowment is more perfect than the state of renunciation of property, and consequently that the papal law by which endowment is established is more perfect than the law of Christ, by which renunciation of property is urged; for, as they say, these two laws and these two states follow one another convertibly, since otherwise human law would be altogether superfluous and would feed the people poisonously, the word of life being set aside. For a people must attend more to that king whose law it weighs more heavily; for a law and the state that it establishes follow upon each other.[14] Hence it seems to me a mark of unbelief and a deceitful cunning of Antichrist that the temporal lords set up for themselves such shepherds and prophets as both are ignorant of the art of feeding and prepare the food of the mind either without order or poisonously. Now it is evident from the faith of scripture that the soul is fed by the word of God, and other words are poison to the soul; and since they do not ordain so for the cook and the food of the body, and according to Chrysostom "prelates ought to be the stomach of the body of the church and the cook of its members", it is clear with how great unbelief the princes of the world labour, who value more, and weigh more heavily, the cook of the body than the cook of the mind.[15] And those "whose God is their belly" are not "sons of peace", since the first peace, with God, is dissolved.[16] And in this the teacher of the Christian faith notably falls short.[17] For one must first set right the apostles and prophets in the church, and as a consequence the rest of the body of the church will be sound. And they would establish this necessary principle of faith, now discredited because of the blinding by the dust of temporal goods: that every Christian [342] **ought to love the virtues infinitely more than honour, pleasure or temporal advantage, just as he ought to hate sin, even venial sin, infinitely**

more than any bodily penalty; and the same principle of faith by this, that as a thing is worse or better, so it is to be fled or loved in proportion.[18]

¶6 342.8–342.18

[342]Ex quibus sequitur quod lex Christi eciam secundum consilia sit generaliter servanda et lex hominum postponenda. Exhinc enim accrescit bonum anime infinitum preciosius quam lucrum aliquod temporale. Et hec racio moveret eciam infidelem, nam melius, facilius et brevius foret observare Christi consilia et precepta, igitur non debemus inniti suis contrariis prestancius omittendo. Peccamus igitur graviter, dum facimus nobis inexpediens, et honorem Dei diminuens, utilitatem ecclesie subtrahendo.

From which it follows that the law of Christ is to be kept generally, even as to the counsels, and the law of men put after it. For from this there accrues a good of the soul infinitely more precious than any temporal gain. And this reason would move even an unbeliever: for it would be better, easier and shorter to observe Christ's counsels and precepts; therefore we ought not to rely on their contraries, omitting what is more excellent. We sin gravely, therefore, when we do what is inexpedient for us and diminishes the honour of God, by withdrawing the benefit of the church.[19]

Notes

1. ***Cui innititur non in lege quam Christus instituit***: the ***non in lege*** is taken with the relative ("relies on him, not in Christ's law"); it could instead go with ***declinavit***, "turned aside, not in the law Christ instituted". Either way the preacher is to show where the saint departed from Christ's law. The margin of both manuscripts heads the passage ***Predicacionis modus de sanctis*** (338.9). The apparatus at 338.12 records ***hoc*** for ***lege*** in a manuscript.
2. The maxim that God rewards adverbs (the manner of the deed), not nouns, comes from the ***Glossa ordinaria*** to the Decretals on X 5.22.1 (***Deus non est remunerator nominum sed adverbiorum***), which Wyclif elsewhere cites as the "glossa Bernhardi" (***De civili dominio*** II.12, ed. Loserth p. 139); Wyclif here gives only the first half. G. ***Patroni***: the saints taken as patrons, as in 12-f.
3. ***Spissius***, literally "more densely", taken as "more closely" (with less slackening of the rule). The speaker shifts to the first person plural (***consideraremus***, ***nostri ordinis***): the preacher is imagined as a member of a religious order.
4. ***Insensibilis ex pravitate peccati***: "imperceptible by the depravity of sin", i.e. too small to be perceived as sin; Wyclif sets ***insensibilis*** against ***sensibile*** in the same sentence.
5. ***Quam per se vel cum adiectis ... legibus hominum adinventis***: the subject of ***per se*** is unexpressed; we take it as the laws of the church just named. G. ***Sentencia***: the second position under discussion in the chapter, "teaching", not a judicial sentence.
6. At 339.11 the manuscripts read ***sed ut*** (the apparatus gives the reading without its lemma in the OCR); the print's ***nec eque sufficiens ut*** is translated.
7. Psalm 9:21 (Vulgate numbering), quoted as in the Vulgate. Wyclif's gloss runs on from ***homines sunt***, which Douay renders "to be but men". C. ***Quibus creavit legem ... condere***: the infinitive has no clear subject; we take it as God's creating men so that a law complete in his reckoning should be established for them. The construction is doubtful.
8. ***Paciendum cum populo***, "suffering with the people", is the print; the sense of the argument (peace with God and with creatures) suggests ***pacificandum*** or a like word, "making peace with the people". We translate the print.
9. ***Cui videret Deum suum amicabiliter obedire***: ***obedire*** takes the dative, so ***cui*** is the one obeyed and ***Deum*** the subject: God himself obeys the man (cf. Joshua 10:14). ***Suum*** may refer to the creature or to the man.
10. John 18 (the betrayal); Christ calls Judas "Friend" at Matthew 26:50.
11. Matthew 5:39–40, paraphrased: the Vulgate has the right cheek (***dexteram***) and "turn to him also the other"; ***dare et pallium*** answers to ***dimitte ei et pallium***; the order of coat and cloak follows Luke 6:29. C. ***Dare debitum***, "to give what is owed": the third clause, against Matthew's "let go thy cloak also", is taken as yielding the coat as though it were owed. B reads ***tunicam contendere*** at 340.23.
12. The objection's ground is answered in the ***quia*** clause: if men's laws were extinguished, God would not leave justice wanting but would provide better for the church. ***Ex hinc***, "from then on". The propertyless state is that of the church without endowment.
13. 2 Thessalonians 2:4; Wyclif has ***super*** for the Vulgate's ***supra***.
14. At 341.10 B reads ***legi***, and at 341.11 ***preponderant***. C. ***Populum illum regi magis intendere***: ***regi*** is taken as the dative of ***rex***, "attend to that king"; it could also be the passive infinitive, "that people must be ruled", which leaves ***magis intendere*** without a construction.
15. Ps.-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 38 (on Matthew 21:12; PG 56.839–840), cited as Chrysostom: priests are the stomach of the church, which takes in the food, "cooks it in itself" and distributes it through the whole body; Wyclif paraphrases. No reference in Loserth. Both manuscripts note in the margin (341.20) that those who prefer the cook of the body to the cook of the mind sin gravely.
16. Philippians 3:19; Luke 10:6 ("the son of peace").

17. ***Doctor fidei christiane*** is not identified; it may be the prelate as teacher of the faith in general. B reads ***defecit*** (341.27).
18. ***Illi autem stabilirent***: ***illi*** is taken as the apostles and prophets once set right. ***Et idem principium fidei per hoc quod …*** has no verb of its own; we take ***stabilirent*** as understood: they would establish the same principle by the rule of proportion. Both manuscripts mark the two principles in the margin (342.1, 342.3).
19. ***Facimus nobis inexpediens, et honorem Dei diminuens***: the participle is taken in parallel with the adjective, "what is inexpedient … and diminishes"; ***utilitatem ecclesie subtrahendo*** gives the means.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 338: ***Sed*** (the main token read the English side note "but"; this slot is the only one for the printed Sed)
  - 339: ***tradicio***
  - 340: ***copiosius*** (15 is the line number)
  - 340: ***accederet*** (30 is the line number)
  - 341: ***illum***
  - 341: ***preponderat***
  - 341: ***toxice*** [NW]
  - 342: ***Ex***
  - 340: ***per*** (first half of per-|cucienti; box misplaced on Domini)
  - 340: ***V 39,*** (print has V and 39, separated by a space; box misplaced)

Part 8: The saints against the laws of men; the sext's rule on rival provisions

Loserth pp. 342.19–345.21

¶1 342.19–343.31

[342]Et de ista subtraccione a libertate legis Christi post multiplicitatem legum Antichristi conquesti sunt sancti; quod patet in exemplo triplici, primo ex decreto beati Augustini ad inquisiciones Januarii superius recitato et ponitur in decretis XII distinccione: Omnia; secundo ex dicto beati Jeronymi epistola CXVIII ad Domicianum de morte Fabiole, ubi exponens illud evangelium Matth. XIX, 9, ubi dominus precepit viris uxorem non debere dimittere, excepta causa fornicacionis, et dimissam manere innuptam sic loquitur: Quicquid viris iubetur, hoc consequenter redundat ad feminas, neque enim adultera uxor dimittenda est [343]et vir mechus tenendus. Si quis meretrici coniungitur unum corpus efficitur, igitur que scortatori impuroque sociatur, unum cum eo corpus efficitur. Alie, inquit, sunt leges cesarum, alie Ihesu Christi, aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus noster precipit. Apud illos viris inpudicicie frena laxantur, et solo stupro atque adulterio condempnato, passim per lupanaria atque ancillulas libido permittitur, quasi culpam dignitas faciat, non voluptas; apud nos quod non licet feminis, eque non licet viris. Igitur in lege Christi oportet fidelem quiescere, et alias leges, nisi de quanto consonant legi Christi, contempnere, quod sepe oportet de vocata lege ecclesie. Unde beatus Bernhardus libro primo ad Eugenium sic effatur: Quid servilius indigniusque presertim summo pontifici, quem non dico omni die, sed pene omni hora insudare talibus rebus et pro talibus. Deinde quando oramus, quando docemus

And of this withdrawal from the freedom of the law of Christ, in following after the multitude of Antichrist's laws, the saints have complained;[1] as is clear in a threefold example: first from the decree of blessed Augustine to the inquiries of Januarius, recited above, which is placed in the Decretum, distinction 12, [the canon] *Omnia*;[2] second from the saying of blessed Jerome in letter 118 to Domitianus on the death of Fabiola, where, expounding that gospel, Matthew 19:9, where the Lord commanded husbands that a wife ought not to be put away except for the cause of fornication, and that one put away should remain unmarried, he speaks thus:[3] "Whatever is commanded to men redounds consequently to women; for neither is an adulterous wife to be put away [343]and an adulterous husband to be kept. If anyone is joined to a harlot, he is made one body; therefore she who is united to a fornicator and unclean man is made one body with him.[4] The laws of the Caesars," he says, "are one thing, those of Jesus Christ another; Papinian commands one thing, our Paul another. Among them the reins of unchastity are loosened for men, and, with only seduction and adultery condemned, lust is permitted everywhere through brothels and slave-girls, as if rank, not pleasure, made the fault; with us what is not lawful for women is equally not lawful for men."[5] Therefore the faithful man must rest in the law of Christ and despise other laws, except in so far as they accord with the law of Christ;

populos, quando edificamus ecclesiam, quando meditamur in lege? Et quidem cottidie perstrepunt in pallacio leges, sed Iustiniani non Domini. Si iustum istud, tu videris, nam certe lex Domini immaculata convertens animas. Hec autem non tam leges quam lites sunt et cavillaciones subvertentes iudicium. Tu igitur pastor et episcopus animarum, qua mente obsecro sustines coram te, semper silere illam, garrire istas? Fallor, si non movet tibi scrupulum perversitas hec, puto quod interdum compellat te clamor ad Dominum cum propheta: Narraverunt michi iniqui fabulaciones, sed non ut lex tua.

which must often be done with the so-called law of the church. Hence blessed Bernard, in the first book to Eugenius, speaks thus:[6] "What is more servile and more unworthy, especially for the supreme pontiff, than to sweat, I do not say every day, but almost every hour, over such matters and for such [people]?[7] Then when do we pray, when do we teach the peoples, when do we build up the church, when do we meditate on the law? And indeed every day laws resound in the palace, but Justinian's, not the Lord's. Whether this is just, you must see; for certainly 'the law of the Lord is unspotted, converting souls'. But these are not so much laws as lawsuits and cavils subverting judgment. You then, shepherd and bishop of souls, with what mind, I beseech you, do you bear it before you that the one is always silent and these chatter? I am mistaken if this perversity does not stir a scruple in you; I think that at times it compels you to cry out to the Lord with the prophet: 'The wicked have told me fables: but not as thy law.'"[8]

¶2 344.1–344.25
344.7 *Attention to human law distracts us from God and his law.*
344.26 *Fraud and injustice in human law.*

[344]Ista autem secundum fidem scripture sunt a papa et quolibet episcopo meditanda, et postpositis cunctis legibus extraneis effectualiter exequenda. In extraneis enim legibus iacet a lege Christi et per consequens a Deo distraccio, utriusque testamenti offensio et periculosa ac latens iniuriacio. Quis (queso) dubitat, quin occupacio circa leges hominum, que omnes sunt conclusio ad viacionem superflue, de tanto distrahunt pusillam capacitatem anime a lege Domini? Quis insuper hesitat de legislatore Christo, quem oportet omnem salvandum sequi? Psalmus primo, 2 scribitur: In lege eius meditabitur die ac nocte, ymo Deutronomio VIII, 1 dicitur: Omne mandatum quod ego precipio tibi hodie, cave diligenter ut facias. Et quia ad hoc requiritur mandatorum noticia; ideo Deutronomio VI, 6, precipitur post precepcionem observancie omnium mandatorum erunt verba hec, que ego precipio tibi hodie, in corde tuo, et narrabis ea filiis tuis et meditaberis sedens in domo tua et ambulans in itinere, dormiens atque consurgens. Et Joh. XIV, 15 ab equo dicitur: Si quis diligit me, sermonem meum servabit. Nichil enim attencius mandatur a Domino, quam iugis meditacio legis Dei.

And these things, according to the faith of scripture, are to be meditated on by the pope and by every bishop, and, all foreign laws being set aside, carried out in effect. For in foreign laws lies a distraction from the law of Christ, and consequently from God, an offence against both testaments, and a dangerous and hidden wronging. Who, I ask, doubts that busying oneself with men's laws, which are all [*conclusio*] superfluous to wayfaring, draws the small capacity of the soul away from the law of the Lord by so much?[9] Who, moreover, hesitates about Christ the lawgiver, whom everyone who is to be saved must follow?[10] In the first Psalm, [verse] 2, it is written: "on his law he shall meditate day and night"; indeed in Deuteronomy 8:1 it is said: "All the commandments, that I command thee this day, take great care to observe." And because for this a knowledge of the commandments is required, therefore in Deuteronomy 6:6, after the commanding of the observance of all the commandments, it is commanded: "these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising."[11] And in John 14[:23] it is said: "If any one love me, he will keep my word."[12] For nothing is more carefully commanded by the Lord than continual meditation on the law of God.

¶3 344.26–345.10

[344]Et quantum ad tercium patet, quod in legibus humanis est fraudis et iniurie plenitudo. Patet hoc de principiis vel maximis legum

And as to the third, it is clear that in human laws there is a fullness of fraud and injury. This is clear of the principles or maxims of the laws of

ecclesie, et multo magis de conclusionibus ex illis sequentibus. Nam libro VI de constitucionibus datur pro regula, quod duobus super eadem provisione litteras a papa habentibus una die, is, cui papa [345] canonicatum contulit preferendus est ei cui non dedit canonicatum, ignorante executore quis prius impetraverit. Si autem sint pares in gracia, quoad formam stili papalis, is qui prius presentavit erit pocior in prebenda. Et tercio si equales fuerint in hiis tribus, tunc canonici, quibus spectat collacio, vel maior pars eorum tenetur eligere reliquo carente fructu gracie nisi ex tenore papalium litterarum expresse appareat, quod papa utrique illorum voluerit providere.

the church, and much more of the conclusions following from them. For in the Sixth Book, [under] "On constitutions", it is given as a rule that "when two have letters from the pope on the same provision on one day, he on whom the pope [345] conferred a canonry is to be preferred to him on whom he did not bestow a canonry, if the executor does not know which obtained [his letters] first. But if they are equal in the grace, as to the form of the papal style, he who presented first shall have the stronger right in the prebend. And third, if they are equal in these three, then the canons to whom the conferral belongs, or the greater part of them, are bound to choose, the other lacking the fruit of the grace, unless it appears expressly from the tenor of the papal letters that the pope wished to provide for both of them."[13]

¶4 345.11–345.18

[345] Ista autem trimembris maxima videtur in toto esse principium contra Christum, quia supposito sicut in maiori parte contingit, quod prepositus in canonicatu vel tempore, in presentacione vel ostensione gracie, vel tercio in capitali eleccione sit reliquo quantumlibet indignior quoad Deum, tunc ex ista maxima Antichristi debet iudicari contra Christi iudicium.

Now this three-membered maxim seems to be wholly a principle against Christ; for supposing, as happens for the greater part, that the one preferred in canonry or in time, in presentation or in showing the grace, or, third, in the chapter's election, is ever so much more unworthy than the other as regards God, then by this maxim of Antichrist judgment must be given against the judgment of Christ.[14]

¶5 345.19–345.21

[345] Ex quo manifeste sequitur quod hoc Antichristi porisma sit iniquum contra iusticiam et per consequens contra Christum.

From which it follows plainly that this porism of Antichrist is wicked, against justice, and consequently against Christ.

Notes

1. ***Post multiplicitatem legum Antichristi***: ***post*** taken as "in following after" (the church goes after Antichrist's many laws); it could be temporal, "after the multiplying of".
2. Augustine, ***Ep.*** 55 to Januarius (on the multiplying of observances), as ***Decretum*** D.12 c.12 ***Omnia talia***: Loserth gives "Cap. XII" (342.24); the modern form is ours. The letter is ***Ep.*** 55.19.35 (PL 33.221); Gratian's inscription numbers it ***Ep.*** 119 in the older numbering.
3. Jerome, letter on the death of Fabiola: Loserth (342.29) notes that it is ***Ep.*** 77 and is addressed to Oceanus, not ***Ep.*** 118 to Domitianus as Wyclif says (PL 22.691). Matthew 19:9; ***manere innuptam***, "remain unmarried", is 1 Corinthians 7:11.
4. Jerome's argument from 1 Corinthians 6:16. T. Both manuscripts read ***scortatori imponitur sociatur*** (343.2–3), and B omits ***igitur*** (343.2); the print's ***impuroque*** is Jerome's text.
5. The manuscripts read ***in viris pudicicie*** (343.6); the print's ***viris inpudicicie*** is Jerome's. R. A marks the passage ***De meretricio***, B ***Meretricacio*** (343.1). Papinian, the Roman jurist.
6. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** 1.4: Loserth gives "Cap. IV. Opp. I, 732" (343.14); = 1.4.5, PL 182.732C–D. R. B notes in the margin (343.15) that human laws chatter above the law of Christ before the pope.
7. The print has ***quem non dico omni die ... insudare***, which does not construe; Bernard's sentence requires ***quam***, "than to sweat" (our emendation, after the source). B omits ***et*** at 343.18.
8. Psalm 18:8 and Psalm 118:85 (Vulgate numbering), within Bernard's text. ***Illam ... istas***: the law of the Lord is silent, the lawsuits chatter.
9. ***Que omnes sunt conclusio ad viacionem superflue***: ***conclusio*** does not construe (a stray word or a misreading in the established text); it is left untranslated in brackets. C. ***Occupacio ... distrahunt***: a singular subject with a plural verb; we take the busying with the laws as the subject. ***Viacio***: the state of the wayfarer on the road to the homeland.
10. The manuscripts read ***hesitat quin*** (344.11); the print's ***hesitat de*** is translated.
11. Psalm 1:2; Deuteronomy 8:1 (Wyclif quotes the first clause); Deuteronomy 6:6–7, where Wyclif omits ***in eis***, "upon them", after ***meditaberis***. R. Both manuscripts note in the margin (344.14) that the law of God ought to be studied most diligently.
12. The print has ***Joh. XIV, 15 ab equo***; the words quoted are John 14:23, which the English gives. ***Ab equo*** does not construe (perhaps for ***ab eo***, "by him") and is not translated.

13. ***Liber Sextus*** **1.3.14** ***Duobus*** **(De rescriptis): Loserth (344.30) notes that Wyclif's "title II" (De constitutionibus) should be title III, chapter 14; the modern form is ours. G.** ***Gracia*****: the papal grace (the letters of provision).** ***Pocior in prebenda*****, "the stronger right in the prebend". T. At 345.1 the manuscripts read** ***eo*** **for** ***ei*****; at 345.3 B reads** ***impetravit*****. R. Both manuscripts note (344.30):** ***Lex papalis patitur instanciam*****.**
14. ***Prepositus*** **is here the participle of** ***preponere*****, "the one preferred", not** ***prepositi*** **"superiors".** ***Capitali eleccione*****: the election by the chapter (*****capitulum*****), the third member of the rule. B reads** ***fit*** **at 345.16.**

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **343:** ***et***
  - **343:** ***ancillulas***
  - **343:** ***dignitas***
  - **343:** ***faciat***
  - **343: ∅ (folio bar after ad (246[c] in margin) read as i)**
  - **343:** ***Deinde***
  - **343:** ***pallacio*** **[NW]**
  - **343:** ***iudicium***
  - **344:** ***Quis***
  - **344:** ***diligenter*** **(hyphenated dili-|genter (15 line number); main token holds the whole word)**
  - **344:** ***Joh. XIV, 15*** **(the in-line verse number, lost in every scan, read on the plate)**
  - **345:** ***canonicatum***
  - **345:** ***canonicatum***
  - **345:** ***hiis***
  - **343:** ***Papinianus,*** **(Papiniauus, -> Papinianus, (scans: papiniauus | papinianus | papiuianns | papiniauus))**
  - **343:** ***leges*** **(specks above e in leges (print: leges))**

Part 9: Causes, benefices and the dangers of papal provision

Loserth pp. 345.22–349.26

¶1 345.22–347.25
345.27 *Godless laws of Boniface VIII.*
346.18 *It is blasphemy to say that God confirms all laws made by the pope.*
347.10 *How appointment to benefices should be made.*
347.32 *Dangers attending choice.*

[345]**Ex quo patet ulterius, quod sit a fidelibus tamquam hereticum abrogandum, et per consequens papa non debet pro toto mundo secundum ipsum generaliter causas ecclesiasticas terminare. Et idem est argumentum de generalibus legum paparum principiis, et specialiter de maximis Bonifacii VIII in Sexto, que manifeste obviant legi Dei. Non enim preferunt nec sciunt preferre quem Deus preelegit, sed communiter preeligunt maximum Antichristum, quia cum Judas non dormit avaricia debriatus sepe contingit quod membrum dyaboli preferatur; calliditas** [346]**enim vulpina sepe preficit minus dignos. Unde apostoli non audebant nec potuerunt sicut nec Christus talem legem statuere. Ideo ista vocata lex est Antichristi, qui extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus. Christus enim non potest ex nuda prelacione momenti temporis, ex callida presentacione priori collacionis papalis nec ex iterata eleccione sepe frivola capituli acceptantis, ineptum virtute preponere, sed oportet omnino, quod ille quem Christus vel lex sua preeligit, sit quoad Deum virtute prestancior. Et hinc apostoli non presumpserunt vel legem eleccionis statuere vel Mathiam eligere, sed commiserunt hec divino iudicio, ut patet Act. I. Sic**

From this it is further clear that it is to be abrogated by the faithful as heretical, and consequently the pope ought not to determine ecclesiastical causes generally for the whole world according to it. And the argument is the same about the general principles of the popes' laws, and especially about the maxims of Boniface VIII in the Sext, which plainly run counter to God's law. For they do not prefer, nor know how to prefer, the one whom God has chosen beforehand, but commonly choose beforehand the greatest Antichrist; for since Judas, drunk with avarice, does not sleep, it often happens that a member of the devil is preferred; for foxlike cunning [346]**often sets the less worthy over [others]. Hence the apostles did not dare and were not able, just as Christ was not, to establish such a law. Therefore this so-called law is Antichrist's, who "is lifted up above all that is called God".[1] For Christ cannot, on the bare priority of a moment of time, on a crafty earlier presentation of the papal conferral, or on the repeated and often frivolous election of the accepting chapter, set over [others] one unfit in virtue; but it must altogether be that the one whom Christ or his law chooses beforehand is more excellent in virtue as regards**

autem faceret papa, cum pro toto mundo non statueret legem iniustam vel committeret peccatum eciam veniale. Est autem maior blasfemia constanter asserrere quod eo ipso quo Papa hoc statuit eciam contra decretum Domini, tunc est iustum, vel quod oportet quod Deus condescendat pape et legem quamcumque pape iustificet. Vel tercio quod levem iniuriam homo debet committere propter maius commodum inde sequens. Cum igitur quoad omnes causas terminandas per se sufficit lex scripture, quomodo presumeret Christi vicarius legem assumere tam iniquam quoad iniurias, commoveatur utraque pars pati iniurias et propter periculum tempus sibi redimere. Hoc autem ex fide est melius quam iudicium quod sentenciat lex humana, quod si neutra pars voluerit decreto Domini in talibus humiliter consentire, compromittant ponendo se in arbitrio boni viri vel ad minimum iudicentur secundum leges civiles intra ecclesiam, vel si omnia ista renuerint, fugiantur tamquam ethnici et publicani [347]et discipuli Antichristi. Et nullomodo trahat Christi vicarius huiusmodi causas sibi, sed effugiat ut venenum iuxta exemplaria legum civilium condere novas leges, sed abnuentem finaliter hanc viam triplicem, excommunicet ut membrum dyaboli. Excommunicanten im quandoque simplices; quia dissentire renuunt legi. Et patet quomodo preter papam oportet esse, sicut fuit in primitiva ecclesia, unum caput ad causas ecclesiasticas terminandum. Quoad secundum patet quod oportet esse unum caput ad beneficia ecclesiastica parciendum, nam lex Christi est ad illud sufficiens, et persona populi, cui preficeretur talis prepositus, foret optimus iudex ad discernendum talem prepositum episcopo presentandum. Sic enim fuit in primitiva ecclesia; nec cessat racio, quare non sic foret hodie. Nam illa persona tenerrime provideret de mediis ad salutem anime necessariis cuiusmodi est pastor discretus; si enim providet de mediis corporis nutritivis, fides necessitat quod infinitum plus provideat de mediis anime nutritivis. Ideo Ecclesiastici XXX, 24 dicitur: Miserere anime tue placens Deo. Istam igitur providenciam non est Christi et per consequens nullius creature vetare.

God. And hence the apostles did not presume either to establish a law of election or to elect Matthias, but committed these things to divine judgment, as is clear from Acts 1.[2] And so the pope would do, since for the whole world he would not establish an unjust law or commit even a venial sin.[3] And it is a greater blasphemy to assert steadfastly that by the very fact that the pope has established this, even against the decree of the Lord, it is then just; or that God must condescend to the pope and justify any law of the pope whatever; or, third, that a man ought to commit a slight injury for the sake of a greater advantage following from it. Since, therefore, the law of scripture by itself suffices for determining all causes, how would the vicar of Christ presume to take up a law so wicked? As to injuries, let each party be moved to suffer injuries and, because of the danger, to redeem the time for itself.[4] And this, as faith teaches, is better than the judgment which human law pronounces; but if neither party is willing humbly to consent to the Lord's decree in such matters, let them compromise by putting themselves in the arbitration of a good man, or at least be judged according to the civil laws within the church; or if they refuse all these, let them be shunned as heathens and publicans [347]and disciples of Antichrist.[5] And let the vicar of Christ in no way draw causes of this kind to himself, but let him flee like poison the making of new laws after the patterns of the civil laws; but let him excommunicate, as a member of the devil, the one who finally refuses this threefold way. For they sometimes excommunicate simple people, because they refuse to dissent from the law.[6] And it is clear how, apart from the pope, there must be, as there was in the primitive church, one head for determining ecclesiastical causes.[7] As to the second, it is clear that there must be one head for distributing ecclesiastical benefices, for the law of Christ is sufficient for that; and the person of the people over whom such a superior would be set would be the best judge for discerning such a superior to be presented to the bishop.[8] For so it was in the primitive church; nor has the reason ceased why it should not be so today.[9] For that person would provide most tenderly for the means necessary to the salvation of the soul, of which kind is a discerning shepherd; for if it provides for the means that nourish the body, faith requires that it provide infinitely more for the means that nourish the soul. Therefore it is said in Ecclesiasticus 30:24: "Have pity on thy own soul, pleasing God." It belongs, therefore, neither to Christ, nor consequently to any creature, to forbid this providing.

¶2 347.26–347.31

[347]**Quantum ad legem, patet quod sola lex Christi perfecte docet pastoris officium, quomodo introducendus est, quomodo nutriendus et quomodo castigandus; illam igitur legem oportet communitatem christianorum defendere et tradiciones contrarias impugnare.**

As to the law, it is clear that the law of Christ alone teaches perfectly the office of a shepherd: how he is to be brought in, how nourished and how corrected; therefore the community of Christians must defend that law and attack the traditions contrary to it.

¶3 347.32–348.26
348.27 *The Pope often appoints persons of whom he knows nothing,*

[347]**Sunt igitur tam ex parte electorum quam electi pericula. Ex parte electoris in hoc, quod posset blasfeme presumere quod sufficit voluntas** [348]**sua, cum signo ab eo accepto ad rite constituendum prelatum ecclesie; et sic foret personaliter Ihesus Christus. Oportet enim Deum prius eligendo et habilitando constituere, cuius ordinacioni concordans sagax instrumentum Dei potest esse nudus promulgator divine sentencie, et ignorando divinam sentenciam reticeret, sicut fecerunt apostoli in eleccione Matthie. Si enim contrariatur divine sentencie, tunc peccat; nec debet sibi in hoc credi nec a fidelibus consentiri, quia aliter posset papa esse cum sibi adherentibus, infra modicum tempus maximus Antichristus, quia proditorie contra Christum dissipans oves suas; hoc autem est signum potissimum Antichristi. Item, est valde possibile quod papa ignoret vel negligat personam ydoneam gregi fideli postponere, sed nimis periculosum et stultum foret cum hoc preficere prelatum ecclesie, igitur in illo officio adiacet pape magnum periculum. Cum igitur in omni tali pars securior est tenenda videtur quod securius et optacius foret illud dimittere et per consequens papa peccaret in eligendo partem tam periculosam atque ambiguam. Nam iuxta legem pape in De Consecracione distinccione V: Non mediocriter peccat, qui maiori bono postposito eligit minus bonum.**

There are therefore dangers both on the side of the electors and on that of the one elected. On the side of the elector in this, that he could blasphemously presume that his will suffices, [348]**with a sign received from him, for duly constituting a prelate of the church; and so he would be Jesus Christ in person.[10] For God must first constitute [him] by electing and qualifying [him]; and, agreeing with his ordinance, a shrewd instrument of God can be the bare promulgator of the divine sentence, and, not knowing the divine sentence, would keep silent, as the apostles did in the election of Matthias.[11] For if he goes against the divine sentence, then he sins; and he ought not to be believed in this, nor consented to by the faithful, since otherwise the pope, with those who adhere to him, could within a short time be the greatest Antichrist, as treacherously scattering against Christ his sheep; and this is the foremost sign of Antichrist. Again, it is very possible that the pope, not knowing or neglecting [him], passes over a person suitable for the faithful flock; now it would be exceedingly dangerous and foolish, with this [possibility], to set a prelate over the church; therefore in that office great danger lies upon the pope.[12] Since, therefore, in every such case the safer part is to be held, it seems that it would be safer and more desirable to give that up, and consequently the pope would sin in choosing a part so dangerous and doubtful. For according to the pope's law in *De consecratione*, distinction 5: "He sins not a little who, setting aside the greater good, chooses the less good."[13]**

¶4 348.27–349.6

[348]**Assumptum patet in facto de distancia personarum inexpertarum quas ex nudo verbo testium eorum sepe preficit, et ex hoc quod ipse ac examinatores sui ignorant communiter mores persone extranee, et quoad scienciam sepe preponderant artem litigandi civiliter arti curandi animas; quod est condicio Antichristi. Recoleret** [349]**igitur quomodo omni facinori perversi prepositi quem stulte sic preficit est non solum consenciens sed ipsum capitaliter auctorizans; pape igitur sanctissimi istam dominativam formam preficiendi prepositos non temptarunt. Que igitur prudencia, quod infirmiores pape hoc facerent?**

The assumption is clear in fact from the distance of untried persons whom he often sets over [others] on the bare word of their witnesses, and from this, that he and his examiners are commonly ignorant of the character of a stranger, and, as to knowledge, often weigh the art of litigating in civil law above the art of the cure of souls; which is the mark of Antichrist.[14] Let him therefore recall [349]**how to every misdeed of a perverse superior whom he so foolishly sets over [them] he is not only consenting but authorizing it as head; the most holy popes, therefore,**

did not attempt this lordly form of setting superiors over [others]. What prudence is it, then, that weaker popes should do this?[15]

¶5 349.7–349.26

[349] Item, grave peccatum est propositis e duabus partibus minus bona eligere, sed hoc sepe contingit in preposituris papalibus, igitur sepius sunt inique. Quis ergo color excommunicandi omnes, qui resistunt pagine tam inique. Iste itaque error sepe devolvit profundius quod excommunicetur persona, quia facit ut debet conformiter legi Dei. Assumptum patet ex hoc, quod Deus vult et precipit quod homo eligat pociora, quia aliter excusaretur stulticia, ne sapiat peccatum et liceret voluntati Dei quamlibet deformari. Principium igitur nature est, quod homo eligat sibi utilius, ideo plane sequitur ex primo principio quod homo debet sic facere. Et hec racio quare fides scripture docet orare et petere condicionaliter media, de quibus ignoratur utrum sint magis utilia. Nec dubium quin Deo bono sit beneplacitum, quod homo laboret continue circa sibi utilius, quia aliter foret invidus.

Again, it is a grave sin, when two sides are put forward, to choose the less good; now this often happens in the papal offices of superior; therefore they are very often wicked.[16] What colour, then, is there for excommunicating all who resist so wicked a page?[17] This error, then, often rolls down deeper, so that a person is excommunicated because he does as he ought, in conformity with God's law. The assumption is clear from this, that God wills and commands that a man choose the better things; since otherwise folly would be excused, so as not to savour of sin, and it would be lawful [for a man] to be deformed in any way whatever from the will of God.[18] It is therefore a principle of nature that a man choose what is more useful to himself; so it plainly follows from the first principle that a man ought so to act. And this is the reason why the faith of scripture teaches us to pray and to ask conditionally for means of which it is not known whether they are more useful.[19] Nor is there doubt that it is well pleasing to the good God that a man labour continually about what is more useful to him, since otherwise he would be envious.

Notes

1. 2 Thessalonians 2:4 (*super* for the Vulgate's *supra*). The "maxims" are the *regulae* of the rule on rival provisions quoted in 12-h (*Liber Sextus* 1.3.14).
2. Acts 1:23–26: the apostles put forward two and committed the choice to the lot.
3. *Sic autem faceret papa*: "so the pope would do", i.e. he would commit such matters to God's judgment; *cum … non statueret* gives the reason: the pope would not for the whole world make an unjust law.
4. We begin a new sentence at *quoad iniurias*; the print runs it on from the question, which leaves *commoveatur* without a link. S. Ephesians 5:16, "redeeming the time".
5. Matthew 18:17, "as the heathen and publican". C. *Quod si*, "but if": the second course, for parties unwilling to suffer injury, is arbitration or the civil laws.
6. *Excommunicant enim*, as the sense requires (the print's *Excommuni-canten im* is a misprint). *Dissentire renuunt legi*: the simple refuse to dissent from God's law, and are excommunicated for it.
7. The one head is taken as Christ: *preter papam*, "apart from the pope", as in the primitive church, which had no such pope. The next sentence supports this: the head for benefices needs no pope, "for the law of Christ is sufficient". Read without that sense, the sentence would assert a single human head, against the argument; a lost negative is possible (Latin doubt). R. Both manuscripts note in the margin (347.10): *Caput unum oportet esse ad distribuendum beneficia*.
8. *Persona populi*: the people taken as one person (the community over whom the superior is set), the subject of *provideret* and *providet* below. *Prepositus*: here the parish superior, the pastor to be presented to the bishop.
9. *Nec cessat racio, quare non sic foret hodie*: literally "nor does the reason cease why it would not be so today"; taken as "the reason for it still holds".
10. *Cum signo ab eo accepto*: the sign (the letter or seal) received from the elector; the elector would act as though his will alone made the prelate, as only Christ can. T. B omits *Christus* (348.3).
11. *Sentencia*: God's sentence, his decision on the person, not a position taught. C. *Reticeret*: if the instrument does not know God's sentence, it would keep silent rather than choose, as the apostles did over Matthias (Acts 1:26).
12. *Quod papa ignoret vel negligat personam ydoneam gregi fideli postponere*: *ydoneam gregi fideli*, "suitable for the faithful flock"; *postponere*, "to put after, pass over", depends loosely on *ignoret vel negligat*. Literally "that the pope does not know or neglects to pass over a suitable person", which inverts the sense; we take *ignoret vel negligat* as giving the cause. *Preponere* would give "does not know how, or neglects, to set a suitable person over the faithful flock" (Latin doubt).
13. *Decretum*, *De consecratione* D.5 c.24: Loserth gives "Cap. XXIV" (348.24); the modern form is ours. He notes (348.25) that the canon's correct reading is *errant*, not *peccat*. R. Both manuscripts note in the margin (347.32): *Eleccio prelati habet pericula*.

14. ***In facto de distancia personarum inexpertarum***: the pope provides to persons far off and untried. T. The apparatus at 348.29 gives a manuscript reading for *testium* that cannot be made out in the OCR.
15. ***Recoleret***, imperfect subjunctive: "let him recall", of the pope. ***Dominativam formam***: compare *potestas dominativa*, "lordly power".
16. ***Propositis e duabus partibus***: "when two sides are put forward" (ablative absolute). ***Sepius***: "very often". R. Both manuscripts note in the margin (349.15): ***Distribucio beneficiorum quid confert pape***.
17. ***Color***: a plausible ground (the period sense, as in "colour of title"). ***Pagina***: the written law.
18. ***Ne sapiat peccatum***: folly would be excused "so that it would not savour of sin". ***Liceret voluntati Dei quamlibet deformari***: ***voluntati Dei*** is taken as dative with ***deformari***, "to be out of form with God's will". R. Both manuscripts note (349.31): ***Eligere pociora homo vult Deus***.
19. Asking ***condicionaliter***: the conditional prayer, ***oracio condicionata***.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 345: ***preferre*** (30 is the line number)
  - 346: ***asserrere*** (print has double r (asserrere), kept as printed)
  - 346: ***quod***
  - 346: ***eo***
  - 346: ***quo***
  - 346: ***sta*** (sta | tuit split by folio bar (247ᵇ in margin), not a hyphen; this part only)
  - 346: ***tuit*** (second part of sta | tuit (folio bar); 247ᵇ is the folio mark)
  - 346: ***eciam***
  - 346: ***vel*** (20 is the line number on that line)
  - 347: ***illa***
  - 348: ***maiori*** (348.25, lost in every scan, read on the plate)
  - 348: ***inexpertarum*** [NW]
  - 349: ***preficiendi*** [NW]
  - 349: ***ideo*** (20 is the line number)
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Dangers choice. ^ (347.32).

Part 10: Provisions, elections and the stipends of failing superiors

Loserth pp. 349.27–352.30

¶1 349.27–350.22
349.27 *The Pope should abstain from provisions.*
350.8 *All patrons are bound to appoint the best man,*
350.23 *and not to promote one inferior because the king favours him.*

[349]Ex isto morali principio sequitur, primo quod papa debet sollicitudinem talium provisionum dimittere et occupari circa edificacionem ecclesie, sicut Petrus fuerat occupatus. Hoc enim foret ecclesie et sibi utilius. Nichil enim acquirit sibi per huiusmodi provisiones et alias dominativas preeminencias infundabiles, si non pecuniam, favorem et famam seculi. Nam postquam distribuit [350] sic bona pauperum vocatus est pater beatissimus, inpeccabilis et Deus in terris, quod si sitit triplicitatem istam per hoc medium, tunc est principium symonie patri mendacii, et in terris fortissimus Antichristus; et subtraccione talis officii rediret ecclesia ad statum primevum, quem Christus instituit. Sed donemus sibi istam iniuriam. Secundo sequitur quod omnis elector spiritualis prepositi sed papa precipue debet positus in adopcione multorum omni obstante postposito ipsum eligere, quem reputat meliorem, hoc est plus ad honorem Dei et utilitatem ecclesie; hoc enim foret sibi, utilius, quia fidelitati sui ministerii, et per consequens remuneracioni Dei plus

From this moral principle it follows, first, that the pope ought to give up his concern with such provisions and be occupied about the building up of the church, as Peter had been occupied.[1] For this would be more useful to the church and to himself. For through provisions of this kind and other lordly preeminences without foundation he acquires nothing for himself, if not money, favour and the fame of the world. For after he has [350]thus distributed the goods of the poor he is called most blessed father, sinless, and God on earth; so that if he thirsts for this threefold [thing] by this means, then he is the principle of simony to the father of lies, and on earth the strongest Antichrist;[2] and by the withdrawal of such an office the church would return to the primitive state which Christ instituted. But let us forgive him this wrong.[3] Secondly, it follows that every elector of a spiritual superior, but the pope above all, when he is placed in the choice among many, ought, every obstacle set aside, to elect the one whom he reckons the better, that is, [the one] more for the honour of God and

congruum. Et patet quod qui propter pecuniam, propter sanguinem vel favorem seculi preponit illum quem credit vel debet credere minus idoneum peccat mortaliter, quia infideliter in amore preponderat temporale vanissimum Deo suo, quia illud, ob cuius amorem facit quod Deo displicet; quod non faceret propter omnia bona mundi.

the profit of the church;[4] for this would be more useful to himself, because more congruous with the fidelity of his ministry, and consequently with the reward of God. And it is clear that he who, for money, for blood or for the favour of the world, prefers one whom he believes, or ought to believe, less fit sins mortally, because in his love he unfaithfully makes the vainest temporal thing outweigh his God, because [he so weighs] that for love of which he does what displeases God; which he would not do for all the goods of the world.[5]

¶2 350.23–350.31

[350] Et tercio sequitur ex dictis quod papa non debet propter peticionem aut instanciam secularium dominorum preficere clericum vel carum regis in episcopum vel prelatum ecclesie, dum reputat vel reputare debeat alium magis aptum; nam cicius desereret omnem favorem principum seculi, omnem dotacionem ecclesie et omnem gloriam, quam ipse vel fratres sui in suo officio habent de seculo.

And, third, it follows from what has been said that the pope ought not, at the petition or urging of secular lords, to set a cleric or one dear to the king over [the church] as bishop or prelate of the church, while he reckons, or ought to reckon, another more apt;[6] for he should sooner give up all the favour of the princes of the world, all the endowment of the church and all the glory which he or his brethren have from the world in their office.

¶3 350.32–351.8
351.1 *Papal appointments often bad.*
351.21 *Any prelate notoriously failing in duty may have his tithes and offering withdrawn.*

[350] Ad reputandum autem talem aptitudinem oportet fidem scripture de bonitate pastoris cognoscere et non cecari in isto porizmate: Plus lucri, plus favoris vel laudis humane reportarem ego cum [351] meis complicibus, ideo hoc est ecclesie Christi utilius. Unde miratur mundus quomodo papa preficit idiotas artis regiminis spiritualis ignaros, dum vel reputat vel reputare debeat quod sunt in eadem provincia multi plus habiles eciam sacre pagine professores, sed divicie quibus liniuntur ecclesie sunt occasio unde franguntur fides et christiana religio.

And to reckon such aptness one must know the faith of scripture about the goodness of a shepherd, and not be blinded in this porism: "More gain, more favour or human praise would I bring back with [351] my accomplices; therefore this is more useful to the church of Christ." Hence the world marvels how the pope sets over [others] unlearned men ignorant of the art of spiritual rule, while he either reckons, or ought to reckon, that there are in the same province many more qualified [men], even professors of the sacred page; but the riches with which the churches are smeared are the occasion by which faith and the Christian religion are broken.[7]

¶4 351.9–351.19

[351] Et patet cum predictis condicio Antichristi; ipse enim est dux capitaneorum qui procuratores pro parte dyaboli dissipant legem Christi, et ideo omnes fideles debent expugnare ducem huiusmodi, cum ille qui debet esse servus cunctis aliis illibertat eos cogens eos recipere cocum mentis et medicum, qui vel non curat vel ex inercia Dei et arte dyaboli dat venenum. Deus enim non potest procurare se esse episcopum populi, nisi qui eligendo Dominum vult sibi gratis subici, sed blasfemia Antichristi facit contrarium.

And with what has been said the condition of Antichrist is clear; for he is the leader of the captains who, as proctors for the devil's side, scatter the law of Christ; and therefore all the faithful ought to fight against a leader of this kind, since he who ought to be the servant of all others robs them of liberty, compelling them to receive a cook and physician of the mind who either does not cure, or, out of sloth towards God and by the devil's art, gives poison.[8] For God cannot procure that he be bishop of a people except [of one] that, by electing the Lord, wills freely to be subject to him; but the blasphemy of Antichrist does the contrary.[9]

¶5 351.21–352.2
352.26 *In paying such we are supporting Antichrist's disciples.*

[351]**Ex istis videtur sequi quod a quocumque preposito spirituali notorie deficiente in suo officio licet stipendia mundana subtrahere ut decimas, oblaciones et alias elemozinas speciales. Probatur sic: Stipendia non dantur tali nisi ut tali, quia scilicet facit quod incumbit tali officio, sed hec causa deficit in quocumque huiusmodi, igitur est causa quecumque medians ad hunc finem. Illa enim est racio, quare ministrari non debet tali preposito, quia aliter subiectus sibi racionabiliter ministraret. Scrutetur igitur fidelis racionem talis ministerii et videbit quod aliena est a racione talis prepositi, quia ut capitur talis deficit a racione veri prepositi, et dare alteri** [352]**debitum secundum racionem falsam et simulatam caret colore discipline veritatis.**

From these [things] it seems to follow that from any spiritual superior notoriously failing in his office it is lawful to withdraw the worldly stipends, such as tithes, offerings and other special alms. It is proved thus: stipends are not given to such a one except as such, namely because he does what pertains to such an office; now this cause fails in any [superior] of this kind; therefore it is any cause whatever mediating to this end.[10] For that is the reason why such a superior ought not to be ministered to: because otherwise his subject would reasonably minister to him. Let the faithful man therefore examine the reason for such ministering, and he will see that it is foreign to the reason of such a superior, because, as he is taken, such a one falls short of the reason of a true superior; and to give to another [352]**what is owed according to a false and feigned reason lacks the colour of the discipline of truth.[11]**

¶6 352.3–352.8

[352]**Item, talis prepositus posset ad tantum indisponi in moribus, quod redderet se indignum stipendium tale recipere. Est igitur dare latitudinem indisposicionis et gradum remississimum dignitatis, sub quibus indigne reciperet tale stipendium.**

Again, such a superior could be made so unfit in morals that he would render himself unworthy to receive such a stipend. One must therefore posit a latitude of unfitness and a most remiss degree of worthiness, below which he would receive such a stipend unworthily.[12]

¶7 352.9–352.30

[352]**Sed probatur quod quilibet gradus talis latitudinis consequitur ad notorium defectum officii prelacie. Nam omne peccatum mortale facit indignum quoad Deum, ut hic supponitur. Sed datus prepositus est notorie in mortali, ergo est notorie indignus quoad Deum et per consequens apud quemlibet qui in nomine Domini tale debitum sibi daret. Nemo enim iuste dat debitum, nisi quod dat in nomine Dei debenti. Cum Deus secundum Augustinum graciose donat omne debitum, et cuilibet creature quodammodo obligatur. Si enim conductus a ministerio omnino se subtrahit, secundum iustas leges humanas subtrahi debet stipendium, multo magis secundum legem Dei iustissimam, in debito magis stricto. Et illud videtur Apostolum sentire II. Tess. III, 10 Qui non laborat, inquit, non manducet. Item, nemo tenetur fovere discolos et discipulos Antichristi, sed sic faceret quicumque voluntarie ministraret talibus ultra vite necessaria, igitur hoc non debet. Deus enim non fovet tales ut tales, sed permittit eos foveri et sustentat naturam.**

Now it is proved that every degree of such a latitude follows upon a notorious failure in the office of prelacy. For every mortal sin makes [a man] unworthy as regards God, as is here supposed. Now the given superior is notoriously in mortal [sin]; therefore he is notoriously unworthy as regards God, and consequently in the eyes of anyone who would give him such a due in the name of the Lord. For no one justly gives what is due except what he gives in the name of God to one to whom it is owed.[13] Since God, according to Augustine, graciously gives everything owed, and is in a certain way bound to every creature.[14] For if a hired man withdraws himself altogether from the service, according to just human laws his stipend ought to be withdrawn; much more according to the most just law of God, in a stricter debt. And the Apostle seems to mean this, 2 Thessalonians 3:10: "He that does not work," he says, "let him not eat."[15] Again, no one is bound to cherish the froward and the disciples of Antichrist; now anyone who voluntarily ministered to such [men] beyond the necessaries of life would do so; therefore he ought not [to do] this. For God does not cherish such [men] as such, but permits them to be cherished, and sustains [their] nature.

Notes

1. ***Ex isto morali principio***: the principle argued at the end of the preceding part (349.7–26), that God wills a man to choose the better of two. ***Provisiones*** are papal provisions to benefices, the subject of 12-h and 12-i.
2. ***tunc est principium symonie patri mendacii***: the dative hangs loosely; taken as "the source of simony [serving] the father of lies" (the devil, John 8:44). The construction is doubtful and a word may be lost at 350.3. ***Triplicitatem istam***: the money, favour and fame just named.
3. ***donemus sibi istam iniuriam***: "let us forgive him this wrong", i.e. let the charge pass; Wyclif turns to the second consequence.
4. ***positus in adopcione multorum***: "placed in the choice among many [candidates]". ***Sed papa precipue*** intensifies ("but the pope above all"). ***Propter sanguinem*** in the next sentence: for kinship.
5. The close (350.20–22) is elliptical: ***quia illud, ob cuius amorem facit quod Deo displicet*** lacks a verb, and ***preponderat*** is supplied from the clause before; ***quod non faceret propter omnia bona mundi*** is taken as what the faithful man would not do (displease God) for all the world's goods. A word may be lost.
6. ***instanciam***: here "urging" (the glossary's second sense of ***instancia***), not "objection". ***Carum regis***: "one dear to the king", Loserth's "because the king favours him".
7. ***liniuntur***: "are smeared" (as with ointment or grease); the riches with which the churches are greased.
8. ***non curat***: both "does not care" and "does not cure"; the physician figure takes "cure". ***Illibertat***, a non-classical verb, "robs of liberty". ***Ex inercia Dei***: taken as an objective genitive, "sloth towards God". R. The manuscripts' margin at 351.11: ***Cocum qui non vult coquere vel venenum procurat quomodo communitas reciperet*** ("how could a community receive a cook who will not cook, or who procures poison?").
9. ***nisi qui eligendo Dominum vult sibi gratis subici***: ***qui*** has no expressed antecedent; taken as "[of a people] that", so that God becomes a people's bishop only by its free choice, against Antichrist's compulsion (***cogens***) just described.
10. ***igitur est causa quecumque medians ad hunc finem*** does not give the conclusion the syllogism needs (that the stipend lacks its cause); a negative or a verb may be lost at 351.25–26. Translated as printed.
11. ***color***: "colour", a plausible ground, as in "colour of title". ***Racio*** runs through the paragraph: the reason or ground of the payment, measured against what a superior is.
12. ***Est … dare***: the schoolmen's "one must posit". ***Latitudo*** and ***gradus remississimus*** are the language of the intension and remission of qualities: a range of unfitness with a lowest degree of worthiness, below which the stipend is unworthily taken.
13. ***debenti*** is Loserth's print; the manuscripts read ***debentis*** (352.17), which would agree with ***Dei***: "in the name of God, who owes [it]", the sense the next sentence supports. The print is translated; strictly ***debens*** is "one who owes", and "to one to whom it is owed" renders it by sense.
14. Augustine: the thought of ***Confessions*** 1.4.4, ***reddis debita nulli debens, donas debita nihil perdens***, PL 32.663, where it follows ***supererogatur tibi ut debeas***, the sense of Wyclif's ***obligatur***; Wyclif paraphrases. C. The sentence is a ***cum***-clause without a main verb; it gives the ground of the sentence before.
15. 2 Thessalonians 3:10. Wyclif's ***Qui non laborat … non manducet*** departs from the Vulgate ***si quis non vult operari, nec manducet*** (DR "if any man will not work, neither let him eat"); his Latin is translated.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 349: ***edificacionem*** (fi ligature)
  - 350: ***illum***
  - 350: ***instanciam***
  - 350: ***officio*** (248[b] is the folio mark)
  - 351: ***officio***
  - 351: ***Illa***
  - 352: ***prepositus***
  - 352: ***III***
  - 352: ***10*** (main splits the verse number 10 into 1 + o; whole number given here, next token ∅)
  - 352: ∅ (rest of 10, given whole at pos 149)
  - 352: ∅ (such is the English side note (In paying such …))
  - 352: ***necessaria***

Part 11: Excommunication for withheld tithes, the schism, and alms against rents

Loserth pp. 352.32–356.26

¶1 352.32–354.32

352.32 *Excommunication for refusal to pay may be disregarded.*

[352]Et patet quod quicumque condit legem vel dat mandatum sub pena excommunicacionis ad nutriendum tales, ipse est pater eorum et precipuus Antichristus. Modicum itaque debet christianus [353]

And it is clear that whoever makes a law or gives a command under pain of excommunication for the nourishing of such [men] is himself their father and the chief Antichrist. So a Christian ought to care little [353]

353.7 *Such excommunication is wrongful or superfluous.*
353.21 *The schism teaches many catholic truths, especially as to the unimportance of excommunication.*
353.32 *Secular laws less unjust than those of Antichrist.*
354.20 *The pope claims that whoever he appoints is to be taken as qualified.*

curare de excommunicacione huiusmodi, cum Deus excommunicat hoc implentes, quia ut sic defraudant pauperes, dando improvide bona sua indignis; quod est indebitum et onerans procuratorem Domini ad satisfaciendum, cum talis solucio non sit apud summum iudicem allocanda. Nam secundum leges ecclesie: Judice fallaci pronunciante talem esse indignum sive hereticum non liceret sic ministrare sibi bona ecclesie, sed vel errat talis iudex vel curatus fuit eque indignus, antequam tulit ipse sentenciam, igitur cum notorietas facti plus docet indignitatem quam sentencia talis iudicis, videtur quod ante sentenciam talem debet credens operibus operari. Nam pars Roberti Gybbonensis excommunicat Urbanum nostrum cum suis complicibus et econtra; et consequenter potentes auferunt ab eis bona ecclesie. Nec dubium quin non sit propter nudam excommunicacionem plus vel minus, sed ut prevaricator excommunicatus a Deo in legem suam offenderit. Ideo multas pulcras veritates catholicas plane docet ista felix dissensio. Sicut enim Roberto volente excommunicare ecclesiam Anglicanam, nisi det suis cardinalibus et aliis indignis decimas et proventus nostre ecclesie, derideremus suam sentenciam, non minus servantes bona pauperum veris ministris ecclesie. Sic Urbano nostro excommunicante ecclesiam Anglicanam nisi det fructus ecclesie eque indignis, deridendo rebellaremus contra suam sentenciam pro lege Domini, ut patet in materia de excommunicacione. Et patet, quomodo antichristus cum suis fraudibus, que sunt leges Antichristiane, superat in fraude seculares. Ipsi enim, docto secundum leges eorum quod creditor sit indignus, faciunt quod cesset exaccio; isti autem statuunt quod fiat exaccio partis Domini, licet fuerit indignitas quoad Deum [354]et homines, et sic contra Christum et legem suam palliant ex se aliam dignitatem. Manet (inquiunt) quantumcumque indignus quoad Deum ex auctoritate nostra dignus, quousque nos vel satrape nostri decreverimus quid sit iustum; et illud decretum fit communiter contra iusticiam, dum emens iniuriam voluerit plus conferre. Seculares eciam volunt quod secundum leges suas Dei iniuria destruatur. Isti autem sophisticant quod ad multiplicandum membra Antichristi quoad Christum iniuria foveatur, ut patet de pseudoprepositis, quos statuunt ad bona pauperum rapiendum. Seculares statuunt quod destruantur iniusti pacem reipublice perturbantes et libertatem ac regaliam regis sui proditorie machinantes. Isti autem infundabiliter statuunt antichristianas leges, quod multiplicentur segnes et sibi conformes prepositi, ex quibus oportet pacem Dei et libertatem regis regum in membris suis diminui. Vendicat enim dux exercitus Antichristi quod subditi non attendant ad dignitatem prelati, quem ipse instituit, cum

about excommunication of this kind, since God excommunicates those who fulfil this, because as such they defraud the poor, giving their goods improvidently to the unworthy; which is not owed, and burdens the Lord's proctor with making satisfaction, since such a payment is not to be allowed before the highest judge.[1] For according to the laws of the church: when a fallible judge pronounces such a one to be unworthy or a heretic, it would not be lawful thus to minister the goods of the church to him; now either such a judge errs, or the curate was equally unworthy before the judge passed the sentence; therefore, since the notoriety of the fact teaches unworthiness more than the sentence of such a judge, it seems that before such a sentence the believer ought to act upon the works.[2] For the party of Robert of Geneva excommunicates our Urban with his accomplices, and the other way about; and consequently the powerful take the goods of the church away from them.[3] Nor is there doubt that this is not on account of the bare excommunication, more or less, but because as a transgressor excommunicated by God he has offended against his law. Therefore this happy dissension plainly teaches many fair catholic truths. For just as, if Robert wished to excommunicate the English church unless it gave to his cardinals and other unworthy men the tithes and proceeds of our church, we would laugh at his sentence, keeping no less the goods of the poor for the true ministers of the church; so, if our Urban excommunicates the English church unless it gives the fruits of the church to men equally unworthy, we would, laughing, rebel against his sentence for the law of the Lord, as is clear in the matter of excommunication.[4] And it is clear how antichrist with his frauds, which are antichristian laws, surpasses the seculars in fraud. For they, when it has been shown according to their laws that the creditor is unworthy, cause the exaction to cease; but these decree that the exaction of the Lord's portion be made, although there was unworthiness as regards God [354]and men; and so against Christ and his law they cloak out of themselves another worthiness.[5] "He remains," they say, "however unworthy as regards God, worthy by our authority, until we or our satraps have decreed what is just"; and that decree is commonly made against justice, when the one buying the wrong is willing to contribute more. The seculars, too, will that according to their laws the wrong [done] to God be destroyed. But these play the sophist [to bring it about] that, to multiply the members of Antichrist, the wrong as regards Christ be fostered, as is clear of the false superiors whom they appoint to plunder the goods of the poor.[6] The seculars decree that the unjust be destroyed who disturb the peace of the commonwealth and treacherously

eo ipso censetur habilis, quod est contra fidem evangelii et libertatem membrorum Christi, Matth. VII, 15, ubi docet Christus: Attendite a falsis prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces. Nam elemosinam dandam parte dignis prepositis ampliarunt ultra civile debitum, nedum tyrannice sed blasfeme per palliatas censuras, quas menciuntur a Christo procedere exigendam; et totum hoc seminavit in ecclesia civilitas cesarea, que est in clero ad deterius transformata.

plot against the liberty and regality of their king. But these, without foundation, decree antichristian laws that sluggish superiors conformed to themselves be multiplied, by whom the peace of God and the liberty of the King of kings in his members must be diminished. For the leader of the army of Antichrist claims that subjects are not to attend to the worthiness of the prelate whom he himself has instituted, since by that very fact he is deemed qualified; which is against the faith of the gospel and the liberty of the members of Christ, Matthew 7:15, where Christ teaches: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."[7] For the alms to be given in part to worthy superiors they have extended beyond the civil debt, not only tyrannically but blasphemously, through cloaked censures, which they falsely claim proceed from Christ for its exaction; and all this was sown in the church by the caesarean civil standing, which in the clergy has been transformed for the worse.[8]

¶2 354.33–355.3
355.4 *Tithes and offerings are alms to be given willingly and with judgment.*
355.12 *Payments to secular lords are on another footing.*
355.23 *Exactions enforced by excommunication should be resisted*

[354]Sed contra dicta arguitur: Videtur enim iuxta hanc viam quod nemo daret redditus infideli [355]domino vel tyranno, quod est contra fidem scripture, que docet obedire eciam discolis, quod Ihesus noster in facto docuit.

But against what has been said it is argued: for it seems, on this way, that no one would give revenues to an unbelieving [355]lord or tyrant; which is against the faith of scripture, which teaches [us] to obey even the froward, as our Jesus taught in deed.[9]

¶3 355.4–356.20
356.3 *We should submit to injustice patiently, awaiting God's judgment.*

[355]Sed hic dicitur negando contrarium; quia omnia temporalia data clerico ut huiusmodi debent dari secundum racionem elemosine, que debet esse voluntaria et discreta; redditus autem dati seculari domino ut tali debent dari secundum racionem contractus et subieccionis civilis, que non respicit dignitatem prepositi quoad Deum; nec est tenens culpandus, licet coacte det temporalia tyranno, quem credit esse indignum, ymo propter pacem emendam debet gratis dare et servire domino infideli, ut docet Apostolus; ne nomen Domini blasfemetur; et si crediderit per subtraccionem servitutis vel redditus convertere dominum infidelem debet ea intencione subtrahere salva fide; talem autem fidem non fecit legibus Antichristi. Quamvis autem leges civiles erant diu ante incarnacionem Domini et sint secundum Augustinum mixte multis nequiciis, tamen sunt plurimum iuste, cum pati rapinas bonorum et ceteras iniurias sit meritorium; lex autem Antichristi sub specie sanctitatis et legis Domini est heretica et blasfema, cui omnes fideles debent resistere et execucioni sue

But here the answer is [given] by denying the contrary;[10] because all temporal goods given to a cleric as such ought to be given according to the nature of alms, which ought to be voluntary and discreet; but revenues given to a secular lord as such ought to be given according to the nature of a contract and of civil subjection, which does not regard the worthiness of the superior as regards God; nor is the tenant to be blamed, although under compulsion he gives temporal goods to a tyrant whom he believes to be unworthy; indeed, for the sake of buying peace he ought to give freely and serve an unbelieving lord, as the Apostle teaches, lest the name of the Lord be blasphemed;[11] and if he believes that by withdrawing servitude or revenue he can convert the unbelieving lord, he ought to withdraw them with that intention, saving faith; but such faith he did not pledge to the laws of Antichrist.[12] And although the civil laws existed long before the incarnation of the Lord, and are, according to Augustine, mixed with many wickednesses, yet they are for the most part just, since

secundum formam ipocrisis; quia si vocatus clerus velit rapere bona subditi per modum tyrannidis est meritorie tollerandus. Sed cum defert talem civilem tyrannidem et blasfeme palliat ac sub colore legis civilis exaccionem bonorum fortune per viam excommunicacionis vel alterius censure, que nec cogit corporaliter nec nocet anime impetiti in contemptum legis, debent servari temporalia, cum nec sit fides nec elemosina [356] sic dare blasfemis bona pauperum, ideo quod ea racione debetur caret colore meriti. Sed dimittendo hanc formam et innitendo pugnis et spoliacioni civili, ut modo faciunt discipuli Antichristi, videtur michi quod via meritorior atque securior foret pati iniurias, confidenter expectando divinum iudicium, sed non propter timorem fulminis quod pretendunt. Sic igitur verificata est de nomine christianis et paganis vel clero et layco prophecia Ezechielis XXIII de duabus sororibus Oolla et Oolliba; nam Oolliba christiana plus fornicata est spiritualiter cum tradicionibus infidelium quam Oolla, quia plus insanivit sophisticando legem, et excanduit in temporalium voluptatem, ideo secundum diffinicionem Dei tradendi sunt in manus gencium puniendi; deseruerunt enim viam, quam Christus docuit, ad intrinsecus se regendum et exteros conquirendum; nam mamme pubertatis sunt fracte, dum leges infancium sunt dirupte.

to suffer the plundering of one's goods and other wrongs is meritorious;[13] but the law of Antichrist, under the appearance of holiness and of the law of the Lord, is heretical and blasphemous, and all the faithful ought to resist it and its execution according to the form of hypocrisy; because if the so-called clergy wishes to seize the goods of a subject by way of tyranny, it is to be meritoriously tolerated. But when it sets aside such civil tyranny, and blasphemously cloaks, and under colour of civil law [pursues], the exaction of goods of fortune by way of excommunication or another censure, which neither coerces bodily nor harms the soul of the one assailed in contempt of the law, the temporal goods ought to be kept, since it is neither faith nor alms [356] to give the goods of the poor thus to blasphemers, because what is owed on that ground lacks the colour of merit.[14] But, leaving this form and relying on fists and civil despoiling, as the disciples of Antichrist now do, it seems to me that the more meritorious and safer way would be to suffer the wrongs, confidently awaiting the divine judgment, but not for fear of the thunderbolt which they hold out. Thus, then, the prophecy of Ezekiel 23 about the two sisters Oolla and Ooliba has been verified of Christians and pagans in name, or of clergy and laity;[15] for the Christian Ooliba has committed spiritual fornication with the traditions of unbelievers more than Oolla, because she went more mad in counterfeiting the law, and burned with desire for the pleasure of temporal goods; therefore according to the definition of God they are to be delivered into the hands of the gentiles to be punished; for they have deserted the way which Christ taught for ruling themselves inwardly and winning those outside; for the teats of [their] virginity are bruised, while the laws of the infants are torn apart.[16]

¶4 356.21–356.26

[356] Sed secundo obicitur per hoc quod de lege Dei evangelizantibus debentur stipendia, ut docet Apostolus prima Cor. IX et Luce X; oportet igitur esse aliquam legem que iniuriantes coherceat, cuiusmodi est lex ecclesie, quam oportet credere in hac parte.

But, secondly, it is objected, by appeal to this: that by God's law stipends are owed to preachers of the gospel, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Corinthians 9 and Luke 10; there must therefore be some law that coerces those who do [them] wrong, of which kind is the law of the church, which must be believed in this respect.[17]

Notes

1. ***onerans procuratorem Domini ad satisfaciendum***: the giver, as steward of goods that are the Lord's, is charged with making satisfaction for them; ***allocanda*** is the accounting sense: such a payment will not be allowed in his account before God.
2. ***Judice fallaci pronunciante***: ablative absolute; ***fallax*** taken as "fallible" (it may also be "deceitful"). The argument: by canon law payment stops once even a fallible judge pronounces the incumbent unworthy; the notorious fact shows unworthiness better than such a sentence, so payment may stop before it. ***Sentenciam*** is the judicial sentence, so "sentence". S. ***credens operibus operari*** recalls John 10:38, "believe the works".

3. Robert of Geneva, elected by the dissident cardinals at Fondi in September 1378 as Clement VII, against Urban VI, whom England recognised; *Gybbonensis* is the print's form of *Gebennensis*.
4. *ut patet in materia de excommunicacione*: Wyclif's treatment of excommunication elsewhere; the work is not named. *Proventus* "proceeds", kept apart from *redditus* "revenues".
5. *Ipsi* are the seculars, *isti* the makers of antichristian law; *creditor* is the one to whom payment is owed, here the incumbent. *Antichristus* is lower-case in the print at 353.33. *Ex se*: a worthiness of their own making.
6. *sophisticant quod*: the active verb with a *quod*-clause, "they argue sophistically to secure that"; the sense is that of *sophisticari* "to play the sophist", not the transitive "counterfeit" (which comes at 356.16). *Dei iniuria*: the wrong done to God.
7. Matthew 7:15, agreeing with the Vulgate; Douay-Rheims. T. At 354.22 B reads *instituunt* for *instituit* and lacks *censetur*; the print is followed.
8. *elemosinam dandam parte dignis prepositis*: *parte* does not construe easily; taken as "in part", i.e. the alms owed, within limits, to worthy superiors. A word may be lost, or *parte* may stand for *parce* "sparingly". *Exigendam* agrees with *elemosinam*. *Civilitas cesarea*: the civil standing the clergy took from Caesar's endowment.
9. 1 Peter 2:18 (DR "not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward"). "In deed": probably the tribute paid for Christ and Peter, Matthew 17:26. C. *redditus* here are the tenant's rents to his lord; the glossary's "revenues" is kept.
10. *negando contrarium*: Wyclif denies that the contrary of scripture's teaching follows from his position; the distinction between alms and civil dues follows.
11. 1 Timothy 6:1 (DR "lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed"); Wyclif shortens the verse, and Loserth does not italicise it, so it is left unquoted.
12. *fidem facere*: "to pledge faith", the tenant's fealty to his lord; *salva fide* keeps that fealty while the dues are withheld. No such fealty binds anyone to Antichrist's laws.
13. Augustine on civil law as mixed with wickedness: the place is not traced; compare *De libero arbitrio* 1.5.13 (PL 32.1228), where the law written for ruling a people rightly permits what divine providence punishes. The merit of suffering the plundering of one's goods: Hebrews 10:34 (DR "took with joy the being stripped of your own goods").
14. *defert*: taken as "sets aside" (as against *dimittendo hanc formam* in the next sentence); *palliat* governs *exaccionem*. *Impetiti*: the one assailed. *In contemptum legis* may go with *nocet* or describe the one excommunicated "for contempt of the law". *Color*: "colour", a plausible ground (also *colore meriti*). T. At 355.24–25 the manuscripts read *blasfemia*; the print's *blasfeme* is followed.
15. Ezekiel 23:4: Oolla is Samaria, Ooliba Jerusalem; the names are given in the Douay-Rheims form (print *Oolliba*). T. The manuscripts read *Cella et Colliba* (356.11, 13); the names are Loserth's correction. C. *de nomine christianis et paganis*: taken as "Christians and pagans in name".
16. Ezekiel 23:11 (DR "she was mad with lust more than she"); 23:9 ("delivered her into the hands of her lovers"); 23:3 (DR "the teats of their virginity were bruised"). C. *diffinicio Dei*: God's determining sentence. *Leges infancium*: the law given to the church in its infancy, taken as the sense; uncertain.
17. 1 Corinthians 9:14 (DR "they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel"); Luke 10:7 ("the labourer is worthy of his hire"). The print gives chapters only.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 352: *Et*
  - 353: *allocanda* [NW]
  - 355: ∅ (folio bar after palliat (249ᶜ in margin) read as i)
  - 356: *Sed* (the main token read the side-note letters (should / to); this slot is the only one for the printed Sed)
  - 356: *pugnis*
  - 353: *Et patet,* (Etpatet, -> Et patet, (two words run together))
  - 356: *Oolla* (OoUa -> Oolla (scans: oolla | ooua | oolla))
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Tithes and (355.4).

Part 12: The minister's stipend and the people's withholding of tithes

Loserth pp. 356.27–360.18

¶1 356.27–358.3
356.27 *We are bound to support God's ministers.*
357.11 *The clergy should not take stipends without ministering.*
357.18 *They should not accept too much.*
358.4 *Most of all they must avoid cursing because temporals are refused.*

[356]Hic conceditur totum, cum utrobique veritas confuse tegitur; nam Christo et apostolis debebantur de lege Dei stipendia officio spiritualis ministerii necessaria, et lex Dei atque suum iudicium plene excuciunt istorum iniurias, quia faciat sacerdos spirituale officium sibi debitum; et incompossibile est quod desint sibi vite necessaria ad dampnum anime. Patet de prophetis legis veteris, de Christo et suis apostolis et de [357]vitis patrum ut sanctis monachis. Si autem talis patitur penam vel defectum corporis, ut sepe contigit de Christo et suis apostolis, hoc servata paciencia redundat in lucrum anime,

Here the whole is conceded, since on both sides the truth is covered indistinctly;[1] for to Christ and the apostles were owed, by the law of God, the stipends necessary to the office of spiritual ministry, and God's law and his judgment fully shake off the wrongs of those [men], provided the priest does the spiritual office owed by him; and it is incompossible that the necessaries of life should be lacking to him to the harm of his soul. It is clear from the prophets of the old law, from Christ and his apostles, and from the [357]lives of the fathers, as [those of] holy monks.[2] And if

358.15 *It is said that if the laity judge they will deprive even the good clergy of their support.*
358.25 *All money withdrawn should be applied to pious uses.*

ideo Christus non tradidit legem in talibus reluctandi, sed humiliter iniurias paciendi, ut patet Luce IX: sed infideliter istam legem Christi contempnimus. Cum igitur discolis non desunt hodie temporalia, quanto magis Deus non deficiet in necessariis servo suo. Sed oportet in isto confuso involucro quod christianus caveat de triplici periculo, primo quod clericus Christi non ocietur accipiendo avide stipendium sine ministerio; hoc enim secundum legem Dei et hominum est iniustum; nec ad illud extinguendum ordinatur aliquod suffragium. Secundo quod in mensura et non in superhabundancia accipiatur de fimo temporalium, iuxta doctrinam Apostoli prima Thym. VI. 8 habentes, inquit, alimenta et quibus tegamur hiis contenti simus. Unde beatus Crysostomus super primo cap. ad Hebreos Hom. II dicit, quod christianus debet sapere in penuria, non in diviciis, quoniam qui in paucis potest vivere, eo qui non potest multo maior et melior est. Ut si vocatorum ad regalem civitatem hii nec subiugalibus egent nec famulis nec palliis nec deversoriis nec calligis nec vasis, sed sufficiat eis panem habere et ex fontibus aquam accipere; illi vero dicunt nisi vehicula, stramenta mollia, numerosam familiam habeamus, non possumus, et adhuc remissis brevibus et interpolatis passibus, civitatem attingere. Si insuper dum civitatem attigerint, sint secundum celeritatem et expedicionem ad civitatem [358] cum ipsam intraverint premiandi, quis dubitat, quin primi excedent secundos? Correspondenter est de viantibus ad patriam senciendum.

such a one suffers pain or want of body, as often happened with Christ and his apostles, this, patience being kept, redounds to the gain of the soul; therefore Christ did not give a law of struggling back in such things but of humbly suffering wrongs, as is clear in Luke 9; but we unfaithfully despise this law of Christ.[3] Since, then, temporal goods are not lacking today to the froward, how much more will God not fail his servant in necessaries. But in this indistinct wrapping a Christian must beware of a threefold danger: first, that the cleric of Christ be not idle, greedily accepting a stipend without ministry; for this is unjust according to the law of God and of men; nor is any aid ordained for extinguishing it.[4] Second, that he take of the dung of temporal goods in measure and not in superabundance, according to the doctrine of the Apostle, 1 Timothy 6:8: "Having," he says, "food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content."[5] Hence blessed Chrysostom, on the first chapter to the Hebrews, Homily 2, says that "a Christian ought to be wise in penury, not in riches, since he who can live on little is much greater and better than he who cannot."[6] As if, of those called to the royal city, these need neither beasts of burden nor servants nor cloaks nor inns nor boots nor vessels, but it suffices them to have bread and to take water from the springs; but those say: "Unless we have carriages, soft bedding and a numerous household, we cannot, even with slack, short and halting steps, reach the city." If, moreover, when they have reached the city, they are to be rewarded according to their speed and dispatch to the city [358] when they have entered it, who doubts that the first will surpass the second? Correspondingly one must judge of those on the road to the homeland.[7]

¶2 358.4–358.24

[358] Sed caveatur tercio ne ad querendum nobis bona superflua et itineris ad patriam tardativa menciamur blasfeme de scriptura, dicentes quod de lege Domini debemus anathematizare strictissime pro temporalium negacione, et sic sollicitemur sollicite exequi tradiciones ad hoc conditas, quia hoc nimis ex Antichristi dogmate tardaret a patria, patet destruccio huius heresis Luce IX et per legem pape Gregorii, XXIII, questione IV, Inter querelas, ubi docetur non sic pro temporalibus vindicandum. Sed tercio obicitur per hoc quod iuxta hanc viam nedum detinerentur decime et proventus ecclesie a cardinalibus et alienigenis indignis nec solum ab ecclesiis appropriatis religiosis subtrahentibus debitum rectoris officium, sed ab assiduis rectoribus vigilanter residentibus, cum aperta sit via laycis ad iudicandum de ministerio sui prepositi et subtrahendum de stipendio

But, third, let care be taken lest, to seek for ourselves superfluous goods that slow the journey to the homeland, we blasphemously lie about scripture, saying that by the law of the Lord we ought to anathematize most strictly for the denial of temporal goods, and so be anxiously solicited to carry out the traditions made for this purpose; because this, out of Antichrist's dogma, would hold [us] back exceedingly from the homeland. The destruction of this heresy is clear from Luke 9 and by the law of Pope Gregory, [Causa] 23, question 4, *Inter querelas*, where it is taught that one is not thus to take vengeance for temporal things.[8] But, third, it is objected, by appeal to this: that on this way the tithes and proceeds of the church would be withheld not only from cardinals and unworthy foreigners, nor only from churches appropriated to the religious, who withdraw the office owed by a rector, but from assiduous

secundum suum iudicium diminuerentur proventus ecclesie ad non quantum.

rectors vigilantly resident; since the way is open to laymen to judge of the ministry of their superior and to withdraw from his stipend according to their own judgment, the proceeds of the church would be diminished to nothing.[9]

¶3 358.25–359.15
359.16 *Appropriations should cease where duty is not done.*
359.25 *Tithepayers might err, but there is more danger on the other side. In the worst case the clergy might be maintained like Christ and the apostles.*

[358] Quoad istud argumentum videtur michi quod primo deficientibus satrapis in casibus duobus prioribus, et secundo deficiente rege ac secularibus dominis, qui ex officio prohiberent ne decime regni et bona pauperum taliter ad discolos devolvantur; populus debet decimas et oblaciones suas ab eis concorditer et constanter subtrahere et in alios pios usus expendere, cum predicti discoli Antichristi discipuli non sunt illi, quibus [359] decime et obligaciones sunt debite. Ideo omnes tradiciones ecclesie malignancium non possunt fundare quod propter istam decenciam populus per censuras ecclesiasticas ad sui dispendium est terrendus, quin pocius propter omissionem negligentem defensionis legum ecclesie et consensum vecordem tradicionibus sathane est a Christo nisi resipiscendo peniteat condempnandus. Unde regi et regno debet esse principium quod quicumque clericus vel laycus intraneus vel extraneus istam veritatem edoctus et remanens mediator vel procurator subtraccionem istam precipuorum bonorum regni procurans post monicionem legitimam tamquam proditor vel hostis regni subdolus est censendus.

As to this argument it seems to me that, first, if the satraps fail in the two former cases, and secondly if the king and the secular lords fail, who by their office should prevent the tithes of the kingdom and the goods of the poor from passing thus to the froward, the people ought, with one accord and steadfastly, to withdraw their tithes and offerings from them and spend them on other pious uses, since the aforesaid froward, the disciples of Antichrist, are not those to whom [359] tithes and obligations are owed.[10] Therefore all the traditions of the church of the malignant cannot ground [the claim] that, on account of this seemly [act], the people is to be terrified by ecclesiastical censures to its own loss;[11] but rather, for the negligent omission of the defence of the church's laws and faint-hearted consent to the traditions of Satan, it is to be condemned by Christ, unless it comes to its senses and repents. Hence it ought to be a principle for the king and the kingdom that any cleric or layman, native or foreign, who has been taught this truth and remains a mediator or proctor procuring this withdrawal of the chief goods of the kingdom, is, after lawful monition, to be judged as a traitor or a subtle enemy of the kingdom.[12]

¶4 359.16–359.22

[359] Ad destruendum itaque hanc antichristianam heresim debet tota ecclesia laborare. Et idem videtur michi iudicium de appropriatis elemosinis vel prebendis, quibuscumque communitatibus vel personis extraneis vel intraneis debitum ecclesie officium notabiliter subtrahentibus, ymo de perpetuis redditibus collatis clericis, ut sepe tetigi.

To destroy this antichristian heresy, therefore, the whole church ought to labour. And the same judgment seems to me [to hold] of alms or prebends appropriated to whatever communities or persons, foreign or native, that notably withdraw the office owed to the church; indeed, of perpetual revenues conferred on clerics, as I have often touched on.[13]

¶5 359.23–360.18

[359] Et quantum ad ultimum membrum, in quo iacet difficultas, conceditur quod occasione male accepta decimantes erranter excederent. Sed in parte altera iacet incomparabiliter maius periculum ut, posito quod tollatur a clero decimacio, sicut tollebatur a Christo et suis apostolis, cum fuit legale legis veteris, cum non debuit tunc remanere nisi secundum moralitatem inclusam, adhuc viveret clerus secundum privatas elemosinas ut tempore Christi, et postmodum magis fructificans nec tot episcopis egerent, ut modo propter penuriam; et sic concesso maximo inconvenienti huius partis

And as to the last member, in which the difficulty lies, it is conceded that, on an occasion wrongly taken, tithe-payers might err and go too far. But on the other side lies an incomparably greater danger; as, supposing that tithing were taken away from the clergy, as it was taken away from Christ and his apostles, since it was a legal precept of the old law, since it ought not then to remain except according to the morality included [in it], the clergy would still live on private alms, as in the time of Christ, and afterwards more fruitfully; nor would they

foret modicum in comparacione [360]ad inconveniens quod insurgit ex legibus et practicis circa ecclesiasticas porciones. Quamvis autem oportet quod senex sacerdos sit sumptuosior, tamen non vidi senem talem sine pena peccati sui a Domino quoad temporale subsidium derelictum. Ille enim, qui non derelinquit in bonis maximis non potest deficere in bonis minimis. Presbiter igitur talis decrepitus debet cavere de avaricia, de omni assistencia familiari vel ministeriali superflua, et dare se oracioni, contemplacioni et omni modo quo sufficit prodesse ecclesie; et sic vite sanctitas ac ecclesie edificacio erit carta, procuratorium ac medium interpellans ad Deum et populum, propter temporale subsidium acquirendum, sic quod sacerdos moriatur clericus, deserto seculo in spe spiritualis porcionis dominice, sicut vixit corporaliter ex porcione domini temporali.

need so many bishops, as now [they do] because of penury;[14] and so, granting the greatest ill consequence on this side, it would be small in comparison [360]with the ill consequence that arises from the laws and practices concerning ecclesiastical portions.[15] And although an old priest must be more costly, yet I have not seen such an old man, without the penalty of his own sin, forsaken by the Lord as to temporal support.[16] For he who does not forsake [us] in the greatest goods cannot fail in the least. Such a decrepit presbyter, therefore, ought to beware of avarice, of all superfluous attendance of household or ministers, and give himself to prayer, contemplation and every way in which he is able to profit the church; and so holiness of life and the building up of the church will be his charter, proctor's mandate and mediating means, interceding with God and the people for acquiring temporal support, so that the priest may die a cleric, having forsaken the world, in hope of the Lord's spiritual portion, as he lived bodily from the Lord's temporal portion.[17]

Notes

1. ***confuse***: "indistinctly", held in the whole without the distinctions that follow (the three dangers). ***Excuciunt***: "shake off", i.e. repel. ***Quia faciat sacerdos***: the subjunctive is taken as a proviso. R. The manuscripts' margin at 356.27: ***Predicans non deficit in cibo*** ("a preacher does not go short of food"; the apparatus OCR reads ***dejicit***).
2. ***vitis patrum***: the ***Vitae patrum***, the lives of the desert monks; ***ut sanctis monachis*** "as [those of] holy monks".
3. Luke 9: the print gives the chapter only; probably 9:3 (DR "Take nothing for your journey") and 9:55, the rebuke of the disciples who would call down fire (DR "you know not of what spirit you are").
4. ***nec ad illud extinguendum ordinatur aliquod suffragium***: ***illud*** taken as the injustice of the idle stipend; no aid of law or privilege is ordained to wipe it out.
5. 1 Timothy 6:8, agreeing with the Vulgate (***simus***); Douay-Rheims. ***De fimo temporalium***: "the dung of temporal goods", cf. Philippians 3:8.
6. Chrysostom, ***Homilies on Hebrews***, hom. 2 (on ch. 1), in the Latin of Mutianus Scholasticus (PG 63.249–250; Loserth: "Opp. tom. XII, 26"), paraphrased: Chrysostom has ***si oportet altum sapere, in pauperie hoc oportet, non in divitiis***. T. The manuscripts read ***Morali II*** (357.21); the print's ***Hom. II*** is followed. R. Both manuscripts' margin at 357.18: ***Victus parcitas et sumptus***, where A adds ***secundum beatum Crisogonum***, which Loserth marks with "!".
7. ***deversoriis*** "inns" (classical ***deversorium***; the print sets ***de | versoriis***, split by the folio mark); the manuscripts read ***Diversionis*** (357.26). C. ***remissis brevibus et interpolatis passibus***: "slack, short and halting steps", going with ***attingere***.
8. Decretum C.23 q.4 c.27, ***Inter querelas*** (Gregory), as Loserth gives it (his "Causa XXII" in the apparatus; modern form ours). Luke 9:55, as in note 3. T. At 358.11 B lacks ***tardaret***. R. Both manuscripts' margin at 358.4: ***Exigere per excommunicacionem decimas***.
9. ***tercio obicitur***: the third objection (the first at 354.33, the second at 356.21), naming three cases: cardinals and foreigners, appropriated churches, resident rectors. ***Ad non quantum***: "to nothing". T. At 358.16 B reads ***detineretur***.
10. ***in casibus duobus prioribus***: the cardinals and foreigners, and the appropriated churches. ***Obligaciones*** (359.1): one expects ***oblaciones*** "offerings", as in the line before; translated as printed.
11. ***ecclesie malignancium***: Psalm 25:5 (DR "the assembly of the malignant"). C. ***istam decenciam***: "this seemly [act]", the people's withholding; the word is doubtful.
12. ***subtraccionem istam precipuorum bonorum regni***: here the drawing of the kingdom's chief goods away (to unworthy and foreign holders), not the people's withholding of tithes.
13. ***quibuscumque communitatibus vel personis***: dative with ***appropriatis***, "appropriated to whatever communities or persons". ***Perpetuis redditibus***: the endowments of the perpetual-alms argument.
14. ***ultimum membrum***: the third case, the resident rectors. ***Legale legis veteris***: tithes as a legal precept of the old law, binding now only by the moral precept included in it (both manuscripts' margin at 359.29: ***Decime sunt legales legis veteris***). ***Nec tot episcopis egerent, ut modo propter penuriam*** is obscure: taken as "nor would they need so many bishops"; the alternative reading ***episcopi*** would give "nor would so many bishops be in want, as now through penury". T. At 359.25 the manuscripts read ***excedere***; the print's ***excederent*** is followed.
15. ***inconveniens***: here the ill consequence in affairs, not the absurdity of an argument.
16. Cf. Psalm 36:25 (DR "I have not seen the just forsaken"). ***Senex sacerdos*** "old priest", and then ***presbiter*** "presbyter", as printed.
17. ***carta, procuratorium***: the documents of a suit: holiness of life will be the priest's charter and his proctor's mandate. T. At 360.10 A reads ***instrumentali***, B ***in sacramentali***; the apparatus does not name the word they stand for.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **357: *hiis***
  - **357: *calligis* (hyphenated cal-|ligis; main token holds the whole word)**
  - **358: *ipsam***
  - **358: *Sed* (the main token read the English side note "that"; this slot is the only one for the printed Sed (15 line number on the line))**
  - **358: *hanc* (15 is the line number)**
  - **359: *elemosinis***
  - **359: *personis* (20 is the line number)**
  - **359: *iacet* [NW]**
  - **359: *legale***
  - **359: *legis***
  - **359: *moralitatem* [NW]**
  - **359: *inclusam* [NW]**
  - **359: *iudicium* (LEFT-nw: print = iudicium)**
- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference 5oc Tithepayers (359.25).**

Part 13: The pope must be the holiest of wayfarers

Loserth pp. 360.19–364.33

¶1 360.19–361.11

360.28 *The pope is bound to be the holiest of men,* 361.1 *if not, he should not take the name of pope.* 361.24 *So too of the honours that he claims,*

[360]**Non igitur sequitur: Multum malum exinde contingeret, igitur non hoc, sed eius contrarium est tenendum. Sic enim destrueretur maior pars legum et sermonum Christi et facienda forent mala ut bona eveniant. Propter talia igitur inconveniencia expedit, quod fidelis teneat se in limitibus legis Christi, videlicet non exigendo plus vel attencius de temporalibus quam hec docet. Quantum vero ad gravandos videtur quod a summo pontifice usque ad minimum sacerdotem omnes peccant in recipiendo bona pauperum et ecclesiasticas dignitates, nam quilibet papa in quantum talis tenetur esse sanctissimus viatorum, et sub illo colore accipit illud nomen; quod videtur** [361]**esse nimis magna presumpcio. Nam iuxta decretum beati Jeronymi recitatum X capitulo et testimonium Bernhardi et Lyncolniensis papa debet esse qualis ibi reputative describitur; sed tunc foret sanctissimus viatorum, igitur ad hoc tenetur; non enim est evidens quod tam sancti et scioli doctores oleo adulacionis linirent pontificem menciendo de illo, pronunciantes de ipso laudes que nec insunt nec inesse debeant. Ideo planum est ex eorum sentencia quod papa debet esse sanctissimus et per idem quilibet papa.**

It does not follow, therefore: "Much evil would come of this; therefore not this, but its contrary, is to be held." For so the greater part of the laws and sermons of Christ would be destroyed, and evils would have to be done that good may come.[1] Because of such absurdities,[2] therefore, it is expedient that the faithful man keep himself within the limits of the law of Christ, namely by not demanding more, or more eagerly, of temporal goods than it teaches. And as to those who are to be charged,[3] it seems that from the highest pontiff down to the least priest all sin in receiving the goods of the poor and ecclesiastical dignities; for every pope, as such, is bound to be the holiest of wayfarers, and under that colour[4] he takes that name; which seems [361]**to be exceedingly great presumption. For according to the decree of blessed Jerome recited in chapter 10, and the testimony of Bernard and of Lincoln, the pope ought to be such as he is there described by estimation;[5] now then he would be the holiest of wayfarers; therefore he is bound to this. For it is not evident that doctors so holy and so knowing would anoint the pontiff with the oil of flattery by lying about him, pronouncing of him praises which neither are in him nor ought to be. So it is plain from their teaching that the pope ought to be the holiest, and by the same token every pope.**

¶2 361.12–361.23

[361]**Item, beatus Gregorius libro II De Cura Pastorali cap. primo dicit quod pastor ecclesie debet se habere ad subditos sicut pastor**

Again, blessed Gregory, in book 2 of the *Pastoral Care*, chapter 1, says that the shepherd of the church ought to bear himself toward his subjects

bestiarum se habet ad bestias quas custodit. Sed constat quod nulla earum equiparatur pastori in prudencia vel virtute, igitur pastor ecclesie debet in virtute omnes subditos suos excellere, quia alia excellencia non est pertinens. Cum igitur papa sit pastor tocius residue universitatis fidelium, videtur quod debet supponi ipsum in prudencia et virtute cunctos illos excellere. Aliter enim eque maneret et pasceret eum subditus ut econtra.

as the shepherd of beasts bears himself toward the beasts he keeps.[6] Now it is evident that none of them is equal to the shepherd in prudence or virtue; therefore the shepherd of the church ought to excel all his subjects in virtue, since no other excellence is relevant. Since therefore the pope is shepherd of the whole remaining body of the faithful, it seems that he ought to be supposed to excel all of them in prudence and virtue. For otherwise the subject would equally abide [with] him and feed him, as the other way round.[7]

¶3 361.24–362.5
362.7 *and of the powers that he is supposed to wield.*
362.24 *To be a true pope he must be chosen by God.*

[361]Item, papa consentit multipliciter, quod vocetur pater beatissimus et vendicat honores ultra omnes mortales alios; cum igitur supponi debet quod hec facit religiose et debite, vel quod sit apostata Antichristus, videtur quod approbantes hec facta papalia, tenentur in istis supponere veritatem et laudis talis materiam. Si igitur veritas est quod ipse est hic pater beatissimus, tunc est viator sanctissimus; et idem sequitur si sit maxime honorandus, cum honor sit ex quo premium virtutis, [362]ut dicunt philosophi et beatus Jacobus II cap. Et patet ex hoc principio quod Deus honorat hominem proporcionaliter ad virtutem; videtur igitur quod papa, cum dicit se digne consentire antecedenti consentire debeat consequenti.

Again, the pope consents in many ways to being called "most blessed father",[8] and claims honours beyond all other mortals; since therefore it must be supposed either that he does these things religiously and duly, or that he is an apostate Antichrist, it seems that those who approve these papal deeds are bound to suppose in them the truth and the matter for such praise. If therefore it is the truth that he is here the most blessed father, then he is the holiest wayfarer; and the same follows if he is to be honoured most, since honour is the reward of virtue,[9] [362]as the philosophers say, and blessed James, chapter 2. And it is clear from this principle that God honours a man in proportion to his virtue; it seems therefore that the pope, since he says that he worthily consents to the antecedent, ought to consent to the consequent.

¶4 362.7–363.13
363.14 *Hence none should take papal honours who does not know himself called of God; but none can know this.*

[362]Item, papa (ut ipse et sui fautores asserunt) gerit singulariter vicariam vicem Christi m terris, sic quod ipse infinitum excedit alios quoscumque episcopos, sicut Christus infinitum excessit apostolos, ut patet de indulgenciis et equiparanciis quotquot aliis episcopis et sibi in excellencia; sed totum illud foret mendacium, nisi eos proporcionaliter excederet in virtute, igitur hoc debet supponi. Non enim debet supponi quod papa propter fastum et questum seculi mendaciter debeat ad talia aspirare. Ideo dicit Gregorius ubi supra: Oportet namque ut pastor metiri sollicite studeat, quanta tenende rectitudinis necessitate constringitur, sub cuius estimacione populus grex vocatur; igitur necesse est ut sit cogitacione mundus, accione precipuus, pre cunctis contemplacione suspensus. Item, ad esse veri pape requiritur originalis Dei eleccio, sed Deus non eligit ad papale officium nisi dignum et virtute cunctos ceteros preeminentem, igitur aliter non est papa. Maior ex fide sepe dicta supponitur; oportet enim Deum concurrere cum quolibet agente creato et omne opus creature legitimum primitus approbare; cum igitur secundum humanitatem non eligit regulariter papas, patet quod oportet eum secundum

Again, the pope (as he and his supporters assert) singularly bears the vicarial office of Christ on earth, so that he infinitely exceeds any other bishops whatever, as Christ infinitely exceeded the apostles, as is clear from the indulgences and the comparisons of any number of other bishops with himself in excellence.[10] Now all that would be a lie unless he exceeded them proportionally in virtue; therefore this ought to be supposed. For it ought not to be supposed that the pope, for the pride and gain of the world, should lyingly aspire to such things. So Gregory says in the place cited: "For the shepherd must study carefully to measure by what necessity of holding to uprightness he is bound, under whose estimation the people is called a flock; therefore it is necessary that he be pure in thought, foremost in action, lifted up in contemplation above all."[11] Again, to the being of a true pope there is required God's original election; now God does not choose for the papal office any but one who is worthy and preeminent in virtue over all the rest; therefore otherwise he is not pope. The major, often stated, is supposed as faith teaches;[12] for God must concur with every created agent and first approve every

divinitatem eleccione eterna eligere [363]quemlibet verum papam. Minor autem patet ex hoc, quod pastor (in quantum huiusmodi) debet esse medium inter Deum et populum et per consequens in virtute Deo propinquior, ut diffuse declarat beatus Gregorius ubi supra. Et patet ex hoc quod distribuere beneficia, decidere causas civiles et cetera, que non sunt preeminencie virtutum officia, sunt abiectum officium laycale, ideo iuxta beatum Gregorium ad papam non pertinent. Deus igitur eligit eum in papam qui ad iuvandum populum preeminet potestate, et aliter in isto deficiens est Antichristus et pseudopapa, ex ficcione mendacii et fraudacione officii.

lawful work of a creature; since therefore according to his humanity he does not as a rule elect popes, it is clear that he must, according to his divinity, choose by eternal election [363]every true pope. And the minor is clear from this, that the shepherd (as such) must be a mean between God and the people, and consequently nearer to God in virtue, as blessed Gregory declares at length in the place cited. And it is clear from this that distributing benefices, deciding civil causes and the rest, which are not offices of preeminence in the virtues, are an abject lay office; so according to blessed Gregory they do not pertain to the pope. God therefore chooses as pope him who is preeminent in power for helping the people, and one who otherwise falls short in this is Antichrist and a pseudo-pope, by the fiction of a lie and the defrauding of the office.

¶5 363.14–364.33

[363]Ex istis videtur quod nemo sumeret sibi honorem papalem, ut dicit Apostolus, nisi a Deo revelacione abscondita sit vocatus; nam debet cognoscere quod nisi virtute preemineat est contrarius veritati. Sed quis scit hoc? Cum igitur gracia fastus vel questus accipiens dignitatem huiusmodi se ipsum excommunicat in principio, patet quam magnum periculum est in presumpcione talis officii. Ideo dicit Gregorius primo Pastoralium IX: Cum curam populi electus presul suscipit, quasi ad egrum medicus accedit. Si igitur adhuc in eius corpore passiones vivunt qua presumpcione percusso mederi properat, qui in facie vulnus portat. Et infra XI: Sollerter se quisque meciatur, ne locum regiminis assumere audeat, si adhuc in se vicium dampnabiliter regnat. Et hinc superna voce Levit. XXI. 17 ad Moysen dicitur, homo de semine tuo per familias qui habuerit maculam non offerat panes Deo suo nec accedat ad ministerium eius. Et forte si prelati forent a Deo examinati radicitus, cognosceretur quod ex [364]perversa affeccione pocius preessendi quam promerendi suscipiunt illud onus. Quod evidenter convincitur ex hoc quod amplectentes temporalia dimittunt officium promerendi, quod oportet laycos si volunt memores esse salutis proprie iudicare. Et sic videtur melius fore ecclesie quod non foret prelatus cesareus. Sic enim Petrus et ceteri apostoli instar Christi preeminenciam illam aufugerant et ministerialiter propter meritum apud Deum absconditum subesse elegerant. Unde Gregorius primo Pastoralium III: Hec breviter diximus, ut quantum sit pondus regiminis monstraremus, ne temerare sacra regimina quisquis impar his est audeat et per concupiscenciam culminis ducatum suscipiat perdicionis. Hinc etenim Jacobus pie prohibet dicens: Nolite plures magistri fieri, fratres mei. Hinc mediator Dei et hominum percipere

From these things it seems that no one should take to himself the papal honour, as the Apostle says, unless he has been called by God by a hidden revelation;[13] for he must know that unless he is preeminent in virtue he is contrary to the truth. But who knows this? Since therefore one who accepts such a dignity for the sake of pride or gain excommunicates himself at the outset, it is clear how great a danger lies in presuming to such an office. So Gregory says in *Pastoral [Care]* 1.9: "When a prelate who has been elected takes up the care of the people, he comes like a physician to the sick. If therefore passions still live in his body, with what presumption does he hasten to heal the stricken, who carries a wound on his own face?" And below, 11: "Let each one skilfully measure himself, lest he dare to assume the place of rule while vice still reigns damnably in him. And hence by the voice from above (Leviticus 21:17) it is said to Moses: 'Whosoever of thy seed throughout their families, hath a blemish, he shall not offer bread to his God, neither shall he approach to minister to him.'"[14] And perhaps, if prelates were examined by God to the root, it would be known that they take up that burden out of [364]a perverse affection for presiding rather than for meriting.[15] Which is evidently proved from this, that those who embrace temporal goods abandon the office of meriting; which laymen must judge, if they wish to be mindful of their own salvation. And so it seems that it would be better for the church that there were no caesarean prelate. For so Peter and the other apostles, after the pattern of Christ, had fled that preeminence, and had chosen to be subject in ministry for the sake of merit hidden with God. Hence Gregory, *Pastoral [Care]* 1.3: "These things we have said briefly, to show how great is the weight of rule, lest whoever is unequal to it dare to

regnum vitavit in terris, qui supernorum spirituum scienciam sensumque transcendens ante secula regnat in celis, Scriptum quippe est, Ihesus cum cognovisset, quia venturi essent ut raperent et facerent eum regem, fugit in montem. Quis enim principari hominibus tam sine culpa potuisset quam is, qui inculpate regeret illos quos creavit? Sed quia idcirco in carne venerat, ut non solum nos per passionem redimeret, verum eciam per conversacionem doceret, exemplum se sequentibus prebens rex fieri noluit, ad crucis vero patibulum sponte convenit, oblatam gloriam culminis fugit, penam probrose mortis expeciit, ut membra eius discerent favores mundi fugere, terrores hominum non timere, pro veritate adversa diligere timendo prospera declinare.

profane the sacred offices of rule, and through desire of eminence take up the leadership of perdition.[16] For hence James piously forbids, saying: 'Be ye not many masters, my brethren.' Hence the mediator of God and men, who, transcending the knowledge and understanding of the spirits above, reigns in heaven before the ages, avoided receiving a kingdom on earth. For it is written: 'Jesus, when he knew that they would come to take him by force and make him king, fled into the mountain.'[17] For who could have ruled over men so without fault as he who would rule blamelessly those whom he had created? But since he had come in the flesh for this purpose, not only to redeem us by his passion but also to teach us by his manner of life, offering an example to those who follow him he would not be made king, but went of his own accord to the gibbet of the cross; he fled the glory of eminence offered him, he sought the penalty of a shameful death, that his members might learn to flee the favours of the world, not to fear the terrors of men, to love adversity for the truth's sake, and in fear to turn away from prosperity."

Notes

1. Rom. 3:8 (DR "let us do evil that there may come good"), turned into Wyclif's own construction; so not quoted.
2. *Inconveniencia* (CONTEXTUAL): here the absurd consequences of the argument just refuted, not troubles in affairs.
3. *Ad gravandos*, "those who are to be charged", i.e. those to be held at fault in what follows; the verb can also mean "to be burdened", which fits the clergy laden with the goods of the poor less well.
4. *Color*: a plausible ground, as in "colour of title"; the pope takes the name on the ground of the holiness it claims.
5. Wyclif refers back to ch. 10 of this work, where a decree of Jerome is recited with Bernard (*De consideratione*) and Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, on what a pope ought to be: the decree is C.24 q.1 c.14 *Hec est fides* (p. 250), Lincoln is cited at pp. 257–258, and Bernard's book *ad papam Eugenium* at p. 265. *Reputative*: by men's estimation, as against revelation.
6. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 2.1 (PL 77.25D: *Tantum debet actionem populi actio transcendere praesulis, quantum distare solet a grege vita pastoris*), which Wyclif paraphrases; Loserth gives "Greg. l. c." at 361.12.
7. The print's *eque maneret et pasceret eum* does not construe well: *manere* with an object is odd. Perhaps *minaret*, "would drive" (as a shepherd his flock); we translate the print.
8. Loserth at 361.24 compares Hus, *Opera* I, 229a ("Cf. Hussii Opp. I, 229 a").
9. The print reads *cum honor sit ex quo premium virtutis*; *ex quo* does not construe and is left untranslated (an intrusion, or a word lost). The maxim is Aristotle's, honour the prize of virtue (*Nic. Eth.* 4.3, 1123b35). James 2 is Wyclif's reference (Jas. 2:1, against respect of persons).
10. Loserth marks this place corrupt (362.11, *Hic locus corruptus est*; B omits *et*). We translate the print: *equiparanciis quotquot aliis episcopis et sibi*, "comparisons of any number of other bishops with himself".
11. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 2.1 (Loserth: "Cap. I"; PL 77.26D–27A); Wyclif leaves out the qualities Gregory lists between *actione praecipuus* and *prae cunctis contemplatione suspensus*.
12. *Maior ex fide sepe dicta supponitur*: *dicta* may agree with *maior* ("the major, often stated") or with *fide* ("from the faith often stated"); we take the first.
13. Heb. 5:4 (DR "Neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was"), given in indirect speech.
14. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 1.9 (PL 77.22D) and 1.11 (PL 77.23D–24A), as Wyclif cites them; Loserth gives no reference. Gregory reads *causam populi* and *in ejus opere* where this text has *curam populi* and *in eius corpore*. The scripture is Lev. 21:17–18, which Gregory introduces with *ad Moysen dicitur: Loquere ad Aaron* and quotes with the Vulgate's futures *offeret*, *accedet*; this text drops *Loquere ad Aaron* and has subjunctives.
15. *Ex* (363.34) is Loserth's supply; the manuscripts omit it.
16. *Ne temerare ... quisquis impar his est audeat* is Loserth's text; the manuscripts read *ne intrare* (364.13) and *quisquis est is nuper audeat* (364.13–14). Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 1.3 (PL 77.16B–C), which reads *ne temerare sacra regimina quisquis his impar est audeat* and so confirms Loserth's emendations.
17. Jas. 3:1 (DR). John 6:15 (Loserth): the text omits the Vulgate's first *eum*, *iterum* and *ipse solus* (DR "fled again into the mountains, himself alone"). "Mediator of God and men" is 1 Tim. 2:5.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **360: *a* (the main token read the English side note "of"; the printed a (end of the line above, "videtur quod a") has no other slot)**
  - **360: *pontifice***
  - **361: *magna***
  - **361: *testimonium Bernhardi* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **361: *et Lyncolniensis* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **361: *pater* (25 is the line number)**
  - **361: *beatissimus***
  - **361: *veritatem* (hyphenated veri-|tatem (30 line number); main token holds the whole word)**
  - **362: *antecedenti***
  - **362: *gerit***
  - **362: *terris* [NW]**
  - **362: *namque***
  - **362: *vocatur***
  - **362: *est ut* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **362: *suspensus* (hyphenated su-|spensus; main token holds the whole word)**
  - **362: ∅ (true is the English side note (To be a true pope ...))**
  - **362: *Item***
  - **362: *Dei* (the main token read the English side note "by"; this slot is the only one for the printed Dei)**
  - **362: ∅ (folio bar after fide (251^{b} in margin) read as i)**
  - **363: *huiusmodi* (20 is the line number)**
  - **363: *portat***
  - **364: *carne***
  - **364: *membra* (mem | bra split by folio bar (251^{d} in margin); main token holds the whole word)**
  - **364: *eius***
  - **364: *diligere***
  - **362: *Oportet* (Oporfet -> Oportet (scans: oporfet | oporiet | oportet | oporfet))**
- **Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Correxi. (364.33).**

Part 14: The papacy is service, and the name of pope is equivocal

Loserth pp. 365.1–368.34

¶1 365.1–367.3
365.7 *The true papacy consists In service.*
365.25 *Ambition of office shews that a man has been blinded by Satan.*
366.13 *The pope should not appoint prelates.*
367.4 *Objection: The pope would be subject to deprivation for every sin.*
367.14 *In this matter much depends on the meaning of Pope;*
367.21 *whether it connotes holiness or worldly supremacy.*

[365]**Hic possumus palpare si plus diligimus Christum sequendo eius vestigia, quam sacerdotes cesareos propter mundum. Et hec racio (ut credo) movit Augustinum epistola ad Cirillum, quando dixit, postquam allocutus est beatum Jeronymum iam mortuum: Testor Deum, quod a tempore illo pocius desideravi subesse quam preesse. Nam iuxta legem et diffinicionem Christi Matth. XX: Maior, superior vel prelatus ecclesie, debet subesse ministerio suis subditis, que servitus dum defuerit prelato cesareo non est papa, non enim habet cesar vel Deus potestatem sic mutandi officia prelatorum ecclesie, stante vero nomine eorum quod Christus instituit; Deus enim non potest in contradiccionem, cum tunc foret contrarius sibi ipsi. Ideo licet cesar ordinet, quod regulariter episcopus suus presit aliis episcopis, recipiendo a toto populo honores mundanos, et totus populus subsit generaliter suo decreto, non propterea sequitur quod**

Here we can feel out whether we love Christ more, by following his footsteps, than [we love] caesarean priests for the world's sake. And this reason (as I believe) moved Augustine in the letter to Cyril, when, after he had addressed blessed Jerome, now dead, he said: "I call God to witness that from that time I have desired rather to be under than to be over."[1] For according to the law and definition of Christ, Matthew 20, the greater, the superior or the prelate of the church must be under his subjects in ministry;[2] and while this servitude is wanting to a caesarean prelate he is not pope. For neither Caesar nor God has power so to change the offices of the prelates of the church while yet their name, which Christ instituted, stands;[3] for God cannot [do] what is a contradiction, since then he would be contrary to himself. So although Caesar ordain that his bishop as a rule preside over other bishops, receiving worldly honours from the whole

sit papa; hoc enim potest competere layco ut cesari vel alii abiecto membro dyaboli. Racio igitur papatus consistit in humiliori officio ministrandi, sicut stetit in beato Petro et ceteris, quod solius Dei est creature concedere. Et patet, quod magis periculosa mutacio regis superbie stat in hoc quod excecat homines, mutando sacerdotes ad contrarium officii quod Christus eis instituit. Equivocato enim officio necesse est ut producant ecclesiam et fructus equivocatos. Et patet generaliter de omni curato sive presbitero quod a signo valde probabili indigne appetit pastoris officium, quando tam [366] remote, tam sumptuose et periculose laborat ad primatum ecclesiasticum obtinendum, quia si pure vel principaliter intendit edificacionem ecclesie, plana est via, brevior, securior et Deo placencior, laborando indiffinite sicut fecerunt apostoli. Quod si primatum pure aut primo intendit, inhabilitat se ad omnem statum ecclesie, cum preponit regem superbie regi vero; et sic videtur quod ecclesia regulanda ut olim eligeret sibi presbiterum vel quod apostoli infidelis gentis constituant sibi presbiteros, quos percepto veneno dyaboli debent abicere. Et patet quam extraneum est a Romano pontifice symoniace principatus ecclesiis assignare; hoc enim foret minus dissonum in milite vel alio populari; ex quibus convincitur quod papa tam perplexe se onerans in tam alieno officio atque ambiguo, propter reputatum commodum temporale nimis gravat suum officium, cum fatue reddit se participem criminis hominum, quos sic prefert. Sic eciam dicitur ampliare potestatem eorum quam Deus minuit vel non causat, et restringere potestatem eorum, quam Deus amplificat. Quomodo igitur respondebit Deo stultus tam precipitanter et blasfeme sibi contrarius; non enim est fundabile quod habet potestatem in episcopis, ipsis sciencioribus et copiosius claves ecclesie habentibus potestatem ordinis sic restringere vel laxare. Nam de potestate propria hoc non potest, quos igitur funes habet circa potestatem alienam maiorem sua potestate, quam Deus dat appropiate ad prodessendum ecclesie? Non igitur valet fingere blasfemiam ad magnificandum suam potenciam, sed necesse habet stabilire ecclesiam in statu et religione primeva, quam Christus instituit, [367] non excedendo limites in sacramentis et sacramentalibus evangelicis, quia tunc est indubie Antichristus.

people, and that the whole people be generally subject to his decree, it does not on that account follow that he is pope; for this can belong to a layman, as to Caesar or to another abject member of the devil. The nature of the papacy therefore consists in the humbler office of ministering, as it stood in blessed Peter and the others; and this it is God's alone to grant to a creature. And it is clear that the more dangerous change wrought by the king of pride stands in this, that he blinds men, changing priests to the contrary of the office which Christ instituted for them. For when the office is made equivocal, they must produce an equivocal church and equivocal fruits. And it is clear generally of every curate or presbyter that, by a very probable sign, he seeks the shepherd's office unworthily when he labours so [366] far off, at such cost and with such danger, to obtain ecclesiastical primacy; for if he purely or principally intends the building up of the church, the way is plain, shorter, safer and more pleasing to God: labouring without fixed bounds, as the apostles did.[4] But if he intends primacy purely or first, he disqualifies himself for every state of the church, since he puts the king of pride before the true king; and so it seems that the church, to be ruled as of old, should choose a presbyter for itself, or that the apostles of an unbelieving people should appoint presbyters for them, whom, once the poison of the devil is perceived, they should cast off. And it is clear how foreign it is to the Roman pontiff to assign principalities to churches simoniacally;[5] for this would be less discordant in a knight or another man of the people; from which it is proved that the pope, burdening himself so perplexedly in an office so alien and so doubtful, for the sake of a reputed temporal advantage, burdens his own office exceedingly, since he foolishly makes himself a partaker in the crime of the men whom he so prefers. So too he is said to enlarge the power of those men which God diminishes or does not cause, and to restrict the power of those men which God amplifies. How then will the fool answer God, so headlong and so blasphemously contrary to himself? For there is no ground for holding that he has power over bishops, who are themselves more knowing and more abundantly have the keys of the church, so to restrict or loose their power of order. For he cannot do this by his own power; what cords then has he about another's power, greater than his own power, which God gives fittingly for profiting the church? He may not therefore feign blasphemy to magnify his own power, but he must establish the church in the primitive state and religion which Christ instituted, [367] not exceeding the limits

in the gospel sacraments and sacramentals; for then he is undoubtedly Antichrist.

¶2 367.4–367.13

[367]Sed obicitur per hoc quod, si papa debet esse sanctissimus viatorum et aliter non est papa, sequitur quod omne peccatum mortale vel veniale debet degradare papam, quod est contra legem distinccione XL: Si papa, in qua dicitur quod solum debet deponi pro heresi. Et iterum videtur idem de regibus, episcopis et quibuscumque ministris ecclesie, ymo summus sacerdos in lege veteri non fuit regulariter sanctissimus, cum sepe fuit pollutus.

But it is objected, by appeal to this, that if the pope must be the holiest of wayfarers and otherwise is not pope, it follows that every sin, mortal or venial, must degrade the pope; which is against the law in distinction 40, ***Si papa***, where it is said that he is to be deposed only for heresy.[6] And again the same seems [to hold] of kings, bishops and any ministers of the church whatever; indeed the high priest in the old law was not as a rule the holiest, since he was often polluted.

¶3 367.14–368.10
368.11 *Objection: Every one ought to be pope, since every one ought to attain the highest holiness.*
368.20 *Even among the saints there are degrees of holiness,*
368.27 *and it is devilish presumption to claim the highest.*

[367]Hic dicitur quod maior pars huius difficultatis stat in signacione termini magistralis, ut aliqui intelligunt papam, ut dicit autonomastice super quoscumque alios mirabilem sanctitatem, sicut Christus se habuit ad suos apostolos. Et sic intelligunt homines de Romano pontifice in hiis que lucrum et honorem mundanam sapiunt, sed non in vita secundum forum consciencie quoad Deum. Et isto modo loquuntur tres sancti doctores predicti. Alii autem intelligunt papam, ut dicit episcopum supereminentem in aliqua sanctitate, ut Ambrosius, Augustinus et ceteri vocati sunt pape. Sed postquam declinavit clerus ad civilitatem, vocati sunt quicumque pape, qui ad decidendum principaliter causas ecclesie seculares sunt humanitus instituti. Et super ista equivocacione currunt raciones, nam Christus fuit papa, quem degradaret quodcumque peccatum, ideo stultum foret christianum ea intencione assumere [368]nomen pape. Ideo caverunt de hoc Petrus, Gregorius et alii sancti, ignorantes si sunt membra dyaboli. In medio vero acceperant sibi sancti episcopi nomen pape, et in tercio propter blasfemum fastum et questum assumpserunt sibi confuse illud nomen prelati cesarei ultra auctoritatem novi vel veteris testamenti. Unde secus est de nomine pape et aliis nominibus primo officiorum, cum papa dicit principaliter preeminenciam sanctitatis. Et patet ex equivocacione solucio.

The answer here is that the greater part of this difficulty stands in the signification of a masters' term:[7] for some understand "pope" as it signifies, by antonomasia, a marvellous holiness above all others whatever, as Christ stood toward his apostles.[8] And so men understand [it] of the Roman pontiff in those things that savour of worldly gain and honour, but not in life according to the court of conscience before God. And in this way the three holy doctors aforesaid speak.[9] But others understand "pope" as it signifies a bishop supereminent in some holiness, as Ambrose, Augustine and the rest were called popes. But after the clergy declined to civil standing, any were called popes who are humanly instituted principally for deciding the secular causes of the church. And the arguments run upon this equivocation; for Christ was pope, whom any sin whatever would degrade; so it would be foolish for a Christian to take [368]the name of pope with that intention. So Peter, Gregory and other saints were wary of this, not knowing whether they are members of the devil. But in the middle [sense] holy bishops had taken the name of pope to themselves, and in the third, out of blasphemous pride and gain, they assumed to themselves indistinctly that name of a caesarean prelate, beyond the authority of the new or the old testament. Hence it is otherwise with the name of pope than with other names that are primarily names of offices, since "pope" signifies principally a preeminence of holiness.[10] And the solution is clear from the equivocation.

¶4 368.11–368.14

[368]Secundo obicitur per hoc, quod iuxta hanc viam quilibet debet esse papa, ut debet esse sanctissimus viatorum. Debet enim esse papa et quocumque iam viante sanctior.

Secondly it is objected, by appeal to this, that on this way every man ought to be pope, as he ought to be the holiest of wayfarers. For he ought to be pope and holier than anyone now on the road.

¶5 368.15–368.34

[368]**Hic dicitur quod logica secundum sensum compositum et divisum in ista materia est cavenda. Non enim est aliqua sanctitas qua prepolleret peccator, quin debet esse sanctior, quia aliter non peccaret. Verumtamen nec in statu vie nec statu lapsus debet homo composite esse sanctissimus viatorum, quia subducto omni peccato foret gradus excessuum sanctitatum. Sed post lapsum non est alius sanctus vivens vitam communem quin debet esse sancior. Sed ut credo quilibet predestinatus debet finire in gradu sanctitatis non summo sed sibi debito. Unde luciferina presumpcio videtur quod christianus accipiat sibi nomen talis preeminencie sanctitatis. Ideo sancti concorditer illud respuerant. Quid igitur moveret Romanum episcopum ultra obligacionem apud Deum absconditam ex professione humana spontanea sibi assumere tale nomen; professio namque et officium mutantur ab officio et more apostolico ad legem et officium Antichristi.**

The answer here is that in this matter one must beware of the logic of the composite and divided sense. For there is no holiness in which a sinner may excel but that he ought to be holier, since otherwise he would not sin. Nevertheless, neither in the state of the way nor in the state of the fall ought a man, in the composite [sense], to be the holiest of wayfarers, since, with all sin taken away, there would [still] be a gradation of holinesses exceeding one another.[11] But after the fall there is no other saint living the common life but ought to be holier. But, as I believe, every predestinate [man] must end in a degree of holiness, not the highest, but the one due to him. Hence it seems a Luciferian presumption that a Christian take to himself the name of such a preeminence of holiness. So the saints with one accord rejected it. What then should move the Roman bishop, beyond an obligation hidden with God, to assume such a name to himself by a spontaneous human profession? For the profession and the office are changed from the apostolic office and custom to the law and office of Antichrist.

Notes

1. The letter to Cyril on Jerome's death is the pseudo-Augustinian *Epistola ad Cyrillum de magnificentiis Hieronymi* (PL 22.288: *Testis enim est Deus ... plus affecto omnibus subesse, quam praeesse*). Loserth (365.4) suggested Augustine, *Ep.* 134.1 to Apringius (PL 33.511, *cui non tam praeesse quam prodesse desidero*), which is only a parallel. T. The manuscripts read *Augustinus*; *Augustinum* is Loserth's.
2. Matt. 20:26–27 (DR "whosoever is the greater among you, let him be your minister"), given in Wyclif's words, so not quoted. R. B in the margin (365.8): *Prelatus vere non est dum viciose deficit a ministerio*, "he is not truly a prelate while he fails viciously in ministry".
3. *Stante vero nomine eorum*: we take *vero* as the particle ("while yet their name stands"), so that the contradiction is a changed office under an unchanged name; it could also be the adjective, "while their true name stands".
4. *Indiffinite*: without bounds of place or charge, as the apostles laboured where they were sent; set against the distant primacy sought at Rome.
5. *Principatus ecclesiis assignare*: to give churches their rulers, i.e. to provide prelates (Loserth's side-note, "The pope should not appoint prelates").
6. *Decretum* D.40 c.6 *Si papa* (Loserth; the modern form is ours). Loserth italicises the clause *quod solum debet deponi pro heresi* as the canon's; we leave it unquoted, since Wyclif reports it.
7. *Magistralis* is Loserth's text; A reads *ingracilis* (367.15). R. B in the margin (367.10): *Papa quid signat*, "what 'pope' signifies".
8. *Dicit* here, and below (*ut dicit episcopum*, *papa dicit ... preeminenciam*), is "signifies", the logicians' use (Loserth's side-note: "connotes").
9. The three doctors are Jerome, Bernard and Lincoln, cited at 361.1–2.
10. *Aliis nominibus primo officiorum*: other names that signify an office first, whereas "pope" first signifies holiness.
11. *Foret gradus excessuum sanctitatum*, literally "there would be a degree of excesses of holinesses": even without sin, holiness would come in degrees, so no one is bound to the highest.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 366: *debent abicere.* (366.12, *debent* lost in every scan, read on the plate; the print opens a new ¶ at *Et patet*, kept within this ¶ here)
  - 365: *si plus* (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 365: *prelato*
  - 365: ∅ (folio bar after sive (252ª in margin) read as i)
  - 366: *remote* (faded leaf; print "remote,")
  - 366: *Et* (main lost the line "Et patet quam extraneum est a Romano ponti-" and kept only "fice"; this slot takes the line's first word, the rest (with pontifice whole) is the GAP row at pos 75)
  - 366: *patet quam extraneum est a Romano pontifice* (print line "Et patet quam extraneum est a Romano ponti-|fice,"; Et given at pos 74, ponti-fice joined) [GAP]
  - 366: *propter reputatum commodum temporale* (print "ambiguo, propter reputatum commodum tempo-|rale nimis"; ambiguo already at pos 103) [GAP]
  - 366: *ipsis* (main splits ipsis into ir + sis on the faded leaf; whole word given here, next token ∅)

- **366: ∅ (rest of ipsis, given whole at pos 157)**
- **366: *sciencioribus* (main splits it into 5circirir + r; whole word given here, next token ∅)**
- **366: ∅ (rest of sciencioribus, given whole at pos 159)**
- **366: *et***
- **366: *copiosius***
- **366: *claves***
- **366: *ecclesie***
- **368: *testamenti***
- **368: *preeminencie* [NW]**

Part 15: The Franciscan pope, insignia, and the propertyless state

Loserth pp. 369.1–373.28

¶1 369.1–370.32

369.1 *Pope Nicholas is said to have ordained that the Pope should always be a Franciscan.*
369.10 *This ordinance can be repealed only by a franciscan Pope and has not been so repealed,*
369.20 *All such decrees are void.*
370.2 *It is madness to set symbols above the virtue symbolized.*
370.16 *Let us be content with the rites which the apostles learned from Christ.*
370.25 *Rulers should withdraw endowments abused by the clergy.*

[369]**Sed tercio obicitur per hoc, quod Nicolaus de ordine fratrum Minorum dicitur de comuni consensu cardinalium et cleri ordinasse, quod non erit amplius papa nisi de suo ordine; quod videtur racionabile, cum ille sit status perfectissimus viatoris, ut patet in Sexto: Exiit qui seminat. Cum igitur illa ordinacio non potest dissolvi nisi per fratrem minorem papam, quod nunquam contigit, videtur quod abhinc non fuit aliquis verus papa. Pro isto supponuntur leges ecclesie, primo quod hec ordinacio fuit valida, secundo quod illa non potest tolli nisi per papam et clerum, et tercio quod nunquam in aliqua synodo tollebatur; tunc videtur quod repugnat ipsam tolli nisi per papam fratrem minorem, quia esto quod cras tolleretur per papam secularem. Sed contra repugnat stante lege ista quod papa huiusmodi sit electus, igitur repugnat legibus predictis quod ordinacio illa taliter dissolvatur. Hic patet quod ecclesia humanis tradicionibus insolubiliter cathenatur; et utinam non forent leges alique papales minus racionales quam est ista. Stat igitur solucio in duobus, primo quod decretalis talis non valuit, secundo quod ordines et alia sacramenta possunt ministrari licite, nullo papa cesareo existente, nec oportet plus dilatare istam materiam. Quantum ad tercium punctum de necessitate privilegiorum et regiminis capitalis in fide catholica, patet quod Christus cum lege sua per se sufficit. Signa autem ut cruces, baculum et similia, que Cesar instituit, ut** [370]**patet XCVI distinccione Constantinus, non vocamus privilegia, sed deliramenta, et, ut Crysostomus loquitur super epistolam ad Thym racionabiliter deridenda. Si enim videres senem puerilibus ornamentis indutum non gracia ludendi, sed maniace necessaria regimini sui corporis repudiantem, nonne deridendo diceres huiusmodi insanire? Multo magis presbiter vel prelatus, qui preponderat signa muta et putrida ante virtutes signatas est ut maniacus deridendus, et per tutorem tamquam decrepitus insaniens regulandus. Ideo necesse est reges**

But thirdly it is objected, by appeal to this, that Nicholas, of the order of Friars Minor, is said to have ordained, with the common consent of the cardinals and the clergy, that there shall be no pope any more except from his order;[1] which seems reasonable, since that is the most perfect state of a wayfarer, as is clear in the Sext, *Exiit qui seminat*.[2] Since therefore that ordinance cannot be dissolved except by a Friar Minor pope, which never happened, it seems that from then on there has not been any true pope. For this the laws of the church are supposed: first, that this ordinance was valid; second, that it cannot be removed except by the pope and the clergy; and third, that it was never removed in any synod. Then it seems that it is incompatible that it be removed except by a Friar Minor pope; for suppose that tomorrow it were removed by a secular pope. But against this: it is incompatible, while that law stands, that such a pope be elected; therefore it is incompatible with the aforesaid laws that that ordinance be dissolved in such a way. Here it is clear that the church is insolubly chained by human traditions; and would that there were no papal laws less reasonable than this one.[3] The solution therefore stands in two things: first, that such a decretal was not valid; second, that orders and the other sacraments can be ministered lawfully with no caesarean pope existing; nor is there need to enlarge further on this matter. As to the third point, on the necessity of privileges and of capital rule in the catholic faith, it is clear that Christ with his law suffices of himself. And signs such as crosses, the staff and the like, which Caesar instituted, as [370]**is clear in distinction 96, *Constantinus*, we call not privileges but ravings, and, as Chrysostom speaks on the epistle to Timothy, reasonably to be derided.[4] For if you saw an old man dressed in childish ornaments, not for the sake of play, but maniacally repudiating what is necessary to**

et principes honorem melancolicum, ut puta copiam temporalium suorum subtrahere, quia ille facit omnes tales prelatos, ultra hoc quod sapuerunt apostoli vel primitiva ecclesia insanire. Contentemur igitur de paucis ritibus quos ex doctrina Christi servarunt apostoli, et omnino honeste superadditos vere et modeste non preponderanter vel ypocritice observemus. Omnia enim talia non expediunt vel sunt licita, nisi de quanto iuvant ad observanciam mandatorum. Unde videtur adulterina degeneracio, quod mandata Dei quasi neutra respicimus, et cum tradicionibus hominum sumus insolubiliter desponsati. Domini igitur, quorum bonis abutimur, debent sua subtrahere, ne ex alieni peccati participio maculentur; nec obest huic sed prodest quod principibus limitatum est a Deo officium ad tuendam ecclesiam, ut patet in decreto beati Ysidori in de summo bono libro III. Et hic notant multi quod dicit ad tuendum, non spoliandum ecclesiam.

the rule of his body, would you not say in derision that such a one is mad? Much more is a presbyter or prelate who weighs mute and rotten signs above the virtues they signify to be derided as a maniac, and to be ruled by a guardian as one decrepit and insane. So it is necessary that kings and princes withdraw the melancholic honour, for example the plenty of their temporal goods; for that honour makes all such prelates mad beyond what the apostles or the primitive church were wise in.[5] Let us therefore be content with the few rites which the apostles kept from the doctrine of Christ, and let us observe those added on with entire decency truly and modestly, not preponderantly or hypocritically. For all such things are not expedient or lawful except in so far as they help toward the keeping of the commandments. Hence it seems an adulterous degeneration that we regard the commandments of God as if they were neutral things, and are insolubly espoused to the traditions of men. The lords therefore whose goods we abuse ought to withdraw what is theirs, lest they be stained by participation in another's sin; nor does it hinder this, but helps it, that the office of protecting the church is assigned to princes by God, as is clear in the decree of blessed Isidore, in *On the Highest Good*, book 3.[6] And here many note that he says "to protect", not "to despoil", the church.

¶2 371.1–371.33
371.1 *To do so is not Church but to protect it.*

[371]Sed constat sciolos quod non est color: Si beatus iste dicit quod principes debent tueri, et non dicit quod debent spoliare ecclesiam, igitur non licet eis ex caritate medicinaliter auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente. Sicut enim magna est distancia inter celum et terram, sic multum distant predanter spoliare et medicinaliter sic auferre. Ideo notaret sic arguens, quod sanctus doctor dicit: Principes debere tueri ecclesiam, non dicit dotare temporaliter vel ditare. Unde maior elemosina foret principibus tueri ecclesiam in limitibus religionis quam Christus instituit quam dare sibi quantamlibet elemosinam corporalem; et hoc possunt, cum possunt culpabiliter hos privilegii limites per accidens destruere, et per consequens possunt meritorie eosdem privilegii limites stabilire. Qui enim habet secundum leges dyaboli facultatem peccandi, habet pocius facultatem secundum leges Dei sibi et ecclesie promerendi. Ideo sicut seculares possunt obesse ecclesie per stultam et secularem dominorum dotacionem, sic possunt facilius atque licencius prodesse ecclesie per prudentem eorum subtraccionem. Pro declaracione autem conclusionis predicte capio quod status exproprietarie vivendi, in quo vixit clerus ante dotacionem, sit melior clero atque perfeccior quam quotquot seculares mundi divicie; quod probo per hoc quod

But it is evident to the knowing that there is no colour [in this]:[7] "If this blessed man says that princes ought to protect, and does not say that they ought to despoil the church, therefore it is not lawful for them, out of charity, to take temporal goods away medicinally from a delinquent church." For as there is a great distance between heaven and earth, so to despoil like a plunderer and to take away medicinally in this way are far apart. So one who argues thus should note that the holy doctor says: "Princes ought to protect the church"; he does not say "endow it temporally or enrich it".[8] Hence it would be greater alms for princes to protect the church within the limits of the religion which Christ instituted than to give it any bodily alms whatever; and this they can do, since they can culpably destroy these limits of privilege by accident, and consequently they can meritoriously establish the same limits of privilege. For he who has, according to the laws of the devil, the faculty of sinning, has rather the faculty, according to the laws of God, of meriting for himself and for the church. So, as seculars can harm the church by the foolish and secular endowment of lords, so they can more easily and more freely profit the church by their prudent withdrawal of it.[9] And for the clarifying of the aforesaid conclusion I take it that the state of

proporcionaliter ut aliquid adiacet viatori plus ipsum habilitans ad beatitudinem acquirendam est ipsum melius atque utilius; sed status ille ad finem illum magis habilitat, igitur est habenti plus utilis.

living without property, in which the clergy lived before the endowment, is better for the clergy and more perfect than all the secular riches of the world; which I prove by this, that in proportion as something attaches to a wayfarer that qualifies him more for acquiring blessedness, it is better and more useful [to him]; now that state qualifies more for that end; therefore it is more useful to the one who has it.

¶3 371.34–372.5
372.17 *To maintain the ordinances of Christ is a work of charity far higher than worldly gifts.*
372.27 *Otherwise the state of possessioners is higher than that of Friars.*

[371]Minor probatur tripliciter: primo per hoc quod Ihesus noster aliter inconvenienter daret ecclesie [372]illum statum, cum posset eque faciliter dotasse quantumcumque clerum suum in mundi diviciis; non enim est potentis, prudentis et benevolentis sic magis bonum postponere, quia tunc vel foret invidus vel ignarus.

The minor is proved in three ways: first by this, that otherwise our Jesus would unfittingly have given the church [372]that state, since he could as easily have endowed his clergy to any extent whatever in the riches of the world; for it is not [the part] of one powerful, prudent and benevolent so to put the greater good after, since then he would be either envious or ignorant.

¶4 372.6–372.16

[372]Similiter, quantumcumque divicie accumulentur, eciam cum securitate mundana perpetua non ponunt possessionatum nisi profundius in statu proprietario minus perfecto. Cum igitur status ille ideo dicitur principaliter minus perfectus, quia est plus a beatitudine tardativus, (ut sepe patet ex fide evangelii) sequitur quod status ille sit proprietate contraria clero utilior. Contrariorum enim oportet unum esse perfeccius tamquam habitus et reliquum imperfeccius tamquam privacio.

Likewise, however much riches are accumulated, even with perpetual worldly security, they only set the possessioner more deeply in the proprietary state, which is less perfect. Since therefore that state is said to be less perfect principally because it holds a man back more from blessedness (as is often clear from the faith of the gospel), it follows that that [other] state is more useful to the clergy than the property contrary to it.[10] For of contraries one must be more perfect, as habit, and the other more imperfect, as privation.

¶5 372.17–373.8
373.9 *As the world grows older avarice increases and needs to be more resisted.*

[372]Similiter, omne opus misericordie vel elemosine spiritualis est pocius quam opus misericordie vel elemosine corporalis, sed dare tuicionem quoad statum et privilegia que Christus instituit est opus misericordie spirituale, non comparacione ad ditacionem mundanam, igitur est ipsa prestancius. Aliter enim Christus invide peiorasset apostolos, vocando eos a mundi diviciis ad purum statum exproprietarium, sicut et fratres contra caritatis regulas dampnificarent pueros et alios divites seculares, dum faciunt eos fratres, ymo procurarent et laudarent plus homines qui facerent eos proprietarios quam conditores suorum ordinum, vel patres qui fecerant eos fratres; quod credo eos dicere esse apostatarum sentenciam; vel aliter sequitur, quod donantes ordinibus illis loca et domicilia ad habitandum et contractas, peccarent graviter, et sic ipsi suum ordinem observando; debent enim iuxta falsigraphum vivendo [373]in statu possessionato meritorius plus prodesse ecclesie. Ideo stulte et sine causa quam Deus approbat viverent sic parce atque penaliter, si sic deficiat perfeccio sui status. Ideo ipsi debent esse

Likewise, every work of mercy or of spiritual alms is preferable to a work of mercy or of bodily alms;[11] now to give protection as regards the state and the privileges which Christ instituted is a spiritual work of mercy, not to be compared with worldly enrichment; therefore it is more excellent than that. For otherwise Christ would enviously have made the apostles worse off, calling them from the riches of the world to the pure propertyless state; just as the friars too, against the rules of charity, would do harm to boys and other rich seculars when they make them friars; indeed they would seek out and praise more the men who would make them proprietaries than the founders of their orders, or the fathers who had made them friars; which I believe they themselves call the teaching of apostates.[12] Or else it follows that those who give those orders places and dwellings to live in, and districts, would sin gravely,[13] and so would the friars themselves in keeping their order; for according to the false writer they ought, by living [373]in a possessioned state, to profit the church more meritoriously. So they would live thus sparingly

singulariter pugiles huius sentencie, nedum quia est fundamentum sui ordinis, sed quia leges ecclesie et fides scripture cum racionibus idem dicunt.

and in hardship foolishly, and without a cause that God approves, if the perfection of their state fails in this way. So they ought to be singularly the champions of this teaching, not only because it is the foundation of their order, but because the laws of the church and the faith of scripture, with reasons, say the same.

¶6 373.9–373.28

[373] Et per idem sequitur quod in dominis temporalibus et tota ecclesia foret status ille utilior, quia aliter religiosi stulte et irreligiose facerent multos fratres. Et patet ex eodem quod successio temporis non impedit, sed requirit quod debemus sic vivere, ymo temporis periculositas, temptacionis crudelitas et temporalium detestabilitas docent nos nunc pocius mundana relinquere; nam senescente mundo est homo pronior ad avariciam, et hinc dyabolus temptans in hoc acucius est caucius obviandus. Et patet, quod est contra racionem hec avaricia, quia res mundane sunt plus solito magis flexibiles, et peiores homines sunt plus debiles ad gaudendum in illis et vita breviores; cum igitur non faciant sed excitant ad sitibundius appetendum, patet ex doctrina in caritate sapiencie quod illis remotis sunt futura spiritualia appetenda, et illi qui ex obligacione vivunt vitam exproprietariam nimis degenerant, si isti sentencie tacite vel expresse contradicant.

And by the same token it follows that in temporal lords and in the whole church that state would be more useful; for otherwise the religious would foolishly and irreligiously make many friars. And it is clear from the same that the succession of time does not hinder, but requires, that we should live so; indeed the dangerousness of the time, the cruelty of temptation and the detestableness of temporal goods teach us now rather to relinquish worldly things; for as the world grows old man is more prone to avarice, and hence the devil, tempting more sharply in this, must be met more warily. And it is clear that this avarice is against reason, because worldly things are more changeable than usual, and worse men are weaker for enjoying them and shorter of life; since therefore they do not [satisfy] but excite to a thirstier desire,[14] it is clear from the teaching in the charity of wisdom that, these being removed, the spiritual things to come are to be desired; and those who live the propertyless life by obligation degenerate exceedingly if they contradict this teaching, tacitly or expressly.

Notes

1. Loserth ("Cf.") refers to Higden, *Polychronicon* VIII, p. 268 (Rolls Series), which says only that Nicholas IV (1288–92) was of the Friars Minor; two of its manuscripts add that he "declared the rule of the Friars Minor by a constitution". The decree confining the papacy to Franciscans, which the manuscripts' margin here also reports, is not in Higden. *Exiit qui seminat* (n2) is Nicholas III's, so Wyclif or his source has run the two Nicholases together.
2. *Exiit qui seminat* (Nicholas III, 1279), *Sext* 5.12.3 (Loserth "Tit. XII, Cap. III"; the modern form is ours).
3. *Racionales* is Loserth's text; the manuscripts read *irracionales* (369.22), "less irrational".
4. *Decretum* D.96 c.14 *Constantinus* (Loserth "Cap. XIV"; the modern form is ours), the Donation of Constantine. Chrysostom on 1 or 2 Timothy: Loserth gives "Chrysostomus l. c."; the image is not found in Chrysostom's homilies on 1 or 2 Timothy (PG 62). The nearest is *In 1 Tim.* hom. 12 on 4:7 (PG 62.559–560), where a grown man still at the nurse's breast is "ridiculus ... quod intempestive id agat", said of outworn observances as "old wives' fables".
5. *Insanire ultra hoc quod sapuerunt*: the play is on *sapere* "be wise" against *insanire* "be mad". The *honor melancolicus* is the honour that breeds madness (melancholy, the humour of madness).
6. *Decretum* C.23 q.5 c.20, from Isidore, *Sententiae* (*De summo bono*) 3.51.4 (PL 83.723B; Loserth "cap. LIII", Gratian's inscription "c. 55"; the modern form is ours).
7. *Constat sciolos*: the accusative is irregular (one expects *sciolis*); we take it as "it is evident to the knowing". *Color*: a plausible ground; the argument quoted has none.
8. Loserth italicises *Principes debere tueri ecclesiam, non dicit dotare temporaliter vel ditare* as one run; *non dicit* is Wyclif's, so we quote the two halves apart.
9. *Licencius*: "more freely" (from *licenter*); "more lawfully" is possible if the word stands for *licitius*.
10. *Status ille* changes referent: in the first clause the proprietary state, in the second the propertyless state set against *proprietas*. We add "[other]".
11. *est pocius*: we take *pocius* as the adjective, "preferable" (*potior*); a comparative (*melius*, *prestancius*) may have dropped out of the text at 372.17.
12. *Sentencia* (CONTEXTUAL): the position held; "teaching".
13. *Contractas*: Loserth, *contratas*, "country"; here "districts", the friars' begging limits. T. *Ad* (*ad habitandum*) is Loserth's supply; the manuscripts omit it (372.35).
14. *Faciant* stands in both manuscripts (Loserth, *ita codd.*); *satiant*, "satisfy", seems meant, and we supply it in brackets.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- **Plate readings; page · reading · note):**
  - **369: *ordinasse* [NW]**
  - **369: *in Sexto* (one main token covers two printed words)**
  - **369: *Exiit***
  - **369: *illa* (252[d] is the folio mark (bar after illa))**
  - **369: *illa***
  - **369: *cras***
  - **369: *illa***
  - **370: *Thym* (abbreviation Thym. as printed; punctuation not carried)**
  - **370: *et***
  - **371: *predanter* [NW]**
  - **371: *illum***
  - **372: *elemosine* (hyphenated elemo-|sine; main token holds the whole word)**
  - **372: *vel***
  - **372: *peiorasset* [NW]**
  - **372: *proprietarios* [NW]**

Part 16: The king's justice: the twenty-two conditions of a king

Loserth pp. 373.29–377.23

¶1 373.29–377.23
373.29 *The fifth commandment teaches us to honour our mother the church and remove all. blots from her.*
374.21 *Those who should advise the king mislead him.*
374.26 *Prelates maintain false counsellors, lawyers and theologians.*
375.11 *It is the duty of kings to put down new sects and ceremonies.*

[373]**Ex istis colligitur talis racio ex lege primi mandati secunde tabule, omnis homo debet honorare sanctam matrem ecclesiam, sed honor eius precipuus foret auferre ab ea turpitudinis maculam, servando in ea statum tam dignum et nobilem et tuendo pristinam libertatem, igitur omnis homo et specialiter secularis dominus ac** [374]**superior clericus hoc tenetur. Si igitur homo sit excommunicatus atque gravis sacrilegus qui spoliat ecclesiam bonis fortune et sacris ecclesie ornamentis, quanto magis qui extinguit in ecclesia vel aufert ab ea iocale preciosius et infinitum? quodammodo magis sacrum, cuiusmodi sunt status, privilegium et libertas, que Christus dedit ecclesie cleri sui. Et hec excommunicacio sacrilega perturbat nimirum totam ecclesiam militantem; nam tam auferentes quam consencientes sunt heretici a Deo maledicti, et eo gravius quo sic honorare matrem suam foret facilius. Nam via Domini est consolativa, plana et facilis, sed via dyaboli est litigativa, sumptuosa atque difficilis. Et istum scrupulum detegeret clerus mundi principibus, quia illorum est extirpare hos nidos hereticos. Melius enim foret et plus ad pacem nostram, quod non foret in Anglia domus vel prepositus sic possessionatus, quam quod sic duraret in ipsa hoc excomunicatum et hereticum sacrilegium antiquatum. Licet enim sit tam contrarium profectui populi et possessioni secularium dominorum induratum et tam diutine vix potest nisi per miraculum semoveri, et illi quos rex conduxit carius ad instruendum eum in hac fide proditorie plus resistunt. Et idem est iudicium de fratrum collegiis, que in**

From these [points] an argument of this kind is gathered, from the law of the first commandment of the second table:[1] every man ought to honour holy mother church; now her chief honour would be to take from her the stain of foulness, by keeping in her a state so worthy and noble and by protecting her original liberty; therefore every man, and especially a secular lord and a [374]**superior cleric, is bound to this. If then a man is excommunicate and gravely sacrilegious who despoils the church of the goods of fortune and of the sacred ornaments of the church, how much more he who extinguishes in the church, or takes from her, a jewel more precious and infinite, in a certain way more sacred,[2] such as are the state, privilege and liberty which Christ gave to the church of his clergy? And this sacrilegious excommunication[3] without doubt disturbs the whole church militant; for both those who take away and those who consent are heretics cursed by God, and the more gravely in that so to honour their mother would be easier. For the way of the Lord is consoling, level and easy, but the way of the devil is litigious, costly and difficult. And the clergy should expose this scruple to the princes of the world, for it is theirs to root out these heretical nests. For it would be better, and more for our peace, that there were in England no house or superior so possessioned than that this excommunicate and heretical sacrilege, grown old, should so endure in it. For although it is so contrary to the progress of the people and to the possession of the secular lords, it is hardened and**

magna parte fovent hoc facinus vel defendunt. Sicut enim Machomed habuit duos complices, scilicet Hebreum peritum in lege veteri, et Sergium monachum subdolum christianum, ita dicitur hodie prelatos cesareos habere ex uno latere peritos in lege cesarea et ex alio latere ypocritam exproprietarium, vocatum sacre pagine [375]professorem; foret (inquam) copia cleri purgati, ut in vitis patrum priorum, clero Christi secundum eius privilegia, libertates Christi et regulas conservante. Nichil enim utile, iustum atque legitimum est alicui statui ecclesie vel legi, quem Christus instituit, contrarium, dampniferum vel nocivum, quia sic Christus foret in membris et legibus sibi ipsi contrarius. Dotacio igitur cleri non foret plus hodie quam tempore Christi contraria dominio seculari; et multo evidencius non foret contenciosa contraria sibi ipsi. Regum itaque est ad pacificacionem regni sui tales sectas et ritus novellos extinguere. Vel aliter quomodo stabit regnum? Domus enim supra domum cadet, tam in contencionibus quam pugnis spiritualibus aut corporalibus; tam inter religiosos quam laycos ac mixtim, cum forent sibi ipsis contrarii ex consensu peccati, quod omnino facit subiectum contrarium sibi ipsi. Nec dissonat sed consonat istis dictum Augustini in de Duodecim Gradibus Abusionum nono capitulo ubi dicit, quod regem non iniquum sed correctorem iniquorum esse oportet. Inde in semet ipso dignitatem sui nominis custodiret, nomen enim regis intellectualiter retinet, ut subiectis omnibus rectoris officium procuret. Ex isto plane sequitur: Si totus clerus regni habet aliquem regem suum, debet subesse eius regimini; ut patet super Jeronymum Omelia XI. Consequenter ponit iste sanctus viginti duas proprietates, que debent regibus convenire. Qualiter, inquit, alios corrigere poterit, qui proprios mores, ne iniqui sint, non corrigit, quoniam iusticia regis exaltatur solium [376]et in veritate solidantur gubernacula populorum. Iusticia vero regis est neminem iniuste per potenciam opprimere, sine personarum accepcione inter virum et proximum suum iuste iudicare, advenis, pupillis et viduis defensorem esse, cohibere furta, adulteria punire, iniquos non exaltare, impudicos et histriones non nutrire, impios de terra perdere, patricidas et prave viventes vivere non sinere, ecclesias defendere, pauperes elemosinis alere, iustos super regni negocia constituere, senes sapientes et sobrios consiliarios habere, magorum, ariolorum, phitonissarum supersticionibus non contendere, iracundiam differre, patriam fortiter et iuste contra adversarios defendere, per omnia in Deo confidere, prosperitatibus animam non elevare, cuncta adversa pacienter tollerare, filios suos non sinere impie agere, certis horis oracionibus insistere, ante horas congruas non gustare cibum. Ve enim

so long-standing [that] it can scarcely be removed except by a miracle;[4] and those whom the king has hired at greater cost to instruct him in this faith resist the more, treacherously. And the same judgement holds of the colleges of the friars, which in great part foster or defend this misdeed. For as Muhammad had two accomplices, namely a Hebrew skilled in the old law and Sergius, a crafty Christian monk,[5] so today the caesarean prelates are said to have on one side men skilled in caesarean law, and on the other side a propertyless hypocrite, called a professor of the sacred [375]page; there would be (I say) plenty of purged clergy, as in the lives of the earlier fathers, with the clergy of Christ keeping, according to his privileges, the liberties and rules of Christ.[6] For nothing useful, just and lawful is contrary, harmful or hurtful to any state of the church, or to [any] law, which Christ instituted; for so Christ would be contrary to himself in his members and his laws. Therefore the endowment of the clergy would not be more contrary to secular lordship today than in the time of Christ; and much more evidently it would not be contentious, contrary to itself. It belongs therefore to kings, for the pacifying of their kingdom, to extinguish such sects and new rites. Or otherwise how shall the kingdom stand? For "house upon house shall fall",[7] both in contentions and in fights, spiritual or bodily; both among the religious and among lay people, and the two mixed, since they would be contrary to themselves by consent to sin, which altogether makes the subject contrary to itself. Nor does the saying of Augustine in *On the Twelve Degrees of Abuses*, the ninth chapter, disagree with these things, but agrees with them, where he says that "a king must be not unjust but a corrector of the unjust. Hence he would keep in himself the dignity of his name;[8] for the name of king holds in its meaning that he should provide the office of ruler for all his subjects." From this it plainly follows: if the whole clergy of a kingdom has any king of its own, it ought to be under his rule, as is clear on Jerome, Homily 11.[9] Next this saint sets down twenty-two properties which ought to belong to kings. "How", he says, "will he be able to correct others, who does not correct his own ways, lest they be unjust? For by the justice of the king the throne is exalted, [376]and in truth the helms of the peoples are made firm.[10] And the justice of the king is: to oppress no one unjustly by power; to judge justly between a man and his neighbour without respect of persons; to be the defender of strangers, orphans and widows; to restrain thefts; to punish adulteries; not to exalt the unjust; not to nourish the shameless and players; to destroy the impious from the land; not to suffer parricides and those

terre, cuius rex puer est et cuius principes mane comedunt. Hec regni prosperitatem in presenti faciunt et regem ad celestia regna meliora perducunt. Et post narrat iste sanctus duodecim condiciones, que ex opposito consequuntur: Qui, inquit, regnum non secundum legem hanc dispensat, multas nimirum adversitates in imperio tollerabit. Idcirco enim pax sepe ipsorum rumpitur, offendicula eciam de regno suscitantur, terrarum fructus diminuuntur, servicia populorum prepediuntur, multi et varii dolores prosperitatem regni inficiunt, carorum et liberorum mors tristiciam confert, hostium incursus et provincias undique vastant, bestie armentorum et pecorum greges dilacerant, tempestas aeris et hyemis turbata rerum fecunditatem et maris ministeria [377]prohibent et aliquando fulminum ictus segetes, arborum flores et pampinos exurunt. Super omnia vero regis iniusticia non solum prosperitatem presentis imperii fuscat, sed eciam filios suos et nepotes, ne post se hereditatem teneant, obscurat. Propter piaculum enim regis Salomonis domus Israhel Dominus de manibus filiorum Israhel dispersit et propter iusticiam regis David lucernam de semine eius in Jerusalem semper reliquit. Ecce quantum iusticia regis seculo valet, intuentibus perspicue patet. Est enim pax populorum tutamentum patrie, immunitas plebis, munimentum gentis, cura languorum, gaudium hominum, temperies aeris, serenitas maris, terre fecunditas, solacium pauperum, hereditas filiorum et sibimet ipsi spes future beatitudinis. Attamen sciat rex: sicut in throno hominum primus constitutus est, sic et in penis, si iusticiam non fecerit, primatum habiturus est, omnes namque quoscumque peccatores in presenti sub se habuerit, supra se modo plagali in pena futura habebit. Et ista bona duodecim cum pena decima tercia moverent regem et populum altrinsecus se iuvare.

who live wickedly to live; to defend the churches; to feed the poor with alms; to set just men over the business of the kingdom; to have old, wise and sober counsellors; not to strive after the superstitions of magicians, soothsayers and pythonesses;[11] to defer anger; to defend the homeland bravely and justly against adversaries; to trust in God in all things; not to lift up his soul in prosperity;[12] to bear all adversities patiently; not to suffer his sons to act impiously; to apply himself to prayers at fixed hours; not to taste food before the fitting hours. For woe to the land whose king is a child, and whose princes eat in the morning.[13] These make the prosperity of the kingdom in the present and lead the king to the better heavenly kingdoms." And afterwards this saint recounts twelve conditions which follow from the opposite. "He who", he says, "does not dispense the kingdom according to this law will without doubt endure many adversities in his rule. For this reason the peace of their [peoples] is often broken, stumbling-blocks are raised up even concerning the kingdom, the fruits of the lands are diminished, the services of the peoples are hindered, many and various griefs infect the prosperity of the kingdom, the death of dear ones and of children brings sadness, the incursions of enemies lay waste even the provinces on every side, beasts tear apart the herds of cattle and the flocks of sheep, the storm of the air and the troubled winter hinder the fruitfulness of things and the services of the sea,[14] [377]and at times strokes of lightning burn up the crops, the blossoms of the trees and the vine-shoots. But above all the king's injustice not only darkens the prosperity of his present rule, but also overshadows his sons and grandsons, so that they do not hold the inheritance after him. For on account of the sin of King Solomon the Lord scattered the house of Israel out of the hands of the sons of Israel, and on account of the justice of King David he always left a lamp of his seed in Jerusalem.[15] See how much the justice of a king avails the world: it is plainly clear to those who look. For [it] is the peace of peoples, the safeguard of the homeland, the immunity of the common people, the fortification of the nation, the cure of sicknesses, the joy of men, the temperateness of the air, the calm of the sea, the fruitfulness of the earth, the solace of the poor, the inheritance of the sons, and for himself the hope of future blessedness.[16] Yet let the king know: as he has been set first on the throne of men, so also in punishments, if he has not done justice, he will have the primacy; for all the sinners whatever he has had under him in the present, he will have above him, by way of blows, in the punishment to come."[17] And these

twelve goods, with the punishment as the thirteenth, should move king and people to help one another.

Notes

1. The first commandment of the second table is "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Exod. 20:12), the fifth in the reckoning of Loserth's side-note; Wyclif applies it to the church as mother. The manuscripts' margin: *Auferre bona temporalia. argumentum bonum* (Loserth).
2. The print sets a question mark after *infinitum* and then runs on *quodammodo magis sacrum*; we take the whole as one question and *quodammodo* with *magis sacrum*. The alternative is *infinitum quodammodo*, "in a certain way infinite". A in marg. at *ornamentis*: *Ornamenta sacra ecclesie*.
3. *Excommunicacio sacrilega* is hard: in this argument it is the sacrilege, not an excommunication, that disturbs the church; compare *hoc excomunicatum et hereticum sacrilegium* a few lines below (374), "this excommunicate and heretical sacrilege". The print may have altered an ending (as *excommunicatum sacrilegium*); there is no variant at the foot, and we translate the print.
4. *Licet enim sit tam contrarium ..., induratum et tam diutine vix potest ... semoveri*: the period lacks a main verb. We take *induratum [est]* and read *tam diutine* as consecutive ("so long-standing [that] ..."); alternatively the whole is governed by *licet* and the concession is left unfinished.
5. The legend that Muhammad was taught by a Jew and by the monk Sergius (Bahira); Loserth refers to *De ecclesia* pp. 290, 333 and 517 (Loserth prints 511), where Wyclif uses it. R. B in marg.: *Machomet habuit duos complices*.
6. *Foret (inquam) copia cleri purgati* joins abruptly to what precedes; the sense seems to be "[were these removed,] there would be plenty of purged clergy". A word such as *aliter* may have been lost; we translate the print. *Secundum eius privilegia* we take with *conservante*, *eius* being Christ.
7. Luke 11:17–18 (DR "house upon house shall fall"; "how shall his kingdom stand?"); Wyclif asks the question of "the kingdom", without *ejus*.
8. Pseudo-Cyprian, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, ch. 9 (*rex iniquus*), ascribed in Wyclif's day to Augustine; Loserth gives Aug. *Opp.* VI, Appendix p. 214, and *nonus abusionis gradus*. The manuscripts read the title *abusionis* (Loserth). *Inde ... custodiret* is the print (read on the plate); the treatise reads *Inde in semetipso nominis sui dignitatem custodire debet* (PL 4, 877; PL 40, 1085).
9. *Super Jeronymum Omelia XI* is the print, and a homily "on Jerome" is unexpected; *super Ieremiam* (a homily on Jeremiah) is a possible reading, but Origen's eleventh homily on Jeremiah in Jerome's Latin (PL 25, 663ff.) says nothing to the point. There is no variant and no reference at the foot; the source is untraced. The manuscripts' margin here: *Regi subesse debet clerus*; at the next sentence, *Regis condiciones 22*.
10. Cf. Prov. 16:12 (DR "the throne is established by justice"); the words are the treatise's, not a quotation.
11. *Superstitionibus non contendere* is the print; the sense wanted is "not to give heed to", and the treatise reads *superstitionibus non intendere* (PL 4, 878; PL 40, 1088). We translate the print.
12. Loserth: *rectius: animo non elevari* ("not to be lifted up in mind"); we translate the print, *animam non elevare* (Loserth's reading is that of PL 40; PL 4 has *animum non elevare*).
13. Eccles. 10:16 (Loserth), DR "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and when the princes eat in the morning"; the treatise's Latin differs slightly (*Ve enim terre*).
14. Loserth on this sentence: for *mors ... confert* "recte: mortes ... conferunt" (deaths ... bring); for *incursus* the manuscripts read *cursus*; for *fecunditatem et maris* they read *fecunditate et moris*, which he emends. We translate the print throughout.
15. 3 Kings 11:11–13, 36 (Solomon's sin; the lamp left for David in Jerusalem). *De manibus filiorum Israhel* is the print; the sense wants "out of the hands of his sons" (Solomon's), and the second *Israhel* may repeat *domus Israhel*: the treatise reads *de manibus filiorum ejus* (PL 4 and PL 40); we translate the print.
16. The manuscripts lack *Est enim*, which Loserth supplies; hence "[it]", the justice of the king. For *munimentum* they read *immunimentum*.
17. *Modo plagali*: "by way of blows", from *plaga*, a stroke: the sinners he ruled will be over him as his tormentors.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 374: *iocale* (5 is the line number on that line) [NW]
  - 374: ∅ (folio bar after tam (254ª in margin) read as i)
  - 374: *dominorum* [NW]
  - 374: *induratum* (hyphenated in-|duratum; main token holds the whole word) [NW]
  - 374: *facinus*
  - 374: *defendunt*
  - 375: *Regum*
  - 375: *extinguere* [NW]
  - 375: *Inde*
  - 375: *semet*
  - 375: *ut*
  - 375: *subiectis* [NW]
  - 375: *convenire* (30 is the line number)
  - 375: *Qualiter*

- **375: *iusticia***
- **376: *iudicare***
- **376: *regem* (20 is the line number)**
- **376: *multi***
- **376: *hostium***
- **377: *piaculum***
- **377: *filiorum* [NW]**
- **377: *populorum***
- **377: *tutamentum* (hyphenated tutamen-|tum; main token holds the whole word)**
- **375: *regibus* (line number 30 glued)**
- **376: *ariolorum,* (folio bar after comma, not text)**

Part 17: The king must rule his clergy first; the clergy's ornaments

Loserth pp. 377.24–381.2

¶1 377.24–378.32
377.24 *The king of England should enforce a right life in his prelates and clergy.*
378.8 *The pope or any other who hinders this action is Antichrist.*
378.20 *Accursed error in the Gloss.*

[377]**Et ex istis primo patet quod rex Anglie primo et principaliter daret operam ad regulandum clerum suum et specialiter episcopos ut vivant similius legi Christi; totum enim regnum est unum corpus, quod tueri atque mederi spectat ad regis officium, ut dicit iste sanctus. Ideo oportet se- cundum beatum Crysostomum Omelia XXXI Operis Imperfecti incipere a clero, cum sit pars principalis et stomachus corporis, per quem cibi digestio et sanitas sunt ad cetera membra corporis derivanda. Oportet enim regem ab illis incipere** [378]**secundum leges ordinis naturalis. Unde quantum ad illas viginti duas condiciones regis, omnes sonant implicite quod rex debet ad regimen cleri sui magis attendere; tunc enim defendit ecclesiam, regnum, viduas et pupillos. Quod si exaltat et fovet indignos episcopos, heresiarcha et autor sui facinoris est censendus. Secundo patet quod sive Romanus pontifex sive quicumque alius ex presumcione infundabili impedierit hoc sacrum regis officium, habet racionem heretici et pessimi Antichristi. Patet ex hoc quod talis est capitalis in heresi talis regis, nam nec Petrus nec Paulus nec eciam dominus Ihesus Christus habet potestatem ad dampnificandum, sed meliorandum ecclesiam; ideo hoc temptans contra reges, qui sunt Dei vicarii, temptat sacrilege contra sanctam ecclesiam et per consequens contra Deum; eciam sic potest sinistre intelligi maledicta glossa ordinaria super XXV questione Sunt quidam, ubi dicit quod papa habet potestatem nedum dispensandi contra Apostolum sed eciam contra Christum, et tunc indubie est Christo contrarius et pessimus Antichristus. Non enim fingi potest quomodo haberet a Deo potenciam ad tollendum vel impediendum potestatem regum, qua edificaretur ecclesia; si enim non liceret regi regere suum clerum, cum ille potest totum residuum regni inficere, ymo residuum populi**

And from these it is clear, first, that the king of England should first and chiefly give his effort to ruling his clergy, and especially the bishops, so that they live more like the law of Christ; for the whole kingdom is one body, which it belongs to the king's office to protect and to heal, as this saint says.[1] Therefore, according to blessed Chrysostom, Homily 31 of the *Unfinished Work*, he must begin with the clergy, since it is the principal part and the stomach of the body, through which the digestion of food and health are to be passed on to the other members of the body.[2] For the king must begin with them [378]**according to the laws of the natural order. Hence, as to those twenty-two conditions of a king, all of them imply that the king ought to attend more to the rule of his clergy; for then he defends the church, the kingdom, widows and orphans. But if he exalts and fosters unworthy bishops, he is to be reckoned a heresiarch and the author of his misdeed. Second, it is clear that whether the Roman pontiff or anyone else should, out of presumption without foundation, hinder this sacred office of the king, he has the nature of a heretic and of the worst Antichrist. This is clear from this, that such a one is chief in the heresy of such a king;[3] for neither Peter nor Paul nor even the Lord Jesus Christ has power to damage the church, but to improve it; therefore one who attempts this against kings, who are God's vicars, attempts sacrilegiously against holy church and consequently against God. In this way too the accursed ordinary gloss on [Causa] 25, question** [1]**, *Sunt quidam*, can be understood in a sinister sense, where it says that the pope has power to dispense not only against the Apostle but even against Christ;[4] and then without doubt he is contrary to Christ and the worst Antichrist. For it cannot be imagined how he would have**

superare, alias non foret rex regni integri. Et sic, ut dicit Augustinus De Antichristo XX De Civitate Dei, XXIV capitulo, ipse destrueret quartum regnum.

from God power to take away or hinder the power of kings by which the church would be built up; for if it were not lawful for the king to rule his clergy, since it can infect the whole remainder of the kingdom, indeed overpower the remainder of the people, then he would not be king of a whole kingdom. And so, as Augustine says of Antichrist in *City of God* 20, chapter 24, he would destroy the fourth kingdom.[5]

¶2 379.1–379.23
379.1 *It is the sin of the clergy that most disturbs peace.*
379.14 *Durham is an evidence oft this,*
379.24 *Dissensions will not cease till the king brings the clergy back to the state ordained by Christ.*

[379] Tercio patet ex verbis sancti doctoris, quod pax regnorum est precipue per cleri maculas perturbata, non propter regis culpam in regendo subiectos; primo enim, ut dicit, pax populorum dissolvitur. Sed defectus illius regiminis a defectu regiminis cleri exoritur; ibidem enim primo pax cum Deo destruitur, et per consequens oportet destrui pacem cum homine, quia Iob IX 4 scribitur: Quis sibi restitit et pacem habuit? Patet igitur quod venenato clero, qui mediaret inter Deum et homines, necesse est pacem in populo perturbari; in cuius signum, ubi clerus insolencius et nequius conversatur, est maior tranquillitatis distancia. Et ut notat quidam intuens successus seculi in diocesi Dunelmiensi, est maior turbacio et minor episcoporum et cleri religio. Ideo gaudent quidam de iusto Dei iudicio, quod ibidem ponuntur pestilencie, fames et unius gentis in alteram insultacio. Surgant itaque et pacificent, qui facto et consensu sextuplici tam cupide et irregulariter ecclesiam Christi turbaverant. Melius enim est pugnare contra hostes extrinsecos quam contra iustos domesticos.

Third, it is clear from the words of the holy doctor that the peace of kingdoms is chiefly disturbed by the stains of the clergy, not on account of the king's fault in ruling his subjects; for first, as he says, the peace of peoples is dissolved.[6] Now the failure of that rule arises from failure in the rule of the clergy; for there peace with God is first destroyed, and consequently peace with man must be destroyed, for it is written in Job 9:4: "Who hath resisted him, and hath had peace?"[7] It is clear therefore that, when the clergy that should mediate between God and men is poisoned, peace among the people must be disturbed; in sign of which, where the clergy lives more insolently and more wickedly, there is the greater distance from tranquillity. And, as one notes who watches the course of the world, in the diocese of Durham there is greater disturbance, and less religion in the bishops and clergy.[8] Therefore some rejoice at the just judgement of God, that pestilences, famine and the assault of one nation upon another are set there. Let them therefore rise up and make peace, who by deed and by sixfold consent have so greedily and irregularly troubled the church of Christ.[9] For it is better to fight against enemies outside than against the just of one's own household.

¶3 379.24–380.29
380.1 *The ornaments of the clergy are of small importance.*

[379] Sed certum est quod nunquam tolletur regnorum dissensio, antequam rex clerum rexerit in statu quem Christus instituit, ut patet Daniel II Omne enim tale peccatum Deus regi imputat ex consensu. Expergiscat igitur rex prudencia et non permittat maniacos per privilegia consumere bona sua et bona pauperum regni sui, nam reducere ad statum primevum ecclesiam regi principaliter spectat ad suum officium. Non autem potest fundari in lege Domini tale privilegium et specialiter emptum cum gravi consumpcione bonorum pauperum. Ideo bona illa ne sic depopulentur, [380] ad regem pertinet sequestrare. In scriptura siquidem legitur de duplici tali privilegio sacerdotis et cetera. Ieremias enim ex mandato Domini appendit ad collum cathenam ligneam, ut patet Jeremie XXVII. et post fracturam illius cathene per pseudoprophetam Ananiam accepit cathenam ferream, ut patet XXVIII capitulo. Sedechias vero pseudopropheta

But it is certain that the dissension of kingdoms will never be taken away before the king has ruled the clergy in the state which Christ instituted, as is clear from Daniel 2.[10] For God imputes every such sin to the king by [his] consent. Let the king therefore awaken in prudence, and not permit madmen through privileges to consume his goods and the goods of the poor of his kingdom; for to bring the church back to its first state belongs chiefly to the king, to his office. Now such a privilege cannot be grounded in the law of the Lord, and especially one bought with grave consumption of the goods of the poor. Therefore it pertains [380] to the king to sequester those goods, lest they be so laid waste. For indeed in scripture one reads of a twofold privilege of this kind for a priest, etc. For Jeremias at the command of the Lord hung a wooden chain about his neck, as is clear from Jeremias 27, and after that chain was broken by the

cesareus libro III Regum XXII et II Paralipomenon XVIII fecisse sibi ornamentum ex parte dyaboli concessum ad fingendum mendacium. Fecit, inquit, sibi Sedechias filius Canaan cornua ferrea, et ait: Hec dicit Dominus Deus: Hiis ventilabis Syriam, donec deleas eam. Et revera sicut contra Micheam erant multi pseudoprophete, false ferentes signa mendacii, sic contra paucos sacerdotes Christi sunt multi cesarei longe falsius ferentes ornamenta cesarea, quibus de victoria contra dyabolum se et suos decipiunt. Cum igitur cessarunt in nobis legalia legis veteris, debemus ad moralia virtutum figurata attendere et videre quid in Christo et suis discipulis invenitur secundum legem suam induere. Nam Psal. CXXXI, 9 per prophetam dicitur: Sacerdotes eius induantur iusticiam. De ornamentis autem corporalibus non legi Christum vel suos apostolos legem particulariter tradidisse, sed sine dissensione vel scandalo nunc unum ornamentum nunc aliud leviter acceptasse, docendo nos ut faciamus similiter.

false prophet Hananias he received an iron chain, as is clear in chapter 28.[11] And Sedecias, a caesarean false prophet, [is read] in 3 Kings 22 and 2 Paralipomenon 18 to have made himself an ornament granted on the devil's part for feigning a lie:[12] "Sedecias", it says, "the son of Chanaana made himself horns of iron, and said: Thus saith the Lord God: With these shalt thou push Syria, till thou destroy it." And truly, as against Micheas there were many false prophets, falsely bearing signs of a lie, so against the few priests of Christ there are many caesareans bearing far more falsely caesarean ornaments, by which they deceive themselves and their own about victory against the devil. Since therefore the legal precepts of the old law have ceased in us, we ought to attend to the moral [meanings] of the virtues figured [in them], and to see what is found in Christ and his disciples to put on according to his law.[13] For it is said by the prophet in Psalm 131:9: "Let his priests be clothed with justice."[14] And as to bodily ornaments, I have not read that Christ or his apostles handed down a law in particular, but that without dissension or scandal they lightly accepted at one time one ornament, at another another, teaching us to do likewise.

¶4 380.30–381.2

[380] Quantum igitur ad privilegia ornamentorum debet christianus ipsa attendere quasi neutra et nullo modo preponderare illa suis signatis, scilicet virtutibus [381] datis a Domino, licet tamen eis uti pro tempore, ut patet de Apostolo Act. XXI.

As to the privileges of ornaments, therefore, a Christian ought to regard them as neutral things and in no way to weigh them above the things they signify, namely the virtues [381] given by the Lord; yet it is lawful to use them for a time, as is clear of the Apostle in Acts 21.[15]

Notes

1. "This saint" is the author of *On the Twelve Degrees of Abuses*, quoted as Augustine at the end of the preceding part; the kingdom as one body is Wyclif's summary of him, not a quotation.
2. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 38 in Migne (PG 56, 839–840, on Matt. 21:12), which Wyclif numbers 31: the priests as the heart and stomach of the church, which digest the word and pass it to the whole body. Loserth gives no reference.
3. *Talis est capitalis in heresi talis regis*: we take *talis regis* as the king just described, who exalts unworthy bishops, and *capitalis* as "chief" in that heresy. *Talis legis* ("of such a law") would read more easily, but there is no variant; we translate the print.
4. Decretum C. 25 q. 1 c. 6 (*Sunt quidam*), with the ordinary gloss; Loserth cites the Venice 1595 edition, I, p. 1347, at the gloss *Papa utrum possit contra Apostolum dispensare* (the modern form is ours). Loserth's side-note: "Accursed error in the Gloss."
5. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 20.23 (PL 41, 694–695), on the fourth kingdom of Daniel; Wyclif writes XXIV (Loserth: Aug. *Opp.* VII, 606). The subject of *destrueret* is the one who hinders the king's power, set beside Antichrist.
6. *Pax populorum dissolvitur* recalls the first of the twelve evils of the unjust king (*pax sepe ipsorum rumpitur*, 376). The argument: the king's failure breaks the peace, but that failure springs from the clergy's.
7. Job 9:4, DR "who hath resisted him, and hath had peace?"; Wyclif reads *sibi* for the Vulgate *ei*.
8. Durham, the see on the Scottish border; Loserth compares *De ecclesia* p. 217, the robbing of cardinals in the county of Durham under Edward II. The observer is not named.
9. *Consensu sextuplici*: the sixfold consent, the ways in which one consents to another's sin, named in the memorial verse *Consentit operans, defendens, consilium dans, / Ac auctorizans, non iuvans nec reprehendens*, which Wyclif quotes in *Sermones* IV, 359. *Irregulariter* here is "against the rule", not the canonical impediment (*irregularitas*).
10. Dan. 2, the statue of the four kingdoms struck by the stone; Wyclif gives the chapter only.

11. Jer. 27:2 (DR "Make thee bands, and chains: and thou shalt put them on thy neck") and 28:10–13, where Hananias breaks the yoke and the Lord answers "Thou hast broken chains of wood, and thou shalt make for them chains of iron". Wyclif has one chain, in the singular.
12. *Fecisse* has no governing verb in its own sentence; we supply *legitur* from the sentence before. The quotation is 3 Kings 22:11 (2 Par. 18:10 is nearly the same), in DR; Wyclif adds *Deus* ("the Lord God").
13. *Moralia virtutum figurata*: we take *moralia* as a noun ("the moral [meanings]"), the virtues being figured by the ornaments of the old law. The manuscripts' margin: *Ornamenta clericorum*.
14. Ps. 131:9, DR "Let thy priests be clothed with justice"; Wyclif reads *eius* for the Vulgate *tui* (cf. 131:16, *sacerdotes ejus*).
15. Acts 21:23–26, where Paul is purified in the temple at the counsel of James. The manuscripts' margin: *Dispensacio ad clericatum*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 377: *se-* (hyphenated se-|cundum; main token holds the first half) [NW]
  - 377: *cundum* (second half of se-|cundum (30 line number)) [NW]
  - 377: *Imperfecti*
  - 378: ∅ (or is the English side note (The pope or any other who hinders this))
  - 378: *XXV questione* (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 378: *Sunt*
  - 378: *quidam*
  - 379: *Quis*
  - 379: *diocesi* [NW]
  - 379: *turbacio*
  - 379: *II* (print "Daniel II." ends the line above Omne; the main scan lost II)
  - 379: *illa* (35 is the line number on that line)
  - 380: *regem*
  - 380: *Ieremias*
  - 380: ∅ (main scan already holds figurata whole (figu-|rata) at pos 132)
  - 380: *illa*
  - 377: *legi Christi;* (two words)

Part 18: Dispensations: the pope only promulgates what God allows

Loserth pp. 381.3–385.31

¶1 381.3–383.1
381.3 *Dispensations as to ordination or matrimony are lawful only when they express the will of God.*
381.25 *We may do what is reasonable and edifying without license of prelates.*
382.14 *Obedience to papal law is falsely made the test of righteousness.*
382.30 *Rapacity of the popes.*
383.3 *Logical difficulty.*

[381]Et quantum ad alia privilegia, ut licenciam varie celebrandi dispensacionem cum irregularibus, bigamis et coniugatis ad sacerdocium vel matrimonium cum infinitis huiusmodi adinventis, videtur michi quod Deus sepe dispensat cum talibus. Sed hoc ex fide capio quod non licet pape vel homini dispensare in quocumque cum aliquo, nisi Deus dispenset ante ea in eodem, sic quod vicarius Christi dispensans in talibus est nudus divine sentencie promulgator, quia cum non dependent sacramentaliter a suo officio, non restat sibi medium dispensandi nisi per modum meriti vel discrecionis promulgandi non esse periculum. Unde quia solet esse in papa maior sanctitas atque discrecio, ideo solet laycus in talibus ad papam recurrere, et modo reputatum est ut sacramentum divinissimum quod ad eum spectat singulariter ista concedere; videtur enim quod ista primo discerneret, si sint racionabilia et edificativa ecclesie, quia stante contrario non obstante sua concessione, tam ipse quam

And as to other privileges, such as licence to celebrate in various ways, dispensation with the irregular, bigamists and the married for the priesthood or for matrimony,[1] with countless invented things of this kind, it seems to me that God often dispenses with such persons. But this I hold as faith teaches: that it is not lawful for the pope or any man to dispense anyone in anything unless God dispenses beforehand in the same thing,[2] so that the vicar of Christ dispensing in such things is the bare promulgator of the divine sentence;[3] for since these things do not depend sacramentally on his office, no means of dispensing remains to him except by way of merit, or of discretion in promulgating that there is no danger. Hence, because there is usually greater holiness and discretion in the pope, the layman usually has recourse to the pope in such things; and nowadays it is reckoned as a most divine sacrament that it belongs to him alone to grant these things. For it seems that he should first discern

privilegiatus deceptorie est in culpa. Quod si sint racionabilia et edificatoria, quicumque promulgaverit eorum licenciam, ymo sola racione movente est licitum secundum illa procedere, cum Deus per se faciat hec licere, nec potest fundari ex humanis tradicionibus adinventis quod oportet capere generaliter sic a prelatis licenciam; vel quod licet eis sic restringendo potestatem populi vel presbiteri in neutris vel licitis ex fide scripture; servare sibi licenciam ad procedendum in talibus singulariter vel quod aliter obedienciam istam non faciens; eciam plus quam propter prevaricacionem decalogi puniatur; quia cuiuslibet christiani et specialiter prelati est ampliare atque defendere [382] privilegia et libertates, quas Christus concessit ecclesie, ut patet Act. XV, sic quod peccatum antichristianum foret libertatem illam tollere vel limites in altero extremo excedere. Ideo oportet fidelem videre secundum legem scripture, exprimendo vel tacendo sic licitum, et procedere secundum doctrinam huius exemplaris generaliter et licenter. Unde pene et dispensacionum reservaciones sive licencie nimis excecant populum, sicut dicam, si Deus voluerit, in materia de sacramentis. Dicitur enim quod sacerdos benedicens in secundis nupciis nedum suspenditur, sed eo ipso irregularitatem incurrit, sed faciendo mille enormitates Deo odibiles nedum reputatur immunis, sed pro pecunia collaudatur; et fundamentum in hiis omnibus est ficta obediencia, sic quod non foret tam grave benedicendo implorare super prius nuptis divinam graciam, nisi quia leges papales precipiunt quod non fiat. Inobediencia, inquiunt, facta statutis papalibus, est gravissime punienda, et sic Christus cum lege sua postponitur. Sic enim papa posset in tollendo vel difficultando legem Christi decernere quod nullus christianus licite faciat aliquod opus neutrum, nisi quod ipse posterius approbando ratificat, et consequenter ordinare satrapas suos ad citandum quoscumque comparere responsuros in suo iudicio, cum legem consimilem ordinat Ihesus noster, ut dicunt parificatur Christo humanitus; sic enim possent ad votum vexare et mulctare populum, ut faciunt in absolucionibus, in reservacionibus et in dispensacionibus, et, ut creditur, practizarent hec amplius, nisi quia timent sibi [383] quod populus percipiens suam versuciam rebellaret.

these things, whether they are reasonable and edifying to the church; for if the contrary holds, notwithstanding his grant, both he and the one privileged are deceptively in fault. But if they are reasonable and edifying, whoever has promulgated their licence, indeed with reason alone moving [one], it is lawful to proceed according to them, since God of himself makes these things lawful; nor can it be grounded from invented human traditions that one must thus generally take licence from prelates; or that it is lawful for them, so restricting the power of the people or of a presbyter in neutral things or in things lawful from the faith of scripture, to reserve to themselves the licence to proceed in such things alone; or that one who otherwise does not perform this obedience should be punished even more than for transgression of the decalogue.[4] For it belongs to every Christian, and especially to a prelate, to enlarge and defend [382] the privileges and liberties which Christ granted to the church, as is clear from Acts 15,[5] so that it would be an antichristian sin to take that liberty away or to exceed the limits at the other extreme. Therefore the faithful man must look to the law of scripture, which by expressing or by keeping silence [shows a thing] thus lawful, and proceed according to the doctrine of this exemplar, generally and freely.[6] Hence the reservations of penalties and of dispensations, or licences, blind the people exceedingly, as I shall say, God willing, in the matter of the sacraments.[7] For it is said that a priest who gives the blessing at second nuptials is not only suspended but by that very fact incurs irregularity; but by doing a thousand enormities hateful to God he is not only reckoned immune but is praised for money;[8] and the foundation in all these things is a feigned obedience, so that it would not be so grave, in blessing, to implore divine grace upon those previously married, except that papal laws command that it not be done. "Disobedience", they say, "done to papal statutes is to be punished most gravely"; and so Christ with his law is put second. For so the pope could, in taking away or making hard the law of Christ, decree that no Christian may lawfully do any neutral work except what he himself afterwards ratifies by approving it, and consequently ordain his satraps to cite whomever to appear and answer in his court, since our Jesus ordains a like law, [and the pope], as they say, is made equal to Christ in his humanity.[9] For so they could harass and fine the people at will, as they do in absolutions, in reservations and in dispensations; and, it is believed, they would put these things into practice more widely, except that they fear for themselves [383] that the people, perceiving their cunning, would rebel.

¶2 383.3–384.14
384.5 *Orders of pope or prelate cannot affect reward or punishment, which depends on God's judgment.*
384.28 *Dispensation as to prohibited degrees useless.*

[383]**Unde logici multiplicant in ista materia argumenta, ut posito quod papa vel alius prelatus iniungat cuicumque clerico sibi subiecto virtute sacre obediencie et sub obtentu absolucionis a pena et culpa vel alterius suffragii spiritualis quod obviet primo plene pape obedienti et iniungat cuicumque layco sub forma consimili, quod obviet primo pape inobedienti, et fiat ista iniunccio sub gravissimo anathemate, et posito cum hoc quod omnis clericus vel laycus pape isti subiectus fuit primo plene sibi obediens, et quod omnis clericus obviet primo singulariter layco et econtra, et videtur sequi contradiccio. Quia da quod non, de Petro clerico et de Paulo layco sibi primo obviantibus, et quero utrum Petrus pro instanti obvie sit pape obediens; si sic, tunc in casu oportet dicere quod Paulus pro illo instanti sit pape inobediens, quia cum primo obviat Petro, qui est plene pape obediens, et iniunctum est sibi quod primo obviet pape inobedienti, sequitur quod Paulus incurrit notam inobediencie et sic Petrus, si in casu isto Petrus sit pro instanti obvie pape inobediens, tunc oportet concedere Paulum esse obedientem et consequenter Petrum, quia ante obviam fuit uterque obediens, et Petrus ex obvia non fit inobediens, sed confirmatur eius obediencia iuxta dicta. Nec valet negare casum propter tria: primo quia solum neutrum vel possibile est preceptum, secundo** [384]**quia prelatus potest precipere simpliciter impossibile et omnino irracionale, igitur per idem vel a maiori potest istud precipere, ideo non restat responsio nisi veritas quod propter suum precipere nec magis nec minus incurrit clerus vel laycus penam vel premium, quia oportet preceptum cui obedietur esse prius racionabile apud Deum: et tunc fieret, licet nemo sub obediencia humana illud preciperet, cum aliter foret homo inobediens racioni. Et patet quod sicut in isto casu non restat expectare plenam remissionem vel anathema, sic generaliter in papali iudicio, nisi de quanto quis meruerit apud Deum; oportet enim quod obiectus sophisticus sit solutus.**

Hence logicians multiply arguments in this matter.[10] For example, suppose that the pope or another prelate enjoins on every cleric subject to him, by virtue of holy obedience and on the inducement of absolution from penalty and fault or of another spiritual suffrage, that he first meet one fully obedient to the pope; and that he enjoin on every layman in like form that he first meet one disobedient to the pope; and let this injunction be made under the gravest anathema; and suppose with this that every cleric or layman subject to this pope was at first fully obedient to him, and that every cleric first meets a single layman, and conversely: then a contradiction seems to follow. For grant that it does not, and take Peter, a cleric, and Paul, a layman, first meeting each other; and I ask whether Peter at the instant of the meeting is obedient to the pope. If so, then in the case one must say that Paul at that instant is disobedient to the pope; for since he first meets Peter, who is fully obedient to the pope, and it was enjoined on him that he first meet one disobedient to the pope, it follows that Paul incurs the mark of disobedience, and so [does] Peter.[11] If in this case Peter is at the instant of the meeting disobedient to the pope, then one must grant that Paul is obedient, and consequently Peter; for before the meeting each was obedient, and Peter does not become disobedient by the meeting, but his obedience is confirmed, according to what has been said. Nor is it any use to deny the case, for three reasons:[12] first, because only a neutral or possible thing is commanded; second, [384] **because a prelate can command what is impossible without qualification and altogether irrational; therefore by the same token, or a fortiori, he can command this. Therefore no reply remains but the truth: that on account of his commanding, a cleric or a layman incurs neither more nor less penalty or reward; for the command which is obeyed must first be reasonable before God, and then it would be done even though no one commanded it under human obedience, since otherwise a man would be disobedient to reason. And it is clear that, as in this case there is no room to expect full remission or anathema, so generally in papal judgement, except in so far as one has merited before God; for the sophistical objection must be solved.**

¶3 384.15–384.27

[384]**Quotlibet sunt tales casus longe coloraciores quam obligaciones obediencie humanitus adinvente, ut posito quod Petrus prior habeat duas duodenas claustrales, omnes sibi obedientes, et precipiat stabiliori duodene, quod non colloquatur cum reliqua, nisi forte**

There are any number of such cases, far more colourable than the obligations of obedience devised by men:[13] as, suppose that Peter the prior has two dozens of cloisterers, all obedient to him, and commands the steadier dozen not to converse with the other except, it may be, with

inobediente Petro ad obedienciam reducendum; et quod secunda duodena non colloquatur cum reliqua, nisi obediente Petro ad obedienciam confirmandum, et incipiat Paulus prioris duodene loqui cum Lino secunde duodene, utroque prestante in hoc obedienciam observare, sic quod continue ante illud colloquium uterque fuit rite Petro obediens.

one disobedient to Peter, to bring him back to obedience; and that the second dozen not converse with the other except with one obedient to Peter, to confirm him in obedience; and let Paul of the first dozen begin to speak with Linus of the second dozen, each undertaking in this to keep obedience, so that continuously before that conversation each was duly obedient to Peter.[14]

¶4 384.28–385.31
385.6 *Reason for the gradual extension of such prohibitions.*

[384] Ulterius quantum ad dispensacionem affinitatis vel consanguineitatis patet quod fabricatur ut plurimum zophistarum illusio, nam si contractus sit racionalis et consentaneus legi Dei, non obstante [385] prohibicione papali est validus; nec licet pape illum dissolvere, quia Matth. XIV, 6 dicitur: Quos Deus coniunxit, homo non separet. Si autem huiusmodi coniugium foret dissolutivum legi Dei, papalis dispensacio utramque partem seduceret. Videtur itaque mihi quod coniugium parentis ad prolem proximam contrariaretur legi nature et sic Dei, quia honor et subieccio debetur parentibus, sed coniugibus amicicia socialis. Fratres autem et sorores oportuit in principio mundi contrahere, ut patet de patriarchis; quibus limitatum est de cognacione propria coniugari; tempore autem legis gracie toto genere gencium converso ad Dominum, racionaliter ordinatum est quod extra cognacionem matrimonium contrahatur, ut liga federis cognacionis habeat aliam ligam affinitatis ex desponsacione carnali, et sic forcius atque extensius sit triplex vinculum pro humani generis federe colligando, et sic dimissa liga fraternitatis spiritualis in Domino multiplicantur tradiciones hominum de gradu contractus liciti et alias revocantur; et dispensacio pro pecunia et de cognacione potencie incurrit. Certum est tamen quod non valet dispensacio papalis nisi subsit racio scripture, sed ad tantum valet diffinicio papalis, de quanto ipse racionem prudenter dilucidat et non ultra. Mille conclusiones ex istis sequuntur, quas omnes oportet concedere; unde stulticia facit quod homines plus appreciantur tradiciones hominum de coniugio cognatorum quam mandata decalogi.

Further, as to dispensation in affinity or consanguinity, it is clear that for the most part a delusion of sophists is fabricated. For if the contract is rational and agreeable to God's law, it is valid notwithstanding [385] papal prohibition; nor is it lawful for the pope to dissolve it, for it is said in Matthew 19:6: "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."[15] But if a marriage of this kind were destructive of God's law, papal dispensation would lead both parties astray. It seems to me therefore that the marriage of a parent to his nearest offspring would be contrary to the law of nature and so of God; for honour and subjection are owed to parents, but to spouses companionable friendship. And brothers and sisters had to contract [marriage] at the beginning of the world, as is clear of the patriarchs, who were limited to marrying within their own kindred;[16] but in the time of the law of grace, the whole race of the gentiles having been converted to the Lord, it was reasonably ordained that marriage be contracted outside the kindred, so that the league of the covenant of kinship might have another league, of affinity, from carnal espousal, and so there might be, more strongly and more widely, a threefold bond for binding together the covenant of the human race.[17] And so, the league of spiritual brotherhood in the Lord being let go, the traditions of men about the degree of lawful contract are multiplied and at other times revoked; and dispensation for money and on account of kinship with power comes in.[18] Yet it is certain that papal dispensation is of no avail unless a reason from scripture underlies it; but papal definition avails just so far as he prudently makes the reason clear, and no further. A thousand conclusions follow from these, all of which must be granted; hence folly makes men value the traditions of men about the marriage of kin more than the commandments of the decalogue.

Notes

1. ***Bigamis***: in canon law a bigamist is a man married twice in succession, or to a widow, which bars him from orders; not one with two wives at once. ***Varie celebrandi*** stands without a conjunction before ***dispensacionem***; we take them as items of a list.
2. ***Ante ea***: we read it as ***antea***, "beforehand" (perhaps a word broken in the print); "before these [men]" is the alternative, with the same sense.

3. ***Sentencia*** is here the judicial sense: God's sentence, which the pope only promulgates; not "teaching".
4. The three clauses after ***nec potest fundari*** (***quod oportet ...; vel quod licet eis ...; vel quod ... puniatur***) all depend on it; the semicolons are the print's. ***Servare sibi licenciam*** we take as governed by ***licet eis***, and ***ex fide scripture*** with ***licitis***.
5. Acts 15:28 (DR "to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things"); Wyclif gives the chapter only.
6. ***Exprimendo vel tacendo sic licitum***: we take the gerunds with ***legem scripture***, which shows a thing lawful either by saying so or by silence; ***huius exemplaris*** is scripture as exemplar.
7. A promise of a treatment of the sacraments; no particular later work has been identified; the complaint that follows returns in ***Opus evangelicum*** III, c. 13 (ed. Loserth, p. 48).
8. The bar on the nuptial blessing at second marriages is in the ***Decretales*** (X 4.21.1 ***Capellanum***, where the priest who blesses is suspended and sent to the apostolic see, and X 4.21.3 ***Vir autem***; Friedberg II, 730–732); Loserth gives no reference. The manuscripts' margin at 383 (***Spoliat clerus populum suum mirabiliter***) belongs to this complaint.
9. Loserth: ***Citacio auctoris alluditur***, an allusion to the summons of the author himself. Christ summons all to appear at his judgement; the pope, said to be made equal to Christ in his humanity (***humanitus***: the claim denied by the seventh teaching, ch. 6, 102), would claim the same power of citation. ***Ihesus noster*** is Christ, as elsewhere in the treatise; the irony lies in ***parificatur***, carried by ***ut dicunt***.
10. Hus copies the case word for word, from ***ut posito*** to ***sit solutus*** (384), in his ***De ecclesia***, ch. 21 (Loserth). A in marg.: ***Nota casum pulchrum***; the manuscripts: ***Casus***. B reads ***post*** for the second ***posito***.
11. ***Et sic Petrus***: "and so [does] Peter", who has met Paul, now disobedient. The next sentence, ***si in casu isto ...***, is the other horn; an ***autem*** or ***si non*** may have been lost before it. B in marg.: ***Obediencia pape in neutris***.
12. Three reasons are announced and two given; the inference ***igitur per idem ... potest istud precipere*** may count as the third. ***Sub obtentu absolucionis*** above: "on the inducement of absolution", the absolution offered as reward.
13. ***Obligaciones obediencie*** may play on the logicians' ***obligationes*** (the art of obligation), the genre in which such cases are posed. The manuscripts' margin: ***Nota casum***.
14. Hus copies this case too, from ***quod Petrus prior*** to ***obediens*** (***De ecclesia***, ch. 21, next to the first case; Loserth: p. 246). Wyclif leaves it unsolved. ***Nisi forte inobediente Petro*** we take as the ablative after ***cum*** understood, "with one disobedient to Peter".
15. The text reads ***Matth. XIV, 6***; Loserth's foot gives ***Cod.: Matth. XIX***, the true place, and we give Matt. 19:6. DR "What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder"; Wyclif reads ***Quos*** ("whom") for the Vulgate ***Quod***.
16. Loserth: after ***contrahere***, "Adde: matrimonia"; hence "[marriage]". ***Limitatum est ... coniugari***: they were restricted to their own kindred, so "limited", not "assigned".
17. The threefold bond recalls Eccles. 4:12 (DR "a threefold cord is not easily broken"): kinship, affinity and spiritual brotherhood.
18. ***Et dispensacio pro pecunia et de cognacione potencie incurrit*** hardly construes: ***de cognacione potencie*** is obscure. ***Incurrit*** as printed (plate checked); it has no expressed object; the sense is "comes in" (dispensation, subject). We take it so and ***cognacio potencie*** as kinship with the powerful; doubtful. The "revocations" are such as Lateran IV (1215) c. 50 (X 4.14.8 ***Non debet***), which revoked earlier constitutions on affinity and limited the prohibition to the fourth degree.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 381: ***bigamis*** (5 is the line number)
  - 381: ***vel*** (15 is the line number)
  - 381: ***illa***
  - 382: ***parificatur*** [NW]
  - 382: ***mulctare*** (30 is the line number) [NW]
  - 384: ***illud***
  - 385: ***illum***
  - 385: ***coniunxit***
  - 385: ***ligam*** [NW]
  - 381: ***coniugatis*** (LEFT-nw: print = coniugatis)
  - 384: ***ad*** (small stray mark before ad; kept as ad)
  - 385: ***proximam*** (box in blank gap after proximam)

Part 19: The pope and heresy; the first six of the twelve abuses

Loserth pp. 385.32–389.27

¶1 385.32–386.26

385.32 *Pope's judgment as to heresies valueless.*

[385] Ulterius quantum ad decisiones heresum, pro quibus dicitur esse necessarium esse papam, patet quod a tempore dotacionis cesaree alii fuerant [386] apciores ad discernendum veritatem catholicam

Further, as to the deciding of heresies, for which it is said to be necessary that there be a pope, it is clear that from the time of the caesarean endowment others have been [386] more apt to discern catholic truth than

386.27 *Twelve abuses of the pope. 1. Method of election.*

quam papa cesareus. Et si dicitur quod auctoritate sui debent vocati decidere, cum solus papa potest synodum congregare, picta et ficta tradicio balbutitur; nam auctoritate illius debet christianus ad edificacionem ecclesie proferre sentenciam a quo capit scienciam; quod est pape impertinens, cum singulariter fit a Deo; debet igitur fieri synodus ex mocione divina consensu unanimi. Ad quem consensum debet papa precipue laborare et in defectu sui alius fidelis ecclesie, ut cesar vel alius magis ydoneus. Unde credo quod facta synodo ad discernendum quid est naturaliter hostia consecrata Robertus et multi prelati cesarei proferrent satis nudam sentenciam nec excederent in diccione procuratoria cesarem vel simplicem ydiotam. Alii autem dicunt quod est quantitas, alii vero quod est qualitas, et tercii quod est panis et sic de aliis variis sentenciis, quas non probant. Ideo sanum videtur fideles se tenere in limitibus quos lex Christi edocet et in aliis curiositatibus non musitare vel plus sapere quam oportet; sufficit enim fides scripture certificare quoad omnia agibilia vel credibilia, que necesse est viantes cognoscere. De toto isto patet diffuse alibi et cetera.

the caesarean pope.[1] And if it is said that those called [to a synod] ought to decide by his authority, since the pope alone can gather a synod, a painted and feigned tradition is being stammered out; for a Christian ought to put forth a teaching for the edifying of the church by the authority of him from whom he takes his knowledge; and this is irrelevant to the pope, since it comes uniquely from God. A synod therefore ought to be held by divine motion, with unanimous consent. For that consent the pope ought chiefly to labour, and in his default another of the church's faithful, such as the emperor or another more fit. Hence I believe that, were a synod held to discern what the consecrated host is in its nature, Robert and many caesarean prelates would put forth a teaching bare enough, and would not surpass the emperor or a plain unlettered man in proctorial pronouncement.[2] And some say that it is quantity, and others that it is quality, and a third party that it is bread, and so of other various teachings, which they do not prove. Therefore it seems sound for the faithful to keep themselves within the limits that the law of Christ teaches, and not to mutter about other curiosities, or "to be more wise than it behoveth"; for the faith of scripture suffices to make certain all things to be done or believed that those on the road must know. Of all this it is clear at length elsewhere, etc.[3]

¶2 386.27–386.35

[386] Possunt autem abusiones Romani pontificis reduci ad numerum duodecim, ut alie abusiones communiter reducuntur. Prima quod institutis ad hoc cardinalibus dimissis ministeriis que Christus instituit, eligant unum caput, quem ex institucione cesarea papam vocant. Hoc nedum caret auctoritate scripture, sed videtur societati apostolorum et eleccioni Mathie singulariter facte per Dominum repugnare.

And the abuses of the Roman pontiff can be reduced to the number twelve, as other abuses are commonly reduced.[4] The first: that cardinals, instituted for this, setting aside the ministries that Christ instituted, elect one head, whom by caesarean institution they call pope. This not only lacks the authority of scripture, but seems to be incompatible with the fellowship of the apostles and with the election of Matthias, made uniquely by the Lord.[5]

¶3 387.1–387.21
387.1
2. Claims of honours,
387.1
2. Claims of worldly honours,
387.22
3. and of secular rule.

[387] Secunda quod mundanos honores contra Christum et apostolos tantum affectant. Debet enim recolere, quia ex Matth. XX debet esse omnibus fratribus suis servus, unde Gregorius II. Pastoral. VI: Petrus, inquit, autore Deo sancte ecclesie principatum tenens a bene agente Cornelio, et sese ei humiliter prosternente, inmoderacius venerari recusavit seque illi similem recognovit dicens: Surge, ne feceris, et ego ipse homo sum, sicut et tu. Patet historia Act. X. 26. Et sequitur: Paulus bene agentibus fratribus prelatum se esse nesciebat, cum diceret: Non quia dominamur fidei vestre sed adiutores sumus gaudii vestri. Atque illico adiunxit: In fide enim statis, ac si id quod pretulerat, aperiret dicens: Ideo non dominamur fidei vestre, quia fide

The second: that they desire worldly honours so much, against Christ and the apostles. For he ought to recall that by Matthew 20 he ought to be the servant of all his brethren; hence Gregory, *Pastoral [Rule]* II.6:[6] "Peter," he says, "holding by God's authority the chief rule of the holy church, refused to be venerated beyond measure by Cornelius, who was doing well and humbly prostrating himself before him, and acknowledged himself like him, saying: Arise, do not do it; I myself also am a man, as thou art." The story is plain in Acts 10:26. And it follows: "Paul did not know himself to be prelate over brethren who did well, when he said: Not because we exercise dominion over your faith: but we are helpers of your

statis; equales enim vobis sumus, in quo vos stare cognoscimus; quasi prelatum se esse fratribus nesciebat, cum diceret: Facti sumus sicut parvuli in medio vestrum, prima Tess. II, 7. Et rursum, nos autem servos vestros per Christum. Patet . . . .

joy. And at once he added: For in faith you stand; as if he were opening what he had put forward, saying: Therefore we exercise no dominion over your faith, because you stand by faith; for we are equal to you in that in which we know you to stand. As if he did not know himself to be prelate over the brethren, when he said: We became as little ones in the midst of you," 1 Thessalonians 2:7. "And again: and ourselves your servants through Christ." It is clear . . . .[7]

¶4 387.22–388.2
388.3
4. Much boasting with little performance.
388.13
5. Encouragement to war, especially in support of his own power.
388.31
6. Unauthorized claims to rule.

[387] Tercia est quod papa innitatur seculari dominio. Unde Gregorius ubi supra: Ne presidentis animus ad elacionem potestatis sue delectacione rapiatur. Recte Ecclesiastici XXXII. 1 dicitur: Ducem te posuerunt, noli extolli sed esto in illis quasi unus ex illis. Hinc eciam Petrus ait: Non dominantes in clero sed forma facti gregis. Hinc eciam Veritas per semetipsam dicit: Scitis quia principes gencium dominantur eorum, non sic erit inter vos. [388] Ideo secundum Bernhardum: Nihil intoxicat ani- mum pape plus quam dominandi libido.

The third is that the pope relies on secular lordship. Hence Gregory in the same place: "Lest the mind of him who presides be carried off into pride by delight in his own power, it is rightly said in Ecclesiasticus 32:1: They have made thee leader: be not lifted up, but be among them as one of them. Hence also Peter says: Not lording it over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock. Hence also the Truth in his own person says: You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; it shall not be so among you."[8] [388] Therefore, according to Bernard: "Nothing poisons the mind of the pope more than the lust of lording it."[9]

¶5 388.3–388.12

[388] Quarta quod papa sit dux loquens grandia, magnificando suam potenciam et faciens modicum in effectu. Ex hinc itaque docet beatus Gregorius, ut patet XCIX distinccione: Quod papa non debet vocari universalis episcopus. Hec enim est condicio Antichristi, cum Christus cepit facere et docere, celans suam potenciam, nisi de quanto est necessarium ipsam detegere et credere ad salutem. Mendax autem potestatis ostensio inducit perfidiam Antichristi.

The fourth: that the pope is a leader speaking great things, magnifying his power and doing little in effect. Hence, accordingly, blessed Gregory teaches, as is clear in Distinction 99: "That the pope ought not to be called universal bishop." For this is the condition of Antichrist, since Christ began to do and to teach, hiding his power, except so far as it is necessary to expose it and [for it] to be believed unto salvation. But a lying display of power brings in the perfidy of Antichrist.[10]

¶6 388.13–388.30

[388] Quinta quod papa, dimissa arte paciendi iniurias et facta evangelica inducendi timorem filialem subiectis, innitatur crudeliter pugnis corporalibus et vindictis non solum in causa Christi ad vindicandum suas iniurias, sed precipue in causa propria ad magnificandum suas potencias, et ad hoc allegat Gregorius II Pastor ubi supra, illud Matth. XXIV, 48: Quod si dixerit malus ille servus in corde suo: Moram facit Dominus meus venire, et ceperit percutere conservos suos, Dominus suus inopinate veniet et ponet partem eius cum ypocritis. Inter ypocritas, inquit, iure deputatur qui ex simulacione discipline ministerium regiminis vertit in usum dominacionis. Deficiente enim spirituali armatura et specialiter gladio spiritus, necesse est quod papa cesareus innitatur refrigescentibus armis timorem servilem inducentibus prepostere contra Christum.

The fifth: that the pope, setting aside the art of suffering injuries and the gospel deeds of inducing filial fear in subjects, relies cruelly on bodily fights and vengeances, not only in Christ's cause, to avenge his injuries, but chiefly in his own cause, to magnify his powers; and on this Gregory, *Pastoral* II, in the same place, alleges that of Matthew 24:48: "But if that evil servant shall say in his heart: My lord is long a coming: and shall begin to strike his fellow servants, his lord shall come unexpectedly and shall appoint his portion with the hypocrites. Among the hypocrites," he says, "is he rightly reckoned who under pretence of discipline turns the ministry of rule to the uses of the exercise of lordship."[11] For when the spiritual armour fails, and especially the sword of the spirit, it is necessary that the caesarean pope rely on arms that grow cold, inducing servile fear, preposterously, against Christ.[12]

¶7 388.31–389.27

[388]Sexta quod papa appetat dominari nedum pecunia et prediis sed suis fratribus, non secundum racionem, qua similantur bestiis ad brutalitatem [389]in honorem Domini expurgandam, sed, dimissa illa sollicitudine vicaria pro Christo, nitatur modo Luciferi secundum omnem racionem que sapit excellenciam suam fratribus suis et specialiter in testinacionem veritatis precellentibus dominari. Istam materiam declarat Gregorius II Pastor. VI notans primo quod culpa ex insufficiencia proprii regiminis induxit huiusmodi prelaciam, secundo quod prelatus debet esse humilis socius bonis subditis, et tercio quod regimen suum debet exercere cum debita severitate in feras egentes regimine, ut puta contra eos in quibus Ihesus contempnitur. Et adducit ad hoc illud Genesis XLVI, 34: Pastores ovium sumus. Secundo Genes. IX, 1 dicit Deus terror vester ac tremor sit super cuncta animalia terre; in quo esse super homines prohibetur. In hoc enim, quod metum sibi a perverse viventibus exigunt, quasi non hominibus sed animalibus dominantur. Ex istis elicit sanctus tercio multas demonstrabiles veritates, prima quod contra naturam est et superbia Luciferi velle ab equalibus in natura et moribus dominari, secunda quod curatus ut prosit debet appetere illud officium, non ut presit, et tercia quod nemo assumeret pastoris officium nisi evidenter haberet artem spiritualis medici ad prodessendum anime subditorum.

The sixth: that the pope seeks to lord it not only over money and estates but over his brethren; not according to the respect in which they are likened to beasts, [389]for purging brutishness to the honour of the Lord, but, setting aside that vicarial solicitude for Christ, he strives after the manner of Lucifer, according to every respect that savours of his own excellence, to lord it over his brethren, and especially over those who excel in [witness] to the truth.[13] This matter Gregory sets out, *Pastoral* II.6, noting first that it was fault, from the insufficiency of one's own rule, that brought in prelacy of this kind; second, that a prelate ought to be a humble fellow to good subjects; and third, that he ought to exercise his rule with due severity upon the wild beasts that need rule, as, say, against those in whom Jesus is despised. And he brings to this that of Genesis 46:34: "We are shepherds of sheep." Second, in Genesis 9:1 God says: "Let the fear and dread of you be upon all the beasts of the earth"; in which to be over men is forbidden. "For in this, that they require fear of themselves from those who live perversely, they lord it, as it were, not over men but over animals."[14] From these the saint draws, third, many demonstrable truths: first, that it is against nature, and the pride of Lucifer, to wish to lord it over one's equals in nature and morals; second, that a curate ought to desire that office in order to profit, not in order to preside; and third, that no one should take up the office of shepherd unless he evidently had the art of the spiritual physician for profiting the souls of his subjects.[15]

Notes

1. ***Dotacio cesarea***: the endowment of the church by Constantine, from which Wyclif dates the decline of the papacy. The manuscripts' margin at 385.32: ***Hereses decidere ad quem spectat***.
2. ***Robertus***: Robert of Geneva, elected in September 1378 as Clement VII against Urban VI (so Loserth's index, ***Robertus antipapa (Clemens VII.)***, at 386; Wyclif names him ***Robertum Gilbonensem*** at 233.15). ***In diccione procuratoria***: we take ***diccio*** as "pronouncement", the speech of those who claim to act as Christ's proctors; ***dicio***, "authority" ("in proctorial authority"), is the alternative.
3. The three positions concern what the consecrated host is in its nature: quantity, quality, or bread (Wyclif's own view). He names no authors. ***Plus sapere quam oportet***: Rom. 12:3 (DR "not to be more wise than it behoveth to be wise"). The manuscripts read ***de aliis de variis*** (386.19).
4. The count of twelve abuses recalls the pseudo-Cyprianic ***De duodecim abusivis saeculi*** (PL 4, 869ff.), whose twelve ***abusionis gradus*** Wyclif cites at 375. The manuscripts' margin: ***Abusiones pape***, and at 386.29 the numeral ***1***.
5. Acts 1:26 (DR "the lot fell upon Matthias"): ***singulariter ... per Dominum***, the lot leaving the choice to God alone.
6. Matt. 20:27 (DR "he that will be first among you shall be your servant"). Gregory, ***Regula pastoralis*** II.6 (PL 77, 34–38; the manuscripts read ***II Past. XVII***, which Loserth marks as an error, but it is the older running count of the chapters, which Migne notes as ***Al. XVII***). The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse ***2***.
7. Loserth prints ***a bene agente*** and ***bene agentibus***; the manuscripts read ***benedicente***, ***benedicentibus*** (387.6, 11). We translate the print. Acts 10:26 (DR), with Gregory's ***ne feceris***, "do not do it", added. 2 Cor. 1:23 (DR); 1 Thess. 2:7, where the manuscripts read ***vestri*** and the Vulgate has no ***sicut***; 2 Cor. 4:5, with ***per Christum*** for the Vulgate ***per Iesum***. ***Patet . . . .*** is the print's gap; Loserth would add ***historia II Cor. IV, 5***.
8. Gregory, ***Reg. past.*** II.6 continued. Ecclus. 32:1: the Vulgate reads ***Rectorem te posuerunt?*** (DR "Have they made thee ruler? be not lifted up: be among them as one of them"); Gregory's text has ***Ducem te constituerunt***, "leader" (PL 77, 37A). The print's margin gives "Eccl. XXXI". 1 Pet. 5:3 (DR "lording it over the clergy ... a pattern of the flock"); Matt. 20:25–26 (DR). B lacks ***rapiatur***, which A adds in the margin (387.24). The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse ***3***.

9. Bernard, *De consideratione* III.1.2 (PL 182, 759B), paraphrased: Bernard has *nullum tibi venenum, nullum gladium plus formido, quam libidinem dominandi*.
10. *Loquens grandia*: Dan. 7:20 (DR "a mouth speaking great things"), of the little horn. Decretum D.99 (Loserth: c.3 *Primae sedis*, where Gratian adds *Universalis autem nec etiam Romanus Pontifex appelletur*); Gregory's own words are c.5 *Ecce in praefatione*, to Eulogius, refusing the title *universalis papa* (PL 187, 471B–473A). *Cepit facere et docere*: Acts 1:1 (DR "began to do and to teach"). The manuscripts number the abuse *IV*.
11. Matt. 24:48–51, through Gregory (*Reg. past.* II.6): *facit* for the Vulgate *fecit*; v. 49 is cut short and v. 50 is given as *inopinate veniet*, "shall come unexpectedly". The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse *5*.
12. *Gladius spiritus*: Eph. 6:17. *Refrigescentibus armis*: "arms that grow cold", which we take as the arms of those whose charity has grown cold (cf. Matt. 24:12); the sense is doubtful. *Prepostere*: in reversed order, the servile fear put where filial fear should be.
13. *Testinacionem* is so in the manuscripts (Loserth: *ita codd.*) and is no Latin word; "[witness]" guesses at *testificacionem*. *Racio* here is "respect": a ruler may be over men only so far as they are like beasts, in their vices, which is Gregory's point below. The manuscripts read *Cap. XVII* for *VI* (389.6), the older running count of the *Regula pastoralis* (Migne's *Al.* XVII), and number the abuse *6*.
14. Gregory, *Reg. past.* II.6 (Loserth at 389.19: "St. Gregorius l. c."; PL 77, 34C–D, where Gregory has *pastores pecorum* and *terror vester ac tremor*). *Pastores ovium sumus* is Gen. 47:3 (DR "We, thy servants, are shepherds"); Gen. 46:34 reads *Viri pastores*. The words given as Gen. 9:1 are Gen. 9:2 (DR).
15. *Curatus* stands for Gregory's ruler of souls; *ut prosit … non ut presit*, "to profit, not to preside", is the old play on *prodesse* and *praeesse* (so Gregory in this chapter, *nec praeesse se hominibus gaudeant, sed prodesse*, PL 77, 34C; cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 19.19, *non se esse episcopum, qui praeesse dilexerit, non prodesse*, PL 41, 647). *Prodessendum* is the print's form of the gerund.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 386: *congregare*
  - 386: *quam*
  - 387: *tu*
  - 387: *cum*
  - 387: *equales*
  - 387: *nesciebat*
  - 387: *Ne*
  - 388: *intoxicat*
  - 388: *ani-* (hyphenated ani-|mum; main token holds the first half)
  - 388: *mum* (second half of ani-|mum)
  - 388: *Quinta*
  - 388: *evangelica*
  - 388: ∅ (folio bar after evangelica (257ᶜ in margin) read as i)
  - 388: *inducendi*
  - 388: *facit*
  - 388: *meus*
  - 388: *inopinate*
  - 388: *vertit* (leaf zoom: both t's of vertit have the crossbar, not l)
  - 388: *prediis*
  - 389: *illa*
  - 389: *testinacionem* (print has testinacionem (after "specialiter in" at line end), kept as printed; 5 is the line number) [NW]
  - 389: *metum*
- Omitted per §3.5 / kept in the English (margin matter): reference Eccl. XXXI. (387.30).

Part 20: The seventh to twelfth abuses: prayer, burdens, appointments, indulgences, captains, earthly cares

Loserth pp. 389.28–393.30

¶1 389.28–391.10
389.28
7. Failure to make intercession for his subjects.
390.23

[389]Septima quod papa negligat disponere se in mentis mundicia, ut pro subiectis debite interpellet. Hoc enim est inseparabiliter papale officium, cum talis debet tamquam intercessor pacificans inter Deum et populum mediare. Inficitur autem oratoris officium per superbiam,

The seventh: that the pope neglects to dispose himself in purity of mind so as to intercede duly for his subjects. For this is inseparably the papal office, since such a one ought, as a peacemaking intercessor, to mediate between God and the people. Now the office of the suppliant is infected

8. Readiness to accept undue burdens for the sake of honour or reward.
391.11
9. Claims of patronage.
391.28
10. False grants of indulgence.

ut patet in sex abusionibus predictis et per avariciam [390]que est alia radix malicie. Sicut enim fistula per quam transiret liquor inficitur per metalli rubiginem inherentem, sic inficitur rectoris fistula ad orandum, quando temporalibus nimis afficitur, cum ad hoc consequitur servitus ydolorum; et sicut liquor non descendit per fistulam ad subiectum, nisi proporcionaliter ad scaturiginem sit depressa, sic sacerdos orando non mediat inter Deum et populum nisi deponendo elacionem de se ipso humiliter senciat, subiciendo se debite quoad Deum. Ideo caveret papa, quomodo de necessitate salutis tenetur orare pro populo, et precipue emundare spirituale organum ab istis duobus criminibus; aliter enim nedum omittendo peccaret, sed mediando inficeret gregem suum, dicente Gregorio primo Pastoralis X: Cuncti, inquit, liquido novimus, quia cum is qui displicet ad intercedendum mittitur, irati animus ad deteriora provocatur. Qui igitur adhuc desideriis terrenis astringitur, caveat ne districti iram iudicis gravius accendens, dum loco delectatur glorie fiat subditis autor ruine. Octava abusio est quod papa oneret se infundabiliter onere alieno. Hic autem exprimit Gregorius primo Pastoralis sub hiis verbis: Hinc precipites colligant cum quanta culpa ex proprio appetitu ceteris preferri non metuunt, si sancti viri plebium ducatum suscipere Deo eciam iubente timuerunt. Moyses suadente Domino trepidat, infirmus quisque, ut honoris onus suscipiat, anhelat; et qui ad casum valde urgetur ex propriis, humerum libenter opprimendus submittit ponderibus alienis; que egit ferre non valet, eciam auget, quod [391]portet. Ex istis videtur quod prelacia ecclesiastica sine peccato saltem veniali non poterit acceptari. Omnes enim quotquot venerunt sunt fures et latrones, qui accipiunt illud propter honorem vel commodum temporale, quod plus prelaciam quesitam sollicitudo et actus eorum diiudicant. Si igitur sine tali obligacione superaddita possumus plus vel tantum prodesse populo, ad quid querimus vincula temporalium et professione superaddita colligari?

by pride, as is clear in the six abuses aforesaid, and by avarice, [390]which is the other root of malice.[1] For as a pipe through which liquor would pass is infected by the rust of the metal clinging to it, so the ruler's pipe for praying is infected when he is too much affected by temporal things, since upon this follows the servitude of idols; and as the liquor does not descend through the pipe to what lies beneath unless it is lowered in proportion to the spring, so the priest in praying does not mediate between God and the people unless, putting down elation, he thinks humbly of himself, subjecting himself duly with respect to God. Therefore let the pope take heed how he is bound, of necessity of salvation, to pray for the people, and above all to cleanse the spiritual organ from these two crimes; for otherwise he would not only sin by omitting, but by mediating would infect his flock, as Gregory says, *Pastoral* I.10: "We all know clearly," he says, "that when one who displeases is sent to intercede, the mind of the angered one is provoked to worse. Let him therefore who is still bound by earthly desires beware lest, kindling the more heavily the wrath of the strict judge, while he delights in the place of glory he become to his subjects the author of ruin."[2] The eighth abuse is that the pope burdens himself without foundation with another's burden. And this Gregory expresses, *Pastoral* I, in these words: "Hence let the headlong gather with how great a fault they do not fear to be preferred to others from their own appetite, if holy men feared to undertake the leadership of peoples even at God's bidding. Moses trembles when the Lord persuades him; every weak man pants to undertake the burden of honour; and he who is sorely pressed toward a fall by his own [weights] willingly puts his shoulder, to be crushed, under the weights of others; what he has done he cannot bear, and he even increases what [391]he must carry."[3] From this it seems that ecclesiastical prelacy cannot be accepted without at least venial sin. For "all, as many as have come, are thieves and robbers" who accept it for honour or temporal advantage, which their care and their acts, more than the prelacy sought, make plain.[4] If therefore, without such an obligation added on, we can profit the people more or as much, to what end do we seek the chains of temporal things, and to be bound by a profession added on?

¶2 391.11–391.27

[391]Et sub ista octava stulticia sunt mille alie germinantes, ut nona abusio est, quod papa presumit per totum christianismum statuere duces spirituales et medicos, pro quorum ducatu oportet ipsum summo iudici respondere. Sic, inquam, non fecerunt Petrus,

And under this eighth folly a thousand others are sprouting, as the ninth abuse is that the pope presumes throughout all Christendom to appoint spiritual leaders and physicians, for whose leadership he must answer to the highest judge. Not so, I say, did Peter, Gregory and the other saints

Gregorius et ceteri sancti ecclesie primitive, sed permiserunt aliorum apostolorum instituciones et expertorum elecciones procedere. Nam hoc debet populus plus curare, dicente Gregorio primo Pastoralis IX capitulo: Cum curam populi electus presul suscipit, quasi ad egrum medicus accedit. Unde creditur quod provisiones, reservaciones et privilegiaciones tam amplas induxit non amor salutis subditi vel excellens specularis prudencia sed mater cupiditas; cum ubi lucrum tollitur cessant constituciones huiusmodi, eciam licet magis prodessent ecclesie.

of the primitive church do; but they allowed the institutions of the other apostles and the elections of experienced men to proceed. For the people ought to care more for this, as Gregory says, *Pastoral* I, chapter 9: "When the bishop chosen undertakes the care of the people, he comes as a physician to the sick." Hence it is believed that not love of the subject's salvation, nor the excellent prudence of a watchman, but mother cupidity brought in provisions, reservations and privilegings so ample; since where gain is taken away constitutions of this kind cease, even though they would profit the church more.[5]

¶3 391.28–392.7
392.9
11. Grants of patronage for selfish ends.
392.22
12. Opposition in study and deed to Christ's law.

[391] Decima abusio est, quod papa presumit ultra Christum vel sanctos apostolos concedere sic cece indulgencias et privilegia, cum ignorat communiter si Deus hec approbat, vel ad utriusque partis deterius reprehendit. Nam vel est indulgencia talis sophistica vel personalis et empta vel dignis quibus proficeret nimis parca. Si igitur [392] servus timeret sibi expendere corporalem thesaurum domini dominorum, et specialiter presumendo blasfeme potestatem et modum proprium regi regum, cum enim talis non humiliter intrat per ostium, sed ascendit superbe dirumpens tectum ecclesie caritatem, et sophisticat thesaurum Domini, restat ut in finali iudicio condempnetur.

The tenth abuse is that the pope presumes, beyond Christ or the holy apostles, to grant indulgences and privileges so blindly, since he commonly does not know whether God approves them, or reproves them, to the worse of both parties. For such an indulgence is either sophistical, or personal and bought, or too sparing to the worthy whom it would profit. If therefore [392] a servant should fear to spend for himself the bodily treasure of the lord of lords, and especially by blasphemously presuming the power and manner proper to the king of kings (for such a one does not enter humbly by the door, but climbs up proudly, breaking through the roof of the church, charity, and counterfeits the Lord's treasure), it remains that he be condemned in the final judgment.[6]

¶4 392.9–392.21

[392] Undecima abusio est quod papa in preficiendo duces christiani exercitus contra dyabolum, in preiudicium Christi acceptat personas vel respicit suum commodum temporale. Nichil enim convinceret evidencius quod venit proditor Antichristus, cum subdole seducit christianum exercitum per capitaneos subdolos secte sue, ymo cum Christus in paciendo accipit denominaciones membrorum suorum, ut patet Matth. XXV, manifestum est quod falsius, nequius et multiplicius quam Scarioth crudelioribus hostibus legis veteris tradunt Christum, ut tangit Crysostomus Omelia XXVII Operis Imperfecti.

The eleventh abuse is that the pope, in setting leaders over the Christian army against the devil, accepts persons to the prejudice of Christ, or looks to his own temporal advantage. For nothing would prove more evidently that Antichrist the traitor has come than when he craftily seduces the Christian army through crafty captains of his sect; indeed, since Christ in suffering takes the names of his members, as is clear in Matthew 25, it is manifest that they hand Christ over more falsely, more wickedly and more manifoldly than Iscariot did, to enemies crueller than those of the old law, as Chrysostom touches on in Homily 27 of the *Opus imperfectum*.[7]

¶5 392.22–393.30

[392] Duodecima abusio est quod papa tam in persona sua quam in suis satrapis innititur tam studio quam praxi contrariis legi Christi, cum lex Dei et ars curandi sua postponitur et ars cesarea vel antichristiana inducitur. Et istum abusum Gregorius sepe conquiritur, unde mandat libro II cap. primo: Quod rector sit pre cunctis contemplacione suspensus internorum, curam in exteriorum occupacioue non minuens. Cum enim predicare verbum Dei et curare animas secundum

The twelfth abuse is that the pope, both in his own person and in his satraps, relies both in study and in practice on things contrary to the law of Christ, since God's law and its art of curing is put after, and the caesarean or antichristian art is brought in. And this abuse Gregory often complains of; hence he enjoins, book II, chapter 1: "That the ruler be, before all, suspended in contemplation; not lessening his care of inward

artem Christi sit precipuum pape officium, patet quod ad eum spectat dimissis curis terrenis verbo illi intendere. Et idem credit iste sanctus in monitu legis Dei. [393]Unde libro II cap. XVIII: Dum, inquit, per animarum presulem terreni exercetur officium iudicis, a gregis custodia vacat cura pastoris et subiecti veritatis lumen apprehendere nequeunt, quia dum pastoris sensus terrena iudicia occupant, vento temptacionis impulsus, ecclesie oculos pulvis cecat. Quod cum Christus a ventris voracitate compesceret, adiunxit dicens: Attendite igitur vobis, ne graventur corda vestra in crapula et ebrietate, illico sic adiunxit: Aut in curis huius vite. Ubi pavorem adiciens, ne forte, inquit, superveniat dies illa repentina, cuius qualitatem denuncians: Tamquam laqueus, inquit, veniat super omnes, qui habitant super faciem omnis terre. Hinc iterum dicit: Nemo potest duobus dominis servire; hinc Paulus religiosorum mentes a mundi consorcio conveniendo suspendit dicens: Nemo militans Deo implicat se negociis secularibus, ut ei placet cui se probavit. Hinc ecclesie rectoribus et vacandi studia precipit et consulendi remedia ostendit dicens: Secularia ergo iudicia, si habueritis contemptibiles qui sunt in ecclesia illos constituite ad iudicandum, ut illi videlicet dispensacionibus terrenis inserviant, quos dona spiritualia non exornant, ut quia penetrare intima nequeunt saltem foris necessaria operentur. Hinc Moyses a Getro alienigena iudicatur quod terrenis negociis populorum stulto labore deserviat, cui consilium mox prebetur, ut pro se alios ad iurgia dirimenda constituat, et ipse liberius ad erudiendos populos spiritualia archana cognoscat.

things in the busyness of outward things."[8] For since preaching the word of God and curing souls according to Christ's art is the pope's chief office, it is clear that it belongs to him, setting aside earthly cares, to attend to that word. And this saint believes the same [to be] in the admonition of God's law. [393]Hence book II, chapter 18: "While," he says, "the office of an earthly judge is exercised by the bishop of souls, the shepherd's care is idle from guarding the flock, and the subjects cannot apprehend the light of truth; because while earthly judgments occupy the shepherd's mind, the dust, driven by the wind of temptation, blinds the eyes of the church. When Christ was restraining [men] from the voracity of the belly, he added, saying: Take heed therefore to yourselves, lest your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness; at once he added thus: or with the cares of this life. Where, adding fear: lest perhaps, he says, that day come upon you suddenly; declaring its quality: As a snare, he says, it shall come upon all that dwell upon the face of the whole earth. Hence again he says: No man can serve two masters. Hence Paul, addressing the minds of the religious, suspends them from the fellowship of the world, saying: No man, being a soldier to God, entangleth himself with secular businesses: that he may please him to whom he hath engaged himself. Hence he both enjoins on the rulers of the church the pursuits of leisure and shows the remedies of counsel, saying: If therefore you have judgments of things pertaining to this world, set them to judge who are the most despised in the church; that is, that those may serve earthly dispensations who are not adorned with spiritual gifts, so that, because they cannot penetrate inward things, they may at least work the necessary things without. Hence Moses is judged by Jethro, a foreigner, in that he serves the earthly business of the peoples with foolish labour; and counsel is soon given him to appoint others in his place for settling quarrels, so that he himself may more freely come to know spiritual secrets for instructing the peoples."[9]

Notes

1. ***Oratoris officium***: the office of one who prays to God for the people, so "suppliant" (glossary: ***orator***), not the bedesman paid to pray. ***Alia radix malicie***: avarice as the root of evils (1 Tim. 6:10), beside pride.
2. Gregory, ***Regula pastoralis*** I.10 (PL 77, 23C). ***Servitus ydolorum***: Eph. 5:5 (DR "covetous person (which is a serving of idols)"). B reads ***gloriose*** for ***glorie*** (390.21).
3. Gregory, ***Reg. past.*** I.7 (PL 77, 20D–21A; Loserth's foot gives chapter V); Moses' fear: Exod. 4:10–13. ***Que egit ferre non valet*** is the print; the manuscripts read ***quem eger ferre*** (390.33). The print is Gregory's text (***quae egit ferre non valet, et auget quod portet***, PL 77, 21A), "what he has done he cannot bear"; we translate the print. The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse ***8***.

4. John 10:8 (DR "All others, as many as have come, are thieves and robbers"). *Quod plus prelaciam quesitam sollicitudo et actus eorum diiudicant*: we take *quod* as the motive (honour or advantage) and *plus prelaciam quesitam* as "more than the prelacy sought"; doubtful. The alternative: "which their care and acts judge [to weigh] more [than] the prelacy sought". The manuscripts have no stop at 391.2.
5. Gregory, *Reg. past.* I.9 (PL 77, 22D, which reads *causam populi* for Wyclif's *curam populi*). *Specularis prudencia*: the prudence of a watchman (*speculator*, the bishop's name); "of a mirror" is the alternative. The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse *9*.
6. The period has no clear main clause for *si*: we take *restat ut … condempnetur* as its close and the *cum enim* clause as a parenthesis; a lost comparison (such as *quanto magis*) is possible. The *corporalis thesaurus* is set against the spiritual treasury from which indulgences are drawn. *Intrat per ostium … ascendit*: John 10:1 (DR "climbeth up another way"). A has *iudicio* only in the margin (392.7).
7. Matt. 25:40 (DR "as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me"). Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, hom. 27 as Wyclif numbers it; Migne's hom. 27 (on Matt. 11) has nothing to the point, and the nearest passage found is hom. 35 (PG 56, 823ff., on Matt. 20:19), where the priests of the present *tradunt* the word of truth *gentibus*, Christians in name and gentiles in manners; the source is untraced. *Crudelioribus hostibus legis veteris*: we take it as "to enemies crueller than [those] of the old law"; "to the crueller enemies of the old law" is the alternative. The subject of *tradunt* is the captains of Antichrist's sect. The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse *11*.
8. Gregory, *Reg. past.* II.1 (PL 77, 27A). The print sets a comma after *internorum*; we join *internorum* to *curam*, as the balance with *exteriorum* asks; with the print's stop, "suspended in the contemplation of inward things" is the alternative. B lacks *non* (392.30), which would reverse the sense. The manuscripts' margin numbers the abuse *12*.
9. Gregory, *Reg. past.* II.7 (PL 77, 39A–D; Loserth: *est cap. VII sec. partis*; the text's *XVIII* is the older running count, which Migne notes as *Al. XVIII*); the quotation runs on into the next part. Within it: Luke 21:34–35 (DR), with *habitant* for the Vulgate *sedent* ("sit"); Luke 16:13 (DR, without *servus*; cf. Matt. 6:24); 2 Tim. 2:4 (Loserth: "I Tim."), with *placet* for *placeat*; 1 Cor. 6:4 (DR); Exod. 18:17–18 (DR "foolish labour"). *Conveniendo*: "addressing", calling to account. *Vacandi studia*: freedom for contemplation, set against *consulendi remedia*.

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 389: *interpellet* (hyphenated inter-|pellet (30 line number); main token holds the whole word)
  - 390: *ruine*
  - 390: ∅ (to is the English side note (8. Readiness to accept …))
  - 390: *precipites* (print "Hinc 25 / precipites colligant"; the main scan lost precipites)
  - 390: *timuerunt* (hyphenated ti-|muerunt; main token holds the whole word)
  - 391: *curam*
  - 391: *egrum*
  - 391: ∅ (25 is the line number)
  - 391: *approbat*
  - 391: *proficeret*
  - 392: *preficiendo* [NW]
  - 392: ∅ (folio bar after teris (258^{c} in margin) read as i)
  - 392: *contemplacione*
  - 393: *iudicia*
  - 393: *vento*
  - 393: *compesceret*
  - 393: *ebrietate*
  - 393: *vite*
  - 393: *illa*
  - 393: *iudicia*
  - 393: *in*
  - 393: *foris*
  - 393: *stulto*
  - 393: ∅ (30 is the line number)
  - 393: *erudiendos*
  - 393: *populos*
  - 393: *archana* [NW]
  - 390: *novimus,* (folio bar after comma, not text)
  - 390: *hiis* (print = hiis)
  - 391: *germinantes,* (ink has comma)
  - 391: *Gregorio* (Gre-|gorio hyphenated, line number 20 glued)
  - 393: *Attendite* (italic, print = Attendite)

- **393:** ***adiunxit:*** **(hyphenated ad-|iunxit:)**

Part 21: The endowed bound to contradictories; why Constantine is not canonized; the protestation

Loserth pp. 393.31–397.17

¶1 393.31–395.7
394.2 *False position of the endowed; they owe more service for gifts which make them less capable of service.*
394.30 *St. Gregory's gift of all his patrimony involved venial sin.*
395.8 *Why Constantine is not*
395.10 *canonized as in the Eastern Church.*
395.29 *Because he burdened the church with endowments*

[393]**A subiectis vero inferiora gerenda sunt, arccioribus celestia cogitanda ut scilicet oculum, qui pro videndi gressibus preeminet, cura pulveris non obscuret.** [394]**Caput namque subiectorum et oculi sunt cuncti qui presunt. Et hinc creditur quod dotati sunt exinde more peccancium ad contradictoria obligati. Tenentur enim racione superaccepti doni a mundi principibus amplius servire illis quam prius, et debent minus deservire eis, cum non illuminantur ex accepcione temporalium sed cecantur et per ante tenebantur servire illis secundum totum ingenium vel donum, quod a Deo habebant, quia in toto illo eis proficere quoad Deum, et aliud mundanum ac laycale servicium est abhominabile dominis et sui meriti tardativum. Cum igitur tenentur habere aliquam providenciam et gubernacionem circa bona collata et ingeniacio sua sit tantum finita, videtur quod oportet ipsam quoad servicium meritorium post dotacionem diminui, cum exinde fracta sit et debilitata, quia circa contraria est dispersa. Et hoc creditur movisse apostolos constituisse dyaconos ad ministrandum mensis, apostolis ipsis intendentibus verbo Dei, ut legitur Act. VI. Et revera illud mensarum ministerium videtur habere maiorem racionem meriti quam occupacio qua dotati sunt circa temporalia preter necessaria occupati. Et ex istis videtur quod sicut dotati ad onus dampnosum spiritus receperant coniugium cum temporalibus monstruosum, sic dotantes ex ceca pietate dampnificarunt ambas partes altrinsecus directe ad contrarium meriti, quod stulte intenderant. Unde creditur beatum Gregorium non obstante reliccione tocius patrimonii, quod reliquerat, habens omnia in communi, nec obstante humilitate tota ac parcitate post pinguem dotacionem ecclesie, nec obstante tota suspensione** [395]**sollicitudinis circa temporalia et inveccione contra philargiam, propter admissionem temporalium venialiter peccavisse et hinc ad purgacionem sui et augmentum meriti Deum ipsum in febribus et dolore capitis per longa tempora punivisse. Alii autem fingunt quod hoc accidit, quia oravit temere pro Trayano.**

"And the lower things are to be carried out by the subjects, the heavenly things to be thought on by the stricter, so that, namely, the care of the dust may not darken the eye, which stands out above for seeing the steps. [394]**For all who preside are the head and the eyes of the subjects."**[1] **And hence it is believed that the endowed are thereby, after the manner of sinners, bound to contradictories. For by reason of the gift received over and above from the princes of the world they are bound to serve them more than before; and they ought to serve them less, since they are not enlightened by the receiving of temporal goods but blinded; and beforehand they were bound to serve them according to the whole wit or gift that they had from God, because [they were bound] in all of that to profit them with respect to God; and other, worldly and lay, service is abominable to the lords and a hindrance to their merit.**[2] **Since therefore they are bound to have some providence and government over the goods conferred, and their wit is only finite, it seems that it must be diminished as to meritorious service after the endowment, since thereby it is broken and weakened, because it is dispersed about contraries. And this is believed to have moved the apostles to appoint deacons to serve tables, the apostles themselves attending to the word of God, as is read in Acts 6.**[3] **And in truth that ministry of tables seems to have a greater ground of merit than the occupation in which the endowed are occupied about temporal goods beyond what is necessary. And from this it seems that, as the endowed, to the damaging burden of the spirit, received a monstrous marriage with temporal goods, so the endowers, from blind piety, damaged both parties on either side, directly contrary to the merit that they had foolishly intended. Hence it is believed that blessed Gregory, notwithstanding the relinquishing of his whole patrimony, which he had relinquished, having all things in common, nor notwithstanding all his humility and frugality after the fat endowment of the church, nor notwithstanding all his suspension** [395]**of solicitude about temporal goods and his invective against love of money, sinned venially by the admission of temporal goods; and hence that God himself punished him with fevers and pain of the head for long periods, for his purging and the**

¶2 395.8–395.21

[395]Sed mirantur nonnulli, quare Romana ecclesia non canonizat Constantinum magnum, qui dotavit ecclesiam nec tantum sollempnizat eum, ut orientalis ecclesia, ut notat Cestrensis libro IV, cap. CXII quomodo Greci sollempnizant eius festum XI die. Maii. Sed audivi ad hoc poni causam triplicem, prima fundatur super mendacem blasfemiam, quod debuit dedisse totum imperium suum clero, et quia eius medietatem iniuste detinuit ac in sacrilegio illo sine satisfaccione obiit, tamquam hereticus est dampnandus et per consequens a sanctorum cathalogo semovendus, et sic forent dampnandi omnes morientes reges vel domini temporales.

increase of his merit. But others feign that this befell because he prayed rashly for Trajan.[4]

But some wonder why the Roman church does not canonize Constantine the Great, who endowed the church, nor solemnizes him so much as the eastern church does; as the Chester chronicler notes, book IV, chapter 112, how the Greeks solemnize his feast on the 11th day of May.[5] But I have heard a threefold cause put for this. The first is founded on a lying blasphemy: that he ought to have given his whole empire to the clergy, and because he unjustly kept back half of it and died in that sacrilege without satisfaction, he is to be condemned as a heretic, and consequently removed from the catalogue of the saints; and so all kings or temporal lords who die [so] would have to be condemned.[6]

¶3 395.22–395.28

[395]Secunda causa videtur coloracior quod canonizacio videtur fuisse alieno Cesari nimium sumptuosa, ideo ut papa habeat cesares magis subiectos suo imperio noluit tantum colere servum suum, fecit tamen magis mirabilia in vita sua, quam illi reges fecerant in morte quos ex nuda relacione vel gracia pecunie canonizat.

The second cause seems more colourable: that canonization seems to have been too costly to a Caesar not [the pope's] own; therefore, that the pope may have the Caesars more subject to his command, he would not honour his servant so much. Yet he did more wonders in his life than those kings had done in death whom [the pope] canonizes on bare report or for the sake of money.[7]

¶4 395.29–397.16
396.1 *which he took from the Eastern Church.*
396.16 *Wyclif's protest of intention to honour and serve the Church;*
396.27 *which is most honoured and advanced by following the Bridegroom.*

[395]Tercia causa realis ponitur quod hoc ideo non evenit, quod tantum onerando ecclesiam cum temporalibus stulte, tantum dampnificaverat se et clerum, quod dispendium quia subtraxit ab [396]orientali ecclesia, propterea ipsum laudat. Ipsi enim ut fratres de statu exproprietario cum iubilo Deum laudant. Nec est color, si talis dominacio vel mundi gloria videatur preciosa febricitanti in animo cuius affeccio discrasiata non sapit celestia, propterea sic est de illo et eius opposito senciendum, quia oportet fidelem credere in omnibus sano palato et iudicio Ihesu nostri. Nec cecemur in isto, quod dominari sic seculariter sit licitum ac meritorium, ideo congruit clero nostro, quia sic purgare latrinas foret eis conveniens. Sed (si non fallor) facere illud officium foret clero minus inconsonum, quam sic dominari terrestribus, que Apostolus vocat stercora, cum nec foret Deo tantum displicens nec adeo ledens mentem. Ista pauca dixerim, alia recitative, alia reputative, assertive ad honorem matris ecclesie; unde super omnibus dictis meis in ista materia testem consciencie mee invoco Deum meum, quod intendo primo honorem et utilitatem sancte matris ecclesie: ad hoc enim obligatur strictissime ex mandato Domini quilibet christianus, cum quoddammodo infinite plus

The third, the real cause, is put thus: that this did not come about because, by so foolishly burdening the church with temporal goods, he had so damaged himself and the clergy; which loss, because he withdrew it from the [396]eastern church, [that church] therefore praises him. For they, like brethren of the propertyless state, praise God with jubilation.[8] Nor is it a colour, if such exercise of lordship or the world's glory seems precious to one fevered in mind, whose distempered affection has no taste for heavenly things, [for holding] that one must therefore so judge of it and of its opposite; for the faithful must believe in all things by the sound palate and judgement of our Jesus.[9] Nor let us be blinded in this, [arguing] that to lord it thus in secular fashion is lawful and meritorious, [and] therefore befits our clergy; for so cleaning latrines would be fitting for them. But (if I am not mistaken) to do that office would be less unbecoming to the clergy than so to lord it over earthly things, which the Apostle calls dung, since it would be neither so displeasing to God nor so hurtful to the mind.[10] These few things I have said, some by way of recital, some by estimation, [some] assertively, to the honour of mother church; hence over all my sayings in this matter I call upon my God as

debemus matrem illam diligere quam parentes carnales vel temporalia aut nosmet ipsos. Intendo secundo quod honor et profectus predicte femine stat principaliter in similitudine conversandi et sequendi sponsum ecclesie, excuciendo omnes tradiciones humanas extraneas que ab expedicione illius itineris retardarent. Et cum ista ambo sint articuli fidei christiane, que cuncti fideles ultra opinionem magnificare tenentur ac cum in mediis ad hunc finem contingit [397] multipliciter oberrare, intendo tercio et protestor quod docto per papam, per quodcumque membrum ecclesie vel aliquam creaturam quod erro in mediis, volo humillime ac paratissime revocare; unde ut procedam securius innitor fundamentaliter summo lapidi, qui est via, veritas et vita, domino Ihesu Christo, capiens testimonium a sanctis doctoribus, de quanto consonant legi sue. Alia vero ab istis tamquam tardativa vel contraria parvipendo; unde credo ut fidem ecclesie, quod quicumque non observat statum et legem quam Christus instituit, quam eciam in se et suis apostolis vita et verbo docuit et servavit, non sequitur Christum per artam viam, que ducit ad celum, sed incedit per latam viam, que ducit membrum dyaboli ad infernum.

witness of my conscience that I intend first the honour and utility of holy mother church: for to this every Christian is most strictly bound by the Lord's command, since in a certain manner we ought to love that mother infinitely more than carnal parents or temporal goods or our very selves.[11] I maintain secondly that the honour and advancement of the said lady stands principally in likeness of living and of following the bridegroom of the church, shaking off all extraneous human traditions that would hold [her] back from making that journey. And since both of these are articles of the Christian faith, which all the faithful are bound to magnify beyond opinion, and since in the means to this end it happens [397] in many ways to go astray, I maintain thirdly, and declare solemnly, that if it is shown by the pope, by any member of the church, or by any creature, that I err in the means, I am willing most humbly and most readily to revoke it.[12] Hence, to proceed more securely, I rely fundamentally on the chief stone, who is the way, the truth and the life, the Lord Jesus Christ, taking testimony from the holy doctors so far as they agree with his law. And other things besides these I make little of, as hindering or contrary; hence I believe, as the faith of the church, that whoever does not observe the state and law that Christ instituted, which he also taught and kept in himself and his apostles by life and word, does not follow Christ by the strait way that leads to heaven, but walks by the broad way that leads the member of the devil to hell.[13]

¶5 397.17–397.17

[397] Explicit tractatus de potestate pape Johannis W.

Here ends the treatise *On the Power of the Pope* of John W.[14]

Notes

1. The quotation of Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* II.7, runs on from the last part to *qui presunt* (Loserth's italics). *Arccioribus*, "the stricter", is the print and fits poorly; Gregory's text reads *a rectoribus summa cogitanda*, "higher things are to be thought on by the rulers" (PL 77, 39D), of which it is a corruption; for *summa* Wyclif has *celestia*. We translate the print.
2. *Ad contradictoria obligati*: bound to two incompatible things, to serve their benefactors more (for the gift) and less (since the gift blinds them). *Per ante*: "beforehand". The verb of *in toto illo eis proficere* is supplied from *tenebantur*. *Abhominabile dominis*: "to the lords", which we take as the endowed clergy themselves, now lords; *Domino*, "to the Lord", would read more easily, but print and apparatus agree on *dominis*.
3. Acts 6:2–4 (DR "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables").
4. The manuscripts read *patrimonium*; Loserth prints *patrimonii* (we translate the print). The manuscripts' margin: *Dotacionem sanctus Gregorius admittens non excusatur quin peccat venialiter*. *Philargiam* is the print's form. On Gregory's prayer for Trajan Loserth refers to Wyclif's *De ecclesia*, pp. 531–534.
5. Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* IV.26 (Rolls Series V, 148–150; Loserth: "Cf. Ranulphi Polychr. V, 148/9"); the print's chapter *CXII* is wrong. Higden ends the chapter *et Graeci festum faciunt de illo undecimo die Maii*, so Wyclif's *XI* is his source's; the Greek church in fact keeps Constantine and Helen on 21 May. The manuscripts' margin: *Constantinum magnum dotatorem quare non canonizat ecclesia*. A reads *sacrilepo* (395.17).
6. *Debuit dedisse*: "ought to have given"; medieval usage also allows "is supposed to have given", which would make the blasphemy the claim of the gift itself. Either way the half "kept back" is the half of the empire that the Donation did not give. *Morientes*: we supply "[so]", that is, without satisfaction.
7. *Alieno Cesari nimium sumptuosa*: we take it that honouring an emperor who is not the pope's would cost the pope too much in standing; the sense is doubtful. *Servum suum*: Constantine, counted the pope's servant. *Gracia pecunie*: "for the sake of money" (as the glossary *gracia concomitancie*).

8. We take the subject of *laudat* to be the eastern church: Constantine took the ruinous burden of endowment away from it (*subtraxit ab orientali ecclesia*), and for that it praises him. Loserth's side-note reads it otherwise, that he took the endowments from the eastern church. *Fratres de statu exproprietario* may glance at the friars, who profess to own nothing.
9. *Color*: a plausible ground, here for concluding from a fevered taste to the worth of the thing. *Discrasiata*: "distempered", the physicians' word.
10. Phil. 3:8 (DR "count them but as dung").
11. *Alia recitative, alia reputative, assertive*: a third *alia* seems lost before *assertive*, giving three modes (reported, estimated, asserted); we supply "[some]". Without it, *reputative, assertive* would be "by estimation, [yet] assertively". *Testem ... invoco Deum*: 2 Cor. 1:23 (DR "I call God to witness upon my soul"). *Intendo* is purpose here ("intend"); at its second and third use it states a thesis ("maintain").
12. The protestation, Wyclif's offer to retract if shown to err. The passage is in his *Protestationes* (Loserth: ed. C. Höfler, *Anna von Luxemburg*, Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie 20, 235–236 (Loserth: 147, presumably the offprint's page), from Prague Univ. XI E 3 = C). A in marg.: *Nota. Protestacio*. C reads *quia intendo primum* (396.19–20), *infinito* (23), *carnalia* (24); the manuscripts read *ac tamen* for *ac cum* (396.32). *In mediis*: the means to the end, not the middle terms of an argument.
13. *Summo lapidi*: 1 Pet. 2:6 (DR "a chief corner stone"); John 14:6; Matt. 7:13–14 (DR "strait is the way", "broad is the way"). C reads *retardancia* (397.9), *in suis* (12), *vite et racio* (13).
14. B reads *Wyk*. A (fol. 262, col. 2) adds a scribe's couplet, *Scriptoris cuncti memores sint ista legentes / atque precentur ei requiem iubilei* ("Let all who read these things be mindful of the scribe, and pray for him the rest of jubilee"), and a line in Czech, which Loserth renders *isto namque dignissimus est*, "for he is most worthy of it".

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 393: *non*
  - 394: *presunt* (print "qui presunt."; the main scan also lost qui (no row queued for it))
  - 394: *onus* (25 is the line number)
  - 394: *patrimonii*
  - 395: *dampnificaverat*
  - 396: *opposito*
  - 396: ∅ (s of the English side note (Wyclif's protest ...))
  - 396: *intendo* (print "quod intendo" ends the line above primo; the main scan lost intendo)
  - 396: *gloria* (print = gloria; box on vel)

Compendium

Part 1: The compendium, chapters one to seven

Loserth pp. 398.2–402.33

¶1 398.2–398.2

[398] **Sentencia libri ultimi in compendio sic habetur:**

The teaching of the last book is had in compendium thus:[1]

¶2 398.3–398.27

[398] **Capitulum primum premittens equivocacionem quadruplicem potestatis dividit ipsam, declarans quomodo ex scriptura non docetur, quod est potestas preter racionalis nature potenciam, et quomodo aliquid alterius subiacet potestati. Secundo descendendo ad divisionem Hugonis elicit descripcionem potestatis secularis et spiritualis et obiciendo dissolvit. Tercio principaliter arguitur quod superfluit ponere aliam potestatem preter liberum arbitrium, secundo quod potestas ordinis, cum nunc potest laxari et nunc restringi sufficit sine potestate regiminis vel iurisdicionis superaddita. Et tercio arguitur per hoc, quod creatura non cooperatur cum Deo comproducendo quantitatem indivisibilem in mente, quo tripliciter confirmat et respondet, quod potestas nunc accipitur simpliciter et nunc aggregative superaddita humana promulgacione autentica, et illam necesse est ponere post lapsum, quando Deus autenticat, et sic sunt multe potestates, que non fuissent in statu innocencie; secundo docet quomodo potest augeri vel minui, et tercio docet quid creatura coefficit cum Deo et quid non, et exponendo scripturas multiplices notat qualiter Christus tacuit, Joh. XIX tacendo doctrinas multiplices.**

The first chapter, setting out first a fourfold equivocation of power, divides it, declaring how it is not taught from scripture that there is a power besides the power of rational nature, and how one thing is subject to the power of another.[2] **Second, coming down to Hugh's division, it draws out a definition of secular and spiritual power, and, raising objections, resolves them.**[3] **Third, as a main head, it is argued that it is superfluous to posit another power besides free choice; second, that the power of order, since at one time it can be loosed and at another restricted, suffices without a power of rule or of jurisdiction added over it.**[4] **And third it is argued, by appeal to this, that a creature does not cooperate with God in co-producing an indivisible quantity in the mind; which it confirms in three ways, and it answers that power is taken at one time without qualification and at another aggregatively, with an authentic human promulgation added over it, and that this [power] must be posited after the fall, when God authenticates [it]; and so there are many powers which would not have been in the state of innocence.**[5] **Second, it teaches how [power] can be increased or diminished; and third it teaches what a creature co-effects with God and what not; and, expounding many scriptures, it notes how Christ was silent (John 19), by keeping silent [teaching] many doctrines.**[6]

¶3 399.1–399.18

[399] **Capitulum secundum obicit tripliciter et dissolvit, primo suadet tripliciter, quod nemo habet potestatem ad faciendum aliud nisi quod Deus intendit quod faciat, quod concedit declarans sensum, et quomodo potestas talis perditur ad non gradum. Secundo obiciens de potestate faciendi miracula ostendit quid est miraculum, et non potest creature ut talis competere, docet quomodo est de miraculis senciendum, secundo principaliter docet quomodo senciendum est de potestate spiritus sancti et gracie, et tercio diffuse declarat quomodo sacerdos non tollit peccata, sed dum fuerit conformis divino iudicio quodammodo remittit et absolvit hominem a peccato. Quarto declarat**

The second chapter raises objections in three ways and resolves them. First, it makes the case in three ways that no one has power to do anything other than what God intends that he do; which it grants, declaring the sense, and [it declares] how such power is lost to the point of no degree.[7] **Second, objecting about the power of working miracles, it shows what a miracle is, and [that it] cannot belong to a creature as such, [and] teaches how one should think about miracles. Second, as a main head, it teaches how one should think about the power of the Holy Spirit and of grace; and third it declares at length how a priest does not take away**

potestatem excomunicandi et puniendi subiectos, et quinto tractat de modo committendi potestates, de origine et perdicione earum et que sit alia maior.

sins, but, while he is conformed to the divine judgement, in a certain manner remits and absolves a man from sin. Fourth, it declares the power of excommunicating and punishing subjects; and fifth it treats of the manner of committing powers, of their origin and their loss, and which [power] is greater than another.

¶4 399.19–399.30

[399] Capitulum tercium probat via triplici, quod P. habuit primatum inter apostolos primo octuplici testimonio evangelii, et exponit, quomodo sathan expetivit ut cribraret apostolos. Secundo probat illud octuplici testimonio factorum Petri, et tercio octuplici testimonio sanctorum. Quarto vero narrando triplicem fructum huius sentencie declarat quod Petrus propter humilitatem in moribus constitutus est a Christo caput ecclesie, et declarando quomodo Petrus precellebat fide, humilitate et caritate, declarat quomodo Petrus Johanne magis dilexerat.

The third chapter proves in a threefold way that P[eter] had primacy among the apostles: first by an eightfold testimony of the gospel; and it expounds how Satan desired to sift the apostles.[8] Second, it proves it by an eightfold testimony of Peter's deeds, and third by an eightfold testimony of the saints. And fourth, recounting a threefold fruit of this teaching, it declares that Peter, for his humility in conduct, was appointed by Christ head of the church; and, declaring how Peter excelled in faith, humility and charity, it declares how Peter had loved more than John.[9]

¶5 399.31–401.27

[399] Capitulum quartum declarat primo quod Petrus non solum accepit illum primatum pro se ipso, sed pro eius vicariis succedentibus in ecclesia militante. Secundo declarat quod, sicut Petrus exhinc fuit per se Christi vicarius, quod suum [400] magistrum quoad actus et mores secutus fuit conformius, sic oportet P. vicarium similius sequi ipsum. Tercio docet, quod humana eleccio non valet, nisi de quanto promulgaverit conformiter ad divinam. Quarto quod precise de tanto debet subditus sequi suum privatum prepositum, de quanto ipse sequitur Ihesum nostrum. Quinto sive electores bene vel male elegerint operibus meritoriis est credendum, et quicumque modus noster eligendi prepositum fuerit eleccioni Dei conformior est eo melior, et obicit quadrupliciter et dissolvit, declarans quod de quatuor modis eligendi prepositum eleccio per sortem foret modo securior. Sexto notat, quod non docetur ex scriptura, quomodo preeminencia Petri super alios apostolos stat in universali iurisdicione super totam militantem ecclesiam, aut quod particularis potestas iurisdicionis debet esse in alios apostolos per illam potestatem ad locum et populum limitata. Capitulum quintum declarat quintupliciter sextam sentenciam, quod Romanus pontifex debet racione officii vicarii sequi Christum in altissima paupertate, et post obicit tripliciter et dissolvit. Primo per hoc quod papa non posset perficere suum officium nec honorifice tenere statum papalem sine tali dominio, et declarat oppositum per Bernhardum. Secundo obicit per hoc, quod multi sancti episcopi approbarunt dotacionem huiusmodi et dissolvit, declarans quantum malum contingit ex isto porismate, cum sequimur mixtim bona secundum racionem qua sunt

The fourth chapter declares, first, that Peter received that primacy not only for himself but for his vicars succeeding [him] in the church militant. Second, it declares that, as Peter was of himself the vicar of Christ on this ground, that he followed his [400] master more conformably in acts and conduct, so P[eter]'s vicar must follow him more closely.[10] Third, it teaches that human election is of no avail except in so far as it has promulgated in conformity with the divine [election]. Fourth, that a subject ought to follow his private superior precisely so far as he follows our Jesus.[11] Fifth, that, whether the electors have chosen well or ill, credence is to be given to meritorious works; and whichever of our ways of electing a superior is more conformed to God's election is by that the better; and it raises objections in four ways and resolves them, declaring that of the four ways of electing a superior, election by lot would now be the safer.[12] Sixth, it notes that it is not taught from scripture that Peter's preeminence over the other apostles consists in a universal jurisdiction over the whole church militant, or that a particular power of jurisdiction ought to be in the other apostles, limited by that power to a place and a people. The fifth chapter declares in five ways the sixth teaching, that the Roman pontiff ought, by reason of the office of vicar, to follow Christ in the highest poverty; and afterwards it raises objections in three ways and resolves them.[13] First, [it objects] by appeal to this, that the pope could not fulfil his office nor honourably maintain the papal state without such lordship; and it declares the opposite by Bernard.[14]

mala. Tercio obicit per hoc, quod est distinccio inter potestatem iurisdicionis et ordinis, eo quod solus papa habet potestatem super universalem ecclesiam; non enim est aliud proprium pape officium, et dissolvit, concedens distinccionem et negans [401] illam universalem potestatem et obiciendo tripliciter ex domino Ardmacano dissolvit, declarans quod Paulus non habuit a Petro sed a Christo licenciam predicandi, et concludit quod, sicut apostoli erant socii et amici, sic debet esse hodie, cum ditacio non dissolveret amiciciam, eo quod Christus non inveniret amicos inter nostros episcopos conversando et declarat in tribus conclusionibus pastoris officium. Capitulum sextum connectit cum declaracione septimam sentenciam et octavam, quarum prior dicit sic: Quod sicut nullus apostolorum habuit tantam potestatem quantam habuit Christus humanitus, sic nec omnis papa habuit tantam potestatem quantam habuit beatus Petrus vel alius Christi apostolus, et declarando utrumque membrum tripliciter obicit et dissolvit. Octava sentencia dicit quod Romano pontifice vel quocumque alio fingente se gerere primatum vicarie potestatis Christi in terris ab eius semita declinante secundum sensum scripture nullus plenius vel periculosius gerit nomen et opus Antichristi; quod probat ex condicionibus undecim, annectens materiam de quiditate et divisione status, quomodo componitur ex non quantis et, declarans quomodo status potest alterari, tangit quomodo subditus potest prelatum corripere et dissolvit.

Second, it objects by appeal to this, that many holy bishops approved an endowment of this kind; and it resolves it, declaring how much evil comes from this porism, when we follow mixed goods in the respect in which they are evil.[15] Third, it objects by appeal to this, that there is a distinction between the power of jurisdiction and [the power] of order, in that the pope alone has power over the universal church; for there is no other office proper to the pope; and it resolves it, granting the distinction and denying [401] that universal power; and, objecting in three ways out of the lord of Armagh, it resolves [the objections], declaring that Paul had his licence to preach not from Peter but from Christ;[16] and it infers that, as the apostles were companions and friends, so it ought to be today, since enrichment ought not to dissolve friendship, in that Christ, keeping company among our bishops, would [otherwise] not find friends; and it declares in three conclusions the office of a shepherd.[17] The sixth chapter joins together, with a declaration, the seventh teaching and the eighth, of which the former says thus: that, as none of the apostles had as much power as Christ had in his humanity, so neither has every pope had as much power as blessed Peter or another apostle of Christ had; and, declaring each member [of the comparison], it raises objections in three ways and resolves them.[18] The eighth teaching says that, when the Roman pontiff, or anyone else who feigns that he bears the primacy of Christ's vicarial power on earth, turns aside from his path, according to the sense of scripture no one bears more fully or more dangerously the name and work of Antichrist; which it proves from eleven conditions, annexing the matter of the quiddity and division of state, how it is composed of things without quantity; and, declaring how a state can be altered, it touches on how a subject can reprove a prelate, and resolves [the objection].[19]

¶6 401.28–402.33

[401] Capitulum septimum discurrit per illa octo argumenta, quibus probatur ex scriptura quod Petrus debet habere primatum super alios apostolos et per consequens papa super alios episcopos; primo igitur declarat quod primatus iste non infert dominacionem vel preeminenciam secularem, quod probat ex triplici testimonio Bernhardi, Augustini et Crysostomi. Secundo declarat [402] quod papa debet esse capitaneus, precedens in spirituali exercitu pacificando, et declarat quod est clavis ad sensum scripture et sanctorum doctorum. Tercio ostendit quomodo papa debet ambulare super aquas ad Dominum instar Petri, et exponit propheciam Apocalipsis XII de dracone stante ante mulierem parituram. Quarto exponit ad quadruplicem sensum quomodo Christi vicarius debet cum Petro se

The seventh chapter runs through those eight arguments by which it is proved from scripture that Peter ought to have primacy over the other apostles, and consequently the pope over the other bishops. First, then, it declares that this primacy does not imply exercise of lordship or secular preeminence, which it proves from a threefold testimony, of Bernard, Augustine and Chrysostom.[20] Second, it declares [402] that the pope ought to be a captain, going before in the spiritual army by making peace; and it declares that this is the key to the sense of scripture and of the holy doctors. Third, it shows how the pope ought to walk upon the waters to the Lord after the pattern of Peter; and it expounds the prophecy of Apocalypse 12 of the dragon standing before the woman "who was ready

mittere in mare. Quinto declarat quomodo papa debet vigilare cum Christo, et quod aliter est secundum Crysostomum Antichristus, et quomodo illud Matth. XXIV: Multi venient in nomine meo, dicentes quia ego sum Christus, verificatur de falsis Christi vicariis et quomodo regna istis papis concertantibus racionabiliter responderent, et quomodo pastores ex dicto beati Gregorii periculosius maculant gregem Dei. Sexto declarat prelati periculum ex dictis Lyncolniensis et quod foret remedium, et quomodo CLIII magni pisces signant totam ecclesiam Christi, et quomodo papa niteretur facere similiter. Septimo declaratur superioritas pape per hoc, quod in prima synodo, de qua Act. XV, primo sentenciavit pro libertate ecclesie, in quo sunt tria pape diligencius annotanda, sicut et ex precepcione Christi Matth. XVIII in qua correpcio fraterna singulariter Petro precipitur. Octavo docetur quomodo papa debet preeminenter amare Christi ecclesiam et stare pro privilegio vite exproprietarie quod Christus iniunxerat et describendo vitam exproprietariam probat tripliciter quod nemo habet a Deo potestatem clericos degradandi.

to be delivered".[21] Fourth, it expounds in a fourfold sense how the vicar of Christ ought with Peter to "cast himself into the sea".[22] Fifth, it declares how the pope ought to watch with Christ, and that otherwise, according to Chrysostom, he is Antichrist; and how that [word] of Matthew 24, "Many will come in my name saying, I am Christ", is verified of the false vicars of Christ; and how kingdoms would reasonably respond while these popes contend with one another; and how shepherds, from the saying of blessed Gregory, more dangerously stain the flock of God.[23] Sixth, it declares the danger of a prelate from the sayings of Lincoln, and that there would be a remedy; and how the 153 great fishes signify the whole church of Christ, and how the pope should strive to do likewise.[24] Seventh, the superiority of the pope is declared by appeal to this, that in the first synod, of which Acts 15 [tells], he first pronounced for the liberty of the church, in which there are three things for the pope to note more diligently; as also from the command of Christ in Matthew 18, in which fraternal correction is enjoined on Peter singly.[25] Eighth, it is taught how the pope ought preeminently to love Christ's church and to stand for the privilege of the propertyless life which Christ had enjoined; and, describing the propertyless life, it proves in three ways that no one has from God the power of degrading clerics.

Notes

1. ***Sentencia***: "teaching", the position taught (CONTEXTUAL; not a judicial sentence). ***Libri ultimi***: "of the last book", presumably this treatise as the last of a series in which it was copied; the heading Loserth prints is ***Sentencia libri in compendio***. What follows is a medieval summary, chapter by chapter, in the third person ("it declares", the chapter being the subject).
2. ***Potencia*** is CONTEXTUAL. Here, as at 2.4 in ch. 1, it is the power of rational nature (free choice), not Aristotle's analysis of potency, so "power". The clause says that scripture teaches no ***potestas*** beyond that ***potencia***, and the treatise uses the two words interchangeably.
3. Hugh of St Victor's division of power into secular and spiritual, ***De sacramentis*** II.2.4 (PL 176, 418A–B), which the treatise quotes in ch. 1, p. 7. ***Obiciendo dissolvit***: literally "by objecting resolves", the compendium's recurring formula for raising objections and answering them.
4. ***Nunc ... nunc***: "at one time ... at another".
5. ***Quo tripliciter confirmat***: the relative ***quo*** has no fitting antecedent; we take it as "which [argument] it confirms in three ways" (as if ***quod***). ***Superaddita*** agrees with ***potestas***: power taken "aggregatively" is the natural power together with an authentic human promulgation added over it.
6. John 19:9 (DR "But Jesus gave him no answer"), Christ's silence before Pilate. ***Tacendo doctrinas multiplices***: we supply "teaching"; the gerund may also mean "by keeping silent about many doctrines".
7. ***Perditur ad non gradum***: "lost to the point of no degree", i.e. lost wholly.
8. Luke 22:31 (DR "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat"). The manuscripts read ***et expetivit*** (Loserth's apparatus, 399.22); the print drops ***et***. At 399.29 A writes ***P.*** where the print has ***Petrus***.
9. John 21:15 (DR "lovest thou me more than these?"). ***Johanne*** is an ablative of comparison: Peter loved [Christ] more than John did. ***Constitutus est ... caput ecclesie***: the compendium's words for the treatise's ch. 3; they are translated as they stand.
10. ***Exhinc ... quod***: "on this ground, that". ***P. vicarium***: "Peter's vicar". ***Sequi ipsum***: "follow him", most likely Christ (the ***magistrum*** just named), possibly Peter.
11. ***Privatum prepositum***: one's own particular superior; ***privatus*** may also carry the sense of ***religio privata***, a superior of a private religion.
12. The print's ***persortem foretmodo*** is read ***per sortem foret modo***, "by lot would now be". ***Securior***: "safer".
13. ***Sextam sentenciam***: the sixth of the numbered teachings the treatise sets out, stated here in the ***quod*** clause; the seventh and eighth follow in ch. 6.
14. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** IV.3.6 (PL 182, 776A: ***In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino***), quoted in the treatise's ch. 5 at 86–87.

15. *Mixtim bona*: goods mixed [with evil]; *secundum racionem qua sunt mala*, "in the respect in which they are evil", i.e. following the endowing saints in what was evil in their act.
16. Richard FitzRalph, *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum* VII.6–7 (Paris 1512, scan p. 100); the compendium names no book. The three are those answered in the treatise's ch. 5 (96.21–99): that someone must rule as head, that much was said to Peter alone (Matt. 16:19), and that Paul had his charge of the gentiles from Peter (Gal. 2:9; FitzRalph VII.7: *paulus gentem certam in suam curam ... de voluntate petri accepit*). On Paul's commission, cf. Gal. 1:1 (DR "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ").
17. *Cum ditacio non dissolveret amiciciam*: the print has *non* (plate checked). We translate it as printed, taking the subjunctive as "ought not to dissolve", and *eo quod ... non inveniret* as the reason: else Christ, keeping company among our bishops, would find no friends.
18. *Nec omnis papa*: "neither has every pope", i.e. not every pope, not "no pope". *Membrum*: each limb of the comparison, not a member of the church.
19. The ablatives *Romano pontifice ... declinante* are absolute: "when the Roman pontiff ... turns aside". They may instead be of comparison after *plenius ... periculosius*: "no one ... bears more fully or more dangerously the name and work of Antichrist than the Roman pontiff ... turning aside from his path". *Quiditas*: "quiddity", what a thing is. *Status* is the state of a man (of disposition, of virtue) that ch. 6 analyses; *ex non quantis*, "of things without quantity".
20. Bernard, *De consideratione* II.6.10–13 and III.1.2 (PL 182, 748–49, 759), and Augustine, *Sermo* 67.7 (PL 38, 436), in the treatise's reply to the first argument (ch. 7, 135–138); Chrysostom, hom. 5 on 1 Timothy, follows in the reply to the second (139.31). The print's semicolon after *Bernhardi* is read as a comma.
21. Matt. 14:29 (DR "walked upon the water to come to Jesus"); Apoc. 12:4 (DR "the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered").
22. John 21:7 (DR "cast himself into the sea").
23. Matt. 26:38 (DR "watch with me"). Matt. 24:5: Vulgate *Multi enim venient ... dicentes: Ego sum Christus*; Wyclif lacks *enim* and has recitative *quia*. Chrysostom, hom. 8 on 2 Tim. 3:1, cited in the treatise's ch. 7 at 148; Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* I.2 (PL 77, 15D–16B), cited in the treatise's ch. 7 at 151. *Istis papis concertantibus* is absolute, "while these popes contend": the rival popes of the schism of 1378, Urban VI at Rome and Clement VII at Avignon, as in the treatise's ch. 7 (149: *nunc papa sit Rome, nunc quod papa sit Avinione*; P13a-7).
24. Lincoln: Robert Grosseteste, letter to Hugh of Pateshull (ed. Luard, p. 99), quoted in the treatise's ch. 7 at 152. John 21:11 (DR "great fishes, one hundred and fifty-three"). *Quod foret remedium*: "that there would be a remedy"; *quid*, "what the remedy would be", is possible. *Facere similiter*: as Peter drew the net to land.
25. Acts 15:7. The subject of *sentenciavit* is Peter, unexpressed. Matt. 18:15–22: the command to reprove a brother, and Peter's question on forgiving (18:21).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 398: ∅ (print has nothing between Sentencia and libri ("Sentencia libri ultimi in compendio"); the other scans were wrong) [GAP]
  - 398: *creatura* (hyphenated crea-|tura (25 line number); main token holds the whole word)
  - 399: *illum*
  - 400: *Primo*
  - 400: ∅ (main scan already holds ecclesiam whole (eccle-|siam) at pos 220)
  - 400: ∅ (main scan already holds "et negans" (pos 232–233) and "illam universalem potestatem" opening p. 401)
  - 401: *quod probat* (one main token covers two printed words)
  - 401: *illa*
  - 402: *nomine*
  - 402: *sum* (print "ego sum Christus" (italic m, not nt))
  - 402: *concertantibus* (hyphenated concertan-|tibus (15 line number); main token holds the whole word)
  - 402: ∅ (folio bar after privilegio (264ª in margin) read as i)
  - 399: *Johanne* (capital J; line number 30 glued)
  - 401: *Capitulum* (specks before C; line number 10 glued)
- Translation: *persortem foretmodo* (400) translated as *per sortem foret modo* (note 12); no Latin altered.

Part 2: The compendium, chapters eight to eleven (breaks off)

Loserth pp. 402.34–406.10

¶1 402.34–403.23

[402]Capitulum octavum declarat primo de nomine pape, quomodo inolevit, secundo declarat tripliciter [403]quod non propter capitalitatem Rome oportet generaliter eius episcopum esse papam. Tercio probat tripliciter quod non propter mutuum iuvamen cleri et milicie oportet papam esse cum cesare, et convincit triplici testimonio mendacium, fingens quod non a cesare sed Christo vel Petro ecclesia est dotata. Quarto probat tripliciter, quod non ex loci sanctitate

The eighth chapter declares, first, about the name of pope, how it grew up; second, it declares in three ways [403]that it is not on account of Rome's capital standing that its bishop must as a rule be pope.[1] Third, it proves in three ways that it is not on account of the mutual help of the clergy and the knighthood that the pope must be with Caesar; and it convicts by a threefold testimony the lie that feigns that the church

oportet Romanum pontificem esse papam. Quinto tollit tripliciter secundum fucum, quo fingitur quod per institucionem Petri Clemens et generaliter Romani pontifices forent pape. Sexto tollitur tripliciter tercia ficticia, qua fingitur quod eleccione humana oportet Romanum pontificem esse papam. Septimo narrat ex cronicis quomodo regula et preeminencia pape originabatur a cesare et irreligiose ac fraudulenter continuabatur a brachio seculari. Octavo narrat tres condiciones Antichristi ex testimonio Augustini. Nono narrat quomodo tres pape occisi sunt a beatis et tercius papatu deposito gloriose occiditur a tyranno. Decimo narrando pericula Romani pontificis exponit quomodo debemus tempus redimere.

was endowed not by Caesar but by Christ or Peter.[2] Fourth, it proves in three ways that it is not from the holiness of the place that the Roman pontiff must be pope. Fifth, it removes in three ways the second pretence, by which it is feigned that by Peter's institution Clement, and the Roman pontiffs generally, would be popes. Sixth, the third fiction is removed in three ways, by which it is feigned that by human election the Roman pontiff must be pope. Seventh, it recounts from the chronicles how the rule and preeminence of the pope took its origin from Caesar, and was continued irreligiously and fraudulently by the secular arm. Eighth, it recounts three conditions of Antichrist from the testimony of Augustine.[3] Ninth, it recounts how three popes were slain by the blessed, and the third, having laid down the papacy, is gloriously slain by a tyrant.[4] Tenth, recounting the perils of the Roman pontiff, it expounds how we ought to "redeem the time".[5]

¶2 403.24–404.10

[403] Capitulum nonum declarat primo quomodo erit necessario unus papa, et declarat tripliciter, quomodo ritus eligendi papam cesaree introductus est nocivus ecclesie: primo racione novelli et infundabilis cetus cardinalium, secundo per hoc quod non licet recedere a ritu quem Christus instituit, in quo declarat sextupliciter quod idem est episcopus et sacerdos, et tercio per hoc quod occasione eleccionis officium predicandi suspenditur, in quo narrando de quantitate potestatis episcopi declarat primo quam vanum est pompare de preeminencia huiusmodi potestatis, secundo [404] quod stul tum est pompare de dignitate status, et tercio quod non est pompacio ex titulo sanctitatis, et exponens diffuse descripcionem sextuplicem pseudochristi ex epistola Yude exponit tripliciter quid dicit Crysostomus de primatu, et confirmando per legem triplicem quod humana eleccio non facit membrum ecclesie, inculcat quomodo sedes mutantur, quomodo oportet adorare Deum in spiritu et veritate et quomodo abhominacio desolacionis catholice potest intelligi.

The ninth chapter declares, first, how there will of necessity be one pope; and it declares in three ways how the rite of electing a pope, introduced in caesarean fashion, is harmful to the church: first, by reason of the novel college of cardinals, which is without foundation; second, by appeal to this, that it is not lawful to depart from the rite which Christ instituted, in which it declares in six ways that bishop and priest are the same; and third, by appeal to this, that by occasion of the election the office of preaching is suspended; in which, recounting the extent of a bishop's power, it declares, first, how vain it is to boast of the preeminence of such power; second, [404] that it is foolish to boast of the dignity of [one's] state; and third, that there is no [ground for] boasting from a title of holiness.[6] And, expounding at length the sixfold definition of a false christ from the epistle of Jude, it expounds in three ways what Chrysostom says of the primacy;[7] and, confirming by a threefold law that human election does not make a member of the church, it impresses how sees are changed, how one "must adore" God "in spirit and in truth", and how the "abomination of desolation" can be understood in a catholic sense.[8]

¶3 404.12–405.22

[404] Capitulum decimum arguit sextupliciter contra dicta: primo per hoc, quod sine tali dominio non sufficeret quis ad papale officium, et narrando cronicam de irregulari peticione subsidii cuiusdam pape de ecclesia Anglicana respondet detegendo versuciam. Secundo obicit per hoc quod papa habet illum primatum immediate a Deo, ut allegat decretum XXII distinccione; et respondet declarans quomodo

The tenth chapter argues in six ways against what has been said: first, by appeal to this, that without such lordship no one would suffice for the papal office; and, recounting a chronicle of a certain pope's irregular petition for a subsidy from the English church, it answers by exposing the cunning.[9] Second, it objects by appeal to this, that the pope has that primacy immediately from God, as it alleges the Decretum, distinction

papa ex dotacione insolubiliter involvitur et quomodo papa excidit a privilegio conferendi dignitates ecclesie per hoc quod preficit indignos, et tercio narrans de absolucione a pena et a culpa declarat quomodo in isto credi debet doctoribus, et obiciendo dissolvit. Tercio obicit principaliter per hoc quod multi sancti episcopi et seculares approbarunt dotacionem cesaream; et respondet, dicens quod in hoc peccaverant plus vel minus; ideo cum solus Christus vel christianus secundum racionem qua sequitur Christum est sequendus patet, quod non sequitur, si sancti qui peccaverunt continue sic fecerunt, tunc in hoc est licitum sequi illos, et respondet ad obiectum quo fingitur quod sancti non penituerunt de isto delicto, et ad obiectum [405]quo fingitur quod melius foret corrigere cleri cupidinem, et declarat primo quomodo debemus in Deo confidere, secundo quomodo Deus dat dupliciter bona sua et tercio quomodo est dare duplicem clericorum ordinem, scilicet cesareum et divinum, Quartum argumentum tangit de iuramento facto Romane ecclesie et dissolvens tangit perplexitatem ecclesie atque remedium istorum paparum. Quintum argumentum obicit per decretum Jeronymi de excellencia Romane ecclesie, et declarans quid est Romana ecclesia docet quod Jeronymus credibiliter et reputative locutus est, et narrando de novellis heresibus et fatuis earum inposicionibus ponit quid est et qualiter senciendum de istis papis. Sextum argumentum est dictum floridis Lynconiensis de preeminencia pape et cardinalium quod primo exponit, secundo docet tripliciter quod non est tam necessarius articulus fidei credere isti pape, in quo declarat quid est fides. Tercio probat tripliciter quod licet subditis papam corripere; et tollit obiectum triplicem.

22; and it answers, declaring how the pope is inextricably entangled by the endowment, and how the pope falls from the privilege of conferring the dignities of the church by the fact that he sets the unworthy over [it]; and third, recounting [the matter] of absolution from penalty and from fault, it declares how in this the doctors ought to be believed; and, raising objections, it resolves them.[10] Third, as a main head, it objects by appeal to this, that many holy bishops and seculars approved the caesarean endowment; and it answers, saying that in this they had sinned more or less. Therefore, since Christ alone, or a Christian in the respect in which he follows Christ, is to be followed, it is clear that it does not follow: "if the saints who sinned did so continually, then in this it is lawful to follow them".[11] And it answers the objection by which it is feigned that the saints did not repent of this offence, and the objection [405]by which it is feigned that it would be better to correct the greed of the clergy; and it declares, first, how we ought to trust in God; second, how God gives his goods in two ways; and third, how one may posit a twofold order of clerics, namely the caesarean and the divine.[12] The fourth argument touches on the oath made to the Roman church; and, resolving it, it touches on the perplexity of the church and the remedy for these popes.[13] The fifth argument objects by appeal to the decree of Jerome on the excellence of the Roman church; and, declaring what the Roman church is, it teaches that Jerome spoke credibly and by estimation; and, recounting the novel heresies and their foolish impositions, it sets out what is [the case] and how one should think about these popes.[14] The sixth argument is the saying of Lincoln, from the *Flores*, on the preeminence of the pope and the cardinals; which it first expounds; second, it teaches in three ways that to believe this pope is not so necessary an article of faith, in which it declares what faith is.[15] Third, it proves in three ways that it is lawful for subjects to reprove the pope; and it removes a threefold objection.

¶4 405.23–405.32

[405]Capitulum undecimum obicit primo per hoc quod de lege nature et lege veteri oportet unicum esse rectorem principalem ecclesie, et dissolvit concedendo conclusionem. Sed pro materia docet primo quomodo necesse est esse papam cesareum, et distinguens de duplici peccato ordinis, adducit triplex testimonium Bernhardi qualis debeat esse papa, et describens sacerdotem cesareum, dicit quod foret expediens ecclesie nullum talem esse.

The eleventh chapter objects, first, by appeal to this, that by the law of nature and the old law there must be one sole principal ruler of the church; and it resolves it by granting the conclusion. But as to the matter, it teaches, first, how it is necessary that there be a caesarean pope; and, distinguishing a twofold sin of order, it adduces a threefold testimony of Bernard as to what the pope ought to be; and, describing the caesarean priest, it says that it would be expedient for the church that there be none such.[16]

¶5 405.33–406.10

[405]Et obiciendo contra descripcionem datam de papa, declarat quomodo oportet rite electum ab homine a Deo preeligi, et declarat tripliciter quomodo [406]turpatur argucia concludendo eleccionem pape cesarei ex elleccione summi sacerdotis veteris testamenti, primo racione libertatis ecclesie, qua legalia cessare debuerant, secundo quomodo potestates ordinum in cunctis sacerdotibus sunt equales, et tercio quomodo potestas iurisdicionis racionabiliter restringi poterat et tam restringi quam laxari irracionabiliter ad onus ecclesie, secundo principaliter arguit per hoc quod ex officiis et ornamentis sacerdotum

And, objecting against the definition given of the pope, it declares how one duly elected by man must be pre-elected by God; and it declares in three ways how [406]the quibble is disgraced that infers the election of the caesarean pope from the election of the high priest of the old testament: first, by reason of the liberty of the church, by which the legal precepts ought to have ceased; second, how the powers of orders are equal in all priests; and third, how the power of jurisdiction could reasonably be restricted, and could be both restricted and loosed unreasonably, to the burden of the church. Second, as a main head, it argues by appeal to this, that from the offices and ornaments of the priests ...[17]

Notes

1. The subject throughout is the chapter ("it declares"). ***Generaliter***: "as a rule", i.e. in every case. ***Capitalitas***: Rome's standing as capital city.
2. ***Mendacium, fingens***: the nominative participle has no fitting noun; we take it with ***mendacium***, "the lie that feigns" (as ***quo fingitur*** below). The print has no stop before ***Quarto***.
3. Augustine, ***Sermo*** 129 on John 5 (***De verbis Domini*** 45 in Wyclif's numbering; PL 38, 720–25), from which the treatise's ch. 8 draws its testimonies to Antichrist's disciples (187–189; P13b-1).
4. ***Occisi sunt a beatis***: "slain by the blessed", i.e. by saints, as the treatise tells it (ch. 8, 190–191): Sabinian, struck down in a vision by Gregory (Higden, ***Polychronicon*** V, 412), and Innocent IV, struck by the dead Grosseteste (Higden VIII, 240–42), whom Wyclif excuses of irregularity ***ex percussione letali summorum pontificum***. The third is Marcellinus, who laid down the papacy and was martyred under Diocletian (Decretum D.21 c.7 ***Nunc autem***).
5. Eph. 5:16 (DR "redeeming the time, because the days are evil").
6. ***Cesaree introductus***: "introduced in caesarean fashion", i.e. by the emperor's order, the ***cesareus*** family (pejorative). ***Occasione eleccionis***: the occasion, not the cause. ***Quantitate potestatis***: the extent, not a measured quantity.
7. Jude 12–13 (DR "clouds without water ... trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead"), the figures of the false teachers. Pseudo-Chrysostom, ***Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum***, hom. 35 on Matt. 20:27 (PG 56, 829–30; Wyclif's "Homily 28"), quoted in the treatise's ch. 9 at 210–213. For ***ex epistola*** (404.4) B appears to read ***et epistola***; the print is followed.
8. John 4:24 (DR "they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth"); John 4:21 on the place of worship may lie behind ***sedes mutantur***. Matt. 24:15 (DR "the abomination of desolation"). ***Catholice***: "in a catholic sense".
9. The manuscripts read ***irregularia***; Loserth prints ***irregulari*** (apparatus 404.15). The chronicle is the ***Flores historiarum***, s.a. 1226 (ed. Luard, II, 184): the nuncio Otto's letters asking a subsidy of the English church, as told in the treatise's ch. 10 at 223–224. ***Detegere***: "expose".
10. ***Ut allegat decretum***: we take ***decretum*** as the object, "as it cites the Decretum", the objection being the subject; "as the decree alleges" is possible. Gratian, ***Decretum*** D. 22 c. 2 ***Sacrosancta*** (Anacletus, Pseudo-Isidore: ***non ab apostolis sed ab ipso Domino primatum obtinuit***; PL 187, 123A–124A), the canon the treatise's ch. 10 cites at 228 (modern form ours; P13b-5). ***A pena et a culpa***: the formula of the plenary indulgence.
11. The print's ***patet; quod non sequitur;*** is read as one clause, ***patet quod non sequitur***: what does not follow is the inference that follows the colon. ***Secundum racionem qua***: "in the respect in which".
12. ***Est dare***: the scholastic "one may posit", "there is to be granted". ***Ordo cesareus / divinus***: the caesarean / divine order of clerics.
13. ***Remedium istorum paparum***: the genitive may be objective, "the remedy for (against) these popes", or subjective, "the remedy these popes offer"; we take the first.
14. Jerome in the Decretum, C. 24 q. 1 c. 14 (***Haec est fides***, PL 187, 1269B; under Jerome's name, though the text is Pelagius' ***Libellus fidei***), cited in the treatise's ch. 10 at 250. ***Reputative***: "by estimation", as opposed to by revelation.
15. ***Floridis***: Loserth, "Rectius: Florum Historiarum. Vide supra p. 223", i.e. the ***Flores historiarum***, the chronicle the treatise names at 223. But the treatise draws Lincoln's saying on the pope and the cardinals from Grosseteste's own letters 36 and 35 (ed. Luard, pp. 125, 123), and at 258–259 says he flattered the pope ***verbis floridis***, "with flowery words", just before ***tam necessarius articulus fidei***. ***Dictum floridis*** may rather echo that phrase, "the flowery saying" (as if ***floridum***); we keep Loserth's correction.
16. ***Sed*** is adversative here: the chapter grants the conclusion but turns to its own matter. Bernard, ***De consideratione*** IV.7.23, II.7.15 and III.1.1–2 (PL 182, 788A, 750C, 758B–C), the three passages quoted in the treatise's ch. 11 at 266–268. ***Quomodo necesse est***: "how", i.e. in what sense, it is necessary.
17. The compendium breaks off here. B: ***sacerdotum etc. Cetera desunt***, "the rest is wanting" (apparatus 406.10).

How the Latin of this passage was established

- Plate readings; page · reading · note):
  - 404: ***stul*** (stul | tum split by folio bar (264^{b} in margin), not a hyphen; this part only)

- **404: *illum***
- **404: *Tercio* (25 is the line number)**
- **405: *debeat* (hyphenated de-|beat (30 line number); main token holds the whole word)**
- **406: *elleccione* (print has double l (elleccione), kept as printed) [NW]**

- **Translation: *estpompare* (403) translated as *est pompare*; *stul tum* (404) as *stultum*; *floridis* (405.16) translated by Loserth's correction; no Latin altered.**

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).