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. English translation.
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.

Page numbers in the text, such as [4], mark the pages of the printed Latin edition, so a passage can be cited and found. Notes are footnotes.

Contents

Chapter 1 9
Part 1: What power is, and the senses of the word 9
Part 2: Spiritual and secular power, after Hugh of St Victor . 15
Part 3: Spiritual power redefined: of order and in common .. 19
Part 4: The divisions of power, and five objections to multiplying them 22
Part 5: Power given from above: the answers, and Christ before Pilate 26
Chapter 2 32
Part 1: Idle priests, the shrinking of power, and miracles 32
Part 2: No man gives the Spirit, takes away sin, or punishes beyond God 36
Part 3: How the apostles were made priests, and the order of powers 42
Part 4: The nine gifts: prophets, doctors, the second and third hierarchies, the body 47
Part 5: Body and church compared; power lost by mortal sin .52
Chapter 3 55
Part 1: Peter's primacy: the sifting, the faith that fails not, the order of the names 55
Part 2: Peter's primacy: the rock, the keys, and the gospel's figures 59
Part 3: Peter's primacy: the mystical sense, Peter's acts after the Ascension, and the witness of the saints 63
Part 4: Peter's faith, the first of his three virtues 68
Part 5: Peter's humility and charity 71
Chapter 4 76
Part 1: The vicar of Peter and what election is worth 76
Part 2: Election by lot, the apostles and Matthias 80
Part 3: Chrysostom on the lot; the hereditary priesthood 84
Part 4: Many bishops over one people 87
Part 5: The apostles had no recourse to Peter 91
Chapter 5 96
Part 1: The chief vicar must live without property 96

Part 2: Charity would leave civil lordship to the laity 99
Part 3: Objections from the papal dignity and from the saints who approved endowment 102
Part 4: Lawful use, the more perfect state, and the likeness of Peter's vicar 105
Part 5: The saints' venial fault, and the powers of order and of jurisdiction 110
Part 6: The keys given for the church, Paul's licence from God, and three conclusions 114
Chapter 6 121
Part 1: The seventh teaching: no apostle had Christ's human power, nor every pope an apostle's 121
Part 2: The apostles' powers and the authority of scripture . 125
Part 3: The decretals are not scripture; the apostles' equal authority 129
Part 4: The power of order and the gentile name of authority 133
Part 5: The eighth teaching: antichrist, and the first six conditions of the pseudo-pope 137
Part 6: The seventh to eleventh conditions of the pseudo-pope 142
Part 7: The pseudo-pope's sophistries: what a state is 146
Part 8: States: whether a man's state is changed by sin 150
Part 9: The duty of reproving superiors 155
Chapter 7 158
Part 1: Peter's preeminence lies in service, not lordship 158
Part 2: The keys are power and knowledge, given to every priest 162
Part 3: Peter on the waters: the dragon, the ship and the propertyless way 166
Part 4: A fourth sense: riches make the mind giddy 171
Part 5: The fifth argument: the watchful vicar and the two who say they are popes 172
Part 6: The sixth argument: Peter's second fishing and the 153 fishes 177

Part 7: The seventh argument: Peter at the council and how a vicar should correct 183
Part 8: The eighth confirmation: the propertyless state of the clergy 186
Chapter 8 192
Part 1: The name "pope", and the reason from Rome as capital 192
Part 2: The lie of Christ's lordship, and the holiness of the place 197
Part 3: No man can elect the highest pontiff 202
Part 4: Two elections: how the name of pope arose 204
Part 5: Rival popes from the chronicle of Ralph de Diceto . 210
Part 6: The rival popes and the signs of antichrist 214
Part 7: Antichrist seeks glory from men; popes struck down 218
Part 8: Redeeming the time 222
Chapter 9 226
Part 1: Human election does not make a pope 226
Part 2: The poison of endowment; presbyter and bishop once the same 230
Part 3: No middle order; election and the boast of the keys . 234
Part 4: The blind quibble of the keys; pride of order and the narrow way 239
Part 5: Holiness of life: Jude's six marks of the proud 242
Part 6: The wandering stars, and the primacy not to be sought 245
Part 7: Human election, the Roman church, and the conditional law 249
Part 8: The dignity of sees, worship in spirit, and the abomination of desolation 254
Chapter 10 259
Part 1: The objection that the pope must be the mightiest lord 259
Part 2: The plea of papal poverty and Otto's demand 260
Part 3: Primacy from the Lord, the submission of kingdoms, the doctors 265

Part 4: The donation of Constantine and the caesarean jurisdiction 269
Part 5: The argument from what the community believes, and a third rejoinder for the endowment 273
Part 6: The answer: the saints who approved the endowment sinned 275
Part 7: Cutting the root of cupidity; the caesarean order not needed for salvation 280
Part 8: The schism and the oaths of obedience 286
Part 9: Jerome's Roman church is the race of the predestinate 290
Part 10: The king charged with heresy, and Lincoln on the cardinals 294
Part 11: New articles of faith: no one must believe the pope is pope 298
Part 12: May the pope be reproved? three arguments answered 302
Chapter 11 308
Part 1: Order in the priesthood, and Bernard against papal lordship 308
Part 2: The caesarean priest and the disciple of Christ; Christ the one prince of priests 312
Part 3: The Virgin, a woman, a layman as pope; the old priesthood no ground for primacy 315
Part 4: Sacramental power equal in all priests; episcopal rites and vestments 319
Part 5: The vestments of the priesthood: girdle, breeches, inner tunic, superhumeral 324
Part 6: The pontiff's vestments: rational, mitre, golden plate, bells, and what they figure 328
Part 7: The priest's six vestments, and signs become false ... 332
Part 8: The prelates' ornaments perverted; the third argument, from order 336
Part 9: Custom, human tradition and the law of God; no secular gradation in the clergy 340

Part 10: Clerical dignity in poverty; Gregory refuses the name "universal"; an argument for the caesarean order 345
Part 11: Sin profits the church by accident; simple priests supply when prelates fail 349
Part 12: Lay baptism, the woman pope, and confession beyond necessity 355
Part 13: All the holy are priests; the two orders of the apostles 359
Chapter 12 366
Part 1: The church can do without a caesarean pope 366
Part 2: The abomination of desolation in the holy place 370
Part 3: Augustine on Antichrist; four degrees of belief 374
Part 4: Not every pope antichrist; canonization a matter of opinion 379
Part 5: The wicked prelate worse than the devil; two heads, two clergies 381
Part 6: The caesarean clergy, Judas's field, and Jesus as patron 383
Part 7: The law of christ suffices for the church without men's laws 389
Part 8: The saints against the laws of men; the sext's rule on rival provisions 394
Part 9: Causes, benefices and the dangers of papal provision 397
Part 10: Provisions, elections and the stipends of failing superiors 402
Part 11: Excommunication for withheld tithes, the schism, and alms against rents 406
Part 12: The minister's stipend and the people's withholding of tithes 410
Part 13: The pope must be the holiest of wayfarers 415
Part 14: The papacy is service, and the name of pope is equivocal 419
Part 15: The Franciscan pope, insignia, and the propertyless state 423

Part 16: The king's justice: the twenty-two conditions of a king 428
Part 17: The king must rule his clergy first; the clergy's ornaments 432
Part 18: Dispensations: the pope only promulgates what God allows 436
Part 19: The pope and heresy; the first six of the twelve abuses 441
Part 20: The seventh to twelfth abuses: prayer, burdens, appointments, indulgences, captains, earthly cares 446
Part 21: The endowed bound to contradictories; why Constantine is not canonized; the protestation 450
Compendium 455
Part 1: The compendium, chapters one to seven 455
Part 2: The compendium, chapters eight to eleven (breaks off) 460
Glossary 465
The church 465
Lordship, law, office 467
Logic, disputation, metaphysics 470
False friends and ordinary words that mislead 475

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.***

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]

For power is the universal instrument of working and of communicating in this matter. And power is defined by Aristotle, *Meta-*

[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.

physics V, as that which "is the principle of motion or change either in another or in so far 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.

And although what is transformed in these cases is not another

[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).

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]**

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."

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 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

[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".

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.

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**

[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.

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 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**

[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).

equivocations of powers must be carefully noted, according to what pertains to the matter under discussion.

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

Loserth pp. 5.22–9.10

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 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**

[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.

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

[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.

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.

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

[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 ...").

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]

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.

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.

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,

[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".

as is clear in chapter 5 of this [treatise].[17]

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

Loserth pp. 9.11–11.32

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

[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).

[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.

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.

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 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

[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.

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]

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]

[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*.

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

Loserth pp. 12.1–16.21

"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 not have the power of

[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.

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

[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.

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.

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

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]

[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.

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 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**

[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).**

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.

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

Loserth pp. 16.22–21.31

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**

[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*.

[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).

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.

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**

[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 ...".

be attributed, but [a part] of the 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]

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.

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**

[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).**

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 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

[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).

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]**

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]

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]

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

[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".

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 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]

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]

[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*.**

Chapter 2

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

Loserth pp. 22.2–26.8

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]

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]

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]

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]

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

[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".

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]

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]

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]

[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".

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.

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 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.

[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.**

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**

[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.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 26.9–32.8

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

[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*.

[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*.

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

[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.

truth it seems to savour less of error that bodily health should be 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

[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

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] 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**

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").

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]**

[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

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 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**

---

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.*

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.

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

Loserth pp. 32.9–36.27

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 differ-

[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).

ence 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]

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

[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.

is said in Acts 1.[4]

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.**

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]

[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*.

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 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**

[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.

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]

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**

[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*.**

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 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.

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

Loserth pp. 36.28–40.30

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**

[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*).**

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]

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]

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, 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

[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.

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]

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

[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").

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]

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 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]

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

---

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.

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]

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, 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

[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").

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]

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

Loserth pp. 40.31–43.9

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]**

[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.

[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*

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]**

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]

---

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".

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] 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]

[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).

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

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**

[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.

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 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

[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.

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]

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**

[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).**

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 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**

[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.

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]

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]

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

Loserth pp. 47.27–51.10

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

[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").

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,**

[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).**

he seems to grant him firstness; therefore Augustine says that "he held the principate of the apostolate", in sign of which possession and 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

[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).

the last chapter of John); and finally in Rome, the head of the world, he suffered for Christ a bitter death.[7]

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 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,

[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.

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]

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]

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

For although the mystical sense of scripture is not of itself evident to the unlearned for proving scholastically the thing figured, yet if

[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.

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.**

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

[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.

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**

[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**

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 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**

***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).

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 than what

[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*.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 55.27–58.7

[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.

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**

[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).

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, 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

[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.

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]

Part 5: Peter's humility and charity

Loserth pp. 58.8–62.8

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

[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".

[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).

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 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,

[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.

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]**

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

[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).

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]

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]

[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*,

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]**

"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.

Chapter 4

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

Loserth pp. 62.10–66.18

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**

[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).

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]

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 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**

[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).

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

[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.**

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]

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]

[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*

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.

[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]

Part 2: Election by lot, the apostles and Matthias

Loserth pp. 66.19–69.29

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**

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".

[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

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**

(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.

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.

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

[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).

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]

[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]

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

[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*).

evangelizing; but now [ceremonies] are added, as in the orders of clerics: of elections, of 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]

Part 3: Chrysostom on the lot; the hereditary priesthood

Loserth pp. 69.30–72.15

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**

[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.

[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).

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 Timothy was elected by Paul, who had many prophecies, as when he circumcised Timothy and**

[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.

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.

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]

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

[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”.

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]

Part 4: Many bishops over one people

Loserth pp. 72.16–76.11

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 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 ob-

[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).

[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.

jected 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**

[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.

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]

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 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**

[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.

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 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**

[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*.

solemnly.[13]

Part 5: The apostles had no recourse to Peter

Loserth pp. 76.12–80.22

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

[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*.

[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*.

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 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.**

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

[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".

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**

[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.

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 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

[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).

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.

[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").

Chapter 5

Part 1: The chief vicar must live without property

Loserth pp. 80.24–83.27

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**

[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.

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 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

[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.

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**

[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.

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.

Part 2: Charity would leave civil lordship to the laity

Loserth pp. 83.28–86.17

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 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**

[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.

[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".

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**

[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.

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 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**

[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).**

[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]

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

Loserth pp. 86.18–89.20

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**

[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.

you have succeeded not Peter but Constantine."[1] It would therefore be an inconsequence [to say] what follows: that in prelates the glory 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

[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.

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 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

[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).**

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]

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

Loserth pp. 89.21–93.30

It is to be noted, however, that temporal goods poison the church not through an occasion given by them but through one wrongly

[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.

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 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**

[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.

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**

[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).

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 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**

[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).

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

[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*

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.

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

Loserth pp. 93.31–97.12

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**

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.

[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

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 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**

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.

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,**

[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".

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.

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]

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

[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*.

the common counsel of the apostles.[14]

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]

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

Loserth pp. 97.13–102.24

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 we should not

[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".

[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.

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]

[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

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 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,

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*).

as to Peter [that of preaching] to the Jews; indeed, he commanded that Paul and Barnabas be separated to him for that office.[11]

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]

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,

[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.

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 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]

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]

From these would follow three conclusions gracious to the church.[19] First, that the pope would not meddle in judging a secular business,

[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*

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 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**

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".

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]

[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.**

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

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]

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

[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***).

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]

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

[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).

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**

[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).

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 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]**

And the second part is clear from the power of working miracles, from the power of authorizing holy scripture, and from the power

[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.

of building up the church.[16]

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]

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

Loserth pp. 106.29–110.19

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 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**

[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.**

[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".**

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]

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,

[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.

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.

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**

[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).**

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**

[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.

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 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.

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

Loserth pp. 110.20–114.29

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

[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.

[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").

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.**

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" 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

[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.

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

[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.

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.

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

[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.

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. 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; 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.

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

Loserth pp. 114.30–118.5

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]

[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.

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]

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

[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.

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, 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**

[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.**

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]

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 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

[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".

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]

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

Loserth pp. 118.6–122.29

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),

[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.

[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*.

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.**

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

[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.

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 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.

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,

[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*).

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 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

[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***).

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]

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]**

[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.

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.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 122.30–125.31

Seventh: whereas Christ forbids his own to strike with the sword, but [bids them] suffer as he did, although he could easily have

[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.**

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]

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]

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 excommu-

[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*.

nicated 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]

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 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

[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.

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]

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

[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.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 125.32–129.31

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 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**

[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".

[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

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

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*.

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]

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

[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*.

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

[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).

greater, must be a quantitative part of what is made greater by it.[16] 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, 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.

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

[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.*

Loserth pp. 129.32–133.25

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 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

[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.**

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

[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.

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]

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 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

[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*

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**

***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).

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]

Part 9: The duty of reproving superiors

Loserth pp. 133.26–135.11

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 [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**

[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*.**

[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".**

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]**

[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).

Chapter 7

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

Loserth pp. 135.13–138.31

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]

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]

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**

[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.

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.

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**

[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*

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

***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).**

the law of Christ and the natural law dictated.[10]

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]

[10] *Sentenciam 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*.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 138.32–142.12

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 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

[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.

[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*

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,**

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).

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 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**

[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".

seems to me that the power of the priestly keys cannot be without the aforesaid knowledge, nor the converse.[9]

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

[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".

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

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

Loserth pp. 142.13–146.33

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

[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.

[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").

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 says, travailing, is in pain to be delivered, because the vicars of Christ, in imprinting Christ

[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").

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

[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.

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]

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 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

[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.

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]**

[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.

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 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]

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

Loserth pp. 146.34–147.26

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

[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.

[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).

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]

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

Loserth pp. 147.27–152.9

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

[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".

[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

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 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

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.

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",

[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*.**

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 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

[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".

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**

[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.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 152.10–156.25

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

[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 sententiam*: 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.

flock. By this the reply to the sixth reason is clear, in which the oftenmentioned 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 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

[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.

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**

[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.

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".

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,

[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.

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

[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).

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. 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]**

[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.

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

Loserth pp. 156.26–160.4

By these things the reply to the seventh is clear, in which Peter's pre-eminence 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 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**

[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.

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 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,**

[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.

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,

[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.

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]

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

Loserth pp. 160.5–164.32

To the eighth confirmation, from the last chapter of John, where Peter alone received the feeding of the sheep because of the prerog-

[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.

ative 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 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**

[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?").

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 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

[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.

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**

[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.

clergy of Christ down from that state. For Peter or Paul had no such power.

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.

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

[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.**

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 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.

[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.

Chapter 8

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

Loserth pp. 165.2–169.31

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

[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.

[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 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.

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

[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).

capital city of Christendom, therefore it is fitting that the capital bishop should rule there.

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.**

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

[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.

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]

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

[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).

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.

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 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**

[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).**

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.

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

Loserth pp. 169.32–173.32

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 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*,

[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.

[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.*

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**

[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.**

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]

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].

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

[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."

more apt.[14]

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]

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.

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

[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.

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 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.

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]

[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".**

Part 3: No man can elect the highest pontiff

Loserth pp. 173.33–176.4

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 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

[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.

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;**

[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*.

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 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]

Part 4: Two elections: how the name of pope arose

Loserth pp. 176.5–180.32

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 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

[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."

[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.

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**

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***.

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 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

[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).

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.

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

[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.*

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.

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 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

[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

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]

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

---

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.

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]

Part 5: Rival popes from the chronicle of Ralph de Diceto

Loserth pp. 180.33–184.33

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.

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

[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.).

[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

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, 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]

"Second, in the year of the Lord 493, Laurence is ordained by contention against Pope Symmachus."[6]

"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."

"Fourth, in the year of the Lord 853, Anastasius invades the bishopric against Pope Benedict."[7]

"Fifth, in the year of the Lord 907, Pope Leo presides, against whom Christopher rises."

"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

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.

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]

"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]

"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]

"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

[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).

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]

"Cadalus at Parma was Parma's bow and arms;"

"Cadalus has fallen, Parma was [his] ruin."[16]

"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."

"Twelfth, in the year of the Lord 1087, Desiderius, also called Victor, was made pope against Clement."

[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.

"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 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]

"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:"

"Peter holds Rome, Gregory the whole world."[18]

"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]

Part 6: The rival popes and the signs of antichrist

Loserth pp. 185.1–188.17

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,

[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.

[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.

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 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

[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.

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 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**

[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).**

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]

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;

[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.

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.

Part 7: Antichrist seeks glory from men; popes struck down

Loserth pp. 188.18–192.9

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,

[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.

[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*.

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

[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.

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 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 tightfistedness 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]

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

[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."

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] 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,

[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).

the worse they are; for Christ would not 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]

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."

Part 8: Redeeming the time

Loserth pp. 192.10–194.6

[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*.

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." 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**

[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*.**

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**

[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).**

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]

[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).**

Chapter 9

Part 1: Human election does not make a pope

Loserth pp. 194.8–197.27

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**

[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

must have one superior living among it, since according to the philosophers every multitude is reduced to unity.[4]

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 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

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.

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

[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***.

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.**

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

[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.

such men have, beyond the apostles, authority from God to elect the head of the church?

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]

Part 2: The poison of endowment; presbyter and bishop once the same

Loserth pp. 197.29–200.29

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 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**

[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.**

[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".**

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

[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".

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 and priest were the same, as the lord of Armagh shows in book 11 of the**

[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.**

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]

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

[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*.

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]

Part 3: No middle order; election and the boast of the keys

Loserth pp. 200.30–204.29

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 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

[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*.

[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*).

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]**

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] 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.

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 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]

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**

[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*.**

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 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

[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***.

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]

[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.

Part 4: The blind quibble of the keys; pride of order and the narrow way

Loserth pp. 204.30–207.22

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**

[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".

thus, according to Augustine on John, Sermon 121, the church of the saints forgives sins by reason of merit.[4]

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 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

[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).

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

[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".**

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]

Part 5: Holiness of life: Jude's six marks of the proud

Loserth pp. 207.23–210.14

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 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**

[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.*

[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").

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**

[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.

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.

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]

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]

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

[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.

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]

Part 6: The wandering stars, and the primacy not to be sought

Loserth pp. 210.15–214.2

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

[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.

[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 exhala-

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, 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,**

tion 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.

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]**

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

[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 saecularem*.

[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".

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]**

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,

[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".**

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]

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]

Part 7: Human election, the Roman church, and the conditional law

Loserth pp. 214.3–218.24

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

[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.

[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*.

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, 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.**

Hence we should note the chronicles mentioned before, how the papal dignity grew up. And the lord of Armagh relates in book 7,

[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.**

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

[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.

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 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.

Secondly, it is to be noted from the saying of blessed Jerome that whoever divides against Christ is Antichrist; of which kind are the

[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.

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]

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 said; and otherwise blessed Jerome,

[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.

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]

Part 8: The dignity of sees, worship in spirit, and the abomination of desolation

Loserth pp. 218.25–222.18

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

[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).

[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.

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 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**

[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.

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:

[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.

"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.

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.

[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.

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.

Chapter 10

Part 1: The objection that the pope must be the mightiest lord

Loserth pp. 222.20–223.12

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.

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**

[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.

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]

Part 2: The plea of papal poverty and Otto's demand

Loserth pp. 223.13–228.13

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

[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*).

[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.

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 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

"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).

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

[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.

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 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**

[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."

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 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**

[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.

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]

Part 3: Primacy from the Lord, the submission of kingdoms, the doctors

Loserth pp. 228.14–232.13

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,

[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").

[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.

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 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**

[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.**

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 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

[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".

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

[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.

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.

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]

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]

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.

Part 4: The donation of Constantine and the caesarean jurisdiction

Loserth pp. 232.14–235.34

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

[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 sententiam*: "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.

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,**

[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).

proud, warlike and ignorant of 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

[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).

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 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,**

[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.

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.

Part 5: The argument from what the community believes, and a third rejoinder for the endowment

Loserth pp. 236.1–237.27

[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

[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.

[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.

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 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

[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.

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.

[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.

Part 6: The answer: the saints who approved the endowment sinned

Loserth pp. 237.28–241.33

[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.

[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").

[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 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 [propo-**

[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.

sitions],[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

[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.

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 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**

[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".**

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]

[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]

[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

[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

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 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.

Part 7: Cutting the root of cupidity; the caesarean order not needed for salvation

Loserth pp. 242.1–246.21

[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]

[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 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).

[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

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, 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]

[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**

---

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.

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 three-

[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

fold 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

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.

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] 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**

[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***

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**

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.**

not acknowledge the preeminence of Constantine's pontiff.[24]

Part 8: The schism and the oaths of obedience

Loserth pp. 246.22–250.21

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.

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]

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

[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".

[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***).

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 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. And the catholic teaching, which I have often repeated, consists in this: that one is neither to believe nor to obey pope, bishop, abbot**

[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.

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 truth I would be ashamed to raise my head in Oxford if I had sown this teaching on obedience publicly in the schools.**

[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.

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.

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]**

Secondly, it is rejoined, by appeal to the decree of blessed Jerome

[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.

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]

Part 9: Jerome's Roman church is the race of the predestinate

Loserth pp. 250.22–253.27

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

[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.

[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".

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

[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.

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, 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

[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).**

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.

[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.

Part 10: The king charged with heresy, and Lincoln on the cardinals

Loserth pp. 253.28–257.32

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**

[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.

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 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

[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*.

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] 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]

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

[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).

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, 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."**

[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.

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.

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]

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.

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.

Part 11: New articles of faith: no one must believe the pope is pope

Loserth pp. 257.33–261.7

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**

[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.

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]

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 declamatory words this

[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

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] 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

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.

privilege all Christians ought to defend.[11]

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]

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 make, but whatever thing, animate or inanimate, has been moving to it. But it would be more evident that someone, by praying to God**

[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*.

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]

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.

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.

Part 12: May the pope be reproved? three arguments answered

Loserth pp. 261.8–265.16

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

[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***.

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 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**

[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.

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**

[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").

Spirit but a sending, and yet necessarily they are equals.[9]

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.

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]

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

[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*.

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]

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]

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]

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;

[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".

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.**

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]

[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".

Chapter 11

Part 1: Order in the priesthood, and Bernard against papal lordship

Loserth pp. 265.18–268.27

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.

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]

[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.

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 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,**

[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.

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**

[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.**

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: '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]

[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".

Part 2: The caesarean priest and the disciple of Christ; Christ the one prince of priests

Loserth pp. 268.28–271.21

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,**

[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.**

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 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

[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

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**

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".**

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]

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]

Part 3: The Virgin, a woman, a layman as pope; the old priesthood no ground for primacy

Loserth pp. 271.22–274.33

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

[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*.

[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.

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],**

[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*.

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]

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]

[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***

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, 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**

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.

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]

Part 4: Sacramental power equal in all priests; episcopal rites and vestments

Loserth pp. 275.1–279.15

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

[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*.

[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

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 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**

(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.

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]

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.

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

[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*.

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 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

[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*.

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

[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.

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]

Part 5: The vestments of the priesthood: girdle, breeches, inner tunic, superhumeral

Loserth pp. 279.16–282.33

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

[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*.

[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.

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 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.

[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.

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.**

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 continually, the word of God willed that a singular chastity should cover the priest performing the office of

[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.**

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]

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]

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

[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.

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."

Part 6: The pontiff's vestments: rational, mitre, golden plate, bells, and what they figure

Loserth pp. 283.1–286.29

"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 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

[20] ***Vere*** **may stand for** ***vero*****, "but in the time of grace"; the print gives "true grace".**

[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).**

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

[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).

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]

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 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.

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

[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*.

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]

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]

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, 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

[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.

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]

Part 7: The priest's six vestments, and signs become false

Loserth pp. 286.30–290.27

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

[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.

[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.

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 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.**

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

[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*.

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]

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

[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.

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 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,**

[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*?).

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.

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]

Part 8: The prelates' ornaments perverted; the third argument, from order

Loserth pp. 290.28–294.2

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**

[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.**

[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).**

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

[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).**

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:

[292] **A fat sacrament I will give,**
A lean one I will not sacrifice.[9]

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]

[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.

indeed, like the bare statue of a cock, more lying for deceiving his subjects.

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]**

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

[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").**

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]

Part 9: Custom, human tradition and the law of God; no secular gradation in the clergy

Loserth pp. 294.3–299.5

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

[16] "Gradation" renders *graduacio*, which the glossary gives as academic "graduation"; here it is rank among lords.

[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).

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 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**

[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.

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 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

[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*.

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**

[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.**

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 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,**

[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.

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]

Part 10: Clerical dignity in poverty; Gregory refuses the name "universal"; an argument for the caesarean order

Loserth pp. 299.6–302.33

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] 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.

[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".

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 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**

[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 benedictione populi*: the people's "blessing" is their alms (as *benedictio* for the collection in the previous sentence); the people's answer is reported indirectly.

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.

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 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.

[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".

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 corre-**

[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.

spondence 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.

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]

Part 11: Sin profits the church by accident; simple priests supply when prelates fail

Loserth pp. 303.1–307.28

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

[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.

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

[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.

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] 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. 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

[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.

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.

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 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.

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

[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.

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.

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]

It is proved first from this, that the sacraments and rites which God instituted singularly for the high priest, a lower priest could and

[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".

ought to perform in default of the high priest, as is clear from what has been said.[15] 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.

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.

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

[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.

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.

Part 12: Lay baptism, the woman pope, and confession beyond necessity

Loserth pp. 307.29–311.33

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 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]

[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.

[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.

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**

[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).

church of Peter to the Lateran church, gripped by 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]

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.

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

[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.

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.**

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

[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.

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]

Part 13: All the holy are priests; the two orders of the apostles

Loserth pp. 312.1–316.23

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]

[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.

[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*.

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]

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]

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**

[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

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,

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*.

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 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]

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

[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.**

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]

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, 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]

[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

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**

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*.

contrary way.[21] Therefore there must be a difference among priests.

[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.**

Chapter 12

Part 1: The church can do without a caesarean pope

Loserth pp. 316.25–320.21

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]

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]

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

[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*.**

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?

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, 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?

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;

[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.

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]

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]

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 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,**

[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*).**

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]

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

[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..

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.

Part 2: The abomination of desolation in the holy place

Loserth pp. 320.23–324.6

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 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,**

[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.**

[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*****.**

need not as a rule so flow into any who are brighter than it.[2]

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]

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

[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.

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 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]

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

[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".

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.**

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

[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".

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.

Part 3: Augustine on Antichrist; four degrees of belief

Loserth pp. 324.8–328.20

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

[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.

[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".

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 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**

[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".

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]

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

[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 revelatur*: 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.

midst", because after the endowment of the church Antichrist will be revealed.[9] And the third teaching is the one stated above.

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

[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*.

punishment of sin.[13] This I believe to be idolatry, in worshipping signs as God, as is especially clear in the consecrated host.

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]

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.**

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]

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]

[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.**

those things the bare credence of which is beyond what is necessary to me for salvation.[16]

Part 4: Not every pope antichrist; canonization a matter of opinion

Loserth pp. 328.21–330.12

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

[16] *Remisse*, "with slackened [assent]": the weaker assent of opinion, against the firm granting or denying of faith (¶4–5).

[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.

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]

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]

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]

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]

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

[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).

he leads treacherously against Christ, seems to deserve the heavier condemnation.[8]

Part 5: The wicked prelate worse than the devil; two heads, two clergies

Loserth pp. 330.13–333.5

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

[8] *Superaddita blasfemia ypocrisi*: *ypocrisi* taken as dative ("added on top of hypocrisy"); it could be a second ablative ("from added blasphemy, from hypocrisy").

[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.

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 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

[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").

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]

Part 6: The caesarean clergy, Judas's field, and Jesus as patron

[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".

Loserth pp. 333.6–338.8

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, 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 conse-**

[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.

quently 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

[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.

pontiffs of the old testament, for so their adulterous generation is continued; [335] and it is taught how the false pontiffs under 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

[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.

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 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

[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").**

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**

[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.

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.**

Part 7: The law of christ suffices for the church without men's laws

Loserth pp. 338.9–342.18

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

[23] ***Ipsi sic sequuntur***: "they" are the erring saints, following their way. ***Viare***: to make one's way as a wayfarer.

[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.

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 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

[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.

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.

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

[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.

to Christ (John 18), and, though serving unwillingly, procured the peace of Christ.[10]

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 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]

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 oth-

[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*.

erwise 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

[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).

faith by this, that as a thing is worse or better, so it is to be fled or loved in proportion.[18]

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]

Part 8: The saints against the laws of men; the sext's rule on rival provisions

Loserth pp. 342.19–345.21

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

[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.

[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.

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; 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

[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.

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]

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

[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.

will keep my word."[12] For nothing is more carefully commanded by the Lord than continual meditation on the law of God.

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 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]

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]

From which it follows plainly that this porism of Antichrist is wicked, against justice, and consequently against Christ.

Part 9: Causes, benefices and the dangers of papal provision

[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.

Loserth pp. 345.22–349.26

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 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**

[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.

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**

[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".

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.

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.

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]**

[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**

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]

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]**

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

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.

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.

Part 10: Provisions, elections and the stipends of failing superiors

Loserth pp. 349.27–352.30

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

[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*.

[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

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 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]

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.

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

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".

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]

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]

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

[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.

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]

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]

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

[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.

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.

Part 11: Excommunication for withheld tithes, the schism, and alms against rents

Loserth pp. 352.32–356.26

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] **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 excommu-**

[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.

[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".

nicates 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**

[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.

goods of the poor.[6] The seculars decree that the unjust be destroyed who disturb the peace of the commonwealth and treacherously 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]

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]

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

[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.

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 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

[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*

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]

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]

Part 12: The minister's stipend and the people's withholding of tithes

Loserth pp. 356.27–360.18

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.

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 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**

[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.

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]

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 rectors vigilantly resident; since the way is open to laymen to judge

[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*.

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]

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]**

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

[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.

church; indeed, of perpetual revenues conferred on clerics, as I have often touched on.[13]

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 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**

[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.

of the Lord's spiritual portion, as he lived bodily from the Lord's temporal portion.[17]

Part 13: The pope must be the holiest of wayfarers

Loserth pp. 360.19–364.33

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

[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.

[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.

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.

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 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]

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.

[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).

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 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**

[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.

falls short in this is Antichrist and a pseudo-pope, by the fiction of a lie and the defrauding of the office.

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]***

[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.

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 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."

Part 14: The papacy is service, and the name of pope is equivocal

Loserth pp. 365.1–368.34

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

[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.

[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*

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 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**

***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.

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.**

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

[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.**

high priest in the old law was not as a rule the holiest, since he was often polluted.

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.**

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.

[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.**

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.

Part 15: The Franciscan pope, insignia, and the propertyless state

Loserth pp. 369.1–373.28

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*

[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.

[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.

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 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.**

[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".**

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.

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

[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.

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 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.

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.**

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.

Likewise, every work of mercy or of spiritual alms is preferable to a

[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]".**

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 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.

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

[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).

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.

Part 16: The king's justice: the twenty-two conditions of a king

Loserth pp. 373.29–377.23

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

[14] *Faciant* stands in both manuscripts (Loserth, *ita codd.*); *satiant*, "satisfy", seems meant, and we supply it in brackets.

[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.

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 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

[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.

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 who live

[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.

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,**

[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.**

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.

Part 17: The king must rule his clergy first; the clergy's ornaments

Loserth pp. 377.24–381.2

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

[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.

[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.

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 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

[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."

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]

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.

[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*).

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 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**

[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").

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.

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]

Part 18: Dispensations: the pope only promulgates what God allows

Loserth pp. 381.3–385.31

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

[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*.

[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".

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 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**

[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.

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.**

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,

[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*.

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.**

[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.**

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 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]

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**

[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".**

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.

Part 19: The pope and heresy; the first six of the twelve abuses

Loserth pp. 385.32–389.27

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 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

[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.

[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*.

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]

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]

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*

[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.

***[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 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]**

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]

[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*.

Therefore, according to Bernard: "Nothing poisons the mind of the pope more than the lust of lording it."[9]

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]

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]

[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.

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]

[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.**

Part 20: The seventh to twelfth abuses: prayer, burdens, appointments, indulgences, captains, earthly cares

Loserth pp. 389.28–393.30

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 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

[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).

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?

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 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] 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

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]

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]

---

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*.

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 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**

[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*.

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]

Part 21: The endowed bound to contradictories; why Constantine is not canonized; the protestation

Loserth pp. 393.31–397.17

"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

[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*.

[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.

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 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

[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.

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]

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]

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**

[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.

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 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**

[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

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]

Here ends the treatise *On the Power of the Pope* of John W.[14]

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".

Compendium

Part 1: The compendium, chapters one to seven

Loserth pp. 398.2–402.33

The teaching of the last book is had in compendium thus:[1]

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

[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".

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]

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 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.

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

[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*.

how Peter excelled in faith, humility and charity, it declares how Peter had loved more than John.[9]

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

[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.

opposite by Bernard.[14] 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

[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.

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]

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 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**

[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").

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.

Part 2: The compendium, chapters eight to eleven (breaks off)

Loserth pp. 402.34–406.10

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

[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).

[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.

be with Caesar; and it convicts by a threefold testimony the lie that feigns that the church 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]

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,

[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").

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]

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 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

[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*

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

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.

is.[15] Third, it proves in three ways that it is lawful for subjects to reprove the pope; and it removes a threefold objection.

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]

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]**

[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).

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 supposicionis / ex supposicione*: necessity of supposition / necessity on supposition.** Conditional necessity.; *ex supposicione* (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).**