JOHN WICLIF

AND HIS

ENGLISH PRECURSORS

BY

PROFESSOR LECHLER, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPSIC

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY

PETER LORIMER, D.D.

AUTHOR OF "JOHN KNOX AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND"

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF SCOTTISH ANTIQUARIES, AND

HONORARY MEMBER OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF BERG

IN THE PRUSSIAN STATES

VOL. II.

LONDON

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1878

WICLIF! strong soul nursed as in eagles' nest
In upper air, it needed breath of Alps,
The keen invigorative air which girds
The Maiden, Monk, and Eiger with their zones
Of thick-ribbed ice, to give me strength to cope
With the new history of thy mighty thoughts,
And deeds and giant strife with Papal Rome—
From fountains fresh deduced, in Teuton speech
Of Lechler's learned page, and to give back
Thy thoughts, full rendered, to thine own dear land.
Sire of our English tongue! Translator once
Thyself of God's own Word.—Immortal work!
A well of truth and English undefiled!
Accept, Great Shade! my toil, humble itself,
Yet noble made by thee—to whom 'twas given
In love and laud, unbought, spontaneous.

LAUTERBRUNNEN, HOTEL STAUBBACH,
22nd August 1876.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER VIII.

Wiclif as a Thinker and Writer; his Philosophical and Theological System.

CHAPTER IX.

APPENDIX.

LIFE OF WICLIF.

CHAPTER VIII.

WICLIF AS A THINKER AND WRITER; HIS PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL SYSTEM.

SECTION I.—*His Gradual Development as a Thinker and Reformer.*

IT makes a great difference in our whole view and judgment of Wiclif, according as, on the one hand, we assume that from the very beginning of his public work he stood forth with a complete and unified system of thoughts, or as, on the other, we recognise a gradual development of his thoughts, and progress of his knowledge. The first assumption was entertained even till recent times. Wiclif's earliest biographer, John Lewis, was followed in this view, and it continued to be held even after Vaughan had been able to throw some light upon the inner progress of Wiclif's ideas. Men imagined they saw Wiclif stand before them at once a finished man, and missed in him that gradual loosening from the bonds of error, and that slow progress in new knowledge, which, in the case of Luther, followed the first decided break with his old thoughts. But this assumption rests upon error, and especially upon an imperfect acquaintance with the underlying facts. Even from the *Trialogus*, the first

of Wiclif's works which was sent to the press, men might have been able to learn with sufficient certainty, that Wiclif must have passed through very considerable changes of opinion. For in more than one place he makes the frankest acknowledgment that on more than one metaphysical question, he had formerly defended with tenacity the opposite of what he now maintained—that "he was sunk in the depths of the sea, and had stammered out many things which he was unable clearly to make good," etc.[2] But still more strongly does he express himself in one of his unprinted writings, where he makes the following free confession — "Other statements which at one time appeared strange to me, now appear to me to be sound and true, and I defend them; for," in the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 11), "when I was a child in the knowledge of the faith, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child; but when, in God's strength, I became a man, I put away, by His grace, childish thoughts." He is speaking in this place of the freedom of man's will and agency.[3] And in a similar way he expresses himself in his work on the "Truth of Holy Scripture," touching his childishly literal understanding of the Bible in his earlier years. "At last," however, he continues—"the Lord, by the power of His grace, opened my mind to understand the Scriptures;" and he even adds the humbling confession—"I acknowledge that ofttimes, for the sake of vain glory I departed from the teaching of Scripture, both in what I maintained and what I opposed, when my double aim was to acquire a dazzling fame among the people, and to lay bare the pride of the sophists."

We could produce other frank acknowledgments of Wiclif of the same kind, but these may suffice, and I only add here a few more particulars which are worthy of mention.

Among the Collections of Wiclif's Latin sermons there is one, upon which we have already remarked above, that when compared with the others it supplies some light regarding the progress of the preacher in knowledge. We refer to the older collection of forty miscellaneous sermons.[5] This comes out especially on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, on which we shall have occasion to remark with more particularity below. In addition to this, it is unmistakeable that on the subject of the Papacy and the Hierarchy, not only the tone of his language, but even his mode of thought, is essentially different, after the occurrence of the Western Schism of 1378, from what it was before that event. Further, on the subject of the Mendicant Orders, Wiclif judges in his earlier writings quite differently from what he does in his later ones. We shall show that there is no good ground for the view which has hitherto prevailed in the tradition of church historians, and upon which even an investigator like Vaughan proceeds in his maturest work upon Wiclif, viz., that Wiclif had commenced his conflict with the Mendicant Orders as early as 1360 or the following year, and carried it on for twenty years afterwards.[6] It was first in connexion with the question of transubstantiation that any controversy of Wiclif with these particular Orders took its rise; whereas before that time it was rather against the endowed Orders that he aimed his attacks, while towards Francis of Assisi and Dominic and the Orders founded by them, he continued to cherish and express all manner of respect and sincere recognition.

All these facts constitute a sufficient proof that Wiclif passed through important changes of opinion even after he had arrived at mature years, and had made his first appearance upon the public stage; and that on several

questions of great moment he gradually arrived at essentially different conclusions from those of his earlier years. It would indeed have been astonishing if a mind so independent and thoughtful—a man whose whole life was spent in labours on behalf of others, and in efforts for God's glory and the public good—had, in the substance of his teaching, adhered stiffly to the stand-points which he had in the first instance taken up. It will accordingly be our aim, as far as possible, to point out the gradual development of Wiclif's views on all the chief points of his philosophical and theological beliefs.[7]

We have to view Wiclif first as a philosophical, and next as a theological thinker and writer; and though his philosophy and theology continually interlock, conformably to the whole character of scholasticism (for Wiclif was a scholastic divine), yet it may be conducive to clearness if we give to each a separate treatment.

SECTION II.—*Wiclif as a Philosophical Thinker and Writer.*

IN order that the distinctive features of Wiclif's philosophy may be adequately described, a sufficient amount of his writings in this department must first be forthcoming. But here much is lacking; for of his philosophical works, in the form of treatises, not a single piece has ever appeared in print, down to the present day; and what is more serious, a considerable number of them have in all probability perished.[8] Contenting ourselves with what remains available, and turning first to his logical pieces, these, so far as we are acquainted with them, consist of only two short tractates, the one entitled *Logica*, the other *Logicæ Continuatio*.[9] Both of these have the peculiarity of limiting themselves to

the simplest ideas and principles; whereas the logical treatises of the fourteenth century generally run into excessive length, and lose themselves in the extremest subtleties.[10] In the *Logica* he treats simply of *terminus*, *propositio*, and *argumentum*, each of these forms of thought being defined and exhibited in its simplest varieties. And here we meet with the memoriter-verses on the manifold forms of syllogism which had been in use since the time of William Shyreswood.[11]

The *Logicae Continuatio*, again, examines somewhat more largely the different kinds of judgments and processes of proof. That Wiclif restricted himself in both works to the most general principles of the science, was no doubt done in view of what was wanted for young men on their first introduction to the study of logic.

It is next worthy of notice that these treatises on formal logic have a theological and especially a biblical end in view. In the introduction to the *Logica*, Wiclif says frankly, "I have been induced by several friends of God's Word (*legis Dei amicos*) to compose a treatise in explanation of the logic of Holy Scripture. For, as I see many entering upon the study of logic, with the idea that they will be the better able thereby to understand the Word of God, and then leaving it again on account of its distasteful mixture of heathenish ideas, and also of the hollowness of the study when thus conducted, I propose, with the view of sharpening the faculties of believing minds, to give processes of proof for propositions which are all to be drawn from Scripture," etc., etc.[12]

The reader sees that it is entirely with Christian ideas —with biblical knowledge—that he proposes to concern himself. And yet the result is no sorry mixture of theologi-

cal and philosophical matter,[13] but a purely formal doctrine of the laws of thought. Even in his latest years he laid great stress upon a right knowledge of logic for the understanding of Christian truth, and maintained that the disesteem of Scripture doctrine, and every error in respect to it, had its root in ignorance of logic and grammar.[14] And this was not a thought exclusively his own. Wiclif shared it with William Occam, whom he names more than once in his manuscript works, and sometimes under his scholastic title of honour, *Venerabilis Inceptor.*

Passing from Logic to Metaphysics, the question which Wiclif regarded as by far the most important was that of *Universals.* He handles this question not only in several treatises devoted to it, *e.g., De Universalibus, Replicatio de Universalibus, De Materia et Forma, De Ideis,* but in his theological works, also, he not seldom returns to this doctrine as being, in his view, one of great reach and decisiveness in its theological bearings. For Wiclif was in philosophy a Realist. He takes his stand firmly and with the greatest decision upon that side which maintains the objectivity and reality of *Universals;* following herein Augustine among the fathers of the Church, and Plato among the ancient philosophers, as his authorities and models. In this point he sides with Plato against the criticism which Aristotle directed against the Platonic doctrine of ideas.[15] However highly he values Aristotle in other respects, calling him, as the middle age in general did, *The philosopher,* and usually leaning upon his authority, he is still distinctly conscious that on this subject he is a Platonist, and essentially at variance with Aristotle—a state of matters which was not at all irreconcileable with the fact that Wiclif, like all his contemporaries, had no knowledge whatever of the Platonic philosophy from its original Greek

sources. He seems to have known Plato only from Augustine and by his mediation; and he was by no means the first who, while of a Platonizing spirit, was yet unable to withdraw himself from the authority of Aristotle. The Parisian teacher Heinrich Göthals of Ghent, †1293 (Henricus de Gandavo, doctor solemnis), the Averroist Johann of Jandun (about 1320), and Walter Burleigh, †1337, to all of whom Wiclif occasionally refers, had preceded him in the path of an Augustinian Church-Platonism conjoined with Aristotelian method.

That Wiclif makes use of the double designation *universal* and *idea* in speaking of the same subject, is sufficient to show that he had not overcome the dualism between Aristotelic and Platonic first principles. Nowhere, so far as we know, does he draw a clear and definite distinction between *idea* and *universal*. And yet one difference may be observed to prevail in his use of language upon this subject. When he treats of ideas, his point of view is always one where he looks at matters from a higher to a lower level; whereas the case is often the reverse when he speaks of *universals*. Manifestly, in the one case, the ground taken is *à priori* ground; in the other case it is empirical. It is the Platonic spirit which prevails in the former, the Aristotelic in the latter.

Still Wiclif is perfectly well aware that the principle is a very disputable one which asserts the objective reality of universals, and he has reflected on the causes which have given rise to the controversy regarding it. Four causes, it appears to him, lie at the bottom of this great and long-standing divergency of opinion. The first cause is found in the strong impressions made by the world of sense, whereby the reason is darkened. The second cause he finds in a striving

after seeming instead of real knowledge, as of old among the Sophists, from which arises much contention, insomuch that men dispute propositions which ought to be conceded as necessary truths. A third cause he finds in the pretentiousness of men, which is always reaching after something peculiar to itself, and stiffly maintaining and defending it. And finally, he discovers a fourth cause in the want of instruction.[18] Wiclif's doctrine of ideas and their reality does not admit of being set forth without the conception of God. For he takes this conception as his starting point. The Idea is, in his view, an absolutely necessary truth,[19] for truth is nothing else but God's thought, which thought is also immediately a willing and working, a proposing and doing, on the part of God. For God cannot think anything which is external to Himself, unless this thing is intellectually thinkable. What God creates, He cannot possibly create by chance or unwisely; he must therefore think it; and his thought, or the archetype of the creature, is identical with the *idea;* and this same is eternal, for it is the same in time with the Divine knowledge. In its essence it is one with God, in its form it is different from God, as a ground conformably to which God thinks out what He creates. It has in itself a ground in reason, by virtue of which it determines the Divine knowledge.[20]

In this last expressed proposition lies, as it appears to me, the kernel of Wiclif's doctrine of ideas, the central point of his Realism. He is not satisfied with regarding human knowledge as a reflex of actual existence, while the Nominalism or Terminism (as Prantl calls it[21]) of Occam looks upon knowledge, in so far as it goes beyond the sensible observation of nature and the empirical self-contemplation of the soul, only as something subjective, and cast in a logical

form. According to Wiclif, in thinking of universals, we conceive what has an independent existence, what has its ground in God's thought and work. But even God's thought, in his view, does not proceed arbitrarily, but conformably to its subject, agreeably to reason, answerably to the reason of things. And hence, in more places than one, he decidedly censures the usual practice of speaking of the thinkability of the unreal, or even of the self-contradictory, as empty subtlety, and a copious source of false reasonings and perverted conclusions.[22] Rather he lays down the proposition that God can only think that which he thinks in point of fact, and he thinks only that which *is*—*is*, at least in the sense of intellectual entity. In like manner as God, on the side of his willing, working, and creating, can only work and produce that which he actually produces, in its own time. For God's knowing and producing are coincident; that God knows any creature, and that he produces or sustains it, are one and the same thing.[23]

The realism of Wiclif accordingly is a principle of great and wide bearing. He is an enemy of all arbitrary, empty, and vague thought; he will not allow it to have the value of thought; as, for example, when a man conceives with himself what would possibly have followed if a certain something presupposed had not taken place (*conclusiones contingentiae*). Only the real can be thought. Thus knowing and thinking are coincident, as well in God as in the human mind, which thinks exactly as much as it knows and no more.[24] Only, if we would hit Wiclif's meaning, we must not restrict the real to what is perceptible by the senses, and what is a matter of experience at the present moment. Agreeably to that principle he does not allow of any endless series of ideas, according to which every idea should give

rise again to another, and that to a third, and so on for ever. Such a reflex action, evermore mirroring back the idea and reduplicating it, is to him something useless and perverted, a mere stammering talk without sense and substance; whereas we have to occupy ourselves with the realities of things, which objectively determine our knowledge by what they actually are.[25]

It remains to add that Wiclif loves to give a biblical as well as a philosophical basis and development to these thoughts by means of the idea of the Logos. He is convinced that his doctrine of ideas is agreeable to Scripture, and he lays stress upon it particularly on that account. For the same reason he holds it advisable to expound this doctrine of ideas only to such who are familiar, at least in some degree, with the thoughts of Scripture; one to whom the latter are still strange may easily take offence at his doctrine.[26] Herein Wiclif supports himself, with special liking, upon an expression of John in the prologue of his Gospel—a passage to which, in several of his writings, and in connection with different thoughts, he ever again returns, partly in the way of express quotation, and partly in the way of allusion.[27] And yet, remarkably, this passage is one which Wiclif has misunderstood (following, it is true, the lead of the Latin Fathers, especially Augustin, and of several of the scholastics, including St. Thomas Aquinas;) his error lying in throwing into one sentence certain words which properly fall into two. In chap. i. 3, the evangelist says of the Logos—"All things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made that was made;" and then in v. 4 continues—"In Him was life," etc. But Wiclif, following the authority of his predecessors, takes the last words of v. 3, "quod factum est" (in the Vulgate), along with "in ipso vita erat"

of v. 4, as forming together one sentence (a mistake which was only possible where the Greek original was not understood); and then he finds the thought of the whole to be this —"Everything which was created was originally, and, before its creation in time, livingly present, was ideally performed, is the eternally pre-existent Logos."[28]

With this passage he connected other biblical expressions; above all the word of Christ where He testifies of Himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (John xiv. 4), which last word he understands, certainly not very happily, of the eternal life of thought. In addition, he appeals to the authority of the Apostle Paul, where (Romans xi. 36) he says "Of Him, and through Him, and in Him are all things." In particular, he supposes that when the Apostle was caught up into heaven, and saw visions and heard unutterable words, he had a view vouchsafed to him of the intellectual world—the world of idea.[29] And then he traces to the instructions of St. Paul the initiation of his great convert Dionysius into those high mysteries which the latter has treated of in his work *On the Divine Names*.[30]

True knowledge is conditioned by Wiclif, conformably to the above basis of thinking, by the apprehension of the ground of things pre-existing in the eternal reason. If men look at the creatures only in their existence as known to them by experience (*in proprio genere*), their minds thereby are only dissipated and drawn off from God. If we desire one day to see God in the heavenly home, we must here below consider the creatures in the light of those deep intellectual principles, in which they are known and ordered by God, and we must turn our eye towards that eternal horizon under which that light lies concealed.[31]

But not only true knowledge, but also true morality is

conditioned, according to Wiclif's fundamental view, by our grasping and striving after that which is universal. All envy, and every sinful act, has its basis in the want of well-ordered love to the universal. Whoever prefers a personal good to a common good, and sets his aim upon riches, human dignities, etc., places that which is lower and individual above that which is higher and universal—*i.e.*, he reverses the right order of things, he loves not truth and peace (Zech. viii. 19), and therein falls into sin. And thus it is that error in knowledge and feeling with regard to universals (*circa universalia*) is the cause of all the sin that is dominant in the world.[32]

After this glance at Wiclif's philosophical principles, especially his realistic metaphysics, we pass on to his theological system, in which we shall see again the reflection of the philosophical standpoint which has been indicated above.

NOTES TO SECTIONS I. AND II.

1. So, *e.g.*, Oscar Jäger, *John Wycliffe and his importance for the Reformation*, Halle, 1854, p. 119-121.

2. *Trialogus*, ed. Lechler. Oxford, 1869. Liber III., c. 8, p. 155; I., c. 10, pp. 69, 70.

3. *Responsiones ad argumenta Radulphi de Strode*, Vienna MS., 1338, f. 116, col. 3. Et aliae conclusiones, quae olim videbantur mihi mirabiles, jam videntur mihi catholicae, defendendo, etc.

4. *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*, c. 6; c. 2, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 13, col. 1; fol. 3, col. 1: De ista vana gloria comfiteor saepe tam arguendo quam respondendo prolapsus sum a doctrina scripturae, etc.

5. This did not escape the notice of attentive readers, even so early as the Hussite period, as is shown by the remark which is to be read in the margin of the Vienna MS. 3928, fol. 193, from another hand than the transcriber's: Constet omnibus quod iste Wycliff XL. Sermones illos scribens fuit alius a se ipso hic quam alibi, ut apparet legenti; Quia demptis paucissimis, paene in omnibus his scriptis sequitur ecclesiam in fide et ritibus et modo loquendi catholico.

6. Vaughan, *John de Wycliffe, a monograph*, pp. 87, 410.

7. The most accurate and thorough exposition of Wycliff's teaching hitherto published is that of Dr. E. A. Lewald, "Die Theologische Doctrin Johann Wycliffe's nach den Quellen dargestellt, und Kritisch beleuchtel," in the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, 1846, p. 171, f. 503, f. 1847; p. 597 f. Lewald, while making use of Vaughan's *Life and Opinions*, &c., has founded chiefly on the *Trialogus*. He investigates Wiclif's doctrine in its most important heads, following the order and carefully analysing the reasonings of the *Trialogus*. What may still be regarded as defects in this, in many respects, excellent product of German industry and learning, are, I think, these two: first, that the author does not exhibit sharply enough what constitute Wiclif's peculiar and distinctive ideas; and secondly, that the exposition binds itself too closely to each section of the *Trialogus* successively taken up, whereby the connection of the different parts of the same Doctrine is, in more than one instance, broken up, and repetitions are introduced.

8. In the list of lost works of Wiclif given by Shirley in his *Catalogue*, p. 50, f., occur not fewer than twenty-four numbers, which appear to have been works of a logical or metaphysical description.

9. Comp. Appendix, No. II.

10. Comp. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik in Abendlande*, Vol. III., p. 178 f.

11. *Ib.*, Vol. III., 10 f.

12. Vienna MS., 4523, fol. 1, col. 1.

13. It is not a *Theologica Logicis inserere*, as the University of Paris expressed its censure in the year 1247. D'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, I., 158. Paris, 1728.

14. *E.g.*, *De Universalibus*, c. 15; Vienna MS. 4523, fol. 57, col. 1. *De Veritate Scripturae*, c. 14; Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 40, col. 4; fol. 41, col. 3.

15. *Trialogus*, ed. Lechler, Book I., c. 8, p. 62; I., c. 9, p. 66; Book II., c. 3, p. 83.

16. Comp. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik in Abendlande*, III., 183, 273, 297 f.

17. *De Universalibus*, Vienna MS., 4523, fol. 70, col. 1: Quidam enim more sophistarum non solum volunt scire sed videri scientes.

18. *Ib.*, fol. 70, cols. 1 and 2.

19. *Trialogus*, Book I., c. 8, p. 61: Ydea est, veritas absolute necessaria.

20. Si (Deus) illud intelligit, illud habet rationem objectivam, secundum quam terminat intellectivitatem divinam. *Trialogus*, I., 8, p. 63.

21. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik in Abendlande*, III., p. 343 f. Comp. Eduard Erdmann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I. Berlin 1866, p. 432 f.

22. *Trialogus*, I., c. 9, p. 67.—Comp. Lewald's *Theol. Doctrin Wycliffe's*, *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1846, 210 f.

23. *Ib.*, I., c. 11, p. 74: Cum idem sit Deum intus legere creaturam quamlibet, ipsam producere et servare.

24. *Ib.*, I., c. 10, p. 70: Intellectus divinus ac ejus notitia sunt paris ambitus, sicut intellectus creatus et ejus notitia.

25. *Ib.*, I., c. 11, p. 72: Falsum est, quod ydeae alia est ydea, et sic in

infinitum cum multiplicando illa verba homo balbutiendo ignorat se ipsum ; p. 73: Intelligimus res, quae per suas existentias movent objective intellectum nostrum.

26. *De Ydeis*, Vienna MS., 4523, fol. 67, cols. 1 and 2 : Ista rudimenta sunt lactea et infantibilia, in quibus oportet juvenes enutriri, ut subtilia ydearum percipiant. Cavebo ne rudibus et non nutritis in lacte scripturae sic loquar ne darem scandalum fratri meo, etc.

27. In *Trialogus*, I., c. 8., p. 63, he refers to the passage, and in the tractate, *De Ydeis*, just quoted, that saying of St. John is, so to speak, the ever-recurring refrain. He applies the same citation in *De Veritate Scripturæ Sac.*, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 19, col. 1.

28. Lewald, as above, p. 208 f.

29. *De Ydeis*, in MS. mentioned above, fol. 64, col. 2.

30. *Ib.*, fol. 65, col. 1.

31. *Liber Mandatorum*, Vienna MS., 1339, fol. 139, col. *a* : Cum visio creaturarum in proprio genere sit tam imperfecta et tantum distrahens etiam in viae :—Verisimile est, quod non erit in patria. Si ergo voluerimus videre naturam divinam in patria, consideremus creaturas secundum rationes suas, quibus ab ipso cognoscuntur et ordinantur, et convertamur ad orizontem æternitatis, sub quo latet lux ista abscondita.

32. *De Universalibus*, c. 3, Vienna MS., 4523, fol. 69, cols. 1 and 2 : Sic error intellectionis et affectus circa universalia est causa totius peccati regnantis in mundo, etc.

SECTION III.—*Wiclif's Theological System.*

(1.) *The Sources of Christian Truth.*

IN proceeding to treat of Wiclif's theological system, we have to inquire first of all into his fundamental ideas of the Sources of our knowledge of Christian truth. The nature of the subject, and the theological peculiarity of Wiclif, both require precedence to be given to this point.

Wiclif recognises a double source from which Christian knowledge is to be derived—reason and revelation, as we are wont to speak ; *ratio* and *auctoritas*, as the scholastics express themselves. For in all the scholastics we find this distinction made ; bringing forward, as it is their wont to do, for one and the same proposition, first *rationes*, or ground of reason, and next *auctoritates* or testimonies of Holy Scripture, or of

the Fathers, Councils, etc. Wiclif distinguishes, in like manner, between *ratio* and *auctoritas* as two bases of theological argument and of all Christian knowledge.[33]

Under "Reason" Wiclif by no means understands anything merely formal—thinking with its inherent laws—in virtue of which it rejects what is contradictory and draws necessary conclusions from given premises, and regulates the formation of ideas, the process of proof, and the like; in one word, with the term *ratio* Wiclif does not denote merely the formal logic and dialectic. However much stress he lays upon these sciences, in the spirit of his age and of its scholastic philosophy, he by no means contents himself with a merely formal doctrine of thought and a scientific method, but he has a conviction that the reason of man has within itself a certain ground-stock of truth in reference to the invisible, the divine, and the moral. To this stock of intuitional truth belong the *universals*, or ideas, so far as knowledge or the theoretical reason is concerned. With reference, on the other hand, to action and the practical reason, Wiclif appeals to the law of nature which has its seat in the conscience and the natural reason.[34] He looks upon the law of nature as the standard of all laws, so that not only municipal law, but even the moral commandments of Christ, are to be valued according to their conformity to the law of nature.[35] On this subject, indeed, I think I have remarked in Wiclif a certain wavering of judgment, or more accurately a progress of thought in the direction of recognising the exclusively decisive authority of revelation—*i.e.*, of Holy Scripture. For while in the book *De Civili Dominio* he sets forth the law of nature as the independent standard of all laws, even of the moral law of Christ, I find that in his treatise *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture*, which

was written several years later at the least, he recognises the law of Christ as the absolutely perfect law, as the source of all that is good in every other law.[36] But in so saying he has no intention to bring into question that there exists a law of nature in the conscience and the reason.

But not only in matters of action and of duty, but also in matters of faith, Wiclif recognises a *natural light;* only he most distinctly pronounces to be erroneous the notion that the light of faith is opposed to the light of nature, so that what appears to be impossible, in the light of nature, must be held for truth in the light of faith, and *vice versa.* There are not two lights thus contradicting each other, but only the natural light has since the fall been weakened, and labours under a degree of imperfection; but this God heals in the way of grace by the impartation of revealed knowledge. Thus it comes to pass that what one man knows by the spiritual light of grace, another man knows by natural light. Hence the different stages of knowledge in respect to the articles of faith among different men.[37] Thus, *e.g.*, Wiclif has no doubt that Plato and other philosophers were able to know, by means of natural light, that there is a Trinity in the nature of God.[38] And he makes the attempt himself to prove by grounds of reason the doctrine of the Trinity, the necessity of the Incarnation of the Divine Logos, and other doctrines of the gospel.[39] He thus credits reason with an independent power of its own of penetrating deeply into the knowledge of the mysteries of salvation. Herein he occupies the same standpoint as the great majority of the scholastic divines.

But his difference from the other scholastics in the view he takes of "Authority," *i.e.*, of positive revelation, is even more marked than his agreement with them on the sub-

ject of reason. On this subject Wiclif approves himself a thoroughly independent thinker, and especially as a man imbued with the spirit of the Reformation; for he has already come in sight of the principle that Holy Scripture is the only authoritative document of revelation, that it is the Rule and Standard of all teachings and teachers. But I find that on this decisive point it was only step by step that Wiclif attained to the right knowledge.

Apart from reason, the scholastics set forth as a standard principle, "Authority." But under this idea they range, in miscellaneous array, conclusions of Councils, decrees of the Popes, doctrines of the Fathers, Biblical statements. In their eyes Holy Scripture has no peculiar, exclusive, privileged position, no weight which is alone of its kind, and absolutely decisive. In other words, the Middle age, in the generic idea of "Authority," brings together, in *naïve* fashion, two different things, which, since the Reformation, have been distinguished from each other, as well by Roman Catholics as by Protestants, viz., Scripture and Tradition. Criticism is still lacking to such an extent that these two elements are looked upon and made use of as of like nature and like validity. The Bible itself was regarded as only a part of tradition—a book handed down from one generation to another, just as the works of the Fathers were. And tradition, on the other hand, was regarded as falling under the idea of "Scripture," as it was only known by the medium of its written form. We do not mean by this to call in question the fact that the scholastic divines were in general aware of the distinction between the Bible and Church tradition. Evidences of this are, no doubt, to be found in their dogmatic systems, sums, quodlibets, etc. But that was a theoretical distinction. In practice, in bringing proof in

support of any Roman dogma, the distinction was immediately forgotten; traditional elements and scripture proofs were all uncritically jumbled together, as though they were all of equal value; they were all alike "Authorities."

With Wiclif in this respect the case was essentially different. It is true, indeed, as shown above, that he too mentions "authority" along with "reason" in a general way, as sources of knowledge and bases of proof in matters of faith; and in dealing with such questions, like other scholastics, he places Scripture and Tradition in line together, under the one banner of "Authority." But this in his case, when closely examined, is only like a small fragment of egg-shell still adhering to the wings of the new-hatched chicken. It is merely the force of custom which we recognise in this still lingering use of the technical word "Authority." For in all cases where he is independently developing his own principles, and maintaining them not merely in theory, but applying them to particular questions of a practical nature, he draws so sharp a line of distinction between Scripture and Tradition that the two can no longer be properly ranged under the common head of "Authority." For he ascribes to Holy Scripture, and to it alone, the precise idea of "unlimited authority;" he distinguishes in principle between God's word and human tradition, and he recognises the Scriptures as, in and by themselves, the all-sufficing source of Christian knowledge.

Nor was it only at a later stage of his teaching that Wiclif grasped this decisive principle; he gave early expression to it. It was only gradually, it is true, that he reached it, and to what extent this was so, will be shown below. But as early as the date of his collection of "Miscellaneous Sermons," which all belong to the period of his academic

labours, and at all events to the years preceding 1378, he expresses himself in a manner which shows that he fully recognises the alone-sufficiency of the Word of God, and pronounces it to be unbelief and sin to give up the following of "the law of God," and to introduce in place of it human traditions.[40]

With a clear consciousness of the whole bearing and extent of this truth, Wiclif lays down the fundamental proposition—God's law, *i.e.*, Holy Scripture, is the unconditional and absolutely binding authority. This fundamental principle he expresses in innumerable places in sermons, learned treatises and popular tracts, and in the most manifold manner, but always with the consciousness of bearing witness to a truth of the greatest scope. His opponents, too, were quite sensible of the far-reaching and weighty consequences which must result from this principle; and for this reason they did not fail to make it the object of their attacks. It was in defence of the principle, as well as to illustrate and establish it to the utmost of his power that Wiclif wrote one of the most important of his works under the title, *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture* (*De Veritate Scripturae Sacrae*).[41]

How he understands his own principle will best appear, if we inquire in what way he partly establishes and partly applies it. In establishing and proving the principle of the absolute authority of Holy Scripture, Wiclif views his subject on the most different sides. First of all, he sets out from the general truth, that in every sphere there is a *first* which is the standard for everything else in the same sphere.[42] But that the Bible is first and highest in the sphere of religion, he proves by pointing to the fact that Holy Scripture is, as a matter of fact, the Word of God. This last proposition he presents in various turns of expression; at one time he

describes Holy Scripture as the Will and Testament of God the Father, which cannot be broken;[43] and at another he asserts that God and his Word are one, and cannot be separated the one from the other.[44] In other passages he is wont to describe Christ as the proper author of Holy Scripture, and to deduce immediately from that fact its infinite superiority, and absolute authority. As the person of one author is to another, so is the merit of one book compared to another; now it is a doctrine of the faith that Christ is infinitely superior to every other man, and therefore His book or Holy Scripture, which is His law, stands in a similar relation to every other writing which can be named.[45] This being so, he knows not how to give any other physiological explanation of the indisposition of many to acknowledge the unbounded authority of the Bible compared with every other book, in any other way than from their want of sincere faith in the Lord Jesus Christ himself.[46] And as it was a standing usage of thought and speech in the mediaeval period to speak of the Bible as God's law and Christ's law,[47] so Wiclif calls Christ our Lawgiver; he warmly exclaims that Christ has given a law which is sufficient in itself for the whole church militant.[48] But Holy Scripture with Wiclif is not only the work of Christ as its author, not only a law by Him given; it stands yet nearer to Christ: Christ himself is the Scripture which we behove to know; and to be ignorant of the Scripture is the same thing as to be ignorant of Christ.[49]

This thought leads directly to a third argument in support of the unlimited authority of Scripture, viz., the *contents* of the Bible. The Bible contains exactly that which is necessary and indispensable to salvation—a thought which Wiclif gave expression to in allusion to the saying of the Apostle

Peter, "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name given under heaven among men by which we can be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ." [50]

With this limitation of the contents of the Bible to what is necessary to salvation stands connected the universal application and force of the prescriptions and commands of the Gospel. "If Christ had gone more into detail, even in the least, the rule of his religion would have become to a certain extent imperfect; but as it now stands, whether layman or cleric, married man or monk, servant or master, a man may live in every position of life in one and the same service under Christ's rule. The evangelical law, moreover, contains no special ceremonies whereby the universal observance of it would have been made impossible; and therefore the Christian rule and religion, according to the form of it handed down to us in the Gospel, is of all religions the most perfect, and the only one which is in and by itself good." [51]

Last of all he points to the effects of Holy Scripture as an evidence of its truly divine and absolute authority. The sense of Scripture is of more efficacy and use than any other thought or language.[52] The experience of the Church at large speaks for the sufficiency and efficacy of the Bible. By the observance of the pure law of Christ, without mixture of human traditions, the Church very rapidly grew; since the mixing up of traditions with it, the Church has steadily declined.[53] Furthermore, all other forms of wisdom vanish away, whereas the wisdom which the Holy Ghost imparted to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost remains for evermore; and all its enemies have never been able effectually to contradict and withstand it.[54]

This principle of the absolute authority of the Scriptures, which Wiclif knows how to confirm on so many different

sides, immediately finds in his hands the most manifold applications.

From the principle of the divine origin of Scripture immediately follows its infallibility (whereas every other surety, even an enlightened church doctor, like St. Augustin, easily errs and leads into error),[55] its moral purity,[56] and its absolute perfection in matter and form. In the respect last named Wiclif more than once calls attention to the fact that Holy Scripture has a logic of its own, and that its logic is firmly based and unanswerable, and that every believer ought to venerate and follow as an example not only the sense and contents of Scripture, but also its logic.[57] For the Holy Ghost led the Apostles into all truth, and delivered to them also, without doubt, a logic of his own, that they might be able to teach others again with the like authority. But the chief inference which Wiclif deduces from the Bible's divine origin and absolute authority is its perfect and entire *sufficiency*. The Bible alone is the ground document of the Church, its fundamental law, its *charta*. Evidently with allusion to the Magna Charta, the fundamental charter of the civil liberties of his nation, Wiclif loves to speak of the Bible as the charter of the Church's liberties, as the God-given deed of grace and promise.[58] It is the kernel of all laws of the Church, so that every prescription profitable to the Church is contained in it, either expressly or by deduction.[59] And Scripture alone and exclusively has this importance and authority for the Church—a doctrine which corresponds almost literally with the motto of the German Reformation, *verbo solo*,[60] *the Word alone*. To Scripture alone, therefore, is the prerogative ascribed of "authenticity." In comparison with it, all other writings, albeit they may be the genuine works of great Church doctors,

are "apocryphal," and have no claim upon our faith for their own sake.[61]

But not merely in the ecclesiastical sphere and in that of religion and morals, but in the whole circle of human existence, including civil life and the state, all law, according to Wiclif, ought to order itself according to the Law of God. Every action, every charitable deed, buying, exchange, etc., is only so far right and good as the action corresponds with the evangelical law; and in so far as it departs from that law, it is to the same extent wrong and invalid.[62] Yea, he goes so far as to assert that the whole code of civil law behoves to be grounded upon the evangelical law as a Divine Rule[63]—a view which is less evangelical than legal, and reaches farther in its consequences than can be approved, for it leads directly to a complete Theocracy, if not a complete Hierarchy.

From what precedes flows the rule—Put nothing, whatever it be, upon a footing of equality with Holy Scripture, still less above it. Wiclif lays down the proposition without reserve, "It is impossible that any word or any deed of the Christian should be of equal authority with Holy Scripture."[64] And to place above Scripture, and prefer to it human traditions, doctrines, and ordinances, is nothing but an act of blind presumption. A power of human appointment which pretends to set itself above the Holy Scriptures is only fitted to lame the efficacy of the Word of God, and to introduce confusion.[65] Yea, it leads to blasphemy, when the Pope puts forward the claim that what he decrees in matters of faith must be received as Gospel, and that his law must, even more than the Gospel itself, be observed and carried out. It is the simple moral consequence of the doctrine, that "Scripture alone is of absolute autho-

rity," when Wiclif enforces the duty of holding wholly and entirely to Scripture, and Scripture alone—of "hearing Moses and the prophets"[67] (Luke xvi.), and not even to mix the commandments of men with evangelical truths. Men who practice such a mixture of God's truth and human traditions Wiclif calls mixtim-theologi, medley divines.[68] He also remarks that it is no justification of a doctrine that it contains, in a collateral way, much that is good and reasonable, for so is it even now with the behests and the whole life of the Devil himself; otherwise God would not suffer him to exercise such power. But Christian law should be only and purely the law of God, which is without spot and giveth life to souls; and therefore a law of tradition ought to be repudiated by all the faithful, on account of the mixture of even a single atom of Antichrist.[69] By a glance into the history of the Church of Christ Wiclif discovers that this departure from the Evangelical Law through the mixture of later traditions was at first very slight and almost inobservable, but that in process of time the corruption became always ranker and ranker.[70]

But this is, unmistakeably, nothing else but the principle that "God's Word pure and simple" ought to be taught, and that God's Word, and nothing else, not even any angel, ought to determine articles of faith, as laid down in the Second of the Lutheran Articles of Schmalkald. In one word, this is the Reformational Bible principle—the so-called *formal* principle of Protestantism. Wiclif himself was well aware of the importance and wide bearing of his Bible principle. That is the reason why he calls his adherents 'Men of the Gospel"—*viri evangelici, doctores evangelici*,[71] etc.—a name which, in the mouth of his admirers and disciples, was applied to himself as a

high title of honour. If honorary titles were created for other scholastic divines, which, for the most part, were taken from their scientific pre-eminences, such as *Doctor subtilis, irrefragabilis, profundus, resolutissimas*, etc., or from their moral purity and elevation, such as *Doctor angelicus, seraphicus*, etc.; so for Wiclif the title of honour, *Doctor Evangelicus*, which early became current among his friends and followers, and was also transplanted to the Continent (as appears from a number of passages in Wiclif-manuscripts transcribed by the Hussites), was one of a kind to indicate, in an appropriate way, his high estimation of the value of the Gospel —an estimate which he put upon nothing else—and to signalise, in fact, his characteristic Bible principle.

And here also may be the proper place to mention that Wiclif's knowledge of the Bible was, in fact, astonishing. The remarkable number of Scripture passages which, in a single work, he sometimes explains and sometimes applies, *e.g.*, in the *Trialogus*, is of itself enough to show that he was, in an extraordinary degree, familiar with the Bible. And although his skill in interpretation is not masterly (how *could* it be so at that time?), yet I have not seldom found in the reading of his unprinted works that he often manifests a felicitous tact and exact judgment in the process, and that an appropriate passage of Scripture does not easily escape him when his object is to arrange a train of Scripture proof. But his Bible knowledge is almost more remarkable in cases when it is not his object to quote Scripture, but when, notwithstanding, the whole life and movement of what he writes is in Scripture thought and phrase.

The fact is not without importance that even the enemies of Wiclif, as before remarked, knew and controverted his

Scripture principle. In particular, it may be in place to mention that one of his opponents accuses him of being, on this point, an adherent of the "heretic Occam"; in other words, that he had borrowed from Occam the principle of resting exclusively on Scripture—as, in fact, men have ever been inclined, in the case of any tendency manifesting itself, at any period, which appeared suspicious and erroneous, to identify it with, and to derive it entirely from, some earlier teaching which had been already condemned and branded as unsound doctrine. The fact of this accusation having been made I know from Wiclif's own words, as in his book, *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture*, he takes notice of the objection, and replies to it.[72] His words are to the effect that his nameless opponent had said, as had been told him by three trustworthy men, that Wiclif did exactly what "that heretic" Occam and his followers had done before him, viz., he took his stand upon the literal sense of Holy Scripture, and would submit to no other judgment whatever. Farther on, where he answers this accusation, Wiclif replies, among other things, that he had neither borrowed his principles from Occam, nor thought them out for himself; instead of that, they are irrefragably grounded in Holy Scripture itself, and are in repeated instances set forth also by the holy Fathers. Now, this assertion of Wiclif is fully confirmed when we look into Occam's own writings upon the point. He appeals, indeed, wherever possible, to Holy Scripture (particularly in his controversial pieces against Pope John XXII.), and he knows how to select his proof-passages with intelligence and judgment. But still there is an important difference between him and Wiclif on the subject of the rank and prerogative of the Bible's authority. The difference is this,

that Occam always appeals to, and claims authority for, Scripture and Church-teaching *in combination*—always thinks of the two as being always found in harmony. Evidently he cannot for a moment reconcile himself to the thought that the sanctioned doctrines of the Church itself, as well as the teaching of the Fathers of the Church, must first be tested by the help of Scripture.[74] Whereas Wiclif distinguishes quite clearly between Scripture and Church teaching, and recognises the Bible as the supreme standard by which even the doctrines of the Church and the Fathers are to be tried. In brief, any dependence of Wiclif upon Occam for his Scripture principle is an allegation which cannot with any show of right be maintained. On the contrary, Wiclif, in point of fact, took a decided step *in advance* to the truly evangelical standpoint, the standpoint of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Wiclif took this step, in our judgment, with entire independence; and it could not have been owing to a mere self-deception that he was conscious of having derived his principle of the absolute authority of the Bible, and the Bible alone, from no other source than from the Scripture itself, by means of his own personal investigations.

Before Wiclif's time, the Waldenses came the nearest to the Biblical principle of the Reformation, when, in their desire to justify their practice of free lay preaching in opposition to the Romish hierarchy, they appealed from the existing law of the Church to divine law, to the Word of God, to Holy Scripture. They thus set against Church tradition and Church law the Holy Scriptures as the higher and decisive authority, by which they measured and tested not only the prohibition of lay preaching, but also other ordinances and traditions of the existing Church.[75] Still it requires to be carefully considered

that the Waldenses were led indeed by their practical necessities to see and to make use of the normal authority of the Holy Scriptures, but the Bible principle itself *as such* they failed abstractly to grasp and consciously to realise; whereas in the case of Wiclif we find all this present in full measure; not to remind the reader again, which is unnecessary in these circumstances, that Wiclif appears to have had only an imperfect knowledge of all that relates to the Waldenses.

We cannot leave this subject before touching upon several points, which, though not of first-rate importance, are yet by no means of quite subordinate interest.

The first of these has reference to the interpretation of Scripture. And here we have reached the point which we before hinted at, where I believe I am able to show an important advance in the personal development of Wiclif. The Scripture principle attains to only half its rights, so long as the Bible is acknowledged, indeed, to be the supreme and decisive authority, but yet in practice the authority of Church tradition is exalted anew as the standard of Scripture interpretation. For then the tradition which had been before repudiated comes in again by a back door, and under cover of the motto "Holy Scripture alone," the authority of the Church, and traditional Church doctrine assert themselves once more.

At this latter stage of opinion Wiclif found himself, at a time when he was already a doctor of theology, and recognised as an authority, apart from reason, only the Holy Scripture, not tradition. On the other hand, he still held two guides to be indispensable to the understanding and interpretation of Scripture, viz., Reason and the interpretation of the Holy Church doctors as approved by the Church.[76] The work in which he so expresses himself

respecting Scripture and its interpretation was written at latest in the year 1376. But only a few years later he had already come to see that not even in the work of Scripture interpretation can the tradition of the Church have a decisive weight. In the third book of his treatise *De Civili Dominio*, c. 26, he opposes the opinion that every part of Scripture is of doubtful meaning, because it can only be understood by the help of the doctors of the Church, and these doctors may put us in a difficulty by opposing interpretations; and because it was competent for the Church of Rome to decide that any part of Scripture has a sense the opposite of that which had hitherto been assumed. To which Wiclif replies, "No created being has power to reverse the sense of the Christian faith—the holy doctors put us in no difficulty, but rather teach us to abstain from the love of novelties, and to be sober-minded." But the chief thought which he opposes to this view is that "The Holy Ghost teaches us the right understanding of Scripture, as Christ opened the Scripture to the Apostles."[77]

Here we see that Wiclif has already begun to have doubts respecting the right of the Church to speak with a decisive voice in the business of Scripture interpretation. And it is thoroughly well meant when Wiclif says "the Holy Ghost instructs us in the understanding of the Scripture." The only remaining question is, By what means and in what way do we arrive at certainty that the sense which we find in a given passage, or in Scripture as a whole, is really the sense of the Holy Ghost? It would, in Wiclif's own judgment, be to enter upon a dangerous path for an interpreter to be so bold as to claim to be assured by the illumination of the Holy Ghost that he had hit upon the right meaning of Scripture.[78] Wiclif goes no farther, indeed, than this, that

an indispensable means of attaining to the right understanding of Scripture is the enlightenment of the Scripture inquirer by God Himself; for Christ is the true light which lighteneth every man (John i. 9), and hence it is impossible that any man should have light to know the meaning of Scripture unless he is first enlightened by Christ.[79] He even confesses on one occasion for himself that at an earlier period of his life he had spoken about the Scripture "as a child" (1 Cor. xiii. 11), and had felt himself greatly at a loss in the defence of Scripture till his eyes had been graciously opened to perceive the right understanding of it, and to arrive at the conviction of its perfect truth.[80] And in connection with this he repeatedly insists upon the truth that a devout and virtuous and humble spirit is requisite if a man would understand the genuine sense of Scripture (*sensus Catholicus*). Putting away all pretentious sophistical hollowness, and renouncing all disputing about mere words, a man must search out the meaning of every Scripture writer in *humility*.[81]

So much on the *personal* spirit of every honest "Disciple of Scripture." But on the objective matter itself, by far the most important truth taught by Wiclif, and what he repeatedly insists upon, is the tenor of Scripture teaching as a whole, from which follows the rule of always explaining it in single passages in a manner agreeable to its collective sense; in other words, to interpret Scripture by Scripture. It is a part of this truth when he warns against "tearing the Scriptures in pieces," as the heretics do. We must rather take them in connection, and as a whole; only then can they be rightly understood, for the whole Holy Scripture is one God's Word. It is in harmony with itself; often one part of Scripture explains the others;

it is all the more useful to read Scripture diligently in order to perceive its harmony with itself.[82] With such views, it may easily be conceived that Wiclif is no friend of arbitrary interpretation, which played so large a part at that period; he opposes it often enough. And although he now no longer recognises in principle that the traditional interpretation of the Church is the authorised guide, still the *consensus* of the Fathers in the understanding of Scriptures has great weight in his judgment, in any case where it occurs; more than once he lays stress upon the *consonantia cum sensu Doctorum.*[83]

But as Wiclif sets out from the conviction, which he derived chiefly from Augustin, that Holy Scripture includes in itself all truth—partly mediately, partly immediately—so he maintains, on the one hand, that reason is indispensable to the right understanding of Scripture; and on the other hand, that the right understanding of Scripture is the only thing which can work in the mind a joyful and unlimited assent to its contents.[84]

It is well known that in mediæval times the conviction was firmly held that Holy Scripture bears a manifold—indeed, a fourfold sense. To this traditional opinion Wiclif nowhere opposes himself. Ever and anon, *e.g.*, in his sermons, he expressly assents to it. But it is characteristic of the good sense and sobriety of his thinking that it is from the literal sense of Scripture that he sets out; and that he claims for this sense to be the indispensable, the never-to-be-depreciated, and the abiding basis of all thorough and deep understanding of the Scriptures. He knows right well that a reckless man would be in a position to pervert the whole sense of Scripture, if he denies the literal sense and invents a figurative sense at his pleasure. On the contrary, he lays down the principle that all the counsels of Christ, as all

Holy Scripture in general, must be observed to the letter, as every particle of Scripture, in virtue of its incontrovertible contents, is true. The literal sense, indeed, may be taken in two ways: sometimes according to first appearances, as ignorant grammarians and logicians take it; at other times according to that understanding of it which an orthodox teacher acquires by the instruction of the Holy Ghost. And that, precisely, is the *spiritual sense*, to reach which the doctors of Holy Scripture are specially bound to use all their endeavours.

On this subject I find a thought expressed which is thoroughly to the point, that there is nothing like a gap intervening betwixt the literal and the spiritual sense; but that the latter is immediately connected with the simple sense of the words; and that everything depends on determining the spiritual sense which is couched in the literal sense. And this is what Wiclif also does in the turn which he gives to Scripture. As a rule, he takes his start from the literal sense; and, as remarked above, he knows, on numerous occasions, how to make Scripture passages yield a sense as simple as it is full and rich.

The Curialists in Wiclif's time were accustomed to found upon Luke 22—"See, here are two swords," taken along with the answer of Jesus—"It is enough"—a Scripture proof of the dogma, that to Peter, and therefore to the Pope as his rightful successor, there appertains a twofold power—the spiritual and the temporal; for this double power is signified, figuratively, by the two swords. In opposition to this Wiclif observes, with the support of Augustin's rules of interpretation, that a *leap* from the literal sense to the spiritual avails nothing if this figurative meaning is not founded upon other places of Scripture. But now, he con-

tinues, this mystical sense of Peter's double power of the keys has a basis in Scripture nowhere else; and the whole, therefore, is merely a sophistical, false conclusion, proceeding ultimately from the suggestion of a wicked spirit.[86] With this well-founded leaning to the literal sense of Holy Scripture, Wiclif's favourable judgment of Nicolas of Lyra, who was his cotemporary (†1340), may be readily understood. In adducing some of his interpretations, he calls him a modern, indeed, but a thoughtful and pregnant interpreter of Scripture according to the letter.[87] As a proof how attentively Wiclif takes notice of the usage of language (*usus loquendi*), even in small particles, let the circumstance be mentioned here, that in investigating the question of man's ability for good, apart from grace, he remarks upon the distinction between ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν and ἐξ ἑαυτων (2 Cor. iii. 5); and then, after a comparison of passages bearing a resemblance in point of expression, he adds the observation that the Apostle Paul, on good grounds, was careful in his use of prepositions and adverbs.[88] On weighing this observation well, we immediately perceive that, if consequently carried through, it would form the basis of a rational system of grammatical interpretation. We are not entitled to suppose, of course, that Wiclif was aware of any such bearing of the thoughts which he expressed. But the expression appears, nevertheless, worthy of remark, as a minute indication of fine observation and careful interpretation of terms.

To the question in what relation to each other Wiclif placed the Old and New Testament, the only answer that can be given is that while he exhibits, on more than one side, the difference between the two revelations, he is yet not clearly aware of their fundamental difference. In repeated instances he has occasion to speak of the distinction

between the two Testaments. Not seldom he mentions, in connection with his censure of the encroachments of the Hierarchy upon the civil province, that the New Testament does not meddle with that sphere.[89] But in one place he examines the distinction in question upon its purely scientific side, under several heads, viz., as to their respective contents, authorship, kind and manner of revelation, degree of perfection, etc.[90] And here Wiclif, it is true, speaks to the effect that in the Old Testament the prevailing thing is *fear;* in the New Testament, *love.*[91] This appears to be quite apposite. He fails notwithstanding, as already said, in the right insight into the radical and essential difference between law and gospel. He makes use, indeed, of these two simple and weighty designations of the two Testaments; and also characterises quite accurately the spirit of the man who stands under the law, and of the man who lives in the state of grace. But the single circumstance that he so often, and without the least misgiving, speaks of the evangelical *law* (*lex Evangelica*), and describes Christ as our *lawgiver* (*Legifer*) is a sufficient indication to us that he had not yet become fully conscious of the essential difference between Moses and Christ, law and gospel, law and grace. The deeper ground of this we shall find below in his doctrine of the way of salvation. It lies in this, that he had not yet come in sight of the *material* principle of Protestantism—justification by faith alone. We have, accordingly, no ground to understand the title of honour which was given him of *Doctor Evangelicus* in the full sense of a decidedly Pauline theology, and of a truly evangelical doctrine of salvation. If Wiclif had been a *Doctor Evangelicus* in his doctrine of the way of salvation, as he was in

his doctrine of the sole authority of Scripture, he would not, humanly speaking, have remained a mere precursor of the Reformation, but would have been himself a Reformer.

That Wiclif recognised the right of all Christians to the use of the Bible is a point which it is hardly necessary to dwell upon here, after having seen above, in the sixth and seventh chapters, how emphatically he inculcated the duty of preaching God's Word, and how he had translated it into English in order to make it accessible to the people. We may remark, however, that the deep veneration which he felt for the Word of God, and the knowledge which he had acquired of its infinite value, were enough to lead him to the conclusion that the Bible is a book for every man. This thought he expresses often enough in the clearest manner, not only in the treatise *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture*, where this was most to be expected, but also in other writings. In the work just mentioned he says in one place, the "Holy Scripture is the faultless, most true, most perfect, and most holy law of God, which it is the duty of all men to learn to know, to defend, and to observe, inasmuch as they are bound to serve the Lord in accordance with it, under the promise of an eternal reward." [92] In *The Mirror for Temporal Lords*, he demands for all believing people immediate access to the Holy Scriptures, chiefly on the ground that Christian truth is made known more clearly and accurately there than the priests are able to declare it; while many of the prelates besides are quite ignorant of Scripture, and others of them intentionally hold back from the people certain portions of Scripture doctrine.[93] And in his English tract, the *Wykett*, he exclaims with emotion—"If God's Word is the life of the world, and every word of God is the life of the human

soul, how may any Antichrist, for dread of God, take it away from us that be Christian men, and thus to suffer the people to die for hunger in heresy and blasphemy of men's laws, that corrupteth and slayeth the soul?"[94]

NOTES TO SECTION III.

33. *E.g.*, *Trialogus*, I., c. 8, p. 61 : Nec ratio, nec auctoritas hoc convincit ; and similarly in other places.

34. *De Veritate Scripturae*, c. 12, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 31, col. 4. Here he is speaking of violences threatened to his own person, and expresses the opinion that a Jew or heathen would, from an inborn sentiment of goodness, abhor those who were guilty of such, inasmuch as they "obviant legi conscientiæ et naturaliter insitæ rationi."

35. *De Civili Dominio*, II., c. 13., Vienna MS., 1341, fol. 207, col. 2 : De quanto aliqua lex ducit propinquius ad conformitatem legis naturæ est ipsa perfectior. Sed lex Christi patiendi injurias propinquius ducit ad statum naturæ quam civilis. Ergo ista cum suis regulis est lege civili perfectior. Comp. c. 17, fol. 236, col. 2.

36. *De Veritate Scrip. Sac.*, c. 20, fol. 67, col. 1. The love of our neighbour is thoroughly learned and acquired by the law of Christ ; in tantum quod si lex alia docet caritatem aut virtutem aliquam, ipsa adeo est lex Christi.

37. *Trialogus*, I., c. 6, p. 55 f.

38. *Ib.*, I., c. 6, p. 56.

39. *Ib.*, I., c. 7, p. 58 ; III., c. 25, p. 214.

40. Vienna MS., 3928, Sermon XVIII., fol. 222, col. 2 : Infidelis consideratio est, quod periret ecclesia nisi præter legem Dei humanis legibus regularetur. In hoc enim peccatur infideliter, dimittendo executionem legis Dei, et inducendo traditiones humanas fomenta litium.

41. *De Veritate Scripturæ Sacræ*, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 1-119, col. 2. This work forms part of the so-called *Summa* of Wiclif, namely, its Sixth Book, and with its 32 chapters would fill a printed volume of about thirty sheets. That this work had its origin in theological lectures is certain, both from its contents and form. Its date also is fixed by two passages to have been the year 1378. The book is properly nothing more than a defence of the Bible against the *accusatores* or *inimici Scripturæ* of whom the author repeatedly speaks, *e.g.*, c. 12 and 28. From one passage in the first chapter it appears that one leading opponent in particular of Wiclif and his teaching, along with others of the same views, had given the proximate occasion to this apology for the Bible ; and this is the reason, no doubt, why the personality of Wiclif himself stands out in this particular work with an almost statuesque effect. I have thought it right to insert in the Appendix a somewhat long extract of this nature.

42. *De Blasphemia*, the 12th book of his *Theological Summa*, Vienna MS., 3943,

fol. 126, col. 2 : In omni genere est unum primum quod est metrum et mensura omnium aliorum.

43. *De Veritate Scrip. Sac.*, Vienna MS., 1294, c. 9, fol. 21, col. 4 : Si non licet filio infringere testamentum patris terreni, multo magis non licet catholico dissolvere testamentum infrangibile Dei patris. Comp. c. 14, fol. 43, col. 3, where he calls Scripture testimonium Dei, quod voluit remanere in terris, ut suam voluntatem cognoscerent, etc.

44. *Wycket*, ed. Oxford, 1828, p. 5 : for he (God) and his word are all one, and they may not be separated.

45. *Trialogus*, B. III, c. 31, p. 239.

46. *Trialogus*, III., 31, p. 238 : Non sincere credimus in Dominum Jesum Christum, cum hoc dato ex fide fructuosa teneremus, quod scripturae s.—sit infinitum major auctoritas quam auctoritas alterius scripturae signandæ.

47. Among the writers of the fourteenth century, I name only Occam, Marsilius of Padua, Peter D'Ailly, and of the fifteenth century, John of Goch, which latter lays great stress upon evangelical liberty ; and yet, as little as Occam, finds any difficulty in boasting of the evangelicæ legis libertas ; Goch, De quatuor erroribus circa legem evangelicam exortis, in Walch, Monimenta medii ævi, *Fasc.*, 4. p. 75 f. ; Occam, De jurisdictione imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus, in Goldast, *Monarchia*, I., p. 24.

48. *De Officio Regis*, Vienna MS., 3933, c. 9, fol. 46, col. 1 : Legifer noster Jesus Christus legem per se sufficientem dedit ad regimen totius ecclesiæ militantis.

49. *De Veritate Scripturæ s.*, c. 21, fol. 70, col. 2 : Ignorare scripturas est ignorare Christum, cum Christus sit scriptura, quam debemus cognoscere.

50. *De Blasphemia*, c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 118, col. 3. Comp. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 1, fol. 1, col. 2 : in illa consistit salus fidelium.

51. *De Civili Dominio*, II., c. 13, Vienna MS., 1341, fol. 311, cols. 1 and 2 : Nullas particulares cerimonias exprimit, quibus eis universalis observantia vetaretur. Ideo regula ac religio Christiana secundum formam in evangelio traditam est omnium perfectissima et sola per se bona.

52. *De Veritate Scripturæ s.*, c. 15, fol. 45, col. 4 : Efficacia sententiæ (the subject spoken of is the Bible) est magis utilis . . . . quam sententia vel locutio aliena.

53. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 44, MS. 1341, fol. 141, col. 1 : Pure per observantiam legis Christi sine commixtione traditionis humanæ crevit ecclesia celerrime ; et post commixtionem fuit continue diminuta.

54. *Ib.*, III., 26, MS. 1340, fol. 252, col. 2 : Aliæ logicæ et sapientiæ evanescunt, sed os et sapientia, quam dedit apostolis in die pentecostes, manet in æternum, cui non potuerunt efficaciter resistere et contradicere omnes adversarii.

55. *Sermons for Saints' Days* No. LV., MS. 3928, fol. 112, col. 3. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 4, col. 3 : Locus a testimonio Augustini non est infallibilis, cum Augustinus sit errabilis.

56. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 34, MS. 1341, fol. 81, col. 2 ; Lex humana est mixta multa nequitia, ut patet de . . . . regulis civilibus, ex quibus pullulant multa

mala; lex autem evangelica est immaculata. Comp. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 10, MS. 1339, fol. 114 col. 2 (after Psalm xviii., 31).

57. *Trialogus*, I., 9, p. 65: Sicut sacrae scripturæ sententia, sic et ejus logica est a fidelibus veneranda, III., 31, p. 242; cum logica scripturæ sit rectissima, subtilissima et maxime usitanda. Comp. *Supplementem Trialogi*, c. 6, p. 434. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 3, MS. 1294, fol. 6, col. 1.

58. *De Ecclesia*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 165, col. 1: Sine conservatione hujus cartæ impossibile est quod maneat dignitas ad privilegium vel aliquod bonum gratuitum capiendum. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 12, fol. 32, col. 4, he calls the Bible carta a Deo scripta et nobis donata, per quam vindicabimus regnum Dei. Comp. c. 14, fol. 43, col. 4.

59. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 21, fol. 71, col. 1: Lex Christi est medulla legum ecclesiæ. *De Ecclesia*, c. 8, fol. 152, col. 3: Omnis lex utilis sanctae matri ecclesiæ docetur explicite vel implicite in scriptura.

60. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 44, MS. 1341, fol. 133, col. 1: Sola scriptura s. est illius auctoritatis et reverentiae, quod, si quidquam asserit, debet credi.

61. *Trialogus*, III., 31, p. 239: quod scriptura s. sit infinitum magis autentica et credenda, quam quæcunque alia . . . . Unde scripta aliorum doctorum magnorum, quantumcunque vera, dicuntur apocrypha, etc. In the use of this term apocrypha (it is the same with Occam), Wiclif does not refer to the genuineness of these writings, but to their credibility and authority.

62. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 35, MS. 1341, fol. 83, col. 2.

63. *Ib.*, c. 20, fol. 45, col. 1: Totum corpus juris humani debet inniti legi evangelicæ tanquam regulæ essentialiter divinae.

64. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 15, fol. 48, col. 2: Impossibile est, ut dictum Christiani vel factum aliquod sit paris auctoritatis cum Scriptura s.

65. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 36, fol. 86, col. 2; *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 22, MS. 1339, fol 180, col. 1: Potestas jurisdictionis super scripturam s. humanitus introducta potest effectum legis Dei casando confundere.

66. *De Blasphemia*, c. 3, MS. 3933, fol. 125, col. 3.

67. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 11, fol. 24, col. 1. Spiritual rulers are bound uti pro suo regimine lege evangelica impermixte. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 14, fol. 32, col. 3: Videtur mihi summum remedium solide credere fidem scripturae, et nulli alii in quocunque credere, nisi de quanto se fundaverit ex scriptura. *Ibid.*, c. 20, fol. 66, col. 1: Utilius et undique expeditius foret sibi (ecclesiæ) regulari pure lege scripturae, quam quod traditiones humanæ sint sic commixtae cum veritatibus evangelicis, ut sunt modo.

68. *De Veritate Scripturae*, c. 7, fol. 17, col. 3: ut quidam Dr. traditionis humanæ et mixtim-theologus dicit. Comp. *De Condemnatione XIX Conclusionum*, in Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizan.*, 1858. The opposite to this is purus theologus, *De Ecclesia*, c. 10.

69. *De Blasphemia*, c. 8, MS. 3933, fol. 144, col. 1: Lex autem christiana debet esse solum lex Domini et immaculata convertens animas, et per consequens recusari debet a cunctis fidelibus propter commixtionem cujuscunque attomi (*sic*) antichristi.

70. *Sermons for Saints' Days*, No. XLIX., MS. 3928, fol. 99, col, 1.

71. *Ib.* No. XXXI., fol. 61, col. 2, No. XXXVIII., fol. 76, col 4. Also in the 24 Miscellaneous Sermons, No. XIX. fol. 175, col. 1. Under *viri evangelici* in these places, at least in the two last, are chiefly meant Wiclif's itinerant preachers. But of *doctores evangelici* he speaks in *De Civili Dominio*, MS. 1340, fol. 163, col. 1.

72. *De Veritate Scripturae*, as above, c. 14, fol. 40, col 4. Comp. fol. 41. col. 3. Both places are found in the excerpt from this work given in Appendix.

73. *E.g.*, Defensorium contra Joannem papam XII., in *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum*, etc., ed. Brown, 1690, fol. 439-957. *Dialogus* in Goldast, *Monarchia*, Frankfort, 1668, II., fol. 398-957. Opus nonaginta dierum contra errores Joannnis XXII. papæ de utili dominio rerum ecclesiasticarum, etc. Goldast, II., f. 993-1236.

74. Occam, in his *Dialogus*, Lib. f. II., fol. 410 f., in Goldast, investigates the question of what constitutes false doctrine, and he brings into view the principle as one which had been held by some, while at the same time himself opposing it, that only those doctrines should be held to be orthodox and necessary to salvation which are taught either directly or indirectly in Holy Scripture. With this principle, Wiclif's, it is true, is identical, but there is nothing to show, notwithstanding, that he had borrowed it from any quarter.

75. *Dieckhoff*, die Waldenser in Mittelalter. Göttingen, 1851, p. 171 f., 267 f.

76. In Pref. to Book I., *De Dominio Divino*, MS. 1339, fol. 1, col. 1 : Innitar . . . . in ordine procedendi rationi et sensui scripturae, cui ex religione et speciali obedientia sum professus. . . . . Sed ut sensum hujus incorrigibilis scripturae sequar securius, innitar ut plurimum duobus ducibus, scilicet rationi philosophis revelatae, et postillationi sanctorum doctorum apud ecclesiam approbatæ.

77. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 26, MS. 1340, fol. 252, col. 2 : Spiritus sanctus docet nos sensum scripturae, sicut Christus aperuit apostolis sensum ejus.

78. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 15, fol. 45, col. 1 : Ne pseudo-discipuli fingant se immediate habere a Deo suam sententiam, ordinavit Deus communem scripturam sensibilem.

79. *De Veritate Scripturae s.* c. 9, fol. 23, col. 1. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 19, fol. 162, col. 2 : Nemo sufficit intelligere minimam scripturæ particulam, nisi spiritus s. aperuerit sibi sensum, sicut Christus fecit apostolis.

80. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 6, fol. 13, col. 1. Comp. c. 2, fol. 4, col 4 : Nisi Deus docuerit sensum scripturae, est error in januis.

81. *Ib.*, c. 15, fol. 45, col. 1 : Ad irradiationem confert sanctitas vitae ; c. 9, fol. 22, col. 4 : virtuosa dispositio discipuli scripturae, is viewed as including auctoritatis scripturae humilis acceptatio ; c. 5, fol. 12, col. 1 : sensus auctoris humiliter indagandus.

82. *De Veritate Scripturae s.* c. 19, fol. 62, col. 3 : Tota scriptura s. est unum Dei verbum. Comp. c. 12, fol. 31, col. 1 : Tota lex Christi est unum perfectum verbum procedens de ore Dei ; c. 4, fol. 9, col. 4 : Non licet lacerare scripturam s., sed allegare eam in sua integritate ad sensum auctoris. Comp. c. 6, fol. 15, col. 3 :

Hæretici lacerando . . . . negant scripturam s. esse veram, et non concedendo eam ex integro capiunt ; e contra autem catholici allegant pro se scripturam s., ... cum acceptant ejus autenticam veritatem ex integro ad sensum, quem sancti Doctores docuerant. Farther, c. 9, fol. 22, col. 3 : Crebra lectio partium scripturae videtur ex hoc necessarium (*sic*), quod saepe una pars scripturae exponit aliam. Prodest crebro legere partes scripturae pro habendo conceptu suae concordantiae. In the *Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. XL., MS. 3928, fol. 213, col. 1, Wiclif observes : Sunt enim veritates scripturae quae sunt verba Dei, sic connexae, quod unumquodque juvat quodlibet.

83. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 15, fol. 45, col. 1. Comp. c. 12, fol. 31, col. 4.

84. Lewald in *Zeitschrift für Historiche Theologie*, 1846, p. 177. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 9, fol. 22, col. 4 : Utrobique in scripturae s. est conformitas rationi, et per consequens ratio est testis necessarius ad habendam sententiam scripturarum.

85. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 2, fol. 4, col. 3 : Et sic posset proterviens totum sensum scripturae subvertere negando sensum literalem et fingendo sensum figurativum ad libitum. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 19 : Omnia Christi consilia—sicut et tota scriptura—ad literatum observanda, etc. Et iste sensus est spiritualis, circa quem doctores sacrae paginae debent specialiter laborare. Comp. c. 9, fol. 56, col. 2.

86. *De Quatuor Sectis Novellis*, MS. 3929, fol. 232, col. 4 : Non valet saltus a literali sensu scripturae ad sensum misticum, nisi ille sensus misticus sit alicubi fundatus. . . .

87. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 12: Doctor de Lyra, licet novellus, tamen copiosus et ingeniosus postillatur scripturae ad literam, scribit, etc.

88. *De Dominio Divino*, III., c. 5, fol. 84, col. 2 : Apostolus autem de ratione notabili respexit praepositiones et adverbia.

89. *De Officio Pastorali*, II., c. 7, p. 39 : Christus renuit judicium seculare, quod approbat in lege veteri.

90. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 7-9, MS. 1339, fol. 104, col. 1 ; fol. 112, col. 1.

91. *Ib.*, c. 7, fol. 105, col. 2 : Brevis est differentia legis et evangelii, timor et amor. Comp. c. 8, fol. 107, col. 1 : Lex nova tanquam amorosa est lege timorosa perfectior.

92. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 7, fol. 17, col. 4 : quam omnes homines tenentur cognoscere defendere et servare, cum secundum illam tenentur sub obtentu aeterni praemii Domino ministrare.

93. *Speculum Secularium Dominorum*, c. 1. *Vide* my essay, *Wiclif und die Lollarden, Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie*, 1853, p. 433, note 30. Comp. Lewald, *Theologische Doctrin des Johann Wycliffe*, in the same *Zeitschrift*, 1846, 180 f.

SECTION IV.—*Doctrine of God and the Divine Trinity.*

IN the first four chapters of his *Trialogus*, Wiclif goes into the proofs of the existence of God. He occupies himself partly with the ontological proofs, in which he closely follows Anselm of Canterbury in his *Proslogium*, partly with the cosmological proofs. In the former he starts from the idea of "The Highest Thinkable," and comes to the conclusion that this highest thinkable also exists. In the latter he starts from the idea of a cause, and arrives at the existence of a last and highest cause.[95] As Wiclif in this place appropriates to himself successions of thought which had already been made use of by previous thinkers, and appears to be peculiar only in the reflections which he makes upon them, it cannot be necessary for me to enter farther into them here, and I content myself with referring to the exposition of them given by Lewald.

In his inquiry into the attributes of God, on the other hand, we come in sight of a peculiarity of Wiclif's doctrine, which we may briefly indicate as *positivity*, in the philosophical sense, or as realism. The subject discussed is the nature of our idea of the infinitude of God. Wiclif sets out from the axiom that God is the absolutely perfect Being. Following Anselm of Canterbury and his *Proslogium*, he lays down the twofold principle—(1), God is the highest that can be thought; (2), God is the best which exists; and in the inquiry into God's attributes he always proceeds upon the ruling principle that God is all which it is better to be than not to be.[97] But according to all this an idea of God may be formed quite different from Wiclif's idea of Him. The infinitude of God may be thought of in a vague and absolutely

indefinite sense, or in the sense of a positive and substantive perfection. Wiclif takes the latter view with distinct consciousness and decision. He insists on its being understood, not merely in a negative but positive sense, that God is immeasurable and infinite, as God possesses a positive perfection in this respect.[98]

How this is meant will become clear when we take up single attributes of God. As to God's omnipotence, Wiclif decidedly rejects the idea of a wholly unlimited power of doing. It does not follow—*e. g.*, from God's omnipotence—that He has the power to become less than He is, or the power to lie, etc. Neither is it allowable to conclude, on the other hand, that God's power is a limited one because He is unable to do what men do, namely, to lie, or to fall away from rectitude; for to lie, or to fall away, does not mean the doing of something, but abstaining from the doing of the good.[99] Wiclif regards it as the action of a mistaken imagination when men suppose that God is able to bring into existence an infinite world for Himself; he puts in the place of an alleged unlimited and boundless power the idea of a power conditioned and limited by no other power, the *greatest positive* power of all.[100] In other words, he conceives of the Divine omnipotence as a power self-determining, morally regulated, ordered by inner laws (*potentia Dei ordinata*, in opposition to *potentia absoluta*).[101] He thus arrives at the proposition that God's almighty power and His actual work of creation and causation are coincident with and cover each other.

In a similar way he expresses himself respecting the Divine *omniscience*. This appears to him to be in every respect a *real* or actual wisdom. God's wisdom is a thing of absolute necessity, for He necessarily knows, first of all,

Himself, and also all of which He is the Creator. But the conclusion is a peculiar one, which Wiclif draws from the Divine all-knowledge, viz., that all which ever was, or shall be, *is*. This he proves in the following way:—Whatever was or shall be, God shall know it. Shall He know that it is, then He knows it *now* that it is, for God cannot begin or cease to know anything; but if God knows anything as being, that thing *is*. Therefore if anything was or shall be, so is it.[102] Further, Wiclif rejects the distinction which men were inclined to make between God's power to know and His actual knowing, and instead of this lays down the proposition, God *can* know nothing unless what He knows in fact. For if God *can* know it, He knows it *now*, for He cannot make a beginning or an end of knowing; and God knows nothing but what is, at least in the sense of the *ens intelligibilis*.[103]

With this again connects itself Wiclif's view of God's *eternity*. He deduces this eternity from the consideration that if there existed any *measure* (*mensura*) which was antecedent to God, then God Himself could not be the first and highest cause, from which it appears that eternity is the proper name for the measure of the Godhead. Accordingly, he regards eternity expressly not as a mere attribute which indwells in God, but as identical with God Himself. But eternity in itself is absolutely indivisible—it has no *before* and *after*, like time. From this last proposition he then deduces the Divine unchangeableness. God cannot change His thoughts, His understanding and knowing. What He thinks and knows, He knows in an eternal manner. If He were to change His thoughts according to the change of their object, He would then be in the highest degree changeable in His thoughts. Yea, God's thought would by and by

be constructed out of observations made from moment to moment.[105] And with this again is connected the doctrine of what he calls *the deep Metaphysic—i.e.*, his own realistic philosophy, viz., that all which ever has been or shall be is present to the Divine mind, *i.e.*, in the sense of real existence.[106]

The doctrine of the Divine Trinity Wiclif evidently took up simply in the form in which it had been in part conceived by the ancient Church, and in part handed down by the scholastic doctors before him. We should in vain seek in his writings for any peculiar and original treatment of this article, especially on the basis of Scripture teaching. There is only a single point of this Trinitarian doctrine, as it seems to me, in which he felt a peculiar interest—the doctrine of God the Son, as the Logos. From all that Wiclif says, as well in the *Trialogus* as occasionally in other writings, on the subject of the Trinity, it appears indubitable that he presupposes, and proceeds upon as conclusively established, the whole body of Church-dogma, as it was sanctioned in the fourth century, and was finally completed by Augustin. He operates with the technical terms of the Latin Church Fathers—*nature* and *person*, as fixed by ecclesiastical sanction; and yet he is not altogether unacquainted with the definitions of the Greek theology. Still, so far as he occupies himself with definitions, as, *e.g.*, of *person*, he by no means penetrates into the subject treated of any deeper than others had done before him.[107]

Further, as to what concerns the speculative proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, Wiclif, it is true, devotes to it much attention. In the *Trialogus*, the sophistical opponent Pseustes censures it as an undue pretension of the reason, and as an injury done to faith and its exclusive

light, that so specific an article of faith as that of the Trinity should be proved by arguments of reason.[108] But Wiclif himself, speaking in the character of Phrenesis, adheres to the belief that the reason is able to attain to a knowledge of this truth. He finds no difficulty in maintaining that Plato and other philosophers had grasped it. But he laid particular stress, notwithstanding, upon the assertion that a *meritorious* knowledge (*meritorie cognoscere*), *i.e.*, a saving knowledge of the mystery of the Trinity is possible, exclusively, to that faith which springs from Divine grace and illumination.[109] As to grounds of reason for the doctrine, however, Wiclif remarks that it is self-evident that here any such proof of the "why" is out of the question, and that only the "that"—the Divine fact itself—can admit of such proof; in other words, the Divine Trinity cannot possibly be grasped and proved from its relation to any cause higher than itself, because God Himself is the highest and last cause; rather this truth can only be proved from facts which are the effects wrought by the Triune God.[110] But when we look more narrowly at the proofs themselves, which Wiclif partly indicates and partly states at length, we find that they are merely the same which were first brought forward by Augustin in his great work on the Trinity, founded upon natural analogies—upon memory, cognition, will, and the like, and which among the scholastics had already been appropriated to his own use by Anselm in his *Monologium*.

As already observed, Wiclif interests himself much the most in the idea of God the Son as the Logos. For in this idea of the Logos lies at the same time the Wiclif doctrine of ideas; in other words, the doctrine of Realism. The Logos—the substantive Word—is the in-

clusive content of all ideas — of all realities *intelligible* (capable of being realised in thought), and is thereby the mediating element or member between God and the world. And yet in the Logos both the God-idea and the world-idea are immediately one. We need not wonder, therefore, if in Wiclif we sometimes stumble upon propositions which graze all too nearly upon Pantheism, such, *e.g.*, as the proposition, "Every existing thing is in reality God Himself, for every creature which can be named is, in regard to its 'intelligible' existence, and consequently its chief existence, in reality the Word of God" (John i. 3). But hardly has he used this language when he becomes conscious that this thesis has its dangerous side, and therefore immediately guards himself against the conclusion which might be drawn from it, that God is the only existence. His words are,— "But this gives no colour to the conclusion that every creature whatever is every other creature whatever, or that every creature whatever is God."[111] Here we see that to give support to Pantheism is not at all his meaning or design; and if, notwithstanding, he approaches it here all too closely, it should not be lost sight of, in excuse for him, that Augustin himself, in whose footsteps he treads in the doctrine of the Logos and that of ideas, has not, in all parts of his works, known how to set aside Pantheistic thoughts.

NOTES TO SECTION IV.

94. *Wycket*, Oxford 1828, p. 5.

95. *Trialogus*, I. c. 1-4, p. 39-53. Comp. Lewald, *Theologische Doctrin Wycliffe's*, in *Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie*, 1846, 188 f.

96. *Ib.*, I., c. 4, p. 50: Deus est, quo majus cogitari non potest; p. 49: Deus est optima rerum mundi.

97. *Trialogus*, I., c. 4, p. 62: Deus est quidquid melius est esse quam non esse.

98. *Ib.*, p. 54: Non solum negative sed positive conceditur Deum esse infinitum, ... cum Deus habeat positivum perfectionis in istis denominationibus.

99. *Ib.*, c. 5, p. 53. Comp. Lewald, as above, p. 196, 215 f.

100. *Ib.*, I., c. 2, p. 42: Deus est maximae potentiae positivae, etc.; comp. c. 10, p. 69: Sicut Deus ad intra nihil potest producere, nisi absolute necessario illud producat, sic nihil ad extra potest producere, nisi pro suo tempore illud producat. As above, p. 71: Omnipotentia Dei et ejus actualis creatio vel causatio adaequantur.

101. *De Dominio Divino*, III., c. 5, MS. 1340, fol. 30, col. 1: phantasiantes de Dei potentia absoluta.

102. *Trialogus*, I., 5, p. 52.

103. *Ib.*, I., 9, p. 67.

104. *Ib.*, I., c. 2, p. 42: Aeternitas, quae est omnino indivisibilis, et cum sit ipse Deus, non accidentaliter sibi inest, nec habet prius et posterius sicut tempus.

105. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 19. Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 62, col. 2: Deus non potest mutare sensum—vel intellectum suum, sed omne quod sentit, intelligit . . . aeternalliter illud cognoscit. Wiclif appeals in support of this partly to Holy Scripture, *e.g.*, Mal. iii. 6, etc., partly to authorities such as Augustin, Anselm, Bradwardine.

106. *Ib.*, c. 6, fol. 19, col. 3.

107. *Trialogus*, I, c. 6 f., especially p. 59 f.

108. *Ib.*, 6, p. 54.

109. *Ib.*, p. 56.

110. *Ib.*, c. 7, p. 58, applying the Aristotelian distinction between proofs which come to a διότι, and such as come to a ὅτι, or, as Wiclif expresses himself, demonstratio propter quid, und demonstratio, quod est. Comp. Lewald, as above, p. 199.

111. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 9, MS., fol. 110, col. 1: Omne ens est realiter ipse Deus; dictum enim est in materia de ydeis, quod omnis creatura nominabilis secundum esse intelligibile et per consequens esse principalissimum est realiter verbum Dei, Joh. 1. Nec ex hoc est color, quod quaelibet creatura sit quaelibet, aut quaelibet sit Deus. Comp. *Trialogus*, I., c. 3, p. 47.

SECTION V.—*Doctrine of the World, of the Creation, and of the Divine Dominion.*

FROM what goes before, we may already gather what Wiclif's views will be on the subject of *the world;* for his ideas of the attributes of God, such as omnipotence and

omniscience, could not be otherwise determined than by having regard to the things of the world. Thus it is nothing more than what, from the foregoing, we might expect, that Wiclif declares the Creation to have been an act of God which was remote from all arbitrariness of determination—an act which in its own nature was necessarily determinate. The School of the Scotists, following the lead of Duns Scotus himself, conceived of the Divine Will and creative work as a matter of freedom and of unconditioned discretion, and maintained, in logical consistency with this view, that God is able to do nothing except what He does in fact; He does not choose to do anything because it is the best, but it is the best because He chooses to do it; and God might have created the world otherwise than He has created it.[112] In direct opposition to such views, Wiclif takes the side of the Thomists, and maintains that it was impossible for God to have made the world larger or fairer or more rapid in its movement, etc., than it is.[113] Like Thomas Aquinas, he lays great stress upon the aphorism expressed in the Book of Wisdom (xi. 22), that God ordered everything by measure, number and weight.[114] But he believes that he discerns therein not only a fact of experience, but also an inner law of the Divine Will and creative action, according to which they are free only in this sense, that they are at the same time determined by an inward necessity.

Still, it does not follow from this that Wiclif meant to say that the existence of the world is a necessity, that God *must needs* create the world. In one passage the only thing he says, and yet with a certain timidity of tone, is that God could not for ever have withheld Himself from creating any being, because otherwise He would not have been in the highest degree communicative and good.[115] At all events,

that is only a *moral* necessity, conditioned by the goodness and love of God—attributes most peculiarly his own. But Wiclif concedes so much as this, that every creature of God, in so far as we regard it as an intelligible nature, is as necessary and as eternal as God Himself, for its intelligible nature is coincident with God Himself—with the substantive Logos.[116]

On the other hand, he draws a sharp line of distinction between God and the World in respect to their mode of existence. God alone is eternal, immutable, without *fore* and *after*. The World is temporal, *i.e.*, it has a mutable existence, including in it a *fore* and *after*. Wiclif posits, besides, as Albertus Magnus had done before him, a third, middling existence, which he calls *ævum* or *ævitas*, and which belongs to pure, spiritual beings, as angels, and the blessed in heaven; and here, too, there is no succession of time. Hereby *ævitas* is distinguished from time; but how it is to be distinguished from eternity cannot be gathered from his explanations.[117] Still, time and eternity form a decisive difference between the world and God. "It is one thing for a thing to be always, and another for a thing to be eternal; the world is always, because at every time; and yet it is not eternal, because it is created; for the moment of creation must have a beginning, as the world had."[118]

Accepting the ideas of the Aristotelian metaphysics, as taken up and further developed by scholastics like Thomas Aquinas, Wiclif distinguishes in the Creation and all single existences, substance and form, *i.e.*, the substratum capable of receiving determination, and the being which determinates it. It is only both these united which make a creature to be what it is; and these three, including the resultant creature, answer to the Trinity. The determinating form answers to

the Logos; the substantive matter answers to God the Father; and their union into one points significantly to the communion of the uncreated Spirit.[119]

Instead, however, of going further into the cosmology of Wiclif, it may be more worth while, as this cosmology contains little that is peculiar to himself, to learn what he teaches on the subject of

The Divine Dominion.

This is a part of his teaching which is quite as characteristic as it has been hitherto little known. The latter circumstance is very easily explained by the fact that the works to which Wiclif committed his views upon this subject have not only never been printed, but are also nowhere to be met with in England, and have come down to us in the Vienna manuscripts alone. The three Books of *The Divine Dominion* (*De Dominio Divino*) form a preliminary work to the great theological collective work of Wiclif, the *Summa in Theologia;* and in the repeated perusal of the books *De Dominio Divino* I have received the impression, that we have here lying marked out before us the path of transition by which Wiclif passed over from the philosophical to the properly theological period of his life and authorship. The work itself is of a mixed nature — metaphysical investigations and biblico-theological inquiries passing over into each other. The author, also, has a special value, not only in scholastics like Anselm of Canterbury, but also in the Fathers of the Church, for their philosophical reasonings in support of Christian doctrines. The preface to the work gives occasion to conjecture, as Shirley was the first to remark, that Wiclif began it not long after his promotion to the Theological Doctorate.[120]

The question is an obvious one enough, How came Wiclif, at this stage of his development, to make precisely this idea of dominion the pole of his philosophico-theological thinking. I am not able to give a direct answer from his own mouth, but from certain hints and indirect proofs, I think I am able to gather that two facts in the history of his century became points of attachment for Wiclif's thinking, and served to link on his thoughts precisely to this idea of Dominion. One of these was the struggle between Church and State which took place on the threshold and in the first half of the fourteenth century—namely, the conflict between France under Philip the Fair and Pope Boniface VIII.; and then the conflict between Emperor Louis the Bavarian and Pope John XXII. These conflicts, the first of them especially, disclosed a new turn of the public mind in Europe, and turned much more upon questions of principle than the earlier wrestling matches between *sacerdotium* and *imperium* under the Emperors of the Staufen race. Men were much more conscious now than before, that the question in dispute was whether the State should be in subjection to the Popedom, and the latter should become an absolute world-monarchy, or whether the State or sovereign power, within the sphere of civil life and affairs, should be independent of the Popedom. It was a question of lordship. It had to do with *dominion.*

The other fact was the collision between the Papacy and the stricter party of the Franciscans, which, taken along with the ecclesiastico-theological investigations which took their rise from it, did not pass away without leaving traces on Wiclif. Here the question in dispute, which was answered in the affirmative by Occam and others, was, Ought the Franciscan Order to be poor and without property? It was

a dispute about *dominium*, in the sense partly of personal and partly of corporate property and rule.

These facts appear to have led Wiclif to take the idea of *dominium* as the kernel or germ of a whole system of thought. But as a mind of deep penetration, he took a more comprehensive view of the subject, and treated it on a much grander scale, than his predecessors who stood nearer to those conflicts in actual life, and had therefore investigated the questions involved with a much more direct practical interest indeed, but also under a more restricted point of view. For example, the representatives of the State idea, or the side of Philip the Fair and Louis the Bavarian, contended for the autonomy of the State in purely civil affairs. But Wiclif goes farther, and recognises, as attaching to the State, both a right and a duty even in the internal affairs of the Church. He widens the *dominium* of the State. Again, the contention of the Franciscans was that the obligation of poverty should be laid only upon the monks, or more strictly upon the Mendicants, and should be stringently enforced. Wiclif goes farther in this matter also, and would have, in place of dominion, a ministry of humility in poverty imposed upon the clergy at large, upon the spiritual office in general. He takes a deeper view of the subject, and treats it with a more penetrating insight; and herein he went in opposition to a mental pre-occupation which everywhere prevailed in the Middle Age. Through the feudal system all the relations of life had been converted into forms of landed possession, all offices into the form of fiefs, into a sort of territorial property and subordinate *dominion*.[121] A natural consequence of this was that the majority of the masters of Canon Law viewed the spiritual office as a dominion. Wiclif, on the contrary, recognises it, not as a mastery,

but as a service. In his view it is not a *dominium* but a *ministerium.*

To come nearer to the subject itself, the plan of Wiclif's great work — the *Summa in Theologia* — comprehending twelve books as the main subject, besides three preliminary books, is laid out in such a way that the doctrine of the *Dominium* forms at bottom the kernel of the whole subject. For he treats, first of all, in the three preliminary books of the Divine dominion, in such wise that the First Book, after some observations of the most general kind, investigates the *Subject* of the dominion, or who is its lord; the Second Book, the Object of the dominion, or upon whom it is exercised; the Third, the Acts of the dominion, or wherein it consists. In the *Summa* itself, the First Book—the *Liber Mandatorum* or *De Preceptis*—developes the rightful foundation of all human dominion, viz., the commandments of God. The Second Book—*De Statu Innocentiæ*—defends the nature of the dominion which obtained in the state of innocency as a dominion of man exclusively over nature, and not over his equal. Then the next three Books, III.-V., treat of Civil Dominion. And not till now Wiclif enters upon the properly ecclesiastical territory. The Sixth Book—*De Veritate Scripturæ Sacræ*—proves the standard authority of the Bible. Then the Seventh Book treats *De Ecclesia.* The Eighth—*De Officio Regis*—handles the question of Christian Magistracy, or of the relation between Church and State. The Ninth Book—*De Potestate Papæ*—illustrates the Roman Primacy; and the three last Books treat of the chief evils under which the Church is suffering, viz., Tenth, *De Simonia;* Eleventh, *De Apostasia;* Twelfth, *De Blasphemia.*

In the preliminary work, *Of the Divine Dominion,*

Wiclif illustrates first of all the Idea of Dominion in general. He remarks that it has four sides: the *subject* ruling; the *object* ruled over; the relation of the ruler to the ruled, or wherein it consists; and the law whereon the rule is founded. He decides for the following definition, "Dominion is the relation of a rational being, in virtue of which he is set over another as his servant,"[123] manifestly an unsatisfactory definition, if judged by a logical standard, as it is only verbal, not substantive, and expresses *idem per idem.* He then gives a survey of the different species of dominion, according to its subjects, its objects, and its foundations. There are three kinds of rational beings, and therefore also three kinds of dominion—divine, angelic, and human. There are also three different objects of dominion, and therefore the distinction between monastic, municipal, and kingly rule. And there is a like difference in the foundations of dominion,—natural law, evangelical law, and human law,—and thus there is natural dominion, evangelical dominion, which is nothing else but a *ministerium*—a service in love in the stead of Christ—and human dominion, *i.e.*, the dominion of force or compulsion.[124]

No dominion, of whatever kind it is, is absolutely eternal, as it, of course, must first begin with the existence of the ministering creature. God Himself is not called "Lord" before He has created the world. But God's dominion comes in immediately with the creation, and as a consequence of it. To uphold the creatures and to rule them are prerogatives belonging to Him, on the very ground that He is Lord.[125]

The Divine dominion excels every other in all respects—in virtue of its subject, inasmuch as God in no way stands in need of the creature put under Him; in virtue of the

ground upon which His dominion rests, viz., His infinite power as Creator, on which account, also, God's dominion never comes to an end; lastly, in respect to the object of His dominion, as the creature *must* be subject to God whether he will or not.[126]

Wiclif also takes up the question whether the service of God admits of a more or a less, which he answers in the negative; for every creature is the servant of God, in the sense of service with his whole and full being. Here, however, he remarks that, besides such beings who stand directly under the dominion of God—the individual creatures—there are also things which stand under it only indirectly or mediately, *e.g.*, errors and sins. These, indeed, do not themselves serve God; but the persons who commit sin and are the slaves of sin are subject notwithstanding, in the main, to the supreme God. Wiclif repeatedly returns to this difficult point. In the chapter, especially, where he enquires into the *extent* of the Divine dominion, he enters into a very full and searching investigation respecting the relation of the human will to the absolute dominion of God over all which is and comes to pass.[128] This, however, is not the appropriate place to enter into this investigation. We shall find a more suitable place for it below.

The Second Book, as remarked above, treats of the Objects of the Divine Dominion. Here Wiclif's realistic view of the universe comes at once into view. All dominion applies to what is created, consequently God's dominion connects itself with the order in which the creatures were made. And, as being is created before everything else, so God's dominion has first of all to do with created being. God has dominion over the general at an earlier stage than over anything individual which can be named.[129]

Finally, the Third Book inquires into the single acts by which dominion is exercised. Of these there are sixteen, of which there are three which belong exclusively to the Divine dominion—creating, upholding, and governing; and thirteen acts which have a relation to human dominion, while some of them likewise belong to God and the Divine government.[130]

The first among these acts is the act of Giving. Wiclif treats of this first; but as the manuscript before me is incomplete, and breaks off at the close of the sixth chapter, he does not get much beyond this act; for in these few chapters he investigates only the idea of Giving, with the corresponding idea of Receiving;[131] also that of Granting and Recalling, as also that of Lending and Borrowing. Meanwhile we may console ourselves over the fragmentary condition of this Book with the thought that enough of what is characteristic is found in what of it still remains to us. Wiclif begins his treatment here with the observation that the act of giving belongs, in the highest measure, to God, for God's giving is of all the richest, and to the creature the most useful—the richest, inasmuch as God never gives to His servants any gift without giving to them his chief gift—Himself.[132]

Further, the inquiry respecting the kinds of granting, lending, and so forth, leads up to the idea of merit, and here the author lays down the principle that merit and the means of attaining to merit are absolute grants of God. He is beforehand with us, awakens us, moves us to the acquiring of merit. But from this again Wiclif deduces the consequence, not to be undervalued, that no creature can merit anything before God unless it be in consideration of congruity (*de congruo*), but under no circumstances in consideration of worthiness (*de condigno*). To this negative proposition, to which plainly the chief importance attaches,

Wiclif often returns afresh, in order to lay special emphasis upon it, and to prove it in the most convincing manner—a thought in which the evangelical ground-truth does not indeed come purely into daylight, but still comes into view in some degree. We shall by and bye refer again to these ideas more at length in their own place.

In the doctrine of the good and evil angels Wiclif has little that is peculiar. He accepts the Patristic and Scholastic ideas with regard to differences affecting them, *e.g.*, the difference between the morning-knowledge and the evening-knowledge of the angels—*i.e.*, their foreknowledge and their knowledge from experience. He attaches special importance to the occasions of various kinds which are made use of by the evil spirits, for the temptation and seduction of men; as well as to the conflict with the powers of darkness which at the end of all things will take the form of a tremendous, decisive struggle between the Church of Christ and the Antichrist.

NOTES TO SECTION V.

112. Comp. Erdmann, *Gundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I., 1866, p. 424 f.

113. *De Dominio Civili*, III., c. 5, MS. 1340, fol. 29, col. 1: Impossibile fuisset ipsum fecisse mundum majorem, pulcriorem, etc.

114. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 40, p. 390, and *De Dominio Civili*, in the passage just quoted: Christus ponit cuncta in mensura, numero, et pondere.

115. *De Dominio* (*in communi*), c. 7, MS. 3929, fol. 123, col. 1: Concedunt quidam, quod Deus non posset perpetuo continere non producendo aliquam creaturam, quia tunc non esset summe communicativus ac bonus, etc.

116. *Trialogus* II, c. 1, p. 76.

117. *Ib.*, I., c. 2, p. 79, f.

118. *Ib.*, I., c. 1, p. 76: Aliud est rem semper esse et eam aeternaliter esse, ... instans creationis oportet incipere sicut mundum.

119. *Ib.*, II., c. 4, p. 87.

120. *Introduction to Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, XVI. f.

121. Augustin Thierry, *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, 7th edition. Paris, 1842. Lettre IX., p. 148.

122. *De Dominio Divino*, Lib. I., in 19 chapters, the last of which has remained a fragment ; at least this applies to all the three Vienna MSS. which contain this book. Lib. II. contains in the MSS. only five chapters, and Lib. III. only six ; both books break off in the middle of the treatment.

123. *De Dominio Divino*, Lib. I., c. 1, MS. 1339, fol. 1, col. 2 : Potest dominium sic describi : dominium est habitudo naturae rationalis, secundum quam denominatur suo praefici servienti.

124. *Ib.*, I., c. 3, MS. 1339, fol. 5, col. 1.

125. *De Dominio Divino*, I., c. 2, fol. 3, col. 6. The observation upon the Divine name "Lord" is founded upon Genesis ii. 2, where the Vulgate translates the two Hebrew names which here, for the first time, occur together, יהוה אלהים by *Dominus Deus.*

126. *Ib.*, c. 3, fol. 5, col. 2, f. Comp. c. 1, fol. 2, Col. 1 : Quaelibet creatura necessario servit Deo, ut sibi canit ecclesia : "Serviunt tibi cuncta, quae creasti."

127. *Ib.*, c. 4, fol. 9, col. 2.

128. *Ib.*, c. 10, 14-18.

129. *De Dominio Divino*, Lib. II., c. 1., MS. fol. 59, col. 1. As the author at this point immediately enters more deeply into his favourite doctrine of the reality of universals, our MS. breaks off at the fifth chapter before he has returned to his proper subject. Still I see, from the commencement of Book III., that in Book II. he had treated of the ideas of creation, conservation, and government.

130. *Ib.*, Lib. III., c. 1, MS. fol. 69, col. 1.

131. *Ib.*, c. 1-3.

132. *Ib.*, c. 4-6.

133. *Ib.*, c. 3, MS. fol. 71, col. 2 : Deus non dat suis famulis quodvis donum, nisi principaliter det se ipsum.

134. *Ib.*, III., c. 4, fol. 78, col. 2 : Nulla creatura potest a Deo mereri aliquid nisi de congruo, sic quod nihil penitus de condigno, fol. 79, col. 1. Creatura penitus nihil a Deo merebitur ex condigno.

SECTION VI.—*Doctrine of Man and of Sin.*

IN his treatment of the Doctrine of Man, Wiclif mixes up an extraordinary amount of matter which is either of a philosophical kind, or entirely belongs to the natural sciences, especially anatomy and physiology—*e.g.*, the anatomy of the brain,[135] or the question in what way the perceptions of

the senses take place.[136] From his manner of speaking on such subjects we see that Wiclif not only possessed extensive knowledge in the field of the natural sciences—on the scale, of course, of his own age—but was also master of a sound and accurate judgment on such matters. But this is not the place to take notice of his observations in this field, and as little of his philosophical expositions respecting the distinction of a double soul in every human being; concerning the mental faculties, cognition, will, and memory (after Augustin); and touching the immortality of the soul.[137] We limit ourselves rather to what is important in a theological sense; and here it is worth remarking that Wiclif, as I see from several places in his unprinted works, finds in the Redemption, with full right, the key to the Creation; and throws a reflex light from the eschatology of Scripture upon its anthropology, in holding fast to the Biblical idea of the *whole* man as a Unit made up of Soul and Body.[138] The greatest importance, however, seems to attach to all that portion of his treatment of "Man and Sin" which belongs to the moral sphere, viz., the doctrine of the will, the question concerning the Freedom of the Will, and concerning Evil and Sin.

In reference to the human will, Wiclif lays great stress upon its freedom, for to him it is clear that the moral worth or worthlessness of action is conditioned by the freedom of the will. He maintains that "God has placed man in so great a condition of freedom that He can demand from him absolutely nothing else than what is "meritorious," (*i.e.*, what is of moral worth), and therefore under the condition that man performs it freely.[139] And yet Wiclif, quite unmistakeably, has a leaning to the Augustinian view. Among all the fathers Augustin is the man to whom he

is at all times most indebted, to whom he renders the profoundest respect, and whose disciple he was held to be by his own adherents, who, for this reason, sometimes gave him the name of Joannes Augustini.[140] Wiclif, moreover, looked upon Thomas of Bradwardine—the *Doctor profundus*—as a teacher with whom he was sensible of standing in intellectual affinity;[141] and manifestly he felt himself one with him not only in a general sense, in virtue of his zeal for God's honour and cause,[142] but also in his fundamental view of the all-sufficing grace of God in Christ, and of God's all-determining will. But notwithstanding this, he is so fully convinced of human freedom, that in its defence he places himself in opposition even to a *Doctor profundus*. He agrees with him, indeed, in the main principle that every thing which takes place takes place of necessity, and, further, in the doctrine that God co-operates in every act of will in the sense of previously determining it;[143] but notwithstanding this, it is not his meaning to encroach upon the freedom of choice of the human will; in particular, he repudiates the conclusion drawn from the main principle, that if any one does an act of sin, it is God himself who determines him to the act of sinning.

And here we come, at the same time, to Wiclif's doctrine of evil. In every action he distinguishes two things, the *act* of a being created by God, and the *feeling* from which the act proceeds. The act itself—the doing of the creature—is good, and is determined by God, who, therefore, so far co-operates in producing it. But the feeling from which the act springs may be a bad, ill-ordered feeling, *i.e.*, morally evil, sinful feeling; in the production of this wrong direction of the soul, of this evil condition of the will, God in no way co-operates.[144] It is only the intention, the feeling of an act,

which makes an act to be a sin, and that intention or feeling is not from God.

It is the distinction between substance and accident which Wiclif applies here to the subject of evil.[145] "Every action," he says, "which is morally evil, is evil only *accidenter*." But evidently this investigation of the question is not of a character to solve its knots. For, first of all, there is a multitude of actions, *e.g.*, of deceit, of betrayal, of malice, in which a line of distinction can only be drawn in a forced and artificial way, between the active power of a created being, on the one hand, and the bad or morally censurable intention and feeling of the act, on the other. But, further, the question must be asked, How then does it stand with actions which are moral, pious, and well-pleasing to God? Does God co-operate in such actions only to the extent of aiding the active power of His creature, and not also towards the production of the pious feeling itself? And if the latter is the true view, viz., that God's co-operation extends, in such cases, both to active power and feeling, as we must assume to be the case, according to the words of the Apostle founded upon by Wiclif in another place, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves" (2 Cor. iii. 5), then arises the question, how it comes that God Himself, in this case, awakens and determines the thoughts and feelings, but does not do so in the other case? And either there appears to be a marvellous inequality, if not arbitrariness, in the divine procedure, or we are brought back again to the thought that God wills and determines ultimately also the *willing* volition of *evil* in the creature, because He determines *all*, and, as the ultimate cause, is the Maker of all.

This is precisely the point on which Wiclif consciously and deliberately departs from the doctrine of Bradwardine. He

gives a decided negative to the view held by the latter, that in the act of sin there obtains a necessity which excludes all freedom of choice, inasmuch as the distinction between God's permission and His positive will and pleasure is, as Bradwardine alleges, a nullity; and the truth rather is that God's will precedes every action of man, and infallibly determines it, so that no will of the creature is in itself really free. Wiclif finds here in the *Doctor profundus* an error of which he seeks an explanation in a false antecedent proposition, viz., that every volition in God is an eternal, absolute substance.[146] The thought that God Himself works and occasions the evil volition in the soul of man is repugnant to the feeling and thinking of Wiclif, not only on the ground that the sinner would then be in a position to excuse himself with more than a mere appearance of reason, but chiefly on the ground that, on that pre-supposition, the dark shadow would fall on God Himself, of being privy to sin and consenting to it, and, therefore, guilty of it. Wiclif says, in distinct terms, that if that were a correct view, every murderer, robber, liar, etc., would be able to say with reason, "God determines me to all these acts of transgression, in order to perfect the beauty of the universe."[147] But it is precisely such blasphemous consequences, so dishonouring to the holiness of God, that Wiclif intends to cut away, and therefore he makes a reservation of autonomous freedom—not absolute, indeed, but relative, and placed out of reach of all compulsion—to the innermost sphere of feeling and of volition.

With this result, however, in reference to moral volition and action, stands connected a view of the whole world of being and becoming, according to which evil is not a being but a not-being; not a positive action, but a defect or negation. This idea of the negativity of evil Wiclif, as he hints

in one place, borrows from no less an authority than Augustin himself. And, in point of fact, however strongly Augustin puts forward the power of sin, especially in his controversial writings against the Pelagians, he nevertheless speaks of sin in other places as having only a negative existence. Such, in effect, is the significance of the thought that sin is only an occasion of good—a thought which scholastics like Anselm, Albertus Magnus, and others, have also appropriated from Augustin.[149] But Augustin also expresses himself in the most direct manner to the effect that sin is not a doing but a defect or omission of doing;[150] it is not anything positive, and therefore has no *causa efficiens* but only a *causa deficiens;* or, otherwise, it is not an *affectio* but a *defectio*, etc. This doctrine of the negativity of evil was, in the case of Augustin at least, a consequence of his internal struggle with Manichæism. In order to avoid the concession of an independent existence of evil in opposition to God, he endeavours to represent it as a thing which has in truth no real or substantive being of its own—an unreality, a nonentity.

This Augustinian thought Wiclif, in fact, made his own. Even in the pulpit (in Latin sermons) he does not shrink from setting forth this speculative doctrine of sin. From the saying of Christ, "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin," he takes occasion to handle the metaphysic of sin, and to maintain its negativity quite in the manner of Augustin.[151] He expresses the same thought both in his earlier and later writings. For example, in his work, *De Dominio Divino*, he lays stress upon the assertion that sin, as such, is a defect, a want, not something positive;[152] and in the *Trialogus* he repeatedly takes occasion to say that sin is not a being, but a non-being—a defection;[153] that sin, even original sin, is only an occasion of good;[154] that there does

not exist an idea of evil or sin[155] (*non habet peccatum ideam*), and that therefore it is out of the question to speak of sin being caused or worked by God. There is, therefore, a putting forth of God's will and power and government in respect to evil, only in so far as God turns the evil into an occasion of good,[156] partly in visiting it with punishment, partly when He takes occasion from sin to institute salvation and redemption. In this he goes so far as not even to shrink from maintaining that it is better that there should be a law (the law of the flesh, Rom. vii.) opposing itself to God, than that the universe should be without such opposition, for now the Providence of God is revealed, and His glorious power.[157] Even in his Sermons he is not afraid to give expression to these thoughts; not, indeed, without guarding his hearers from the misunderstanding, as though it might be lawful to do evil that good may come out of it (Rom. iii. 8); for in the case of obstinate sinners, their sins serve only to land them in unutterable miseries, and to the redeemed their guilt is of benefit only in the sense of being the occasion of the Mediator's fulness of grace.[158]

We shall only mention, in brief, that Wiclif treats of the state of innocence in Paradise, of the fall of the first man, and of original sin, entirely in the sense of Scripture and the doctrine of the Church, keeping specially close to Augustin. In his view, Adam was the representative of the whole human race, which he already carried in germ within himself —a view which lay all the nearer to his hand the more deeply he was imbued with the *realistic* mode of thought; for as he regarded the *genus* humanity as a *real* collective personality, it became easy to him to see represented in Adam, the first transgressor, his whole sinful posterity.[159] And yet in this matter Wiclif is not without a mode of thinking which is pecu-

liar to himself. Personality stands so high in his regard that he is not content with looking upon the first sin as the collective act of the whole human race, but he attempts to conceive of original sin as a personal act of every individual human being, *i.e.*, in the *intelligible* sense.[160] Further, in intimate connection with this subject, he pronounces most decidedly against the doctrine which regards the *semen generativum* as the bearer of the self-propagating *peccatum originale*. However much he sides with Augustin and differs from Pelagius in other things, he has no difficulty in openly acknowledging that the latter has proved convincingly that the *semen generativum* is not the conveyer of original sin. Wiclif himself pronounces with emphasis that not what is corporeal, but the mind is the conveyer of it.[161] This does not rest, indeed, upon any original reflection of Wiclif himself, for Thomas Aquinas had already given expression to the same thought.[162] But it is, nevertheless, a fact of some significance for Wiclif's character as a theologian that he preferred the mental to the corporeal view of the subject, and that he laboured to place above everything else the moral personality of every individual man.

NOTES TO SECTION VI.

135. *Trialogus*, II., c. 6, p. 94.

136. *Ib.*, II., c. 7, p. 97 f.

137. *Ib.*, II., c. 5, p. 90 f., and c. 8, p. 101 f. Wiclif himself, however, in his sermons, does not entirely avoid entering into philosophical questions of this kind, *e.g.*, in No. XXIX. of the *Sermons for Saints' Days*, MS. 3928, fol. 57, col. 4 f.

138. *E.g.*, in the sermon just now mentioned, fol. 58, col. 1.

139. *De Ecclesia*, c. 13, MS. 1294, fol. 168, col. 3.

140. According to the testimony of Thomas Waldensis, *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei*, I., c. 34, Venetian edition 1571, vol. I. fol. 105, col. 2: Sui discipuli vocabant eum famoso et elato nomine Joannem Augustini.

141. In the *De Dominio Divino,* MS., c. 14, fol. 139, col. 1, Wiclif calls *Armachanus* Archbishop Richard Fitz-Ralph, and the *doctor profundus, duo praecipui Doctores nostri ordinis,* which, I suppose, could only be intended to mean that these were men with whom he was conscious of being at one in his views.

142. "*De Causa Dei*" was the title which Bradwardine gave to his principal work. Comp. p. 230 f. above.

143. *De Dominio Divino,* I., c. 14, fol. 139, col. 1—a passage in which Wiclif entirely follows Bradwardine's course of thought.

144. Obliquitas animi, malitia voluntatis. *De Dominio Divino,* I., c. 14, f. 139, col. 2.

145. *Ib.,* Omnis actus—malus moraliter est accidenter solum malus.

146. *Ib.,* c. 16, fol. 144, col. 1. He begins by remarking that this subject is one of those things which are, according to 2 Peter iii. 16, hard to be understood, and that not all the Doctors had entertained right notions about it: Ideo restat ulterius declarandum: si ponatur in actu peccati necessitas ultra contingentiam ad utrumlibet, sicut videtur multis Doctorem profundum dicere, ymo quod Deus velit beneplacite hominem peccare; . . . quia, ut dicit, omnis Dei permissio, est ejus beneplacitum, cum tam potens dominus non permittit aliquod (aliud, MS. 1339) nec aliqualiter, quod non placet. Maximum autem fundamentum in ista materia est de actu volitionis divinae, quod non subsequitur sed praecedit naturaliter quemlibet actum vel effectum . . . Ex isto quidem videtur sibi (Thomas Bradwardine) libro III., 4 capitulo, quod omnis actus est inevitabilis creaturae, et per consequens nulla volitio creata est pure libera (per se pure libera, MS. 1339). Nec mirum, si variet ab aliis in ista materia, quia III. libro, c. 6, ponit quotlibet volitiones in Deo esse aeternas essentias absolutas. Ideo cum modicus error in principio (primo, MS. 1339) scilicet in quaestione, quid est (quidem, MS. 1339) hujusmodi voluntatum, facit variationem maximam in opinione de passionibus communiter; non mirum, si variet a sapientibus, qui ponunt, omnes volitiones hujusmodi non esse absolutas substantias, etc. And here he names Thomas (of Aquino I., Pars *Summae,* Quaest. 15 and 16), the Doctor subtilis (Duns Scotus) as well as Dominus Ardmachanus, Lib. xvi., c. 5, *De quaestionibus Armenorum.* In the following chapter, 17th, he came back once more to Bradwardine, in controverting the doctrine maintained in the *De Causa Dei,* II., c. 30, of the inevitability of every act of creaturely will in presence of the Divine will.

147. *De Dominio Divino,* I., c. 15; MS. 1339, fol. 141, col. 2: Deus me necessitat ad omnes istos actus nefarios pro perfectione pulcritudinis universi.

148. Immediately after the last quoted words follows the reply: Hic dicitur, quod creatura rationalis est tam libera, sicut creatura aliqua potest esse (licet non possit aequari libertati summi opificis), cum sit tam libera, quod cogi non poterit (sic), licet tam Deus quam bonum infimum (a lower good, the possession or enjoyment of which excites desire) ipsam necessitare poterit ad volendum. Comp. c. 18, fol. 151, col. 2. *De Veritate s. Scripturae,* c. 23, MS. 1294, fol. 76, col. 4. Cum praedestinatione et praescientia stat libertas arbitrii.

149. Augustinus, *De Libero Arbitrio,* III., 13. *Opp. Venet.,* 1729., I., 625 f. *Enchiridion,* c. ii. Quid est aliud quod natura dicitur nisi privatio boni. Comp.

Anselmi, *Cant. tract.* De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis . . . cum libero arbitrio, Qu. I., c. 7. Alberti Magni, *Summa Theol.*, Tract VI.

150. Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, XII., 7. *Opp.*, Tom. VII., Venet. 1732, 306.

151. In the 30th of his *Sermons for Saints' Days*, MS. 3928, fol. 60, col. 2: Non habet causam nisi in quantum sapit bonum, sicut non dicitur esse, sed potius deesse secundum aliam rationem. . . . Nec valet excusatio capta a beato Augustino, quod peccatum non habet causam efficientem sed deficientem.

152. *De Dominio Divino*, I., c. 14, MS. 1339, fol. 40, col. 1: Secus est de effectu et defectu secundum conditiones oppositas: nam omnis effectus, in quantum hujusmodi, placet Deo secundum Esse primum, quamvis secundum Deesse . . . sibi displiceat.

153. *Trialogus*, I., c. 10, p. 71: Peccatum, quod est defectus hominis, etc.

154. *Ib.*, c. 11, p. 74; III., 22, p. 205. Comp. III., 26, p. 222.

155. *Ib.*, I., c. 9, p. 67. Non habet peccatum ideam, cf., c. 11, p. 74. Cum peccati non sit idea, etc. Comp. Lewald, *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1846, p. 217.

156. *Ib.*, III., c. 22, p. 205: Creatura mala facit defectum, de quo Deus facit gratiose bonum. Comp. c. 4, p. 141.

157. *Liber Mandatorum sive Decalogus*, c. 5. MS. 1339, fol. 100, col. 2: Melius est, esse legem Deo adversantem, ad manifestandam ejus providentiam et gloriosam potentiam, quam esse, quod tota universitas sine repugnantia fundaretur.

158. *Miscel. Sermons*, No. XXV.; MS. 3928, fol. 234, col. 3.

159. *Trialogus*, III., c. 24-26.

160. *Ib.*, III., 26, p. 220. Quilibet ex traduce descendens a primo homine in principio suae originis habet proprium peccatum originale, etc. Comp. Lewald, in *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1846, 231 f., 517 f.

161. *Ib.*, 221: Ideo, sicut bene probat Pelagius, peccatum originale non in illo semine subjectatur, quamvis illud semen sit signum vel occasio sic peccandi; . . . patet, quod . . . peccatum illud in spiritu subjectatur.

162. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, Secundae Pars I., Qu. 83, Art. 1, ed. Venet., 1478. Comp. Lewald, as above, p. 517.

SECTION VII.—*Doctrine of the Person of Christ and the Work of Redemption.*

WICLIF speaks of the person of Christ as the God-man on innumerable occasions, and he takes occasion to do so when treating of the most different points of the Christian doctrine and life. But all his enquiries into the personality of the Redeemer, divine and human in one, in so far as they

are of a doctrinal character, suffer under a certain monotony and stiffness. He simply repeats in a stereotyped fashion the traditional Christology of the Church, along with the proofs alleged in support of it by the Fathers and the Scholastics. But of profound original reflection on the godly mystery we find no trace; his thought upon it never flows in the channel of speculation.

Wiclif emphasises the truth that Christ was a true Man, that He is, in fact, our Brother; and he defends the doctrine of the true humanity of the Redeemer against dialectical objections.[163] On the other side, he bears testimony to the true Godhood of Christ as the Logos on so many occasions, not only in sermons but also in treatises, both scientific and practical, that it hardly seems necessary to adduce single passages in proof of the statement. It will suffice to mention that Wiclif maintains with all distinctness the pre-existence of Christ, the eternity of His personal Being.[164] And further, the idea of the incarnation of God, the union of both natures in the one person of the God-man, as well as all questions respecting the possibility and necessity of the incarnation, were all taken up into his sytem by Wiclif entirely in the form in which they had been settled in the course of the Christological contests of the fourth and fifth centuries, and in which they had been speculatively carried out by Augustin, Anselm of Canterbury, and others.[165] On these points, and all which stands in connection with them, we are not able to discover anything characteristic or peculiar in his mode of thought or treatment.

And yet Wiclif's Christology has one remarkable distinctive feature, viz., that he always and everywhere lays the utmost possible emphasis upon the incomparable grandeur of Jesus Christ, as the only mediator between God and men, as the

centre of humanity,[166] and our one only Head. He is in truth quite inexhaustible in the task of bringing these truths into full expression by means of the most manifold ideas and figurative illustrations. He loves especially to set forth Christ as the centre of humanity. In the passages of his festival sermons, referred to below, he says, Christ in His Godhood is an *intelligible* circle, whose centre is everywhere, and its circumference nowhere. In His Manhood He is everywhere in the midst of His Church; and as from every point of a circle a straight line reaches the centre, so the Christian Pilgrim, in whatever position of life he may find himself, reaches straight to Christ Himself as the centre; whereas the modern Sects (the Mendicant Orders) find themselves, so to speak, as the angles of a straight-lined figure, outside the circumference of those who are in a state of salvation. Wiclif also makes use of the most manifold thoughts and figures to express the truth, that Christ is the one incomparable Head of redeemed humanity. He chooses his expressions for this purpose sometimes from the secular and political, and sometimes from the spiritual and ecclesiastical sphere. Thus, in a sermon preached on All Saints' Day, he calls Christ the best of conquerors, who teaches his soldiers how to conquer a kingdom for Him by patience.[167] In like manner, he calls Him "our Cesar," "Cesar always Augustus," etc.[168] His figure of a Giant marching forward with joy upon his path, applies also to Christ, resting originally upon a Bible passage (Ps. xix. 6), and allegorically applied long before Wiclif's day (*e.g.*, by Gregory VII. in his letters), but applied by Wiclif with a special preference to the Redeemer.[169] But still more frequently does he derive his figures and descriptions from religious and Church life, when

he would express the fundamental thoughts that Christ is the true Head, and the only authoritative Superior of redeemed, believing men. In this sense he calls Christ "The Prior of our Order,"[170] or "The Common Abbot," "The Highest Abbot of our Order."[171] The expression, in like manner, is borrowed from the Monastic sphere, when, in comparison with other founders and holy patrons, such as St. Francis and others, Christ is called "our Patron."[172] It is an idea borrowed from the general constitution of the Church, when Wiclif says of Christ, with a conscious allusion to 1 Peter ii. 25, that "the Bishop of our souls[173] and our eternal Priest, from whom we have consecration, is one who far surpasses our Bishops on earth." He even gives to the Redeemer, inasmuch as He is a Royal Priest, the title of Pope.[174]

But not only from human ties and relations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, does Wiclif borrow his comparisons when his object is to picture forth the solitary grandeur of the Redeemer; he also summons to his aid the invisible world, and again and again exclaims that Christ is the Saint of all Saints. This description rests upon the passage in Daniel ix. 24, where the promised Messiah appears under this name, and Wiclif makes frequent use of it.[175] What he means to say, in doing so, he developes clearly enough when he goes on to remark that "to all saints, whosoever they be, is due remembrance, praise, and veneration, only in so far as they derived all of good which they possessed and verified in deed and suffering, from Christ himself, who is the alone source of salvation; and in so far as they walked in the imitation of Christ.[176] In accordance with this is the judgment which he gives on the subjects of the invocation of saints, and the festivals and devotional services observed

in their honour; these, he says, can only be of use in so far as the souls of men are kindled by them into love for Christ himself. But it results from the multitude of saints whose intercession is thus sought, while yet Christ is the only true mediator and intercessor, that the soul is drawn away from Christ, and love to Him is made weak.

In all this, it is true, there is nothing set forth which is new and important in a scientific and dogmatic sense; but the devout spirit which it breathes, and the whole posture of the author's heart to Godward, enforces a truth which is one of the most decisive weight, "that there is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved, save the name of Jesus only; neither is there salvation in any other." Where the grand truth of "salvation in Christ alone" is so consciously and clearly, as it is here, set over against the piebald variety of saint-worships, Church-authorities, foundations, and institutions in which men sought salvation, side by side with Christ, we find ourselves in presence of, and are able to recognise, a knowledge, a feeling, and an action truly reformational. And undoubtedly Wiclif had a distinct self-consciousness of regarding Christ as the only Mediator, as the alone source of salvation.[178] Thus he lays down the following principle, that "If we had Christ alone before our eyes, and if we served Him continually in teaching and learning, in prayer, and work, and rest, then would we all be brothers, sisters, and mothers of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Mark iii. 35).[179] He looks upon himself and those who were like minded with him, as those who before all things seek the honour of Christ, who contend for the Grace of God and Christ's cause, who carry on a warfare against the enemies of the Cross of Christ; in a word, as the party of Christ.[180] And when Wiclif, as

was shown above, in the most emphatic manner and on many sides, affirms the sole standard authority of the Bible, this, the *formal* principle of his system, *verbo solo*, has a connexion of the most intimate and essential kind with its *material* principle, viz., that "Christ alone is our Mediator, Saviour, and Leader," not only in itself, but also in reference to Wiclif's own personal consciousness of the fact of such a connection. For to him, and in his view, Christ and the Bible are not two separated powers, but in the most intimate sense one, as we have already seen above.

This characteristic thought of Wiclif—Christ alone the source of Salvation—rests, indeed, not only upon the idea of the *person* of Jesus Christ as the God-man, but quite as much upon the doctrine of the *work* of Christ. Proceeding, then, to develope Wiclif's view of the salvation-work of Christ, the fact immediately presents itself to us that he contemplates Christ in a threefold character, as prophet, priest, and king. It is not properly the phrase so current among ourselves, of the threefold *office* of Christ, which we meet with in Wiclif; but his representation of the threefold personal dignity of the Redeemer comes in substance to the same thing.[181]

1. As to what concerns Christ as a prophet, we meet here again with a one-sidedness of view which has been already mentioned. It is that by which the Gospel is predominantly regarded in the light of a new law, and Christ accordingly is seen as a lawgiver. Wiclif indeed, as was shown above in the investigation of his *formal* principle, knows how to place in a clear light the manifold difference between the two covenants and the infinite superiority of the new over the old; but notwithstanding this he places the Redeemer in so far on the same line with Moses, as he holds Christ to be

a lawgiver. Occasionally, indeed, he comes very near to the right view, but almost only in an unconscious way. Thus, *e.g.*, when he answers the question, why Christ, our lawgiver, did not deliver the new law in a written form, as Moses delivered the old one, his answer is threefold—first, Christ, as the perfectly sinless One, behoved to conform his life to the state of unfallen innocence, in which men knew and fulfilled God's will in a purely natural way, without the help of writing or paper; secondly, his work was, in the power of his Godhood, to write the commandments of life upon the inner man created after His own image; and thirdly, if Christ had occupied himself with the business of a written record, the holy Evangelists would never have undertaken to write, and they would not in particular have accomplished that miracle of unity in so great diversity (*concordia tante distantium*) which we see in their narratives.[182]

When, however, Wiclif designates Christ as a prophet and teacher, it is by no means only His spoken word that he has in his eye, but also quite as much the Example which He exhibited in His actions and sufferings; for, as he observes, "the works of Christ are the best interpreters of His law,[183] and all the doings of Christ are an instruction for us."[184] It is on these grounds that he demands that the life of Christ should be placed before the eyes of men of all classes, in schools, in sermons, and in churches,[185] because it is a life which concerns every man, and is known to the whole Church as a city set on a hill. To mention here shortly only one particular, Wiclif is accustomed to hold up with special preference one feature of the character of Jesus, His humility and gentleness, and another from the history of His life, His poverty. In one of his sermons he remarks that it is to Christ that men must look for a perfect example, for

"He is our sinless Abbot; whereas the saints, even the Apostles Peter, Paul, John, and the rest, were not free from sin, and error, and foolishness, as we know from Scripture itself." [186]

Here we may be allowed to add what was Wiclif's manner of thinking respecting the holy Virgin. In his sermons preached on the Festivals of Mary, he could not do otherwise than speak of her. On the Festival of the Purification, Wiclif touches the question whether she was absolutely without sin, and he speaks in the close to this effect—that in no case is it necessary to salvation to believe that Mary was free from original and all actual sin. Yea, it is a pharisaic folly to contend so much upon such a question. The most advisable course is not to give any categorical decision upon either of the two sides. His own personal view is that the holy Virgin was *probably* without sin.[187] From this it appears evident enough that Wiclif, who acknowledges clearly and emphatically the sinlessness of the Redeemer, was at least not disposed to recognise the sinlessness of Mary as a matter of dogma. In a sermon preached on the Festival of the Assumption, he also handles the question whether Mary was taken up to Heaven corporeally, or only in her soul. In doing so he weighs the reasons for and against the alleged Assumption in an unprejudiced and cool tone, and so as to show that the scale inclined to the negative of that opinion.[188] He remarks that God has kept such things secret from us in order that we may humbly confess our ignorance, and may hold fast all the more earnestly the things which are more necessary to the faith.

2. Christ as "everlasting Priest" (Heb. vii.), and the power of His reconciliation, Wiclif commends with a warmth altogether peculiar. He never fails to lay a simple and truly

devout emphasis upon Christ's Passion. In a Passion sermon he remarks that Christ is saying every day in our hearts—"This I suffered for thee, what dost thou suffer for me?"[190] And peculiarly worthy of notice is what he says of the infinite power and eternal importance of the Passion of Christ and the Reconciliation accomplished by Him. Again and again he affirms that the effect of the passion of Christ extends as well to later ages as to the ages preceding it, and therefore reaches forwards to the world's end, and backwards to the world's beginning. And were this not so, then never would a single member of the human family since the fall of the first man have become morally righteous or a saved man.[191] No one can be saved unless he is washed in the blood of Christ (Rev. i. 5). The blood of Christ, in virtue of His spiritual nature, is so constituted that it penetrates to the kernel of the mind and purifies it from sin both[192] original and actual. The boundless power of the sufferings of Christ Wiclif describes in such terms as to say that it is enough for the redemption of many worlds;[193] and he places the state of grace, which has its ground in the redemption of Christ, higher than the state of innocence in Paradise. Christ, he affirms, has gained more for mankind than Adam lost.[194]

This, however, is to be understood only of the *intensive power* of the grace of God in Christ, not of the extensive reach of the reconciliation. For Wiclif, quite in Augustin's manner, limits the work of redemption to the elect, and does not fear to say that Christ has not redeemed all men, for there are many who shall remain in the eternal prison of sin[195]—a proposition respecting whose unscriptural character we do not need here to throw away a single word.

Only one point more may still be mentioned in this place,

viz., the continued mediation and intercession of Christ, which Wiclif warmly affirms, on the ground of Scripture (1 John ii. 1), in opposition to the pretended intercession of the saints.[196]

3. The dignity of Christ as "King of kings" Wiclif chiefly mentions, in so far as he deduces from it the duty of worldly rulers to serve Christ and to further His kingdom. In relation to which he calls to remembrance the fact that Christ more than once made use of His royal power, when in His own person He drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple, etc.[197]

SECTION VIII.—*Doctrine of the Order of Personal Salvation.*

To the question concerning the personal application of the salvation wrought out by Christ, Wiclif gives the same general answer as the Church-doctrine of his time and as Scripture itself; the way in which the individual becomes a partaker of salvation is by conversion and sanctification.

With regard to conversion, Wiclif recognises that it includes two things—turning away from sin, and a believing appropriation of the saving grace of Christ; in other words, repentance and faith. Repentance he regards as an indispensable condition of the forgiveness of sins and of a real participation in the merits of the Redeemer. He acknowledges without reserve that "no man would be in a condition to make satisfaction for a single sin, if it were not for the unmeasurable mercy of the Redeemer. Let a man, therefore, give proof of fruitful repentance before God, and forsake past sins, and by virtue of the merits of Christ and His grace, his sins have all been deleted and done away."[198]

But the repentance which he holds to be indispensable

must not only be sincere and heartfelt, must not only have respect to sin itself and not merely to its punishment, must not only be a "godly sorrow," as the apostle calls it, but it must also be a "fruitful" repentance; it must verify itself in an actual and abiding leaving off of sin. In other words, Wiclif here views the penitence and turning from sin included in conversion as one and the same with the work of sanctification, in which self-denial, or the constant avoidance of sin forms the one side, while the love of God and our neighbour forms the positive completing side. But precisely this blending together, without any distinction, of initial repentance, with the subsequent and abiding giving up of sin, is a defect which Wiclif has in common with the teaching which prevailed in his time; and this defect corresponds with another of much greater moment in reference to faith.

Passing on to the idea of faith as constituting the other side of the work of conversion, Wiclif distinguishes, as had been usual since Augustin set the example, a threefold use of the term. By "Faith" is understood—(1), The *act* by which a man believes; (2), The *condition of soul* in which a man believes; (3), The *truth* which a man believes.[199] Further, he makes the distinction, also a favourite one, between *explicit*, or conscious faith, and *implicit* or unconscious faith; meaning by the latter the faith which a good Christian who explicitly believes in the Catholic Church in general, extends to every particular item of doctrine which is included in the Church's whole belief.[200] When now we hear Wiclif say that "Faith is the foundation of the Christian religion, and without faith it is impossible to please God;"[201] or when he lays down the principle that faith is the primary foundation of the virtues, and unbelief the first mischief which leads to sin, which was the

reason why the Devil enticed men first of all into unbelief,[202] we might naturally be led to suppose that Wiclif must have grasped the idea of faith at its very kernel, and must have understood it to mean a heartfelt turning of the soul to God —a most inward laying hold of the reconciliation in Christ. And yet this is not the case. After careful investigation, the result which I have arrived at is this, that Wiclif views faith as being, on one of its sides, a knowledge and recognition of certain truths of Christianity, and as being, on another side, a moral acting in imitation of Christ from a motive of love; whereas that element of faith which, to a certain extent, forms the connecting link between these two, viz., the heartfelt turning of one's self to, and laying hold of, the redeeming love of God in Christ, is almost overlooked and overleaped. For in places where Wiclif describes faith more closely, the kernel of it appears to be something intellectual — a faith-knowledge, which, however, has for its consequence and fruit a course of moral action. In particular, he adduces, as a proof of the necessity of faith, the fact that all those who have reached the years of youthful ripeness are obliged to learn their *credo*.[203] And in a connexion quite different from this, where faith is his subject, Wiclif lays it down as a principle, "that it is absolutely necessary to salvation that every Christian should believe, at least implicitly, every article of the faith."[204] It is not at all his meaning in this to say a word in favour of easy belief or credulity. He is much too sensible and critical to mean that. Even in his sermons this critical vein reveals itself.

Turning now to the other side of faith, Wiclif evidently assumes that the kernel of faith is a state of *feeling*—a moral activity—when, in accord with the theology of his age and

agreeably to Aristotelian metaphysics, he lays particular stress upon the *fides formata*, and defines faith to be a steadfast cleaving to God or to Christ in love (*per amorem caritatis perpetuo adhaerere*).[205] In so defining it, Wiclif, hand-in-hand with his theological contemporaries, passes immediately beyond the moment of conversion, and takes his standpoint within the work of sanctification; in other words, he mixes up conversion and sanctification, faith and works. And, for this reason, we can hardly expect beforehand to find Wiclif doing homage to the Pauline Reformation-truth of the justification of the sinner by faith alone. There are not wanting, indeed, expressions which, at first sight, graze upon this truth, *e.g.*, when, founding upon Heb. xi., he describes faith as "the ground of the justification of man before God,"[207] or when he sets forth the purposes for which faith is profitable, as follows:—(1) It animates all the regenerate in the path of virtue; (2) It wakes up and strengthens pilgrims to do battle with their enemies; (3) It covers the enemy with defeat. And here it is interesting to note that Wiclif grounds the first of these statements upon Rom. i. 17, and Habakkuk ii. 4, "The just shall live by his faith."[208]

But the nearer he approaches to the truth, it comes out to view all the more unmistakeably that Wiclif, in his estimate of faith, still occupies the standpoint of mediæval scholasticism, and has not even a presentiment, to say nothing of an understanding, of what faith was to the mind of the Apostle Paul. In the perusal of his writings I have scarcely met with a more characteristic passage than the following, which occurs in a sermon on that purely Pauline passage, Rom. x. 10, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the tongue confession is made unto salvation."[209]

Wiclif remarks, in the course of his sermon, that "as life precedes all life acts, so faith goes before all other virtues. It is for this reason that the Apostle, in Heb. x., says, in the words of the prophet, 'The just man lives by his faith;' as if he would say that the spiritual life of the just springs out of faith. In order that a man may be righteous, it is necessary that he should believe what he knows. And as faith under favourable circumstances works great things, inasmuch as it is impossible that a seed so great, when sown in fruitful soil, should not spring forth and work to good effect, it is for this reason the Apostle adds, 'Confession is made with the mouth unto salvation.'" Wiclif, it is manifest, failed to seize the evangelical idea of faith. One might almost say that in his case, as in that of other scholastics, as Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and others, the very organ was wanting which was needed for this. He has, therefore, no faculty of perception for the truth of justification by faith alone. On the contrary, he is inclined to put "righteousness before God" to the account of good works along with faith, and for this reason does not even deny to these all "merit."

This leads us from the work of conversion to the work of sanctification; and, on going more closely into the latter, we come, at the same time, in sight of Wiclif's fundamental thoughts on the subject of morals. And, if we are not mistaken, his ethical system is worthy of a more careful study than it has ever hitherto received.

To the question respecting the highest good, *summum bonum*, Wiclif replies that there are three kinds of good, which are graduated according to their value thus:—The good things of fortune, which possess the smallest value; the good things of nature, which have a middling value; and lastly, the good things of virtue and grace, which are of

the highest worth.[210] The highest good, then, to him is coincident with virtue, which virtue is conditioned by grace. The good things of virtue are, at the same time, the good things of grace. The standing in grace is the condition of Christian freedom, and freedom from sin is the summit of all freedom.[211] In the standing of grace the Christian has a right to all things; not in the sense of municipal right, but in virtue of grace, *titulo gratiæ*.[212]

Coming up closer to Wiclif's doctrine of virtue, we have, it is true, at first, the well known old song of the five philosophical or cardinal virtues, righteousness, courage, prudence, and moderation (this is Wiclif's usual way of arranging them), and of the three theological virtues, faith, hope, and love.[213] But still, on a closer examination, ethical ideas peculiar to himself, and characteristic of his mode of Christian thought, are not altogether lacking. These I find in what Wiclif says of humility and of love. In humility he recognises the root-virtue; as in pride he discovers the first sin. In the third book of the *Trialogus* he gives an outline of the fundamental principles of his ethics (c. i.-xxiii.). In particular he treats (c. ix.-xxiii.) of the seven mortal sins and the opposite virtues, and there he places pride foremost among the sins, and humility foremost among the virtues. And why so? Because the root of every kind of pride lies in this, that man does not humbly believe that all that he has comes to him from God.[214] Pride is the first step to apostacy from God. When man is proud he is guilty of an implicit blasphemy, for he denies by implication that he has any one above him to whose laws he owes obedience.[215] On the other hand humility, according to expressions of Wiclif often repeated, is the root of all virtues. It is even the root of Christian piety. The more humility a man has the nearer is

he to Christ. Humility — *i.e.*, the heartfelt and practical recognition that we are God's servants, and that to Him alone belongs the glory—is, so to speak, the mild atmosphere in which all other virtues can alone grow and flourish.[216] This view of humility as the basis and root of all virtue rests unmistakeably upon a religious sentiment, and upon a dogmatic conviction which gives to God alone the glory, and which sees in Christ alone the salvation of mankind. These ethical thoughts of Wiclif are thus a mirror of his religious and dogmatic individuality.

The proper kernel of all Christian virtue Wiclif declares to be the love of God and our neighbour. Without love to God with all the heart and all the soul, there dwells no moral virtue in man. No one can reach the blessed home without it; it is the wedding garment without which we cannot stand in the final judgment.[217] Love to God is the chief lesson which man learns in the school of the virtues; and no action of a man has value except that which is animated by the love of God above everything else.[218] In his treatise, *Of the Ten Commandments*, Wiclif investigates psychologically, in the hand of St. Bernard, the different gradations of the love of God; and he declares to be the highest stage of it that state of feeling which, in virtue of a certain relish of the Divine sweetness, passes beyond all created things and goes forth in love to God Himself, purely for His own sake; while there is also a love of God which seeks a recompense for its affection, which loves Him not for what He is in Himself, but in view of reward.[212] From the pure love of God springs the love of our neighbour.[220] On this subject Wiclif calls attention to the fact that love has its own order, according to which it is bound to love, in the first line, the members of its own household, etc. (1 Tim. v. 8). But honest love

manifests itself, according to circumstances, by candid remonstrance and earnest censure (like as God Himself chasteneth those whom He loveth), while that weak indulgence which allows everything to take its own way is nothing else but a blind love and a false compassion.[221] The principle, that the love of our neighbour should begin with what stands nearest to it ("Charity begins at home," according to the modern proverb), is connected with another held by Wiclif, that it is the duty of every man to do what belongs to his position and calling, be that calling what it may. The more faithfully and conscientiously he fulfils his nearest duty, the more certainly, in virtue of a certain concatenation in things, will he be useful to others and advance their welfare.[222]

This thought stands in unmistakeable opposition to the one-sidedness of a narrow, monkish mode of feeling and thinking on moral subjects, which considered the contemplative life and seclusion from the world as the surest means of virtue. Wiclif, on the contrary, sets out with the design of restoring the active life of the Christian man in the most different callings to its true moral rights, so often ignored in his day; and how he did this in respect to civil life and the State we shall show below.

But when the question is put, What is the moral standard which the individual should apply in any given case, when he is concerned to know what is well-pleasing to God, or what is conformable to the love of God and our neighbour—we are pointed by Wiclif to the example of Christ, the imitation of which will lead us in an unerring and sure path. Christ says to us—"Follow me," and every man who desires to be saved must follow Him, either in suffering or at least in moral conduct.[443] To give a particular instance, Wiclif, taking occasion from the Gospel concerning "the woman that

was a sinner" in the house of Simon the Pharisee,[444] deduces from the intercourse of Jesus with sinners, rules as to the way and manner in which a servant of Christ has to carry himself in such intercourse. He lays down this principle, "The nearer the life of a Christian comes to Christ, the more rich it is in virtue. It follows that men's departure from the principles of the Christian religion is owing to their having too high a value for many teachers who stand in opposition to Christ, to the neglect of the doctrine and example of the best Master and Leader. Manifestly, Wiclif applies here an ideal standard; he is also clearly conscious of doing so; at least he censures, in the sharpest manner, the practice of attempting to reduce at pleasure the moral standard, and of pretending, *e.g.*, that the *commands* of Christ are indeed binding upon every man, but not so his *counsels*, for these last are obligatory only upon heroic Christians like the saints, but not upon people of an average sort. Proceeding on such an allegation, men would extinguish the religion of Christ, for then every man might set aside all Christ's counsels together, and maintain that they were not binding upon him, for he is one of the weak. Wiclif, on the contrary, lays down the principle that "Every counsel which Christ has imparted is binding upon every one to whom it is given."[226]

With this view stands connected the circumstance that Wiclif pronounces a moral neutrality to be entirely inadmissible, yea, unthinkable: "like as no man can be neutral in regard to virtue and vice, so neither can the life and walk of any man be neutral."[227] He rightly looks upon the moral character of a man as a complete whole, whose prevailing trait gives its value to every single feature and act—or takes it away. Wiclif is far removed from that atomistic view which, as in the instance of Pelagius and others,

regards every single act as an isolated phenomenon. He prefers, on the contrary, a comprehensive way of looking at the subject, which recognises the connection of the moral life as constituting a whole made up of many parts. "As the earlier drops have a preparatory effect, and the last drop completes the hollowing of the stone, so sins which have full swing in the middle of a man's life prepare the way for his despair at last." Wiclif admits, indeed, that any one may do a work which is in its own nature good (*opus bonum de genere*) while living in a state of mortal sin; but he holds that in that case the work is a sin, and the doer of it even incurs, in the act, a mortal sin, as, *e.g.*, when a parish priest, while living in an unconverted and dissolute state of life, administers the sacraments correctly, does good to the poor, etc., etc. Not only *what* a man does is to be considered, but how he does it, and from what feeling and motive. Wiclif is fond of expressing this in the words of St. Bernard, "God recompenses not the good thing which is done, but that which is done in a good way, as God rewards not the *what* but the *how*.[228] And from this it further follows, that every pilgrim upon earth has need to test his own life most carefully in reference to this point, whether he is living in the hope of salvation, and has a standing thereby in the state of grace."

After this survey of the ethical thoughts of Wiclif, we return to his view, before touched upon, respecting the way in which the sinner attains to righteousness before God. Bringing all he says together, the view he takes amounts to this—that man can obtain righteousness before God, forgiveness of sins, and hope of eternal life, only in the way of grace, but not without his own moral work and sanctification. Now, it is true that he is wont to express this in a way which looks as if he had stood at no great distance from the delusion

that heaven can be *earned* or merited by men.[229] But we must be on our guard not to mete Wiclif's theology with the measuring line of the Reformed Confessions. For, in the first place, he goes to work with quite a different apparatus of ideas from an evangelical theologian of the present day. Ideas such as *meritum* and *demeritum* (for he makes very frequent use of these correlative ideas) he took over, like the Scholastics before him, from the Latin Fathers, chiefly in the sense of moral worth and unworth. The proper idea of *merit, i.e.*, of an independent performance, conferring a full legal claim upon God's recognition and recompense, in the form of eternal blessedness, he designates according to scholastic usage *meritum de condigno;* while the *meritum de congruo* obtains validity and recognition only by way of what is fair and reasonable, not of strict right.[230] Then, secondly, when it comes to the application of these ideas to the actual state of things, Wiclif contends, quite categorically, against all thoughts of proper merit in the full sense of the word, *i.e., meritum de condigno.* We have already quoted above an unmistakeable utterance of his to the effect that under no circumstances can a creature merit anything of God in virtue of its own worthiness,[231] and he expresses repeatedly the same thought with the greatest emphasis. He declares it to be a vain imagination, when the case is put that "nature"—*i.e.*, the will-power naturally inherent in man—might be able to perform anything good without the co-operation of grace; and in his judgment this would amount to God's making a creature of His own, which should in such sort acquire merit of its own by its own powers, to be God. In connection with that point he gives a detailed interpretation of the words of St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 5, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency

is of God." His meaning is that Paul, in these words, saves, on the one hand, the freedom of the will, and the power of acquiring a merit *de congruo*, but denies, at the same time, that we are able, without the prevenience of grace, to merit anything *de condigno*; *i.e.*, he declares that we merit absolutely nothing in the sense of legal claim.

Thirdly, When we come still nearer to the actual facts of the case, no fewer than four different questions come under discussion. (1.) Can man make satisfaction for sin by good works? *i.e.*, Can he merit the forgiveness of sins thereby? (2.) Can he, by his moral behaviour, merit the gift of grace requisite to conversion? (3.) Can he, after conversion, merit by good works eternal life or blessedness? (4.) Is there in reality such a thing as supererogatory merit? The first question Wiclif answers in the negative. His straightforward confession upon this point is this—"I do not believe that even the smallest sin committed against the Lord can be deleted by any merit, unless it is done away in the main or principally by the merit of this Man (the Redeemer).[233] Quite similarly he speaks on this subject in one of his sermons. "I do not see how any sin can be done away by means of *meritum de condigno* in the sinner, since infinite grace is required (he refers to the individual's standing in grace) in order to satisfaction for sin." The passage also already quoted from the sixth of his Twenty-four sermons contains the same thought, that the infinite compassion of the Redeemer and His all-availing merit alone make possible the forgiveness of sins; while it is by no means excluded that some moral performance of the individual sinner is requisite, if his own committed sins are to be forgiven him.

As to the second question, Can man by his moral be-

haviour merit the gift of grace for conversion? it is well known that many scholastics were accustomed to answer it in the affirmative—in assuming that God grants to those who are honest in their endeavours after a better life the grace which is needed in order to conversion. He does this, indeed, not *de condigno*, as if he were bound in law to do it; but still he does it *de congruo*, for it is fair and meet that honest strivers should be met so far with the needed help. What position does Wiclif take up in relation to this teaching? He rejects it with the utmost decision as a vain imagination[234] (*vanitas*). He declares himself clearly and roundly in opposition to the supposition that, before his conversion, man can contribute anything by his moral behaviour towards the object that God should give him the grace of the Holy Spirit needful to conversion. In other words, he rejects the error that converting grace is conferred by God as at least a half-and-half merited reward. Indeed, Thomas Aquinas had also declared against the supposition that any one could merit this grace *de condigno*, but the milder view of the possibility of meriting the grace *de congruo* he had passed over in silence.

The third question is as follows—Can man, after his conversion, merit eternal blessedness by good works? To this question, also, Wiclif replies in the negative, in so far as any *meritum de condigno* is thought of. On this point we simply recall the expressions already adduced above, to which we only add what follows, in the way of confirmation. Wiclif is honestly striving to set aside all vain self-approbation, which gives the glory not to God, but to itself. For this reason he lays stress upon the words of Christ—"When ye have done all, then say we are unprofitable servants."[235] The holy life of Christ alone is deemed

by him to be absolutely meritorious, and taken to be the principle which first lends life, *i.e.*, power and weight, to every other merit.[236] And in another place he brings into view the thought that every moral virtue, every truly God-pleasing action, is conditioned, in its coming into existence by the gracious working of God, by the "power from on high," while its availment and weight in God's eyes is dependent on this, that God is pleased, in the riches of His grace, to accept it.[237] There cannot, then, well exist any doubt regarding so much as this, that Wiclif consciously and distinctly rejects the notion that the converted Christian can have any full and perfect merit to show, *i.e.*, any moral performance or achievement, in virtue of which he acquires a right in law to the coming blessedness—*a meritum de condigno.* Herein he agrees with Thomas Aquinas, except that the latter acknowledges such a merit as existing in cases where this meritorious work is viewed as effected by the Holy Ghost.[238] This, indeed, does not exclude, but indirectly concedes, the fact that there is a moral merit, improperly so called—*a meritum de congruo*—or works meritorious in the widest sense. The latter are what are meant when Wiclif says, on one occasion, "If the husbandman already has joy in the hope of the fruit of his sowing, how much more may a pilgrim, who may believe that he has done many meritorious works, rejoice in the hope of the fruits which these will yield to him."[239]

From what precedes, the fourth question answers itself—Whether such a thing as supererogation really exists? For if human merit, in the strict and proper sense of the word, is not, speaking generally, recognised, much less, of course, can there be anything to say for a pretended surplus merit (*meritum supererogatum*). It is no wonder, therefore, that Wiclif

pronounces the notion of a boundless treasure of supererogatory merit, which it belongs to the Church, and in part to every Pope for the time being, to administer, to be nothing less than a "lying fiction."[240]

According to all this, Wiclif absolutely rejected, indeed, the notion that man is able to acquire any moral merit in the full sense of the word, whether in order to make satisfaction for sin, or to attain thereby to conversion or eternal blessedness. On the other hand, it must be conceded that he recognised a merit bearing an improper sense, and so also some co-operation of man's own moral power, partly in the matter of forgiveness of sin, and partly in reference to the hope of the eternal blessedness.

When Melanchthon, in a short critique upon Wiclif, pronounces, among other things, the judgment that he was totally ignorant of the righteousness of faith, *i.e.*, of the doctrine of justification by faith alone,[241] we cannot do other than acknowledge this judgment to be exact and just. It was reserved for Luther, first of all men, to be called of God to separate by felicitous tact this kernel of saving truth from the husk, and to make it the central doctrine of the Evangelical Confession.

NOTES TO SECTIONS VII. AND VIII.

163. *Trialogus*, III., 29, p. 230 f., cf. IV., 39, p. 386.

164. *Ib.*, III., 30, p. 235 : Personalitas Christi est aeterna, et suae humanitatis assumptio aeternaliter praeparata, etc.

165. *Ib.*, II., 7, p. 99 ; cf. III., 30, p. 235 : unio hypostatica naturarum. III., 25, p. 215 : necesse fuit Verbum divinum incarnari, etc. Comp. Lewald, *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1846, 519 f., 523 f.

166. *Ib.*, III., 11, p. 164. Comp. *Sermons for Saints' Days*, No. XVII., MS. 3928, fol. 33, col. 2. *Miscel. Sermons*, XXV., fol. 234, col. 3.

167. *Sermons for Saints' Days*, XXXIX., MS. 3928, fol. 77, col. 4 : Christus

conquestor optimus docet suos milites per fugam et patientiam conquirere sibi regnum.

168. *De Statu Innocentiae*, c. 1, MS, 1339, fol. 238, col. 1. *De Civili Dominio*, III., c. 25. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 8, f. 106, col. 2, Christus qui existens Caesar semper augustus semper meliorando procedit. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, c. 28, MS. 1294, f. 98, col. 1.

169. *De Divino Dominio*, III., 4, MS. 1339, f. 81, col. 1. *De Civili Dominio*, III., c. 7, MS. 1340, f. 37, col. 1. *Miscel. Sermons*, No. III., MS. 3928, f. 134, col. 1. In the latter passage is combined with the Biblical image of the victorious giant, the antique image of Atlas bearing up the world, inasmuch as Christ (Heb. i. 3) upholdeth all things by His mighty Word.

170. *De Civili Dominio*, II., c. 8, MS. 1341, fol. 179, col. 1 : Christus, qui est prior nostri ordinis atque principium.

171. *Trialogus* IV., 6, p. 263 ; c. 33, p. 364. *De Ecclesia*, c. 5. *De Sex Jugis*, c. 2. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 13 ; MS., 1341, fol. 212, col. 1. *Sermons for Saints' Days*, No. 6, MS. 3928, fol. 12, col. 1. *English Sermons on the Gospels*, No. XXX. God made him . . . . priour of al his religioun ; and he was abbot, as Poul seith, of the best ordre that may be. *Select English Works*, ed. Thom. Arnold, Vol. I., fol. 77. The expression, somewhat strange to us, occurs also elsewhere, *e.g.*, in John Gerson.

172. *Ib.*, IV., 35, p. 371 : sequi Christum patronum, etc.

173. *Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. VII. MS., 3928, fol. 148, col. 4 : Episcopus nos consecrans et excedens nostros episcopos est episcopus animarum et sacerdos in aeternum, etc.

174. *Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. VIII., fol. 149, col. 1 : Illi ergo episcopo (Christo) fuit gloria et imperium, cum sit simul rex et imperator, cum sit simul rex et imperator et sacerdos sanctissimus sive papa. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 3929, f. 8, col. 2 : Quilibet laicus fidelis tenetur credere, quod habet Christum sacerdotem suum, rectorem (parish priest), episcopum atque papam, etc. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 22, MS. 1340, fol. 196, col. 2. He calls Christ, in order to distinguish Him from the Roman Pontiff, Summus Pontifix longe majoris auctoritatis . . . . cui oportet amplius obedire.

175. z. B. *De Statu Innocentiae*, c. 2, MS. 1339, fol. 239, col. 1. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 1, col. 1. Comp. *Trialogus*, III., 30, p. 234 f.

176. *Trialogus*, III., 30.

177. *Trialogus*, III., 30, p. 234 : Nullus homo potest—sine illo ut fonte salvari.

178. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 13, MS. 1341, fol. 212, col. 1.

179. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. VII., MS. 3928, fol. 13, col. 1 : Totus honor Dei gratiae ex integro tribuatur. No. III., fol. 6, col. 2 : Christus—fortificat pugnantes pro causa sua, etc. When in No. II., fol. 3, col. 1, Wiclif says of St. Paul that he lifts the banner of his Captain in glorying only in the Cross of Christ, his words admit of being justly applied to Wiclif himself. In the *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 26, MS. 3928, fol. 206, col. 2, he remarks that pars Christi sit parte adversa

potentior; and in the same treatise, c. 28, fol. 214, col. 2, he speaks of *doctores detegentes sensum scripturae* as *Christi discipuli.*

180. *De Civili Dominio,* II., c. 8, MS. 1341, fol. 179, col. 1: Ille enim, qui est sacerdos in aeternum, propheta magnus atque magister, exhortatus est saluberrime crebrius praedicando; sed cum sit rex regum, exercuit tam auctoritative quam ministerialiter correptionem humanitus coactivam. Comp. the words quoted in the preceding note, 174: illi ergo episcopo . . . . papa.

181. *Liber Mandatorum,* c. 6, MS. 1339, fol. 102, col. 1.

182. *Trialogus,* IV., 16, p. 300: Opera Christi sunt interpres optimus legis suae, cf. III., 31.

183. *De Civili Dominio,* I., 28, MS. 65, col. 1: Omnis Christi actio est nostra instructio.

184. *De Veritate s. Scripturae,* c. 29, MS. 1194, fol. 101, col. 4: Vita Christi tanquam communissima et toti ecclesiae notissima super verticem montium posita, est in scolis, in sermonibus atque ecclesiis omni generi hominum detegenda.

185. *Saints' Day Sermons,* No. VI., MS. 3928, fol. 12, col. 1: Petro, Paulo, evangelistae Johanni et ceteris citra Christum scriptura imponit grave peccatum, et per consequens errorem et stultitiam, ... ideo abbas noster Christus impeccabilis est videndus.

186. *Saints' Day Sermons,* No. VIII., MS. 3928, fol. 14, col. 2.

187. *Miscellaneous Sermons,* No. XXVI., MS. 3928, fol. 235, col. 3 and 4: Adhuc Deus celavit a nobis puncta talia, ut recognoscentes humiliter nostram ignorantiam, fidei necessarioribus fortius insistamus.

188. *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons,* No. XVIII., MS. 3928, fol. 222, col. 4: Christus dicit in nobis cottidie: Hoc passus sum pro te, quid pateris pro me? Comp. the well-known word, "This I did for thee, what doest thou for me?"

189. *Trialogus,* IV., 12, p. 288: Non dubito quin passio Christi tam ad posterius tempore (*sic*) quam ad anterius in fructus efficacia se extendit. *Miscellaneous Sermons,* No. I., MS. 3128, fol. 193, col. 2: Sicut virtus meriti Christi se extendit usque ad finem mundi post ejus completionem, sic virtus ejusdem meriti se extendit usque ad principium mundi ante ejus impletionem. Et nisi sic esset, nunquam fuisset persona humani generis, post praevaricationem primi hominis, justa moraliter sive salva.

190. *XXIV. Miscellaneous Sermons,* No. VIII., MS. 3928, fol. 148, col. 4.

191. *De Ecclesia,* c. 3; MS. 3929, fol. 11, col. 2: Christus salvavit totum mundum humani generis, cum apposuit medicinam passionis, quae suffecit redimere multos mundos.

192. *De Veritate s. Scripturae,* c. 30, MS. 1294, fol. 107. col. 3: Humanum genus est in majori gratia, per reparationem domini nostri Jesu Christi, quam fuisset, posito, quod nemo a statu innocentiae cecidisset, etc.

193. *De Civili Dominio,* III., 25; MS. 1340, fol. 246, col. 1: Patet, quod Christus non redemit omnes homines a damnatione ad regnum, cum multi sunt qui non resurgent in jvdicio. sed manebunt in perpetuo carcere peccatorum. Comp. *De*

Veritate Scripturae s., c. 30. Tertii dicunt, sicut ego saepe locutus sum, quod Christus solum redemit praedestinatos, quos ordinavit ad gloriam.

194. *Trialogus*, III., 30, p. 236.

195. *Trialogus*, IV., 18, p. 306.

195. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. VI., MS. 3628, fol. 143, col. 4: Verum concludit-ur, quod pro nullo peccato suo posset homo satisfacere, nisi esset immensitas misericordiae Salvatoris. Poeniteat ergo homo Deo fructuose, et deserat peccata praeterita, et virtute meriti Christi et suae gratiae sunt deleta.

196. *Trialogus*, III.. 2, p. 133. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 133, col. 4: Fides nunc sumitur pro actu credendi, quo creditur, nunc pro habitu credendi, per quem creditur, et nunc pro veritate, quae creditur, ut docet Augustinus XIIIo De Trin. (c. 2 and 3).

197. *Ib.*, Alia est fides, quae est credulitas fidelis explicita, et alia fides implicita, ut catholicus, habens habitum fidei infusum vel acquisitum explicite credit ecclesiam catholicam in communi, et in illa fide communi credit implicite . . . quodcunque singulariter contentum sub s. matre ecclesia.

198. *XL. Sermons*, No. XII.; MS. 3928, fol. 214, col. 1: Fides est fundamentum religionis Christianae, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo.

199. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 21, MS. 1594, fol. 71, col. 4: Sicut primum fundamentum virtutum est fides (Heb. xi.), sic primum detrimentum alliciens ad peccandum est infidelitas, etc. And some lines before he says it is certain, non esse quenquam possibile peccare, nisi propter defectum fidei. *Trialogus*, III., 2, p. 135. Cum impossibile sit quenquam peccare, nisi de tanto in fide deficiat.

200. *XL. Miscell. Serm.*, No. XII., MS. 3928, fol. 214, cols. 1-3. The connection of thought in this passage is significant: Nemo potest placere Deo nisi ipsum diligendo; sed nemo potest Deum diligere, nisi ipsum per fidem cognoscendo.

201. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 44, MS. 1341, fol. 143, col. 2: Oportet—omnem christianum de absoluta necessitate salutis quemlibet articulum fidei saltem implicite credere.

202. *XXIV. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. X., MS. 3928, fol. 155, col. 1: Quantum ad illud de Gregorio orante pro Trajano, credere potest, qui voluerit; sed ratio exigit, quod quaelibet talis credulitas, si infuerit, insit homini citra fidem, Wiclif refers at some length to the same tradition in the tractate *De Ecclesia*, c. 22, MS. 1294 f.

203. *Trialogus*, III. 2, p. 133: Fides (ut dicunt scholastici) alia est informis,—et alia est fides caritate formata. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 10, MS. 1294, fol. 25, col. 1: *Nisi habuerint fidem formatam, damnabuntur tanquam vacui inutiles;* c. 2, fol. 133, col. 4: si habuerit fidem caritate formatam. *XXIV. Serm.*, No. XVII., MS. 3928, fol. 169, col. 1: in Christum credere—sibi (Christo) per amorem caritatis perpetuo adhaerere. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 21: Credere in Deum est credendo ipsum sibi adhaerere firmiter per amorem.

204. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 10, MS. 1294, fol. 25, col. 3: Probat apostolus 11º Hebr., quod fides sit fundamentum justificationis hominis quoad Deum.

205. *XL. Sermons*, No. XII., MS. 3928, fol. 214, col. 3: Inter alia, in quo (*sic*) fides

est utilis, prodest generaliter ad haec tria: 1, omnes regeneneratos in via virtutum vivificat; 2, viantes ad invadendum inimicos excitat et comfortat; 3, protegendo impugnantes confundit. . . . . Habak. ii, 4: "Justus meus ex fide vivit," etc.

206. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. XX., MS. 3928, fol. 175, col. 3: Sicut vita praecedit omnes alios actus secundos, sic fides virtutes alias, et hinc dicit apostolus Hebr. x. extestimonio prophetae: "Justus ex fide vivet;" ac si intenderet, quod vita spiritualis justorum originatur ex fide. . . . . Ideo dicit apostolus: Corde creditur ad Justitiam, *i.e.*, quod homo sit justus, requiritur ipsum credere intellectum. Et cum fides, habita opportunitate, operatur magna, si est, cum impossibile est tantum semen in terra fructifera non in bonam operam ebullire, ideo subjungit apostolus, quod "ore confessio fit ad salutem."

207. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. V., MS. 3928, fol. 8, col. 1: bona fortunae quae sunt minima, bona naturae, quae sunt media, bona virtutis et gratiae, quae sunt maxima.

208. *Trialogus*, III., 29, p. 229. *De Ecclesia*, c. 11, MS. 1294., fol. 161, col. 2: Libertas a peccato est maxima, sine qua non est aliqua vera libertas.

209. *De Ecclesia*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 174, col. 1, on mentioning the pretended donation of Constantine Wiclif says of Silvester: Fuit dominus super astra et omnia inferiora homine in natura, sed non titulo civili, imo titulo gratiae, quo justi sunt omnia.

210. *Trialogus*, III., 1 and 2, p. 128 f.

211. *Ib.*, III., 10, p. 163: Tota radix cujuslibet speciei superbiae stat in isto quod homo errat non credendo humiliter, quod quidquid habuerit est a Deo.

212. *De Christo et ejus Adversario*, c. 10, MS. 3933, fol. 74, col. 3: Superbia est primus pes, per quem peccator a Deo decidit, ut patet de Lucifero, etc. *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. VI., MS. 3928, fol. 8, col. 1: Superbia est implicite blasphemia. . . . . Quum homo superbit, negat implicite se habere superiorem, legibus cujus obediat.

213. *Trialogus*, III., 11, p. 164 f.: Humilitas est aliis virtutibus fundamentum. Quicunque est humilior, est Christo propinquior; religio in humilitate fundata. *De Graduationibus Scholasticis*, c. 2, MS. 1337, fol. 111, col. 3: Radix religionis Christi est humilitas. *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. VI., MS. 3927, fol. 202, cols. 3 and 4: Fides et humilitas connexae sunt fundamentum religionis Christianae. Humilitas est quasi aura temperata, in qua oportet omnia plantaria aliarum virtutum conseri, si debeant crescere in christiano. In his English writings, sermons, etc., Wiclif insists often enough, and with the greatest emphasis, upon *meekness*, *e.g.*, in the 121st sermon in Arnold's edition, I., 399, he says, "Ever as a man is more meek, evere the betere man he is." And *meek*, *meekness* signify with Wiclif, according to his Bible translations—*vide* Wicliffe's *Versions of the Bible*, Vol. IV., 10—not softness or gentleness, but *humility*.

214. *Trialogus* III., 2, p. 132, 136 f.

215. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 26, MS. 1340, fol. 247, col. 2: Ars praecipua, quam in schola virtutem addiscimus, est ars diligendi Deum. *XL. Miscel. Serm.*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 194, col 2: Nullus actus hominis meritorius est, nisi in quo Deus supereminenter diligitur. In one of his English sermons Wiclf says, "Humility is

the foundation of all virtues, and Love their summit which reaches to heaven." *Select English Works*, Vol. I., 64.

216. *Liber Mandatorum sive Decalogus*, c. 31, MS. 1339, fol. 126, col. 2.

217. *Trialogus*, III., 2, p. 136: Consistit autem caritas in amore, quo Deus debite diligitur et tota sua fabrica.

218. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. LVI., MS. 3928, fol. 114, col. 4: Ordo caritatis exigit, quod homo primo in ordine diligat suos domesticos, etc. *De Ecclesia*, c. 15 MS. 1294, fol. 177, col 2: Patet, quod de lege caritatis et spiritualis elemosinae—tenetur praepositus, subjectos corripere. Unde inter omnia peccata, de quibus magis timeo in superioribus regni nostri, sunt caeca pietas, falsa misericordia, etc.

219. *Liber Mandatorum* (*Decalogus*), c. 23, MS. 1339, fol. 186, col. 2: Faciat ergo quodlibet membrum ecclesiae, quod incumbit officio sui status, et de quanto facit solicius (*sic*, from *solliciete*), de tanto quadam naturalitate cuilibet membro capaci prodest amplius, etc., cf., fol. 187, col. 1.

220. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. III., MS. 3928, fol. 4, col. 2: Omnem salvandum oportet sequi ipsum vel in passione vel saltem in moribus. Et si sit virtuosus, quomodo Dei virtus causans et exemplans virtutem suam non erit dux, quem sequitur in moribus?

221. *Ib.*, No. XVIII., fol. 36, col. 3.

222. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 29, MS. 1294, fol 101, col. 4: De quanto vita Christiani est Christo propinquior, de tanto est virtuosior. Et patet correlarie, quod declinatio a religione Christiana ex hoc oritur, quod nimis attenditur ad multos magistros Christo contrarios, doctrina et sequela magistri et ducis optimi praetermissa.

223. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 13, MS. 1341, fol. 208, cols. 1 and 2: Secundus fucus hoc dicit, quod sic (cf. Hebr. xi., 36) pati injurias, cum sit consilium, non obligat nisi heroicos, cujusmodi sunt sancti ab ecclesia canonizati; talia consilia non obligant mediocres.

224. *Ib.*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 123, col. 1: Sicut nemo potest esse neuter quoad virtutem et vitium, sic nulla conversatio hominis potest esse neutra.

225. *Ib.*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 202, col. 1; fol. 203, col. 1: Sicut malum de genere potest bene fieri (*e.g.*, Execution of Criminals), sic bonum de genere potest male fieri. Glossa Bernhardi "Deus, inquit, non est remunerator hominum sed adverbiorum," hoc est tantum dicere; non remunerat (*sic*) Deus bonum quod fit, sed quod bene fit. Comp. *De Officio Pastorali*, I., 10, p. 18. Ideo dicunt loquentes communiter, quod Deus est remunerator adverbiorum. Farther, *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 116, col. 4: Non solum debet attendi, quid homo faciat, sed qualiter et qua intentione, cum Deus sit remunerator adverbiorum, quae faciunt maxime ad moralitatem, quam oportet fundari in gratia et caritate, quae non possunt inesse, nisi insit moralitas.

226. The expressions *mereri praemium in alio seculo, meritum, opera meritoria*, are of such frequent occurrence with Wiclif, that the slightest doubt can evidently never have occurred to him of the propriety of applying them to Christians. They

are also repeated so often that it appears superfluous to quote passages in proof of the fact.

227. Wiclif defines *meritum* in one place to be something done by a rational creature which is worthy of reward ; and he remarks that, as the same man may be both father and son, so the same act may be *de condigno* in relation to one set in authority, who rewards without any grace, and *de congruo* in relation to a Lord who rewards only of grace. *De Dominio Divino*, III., MS. 1339, fol. 87, col. 1.

228. *De Dominio Divino*, III., 4, MS. 1339, fol. 79, col. 1 : Creatura penitus nihil a Deo merebitur ex condigno, cf. 78, col. 2.

229. *Ib.*, III., 5, MS., 1339, fol. 84, col. 1, f., über 2 Cor., iii. 5: In quo dicto videtur mihi, quod apostolus more suo profunde primo innuit, nos posse cogitare aliquid "a nobis," et per consequens salvatur nobis liberum arbitrium cum potentia merendi de congruo ; secundo per hoc, quod negat nos posse aliquid cogitare "ex nobis," explicat, quod non possumus mereri aliquid sine praecedente gratia, et sic nihil simpliciter de condigno.

230. *Ib.*, III., 4, MS., 1339, fol. 30, col. 2 : Non—reor peccatum vel minimum commissum contra dominum per aliquod meritum posse tolli, nisi per meritum hujus viri principaliter sit ablatum.

231. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. II., MS. 3928, fol. 132, col. 3 f. : Ego non video, quomodo ex condignitate meriti peccantis deleri possit quodcunque peccatum, cum ad satisfactionem requiritur gratia infinita specialis.

232. *Trialogus*, III., 7, p. 153. Et patet vanitas nostrorum loquentium, qui ponunt, quod gratia talis datur homini. . . . de congruo, ut facilitet hominem ad merendum.

233. *De Dominio Divino*, III., MS. 1339, fol. 89, col. 2. Here Wiclif lays down the principle that worldly rulers should ever remember that they are the servants and stewards of God, and he continues as follows : Si ergo istam sententiam haberemus prae oculis, tunc non inaniter gloriaremur, quasi hoc haberemus ex nobis, sed cum timore distribueremus bona domini solum dignis, ascribentes Deo honores (*sic*) et non nobis, qui solum sumus dispensatores et "servi sibi inutiles."

234. *Ib.*, III., 4, MS. 1339, fol. 80, col. 1 : Ejus (Christi) quidem conversatio summe meritoria in plenitudine temporis ordinata est principium vivificans, quodlibet aliud meritum subsequens vel praecedens.

235. *Trialogus*, III., 2, p. 132 f. : Quomodo quaeso posset homo mereri beatitudinem, vivendo et agendo secundum beneplacitum Dei, nisi Deus ex magna sua gratia hoc acceptet? Ideo quidquid homo egerit vel natura creata in ipso genuerit, non dicitur virtus moralis meritoria praemii vel laudis perpetuae, nisi illa virtus ab alto venerit, et per consequens ex gratia Dei sui.

236. *Summa*, II., 1 Quaest. 114, 3.

237. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXXIV., MS. 3928, fol. 67, col. 2 : Si agricultor in spe gaudet de fructu sui seminis, quanto magis viator, qui debet credere, se fecisse multa opera meritoria, debet eorum fructibus spe gaudere.

238. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. VII., MS. 3928, fol. 146, col. 2 : Cautela subtilissima a fratribus inventa stat in mendaci fictione thesauri infiniti supererogati

meriti ecclesiae triumphantis, quem Deus ponit in potestate distributiva cujuscunque papae caesarii. Comp. *Trialogus*, IV., 32, p. 158. Supponunt, quod in cölis sint infinita sanctorum supererogata merita. . . . . et super totum illum thesaurum Christus papam constituit, etc.

239. Preface to *Sententiae veterum de eöna Domini*, in a letter to Frederick Myconius, about March 1530, *Corpus Reformatorum*, Vol. II., 32: Prorsus nec intellexit nec tenuit fidei justitiam.

240. *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe*, ed. 2, Lond. 1831, II., 324 f.

241. *De Christo et ejus Adversario*, c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 70, col. 1: Secundum catholicos ecclesia est praedestinatorum universitas, et sic est triplex ecclesia scilicet, ecclesia triumphantium in coelo, ecclesia militantium hic in mundo, et ecclesia dormientium in purgatorio. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVIII., MS. 3928, fol. 97, col. 3; *XXIV. Sermons*, No. XII., fol. 157, cols. 3 and 4. In both sermons I find the above *sequence* introduced. Comp. Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, V., 106.

242. Comp. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 1, MS. 1294, fol. 2, col. 1; *De Ecclesia*, c. 1, fol. 145, col. 2.

SECTION IX.—*Doctrine of the Church as the Communion of the Saved.*

IF we ask for Wiclif's most general and most comprehensive idea of the Church, he meets our inquiry with a view which is wide enough to embrace both what is visible and invisible, both the temporal and the eternal. "The Church," he says, "is threefold, of the *triumphant* (*triumphantium in coelo*); of the *militant* (*militantium hic in mundo*); and of the *sleepers* (*dormientium in purgatorio*)." The first division embraces the angels and the blessed saints in heaven; the second, the Christians who are alive on earth in conflict with the world; the third embraces those who are fallen asleep, in so far as they have not yet reached the estate of blessedness, but are still in Purgatory. More than once Wiclif compares these three parts of the whole Church to the threefold division of Solomon's Temple, as set forth in the well-known sequence—

Rex Solomon fecit templum,
Cujus instar et exemplum
Christus et ecclesia.
Sed tres partes sunt in templo
Trinitatis sub exemplo;
Ima, summa, media.

This division of the Church, however, is not a thought peculiar to Wiclif; it is acknowledged by himself to be an ancient division, and he regards it simply as a Catholic doctrine.[243] Ancient, indeed, it is not, but, no doubt, mediæval, and everywhere current among the scholastic divines. There is nothing, then, characteristic of Wiclif in this division any more than there is in the oneness of the Church on earth with the Church in heaven and in Purgatory which it assumes.

But there is certainly one peculiar feature in his fundamental idea of the Church. Not that this peculiarity was anything new, or belonging only to Wiclif (he has it, as he was well aware, in common with Augustin),[244] but it is a peculiarity of very great importance, and runs like a red thread through the whole system of Wiclif's thinking—we mean the thought that the Church is nothing else than the whole number of the elect. It is to this view that we have, before every other, to direct our attention, for this leads back to the eternal ground of the Church, while its other features relate to its temporal physiognomy and life.

According to Wiclif, the eternal ground or basis of the Church lies in the Divine election. He always defines the Church to be the communion or the whole body of the elect.[245] In other words, he places himself in deliberate opposition to the idea of the Church which prevailed in his time, and expressly disapproves of those notions and forms of speech according to which men took the Church

to mean the *visible* Catholic Church—the organised communion of the hierarchy. Wiclif, on the contrary, seeks the Church's centre of gravity in the past eternity, in the invisible world above; for to him the Church is essentially Christ's body or Christ's bride, according to the well-known apostolic figures. A soul is incorporated with Christ, or betrothed to Christ, not by any act of man, not by any earthly means and visible signs, but by the counsel of God, by His eternal election and fore-ordination.[246] The Church therefore, has in the visible world only its manifestation, its temporary pilgrimage; its home, and its origin, as also its end, it has in the invisible world, in eternity. Every individual devout Christian owes all that he possesses in his inner life to the regeneration which springs out of the seed of election.[247] It is only in virtue of the gracious election of God that the individual belongs to the number of the saved, and is a member of the body of Christ, a child of the Holy Mother Church, of which Christ is the Husband.

It is self-evident that, with such a view of the Church as this, Wiclif could not but regard as radically false the prevailing notion, according to which the Church and the clergy were looked upon as one and the same thing, all the members of the clerical order being included in the Church, and all non-clergy excluded from it,[248]—an error involving immense consequences, against which Luther in his day had still to contend. But the idea of the Church as the whole body of the elect is not only, on the one hand, wider than that conception of it which identified the Church with the clergy; it is also, on the other hand, narrower and more exclusive than that conception which it contests—narrower, inasmuch as it shuts out from the com-

munion of the Church the ungodly, the hypocrites, and the half-hearted, even when they fill the offices, high or low, of the Church. Further, as Wiclif carries back conversion, salvation, and membership of the Church to the election of grace, *i.e.*, to the eternal and free counsel of God in Christ, he also distances himself at the same time from the assumption, which up till that time was universal, that participation in salvation and the hope of heaven were conditioned exclusively by a man's connection with the official Church, and were dependent entirely upon the mediation of the priesthood. There is thus included in Wiclif's idea of the Church the recognition of the free and immediate access of believers to the grace of God in Christ, in other words, of the general priesthood of believers.

After thus indicating in general terms the extreme bearings and the Reformational importance of Wiclif's idea of the Church, let us now look at it from a nearer point of view. There is included or implied in the idea of "the whole body of the elect" an unexpressed antithesis which not only runs through all time, or all the present, but also reaches into eternity, backwards to the counsel of election, and forwards into the eternity both of the blessed and the condemned. The eternal purpose of God Wiclif conceives of as a twofold ordaining: God has fore-ordained some to salvation and glory, in virtue of his election (*praedestinatio*); to others he has appointed everlasting punishment, in virtue of his foreknowledge of their sin (*praescientia*). The former Wiclif calls *praedestinati*, the latter ordinarily *praesciti*; only in one instance do I find him using instead the expression *reprobi*.[249] He purposely and persistently avoids to speak of a purpose of rejection (*reprobatio*, or such like), following, therein, in Augustin's steps. But in so doing he

avoids also to maintain a twofold predestination. And yet it is not his meaning, that the Divine adjudication of eternal punishment and damnation is conditioned entirely and purely by God's omniscient prevision of men's own spontaneous choice of evil, and their final continuance in sin. For Wiclif is well assured of the principle that in the nature of things it cannot be the creature which is the cause of any action or even any knowledge in God, but that the ultimate ground of these must lie in God himself.[250] But it by no means follows from this, in his judgment, that the guilt of sin, on account of which a man is punished eternally, should be laid in any wise upon God's ordination or decree. His meaning rather is this, that when predestination to punishment is viewed passively, it is the result of the concurrent working of several causes—(1), God himself; (2), The *esse intelligibile* of the creature; (3), The future entrance of sin or crime.[251] The final issue, accordingly, *i.e.*, the eternal reward or punishment, is, on the one hand, it is true, brought about by the moral action of man or his transgression (*factum meritorium sive demeritorium*); but, on the other hand, this action of man in time is preceded by a conditioning cause in eternity, viz., God's election, or else his ordination in respect to the future action of his creature. But when God ordains a punishment or act of this kind (*ordinat punitionem vel actum hujusmodi*), He has an end in view which is morally good, which subserves the best interests of the Church, and contributes to the perfection of the world.[252]

It needs no lengthened investigation to make it clear that Wiclif has by no means succeeded by these statements in solving all the difficulties which confront his view of election and the fore-ordination of God. For, assuming

this view, only two cases are thinkable. Either the self-determination of a man (as foreknown by God) on the side of evil, and an impenitent persistency in it, is a really free act, and then God's eternal prevision of it and His decree of damnation awaiting the sinner must be thought of as conditioned by the self-determination of the creature emerging in its own time; in other words, the Eternal in this case must be determined by the temporal; the infinite God in His knowing and willing must be thought of as dependent upon His own finite creature. Or, alternatively, the Divine election and eternal ordination of what comes to pass is absolutely free and independent and all-conditioning, and then the logical sequence cannot be escaped, that the transgression of the creature, the sin of man, comes of God's own will and ordering—a conclusion which would throw a dark shadow of blame upon God Himself, and destroy the responsibility of man.

It is to be remarked further, in regard to Wiclif's doctrine of the election of the saved, and the eternal foreknowledge of those who fall into the state of eternal punishment, that he does not ground it, as Augustin does, upon the doctrine of original sin, and the utter impotency of fallen man for moral good, but exclusively upon the idea of the omnipotence of God, and His all-conditioning work in regard to all that comes to pass.

Wiclif's fundamental idea of the Church as "the whole body of the elect," includes in it, as already remarked, an *antithesis* which runs through the present and actual, as well as through the eternal past and future. He gives clear and sharp expression to this himself. "There are two kinds of men," he observes, "who stand over against each other, since the world's beginning to the world's end. The first kind,

that of the elect, begins with Adam and descends through Abel and all the elect to the last saint who, before the final judgment, contends for the cause of God. The second kind is that of the reprobate, which begins with Cain and descends to the last man whom God has foreseen in his persistent impenitence. To the latter Christ addresses the words, "Woe unto you, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets," etc. (Luke xi. 47), in which special reference is made to Abel's blood, and the afflicted lot of all the prophets and righteous men. Here Wiclif has in his eye the whole history of mankind, not the Church of Christ exclusively.[253] As to the latter, the fundamental conception of it as the whole number of the elect draws a separating line in connection with it also; and the only question is whether this line is drawn within the Church or outside of it. There are some authors well acquainted with Wiclif's writings who are of opinion, that his conception of the Church draws the separating line outside and around the Church; and that precisely this is the fundamental error of his teaching on the subject of the Church, viz, his maintaining that only those who are saved souls are members of the Church on earth, while the ungodly, on the contrary, are in no sense of the word Church members.[254] In this judgment we cannot entirely concur. At the beginning of the English tract adduced in support of this view by Dr. Todd of Dublin, Wiclif, it is true, makes use of language which appears to warrant it.[255] And in other places besides we find the same principle expressed in the most decided manner, as one agreeable to Scripture and confirmed by many testimonies of the Fathers—*i.e.*, that only the elect man is a member of the Church.[256] And it is only an application of this doctrine when Wiclif, speaking of worldly-minded and immoral bishops, says of them

—"That they are indisputably no members of the Holy Church, but members of Satan, disciples of Antichrist, and children of the synagogue of Satan."[257] Here we have a strong antithesis, not between the Church and the world outside of Christendom, but between holy Mother Church and the Church of the malignants, *ecclesia malignantium*, a term borrowed from Ps. lxiv. 3 in the Vulgate version;[258] and between the members of the Holy Church and the members of Satan and the disciples of Antichrist.[259] The harshness of this dualism may seem strange to us, as though it were an utterance of excited feeling and very violent antagonism. We shall, however, judge it more mildly when we remember that even with a Pope like Gregory VII. the very same dualism between members of Christ and members of the devil or members of Antichrist was quite a common usage of speech. The application of the language, it is true, is exactly opposite in the hands of Gregory VII. and Wiclif, but that makes no difference with regard to the dualism itself.

But still, on the other hand, I find that Wiclif not very unfrequently gives expression also to another view, according to which his fundamental conception of the Church as the whole body of the elect draws a separating line through the heart of the Church itself. In other words, Wiclif at times makes use of language which shows that he distinguishes within the circle of the Church between true members and only apparent members, which is an approximation to the distinction made by the Reformers of the sixteenth century between the *visible* and the *invisible* Church. Thus, in a sermon on the marriage feast and the guest without a marriage garment, he says of the Apostles that they filled the Church militant with the elect and the foredoomed (*praedestinatis et praescitis*); and in another

sermon he observes on the words of Christ (John x. 26), "Ye are not my sheep," that there are two flocks in the militant Church, the flock of Christ and manifold flocks of antichrist; and the shepherds, too, are of opposite kinds;[260] and by the Church militant Wiclif always understands the Church upon earth. Thus, in his view, there is not only a separating line, drawn like a tangent to the circle outside the Church, to serve as a bounding line, but there is another also, like a cord drawn through the Church itself. Wiclif took over from Augustin the distinction between the *true* body of Christ and the *mixed* or *simulated* body of Christ, *permixtum, simulatum.*[261] It was his contest with the Donatists which led Augustin to that distinction. He holds, indeed, firmly to the truth that only true believers —the elect—belong to the Church in the proper sense, and form the true body of Christ; but still he concedes that these true members of the Church are for the present mixed with the unconverted, as wheat and chaff are mixed together on the thrashing-floor (*permixtum*). He acknowledges that in the present life the unconverted, to all appearance, form also a part of the Church (*corpus simulatum*). Thus Augustin recognises, indeed, the whole body of elect and truly converted men as the proper kernel of the Church, and yet does not shut his eyes to the observation that in actual experience that kernel exists only with a shell-like surrounding of seeming Christians — a view which coincides with the Reformation doctrine that the Church in the proper sense of the word is the congregation of believers.[262] And inasmuch as Wiclif accepts that Augustinian distinction, he recognises the unconverted, the only apparently holy, etc., as being also members of the Church in a wider or improper sense, and thus draws by

his conception of "the whole body of the elect" a separating line which runs through the Church itself, when the Church is taken in the wider sense.

The fact is, that Wiclif did not disengage himself from a certain wavering of view between these two ideas. I cannot find that he was attached to one of the two only in an earlier stage of his thinking, while giving his preference to the other in a later stage; at least the last quoted passages of his sermons belong to very different periods of his life—the one to a collection of sermons preached in his earlier years, the other to another collection belonging to his latest life[263]—and in both alike he avers that even within the Church militant the elect of God and the adherents of Antichrist exist side by side. This wavering, however, serves to prove that Wiclif cannot have made the idea of the Church the subject of very mature reflection in a dogmatic sense; he attached more importance to the practical side of the subject.

So much is certain that the real members of the Church, or of the true body of Christ, are, upon Wiclif's fundamental principle, exclusively those who have been chosen of God unto salvation, and who therefore persevere in the standing of grace to the end; from which it necessarily follows that no man knows with certainty the extent of the Church, or who does, or does not, belong in fact to it. No one knows of another whether he is an elect man and a child of the Church or no; and Wiclif thinks that this ignorance is a real advantage to us; it keeps us from hasty judgments respecting the spiritual condition of those among whom we live,—for no one has a right to pass judgment upon a man that he is a true member of the Church, or to condemn and excommunicate him, to canonise him as a saint, or to allow himself in any

other sentence upon him, unless on the footing that he has received a supernatural revelation upon the subject.[264] Nor only so; Wiclif also holds to the purely Roman Catholic view, that no Christian can even be sure of his own standing in grace, and so be able to arrive at an assured conviction of his own proper membership in the Church of Christ; no more than probability, and by no means assurance, is to be reached on the question.[265] A man may, indeed, have knowledge of his standing in grace for the present, but the main point concerns the question whether he will continue therein to the end; and this is what no one can know of himself with certainty for the future.[266] But the probability that any one is of the number of God's elect, and therefore a real child of the Church, rests upon a life of piety and morality, upon good works and the imitation of Christ.[267] Every pilgrim upon earth should have the hope of eternal blessedness, and therefore should be able to rest in the calm belief that he has a standing in grace which makes him well-pleasing to God; and for this very reason it is needful that he should carefully search and try his walk and conversation, whether he is conscious to himself of no mortal sin, and whether, without any misgiving, he is able to believe that he has a standing in love.[268]

The thought is no doubt one of great importance—that a Christian, as well in regard to his own standing in grace as in regard to the membership of others in the Church of Christ, can only find in the moral fruits of grace a true standard of measurement, and distinctive marks which are really certain. It establishes the right, at all times, to apply the moral standard in testing the actual life of the Church, as it presently is; and this moral feature is one which we find, from Wiclif downwards, in all the Precursors of the Reformation.

NOTES TO SECTION IX.

243. *Trialogus*, IV., 22, p. 324 f.: Vere dicitur ecclesia corpus Christi mysticum, quod verbis praedestinationis aeternis est cum Christo sponso ecclesiae copulatum, etc. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 116, col. 1. Necesse est supponere unam veritatem metaphysicam . . . . scilicet quod ecclesia catholica sancta apostolica sit universitas praedestinatorum . . . . et istam ecclesiam necesse est esse sponsam capitis, quam ratione praeordinationis ac promissionis non potest ipsam (*sic*) deserere. *Liber Mandatorum* (*Decalogus*), c. 23, MS. 1339, fol. 184, col. 1: Omnes Christiani praedestinati simul collecti constituunt unam personam, quae est sponsa Christi. *De Ecclesia et membris ejus*, c. 1, p. 4, and this chirche is moder to eche (each) man that shal be saved, and conteyneth no membre but oonly men that shulen be saved.

244. *Trialogus*, IV., 22, p. 324 f., where this doctrine of the church is significantly enough attached to the treatment of the sacrament of marriage.

245. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. XII., MS. 3928, fol. 158, col. 1: De nativitate ex semine praedestinationis, after 1 Joh. iii. 9.

246. In the English tract under the title *Octo in quibus seducuntur simplices Christiani*, in Wiclif's *Select English Works*, ed. Arnold, III., 447, Wiclif says: "Whanne men speken of holy Chirche, thei understondeu anoon prelatis and prestis, monkis, and chanouns, and freris, and alle men that han crownes (that have the tonsure) though thei lyven nevere so cursedly agenst Goddis lawe, and clepen not ne holden seculeris men of holy churche, though thei lyven nevere so trewely after Goddis lawe, and enden in perfect charite. But netheles alle that schullen be savyd in blisse of hevene ben membris of holy Chirche, and ne moo."

247. In a passage of his *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVII., given below in note 251.

248. *Trialogus*, II., 14, p. 122. Praedestinationis aut praescientiae divinae est causa indubie ipse Deus, cum nulla creatura causat, formaliter intelligendo, hos actus sive notitias Deo intrinsecas atque aeternas.

249. *Ib.*, II., 14, p. 122. Intelligendo autem passive praedestinationem vel praeparationem ad pœnam, videtur, quod illae sunt a Deo, ab esse intelligibili creaturae, et a futuritione criminis concausatae.

250. Comp. the whole 14th chap. of 2d Book of the *Trialogus*, and the Analysis of the same in Lewald. *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1846, p. 222-225.

251. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVII., MS. 3928, fol. 94, col. 1. Duo genera a principio mundi usque ad finem contraria, primum electorum ab Adam incipiens et descendens per Abel et cunctos electos usque ad sanctum novissimum ante diem judicii militantem; secundum genus reproborum a Caym incipiens et transiens per alios reprobos usque ad praescitum novissimum; et illis Christus dirigit hunc sermonem.

252. Dr. Todd has taken this view in his notes to Wiclif's tract, *De Ecclesia et membris ejus, vide Three Treatises by John Wycklyffe*, Dublin, 1851, p. CLVII. f.

253. *De Ecclesia et membris ejus*, c. 1, p. 543, note 2, end.

254. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 2, p. 415: Patet ex fide Christi scripturae et multiplici testimonio sanctorum, quod nullum est membrum sanctae matris ecclesiae nisi persona praedestinata. *De Ecclesia*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 189, col. 4: Supposito ex fide scripturae elaborata a sanctis doctoribus, quod solum praedestinati sunt membra s. matris ecclesiae, restat dubium ulterius: si praesciti gerant ordines et officia illius ecclesiae? Et videtur ex dictis, quod non, etc. In the same Book, c. 3, Wiclif appeals, in support of this view, particularly to Thomas Aquinas: Non enim vidi in S. Thoma vel alio Doctore probabili, quod totum genus (humanum) sed pars ejus praedestinata sit sancta mater ecclesia . . . et universalis ecclesia, etc.

255. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. II., MS. 3928, fol. 3, col. 1: Omnes episcopi, qui ad temporalia, ad mundanos honores in familia, in apparatibus, vel expensis ministerio Christi superfluis anhelant, omnes inquam tales apostotant (*sic*) cum antichristo et solvunt infidelitur—totum decalogum; et tales indubie non sunt membra s. matris ecclesiae. Vita eorum mundana ostendit patule, quod sunt membra diaboli et discipuli antichristi. Comp. *Trialogus*, IV., 32, p. 325: Filios sanctae matris ecclesiae. . . . filios synagogae Satanae (after Apocal. ii., 9).

256. *E.g.*, *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 2, p. 416; c. 8, p. 447.

257. *XX. Sermons*, in *Select Works*, ed. Arnold, I., 50: There ben (are) here two, manere of chirche, holy Chirche or Chirche of God, that on no manere may be dampned, and the cherche of the fend, that for a time is good, and lastith not; and this was nevere holy Chirche, ne part therof.

258. *Miscel. Sermons*, No. XXXIII., MS. 3928, fol. 243, col. 2: Et impleverunt (sc. apostoli) ecclesiam militantem de praedestinatis et praescitis. And *XXIV. Serm.*, No. IV., fol. 136, col. 4: Sunt autem greges duplices in ecclesia militante, scilicet grex Christi et greges multiplices antichristi, etc.

259. *Augustinus de Doctrina Christ.*, III., c. 32.

260. *Confessio Augustana*, Art. VII.: Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta.

261. The *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons* belong to the earlier years, the *XXIV. Sermons* to the very latest period of Wiclif's life.

262. *Trialogus*, IV., 22, p. 325: Ex istis videtur, quod non solum quantitatem ecclesiae sed ejus quidditatem communiter ignoramus, etc.

263. *De Ecclesia et membris ejus*, c. 7, L. ed. Todd: Certis this pope wot not him silf, *i.e.*, whether he is one of the members of Christ.

264. *Trialogus*, III., 6., p. 150: Concedi debet, quod multi praesciti sunt in gratia secundum praesentem justitiam, praesciti tamen nunquam sunt in gratia finalis perseverantiae, etc.

265. *Ib.*, IV., 22, p. 325: Reputare tamen debemus recte nobiscum viventes esse filios sanctae matris ecclesiae, et contrarie viventes esse filios synagogae Satanae. *Supplementum Trial.*, c. 2, p. 416: Non enim supponeret, quod sint tales (real members of the Holy Church), nisi ab evidentia capta ex opere, quo sequerentur dominum Jesum Christum.

266. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 33, col. 3.

SECTION X.—*The Worship of the Church.*

WE pass on now to the *temporal existence and life of the Church*, and direct our attention (1) to its Worship.

One principal side of the worship of the Church—viz., the preaching of the Word—we do not think it necessary to speak of in this place at any length, as we have already shown (chap. vi.) what Wiclif's judgment was regarding the manner of preaching which was prevalent in his time. We only remind the reader in a word that there were two things which he censured in the sermons of his age: first, that men, as a general rule, did not preach the Word of God, but other things; and secondly, that when the Word of God was preached, this was not done in a way suitable to make its influence felt as a "Word of eternal life."

With regard to the other parts of Divine service, Wiclif again and again censures its degeneracy in the direction of an extreme sensuousness. "Would that so many ceremonies and symbols," he exclaims in one place, "were not multiplied in our Church,"[269] for in this he recognises a relapse into Judaism, which seeks after signs, and a departure from the spiritual nature of Christianity. "There lies a danger for the Church militant in the practice of Judaising—*i.e.*, of valuing in a carnally sensuous spirit those symbols and the human traditions connected with them more highly than the spiritual things which they signify; and even of giving heed to the Word of God more with the bodily eye than with the eye of the mind and by the light of faith.[270] When the monks appealed, in defence of the splendour of their cloister churches, to the glory of Solomon's temple, as a proof that the Basilicas ought to be more beautiful still in the period of grace, Wiclif in one passage replies that one must only mar-

vel that the monks should imitate so closely that idolatrous and luxurious king in the Old Testament, and not the example of Christ, the Head of the Church and the King of kings, who also had foretold the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem.[271] And he gives on another occasion a reply still more severe. "Those senseless Galatians (Gal. iii. 1) wished to burden the Church with the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, and to leave on one side the counsels of Christ; and yet it is the inner man that should be adorned with virtues, as every moral virtue is infinitely better than all the riches or all the ornaments of a body without a soul.[272]

What gave most offence to Wiclif's eye in the sensuous degeneracy of Christian worship was the numerous images in the churches, and the veneration paid to them. He was prudent enough, indeed, to admit that images, though prohibited in the law of Moses, are not in themselves forbidden in the Christian Church. He acknowledges it also to be indisputable that images may be made with a good design, when it is done for the purpose of stirring up the believing to a devout adoration of God Himself. But, on the other hand, he recalls the fact that in the early Church images were not used in such great numbers as they are at present. Nor does he conceal the fact that the use of images operates mischievously on men's minds in more than one direction. It leads, *e.g.*, to error in the faith, and to the idea that God the Father and the Holy Ghost are corporeal, when the Trinity is represented by artists in such a way that God the Father appears as an old man who holds between His knees God the Son hanging upon the cross, while God the Holy Ghost lights down in the form of a dove upon them both; and such like. Very many besides have fallen into the error of taking an image for something animated, and solemnly bowing to it,

which indisputably is idolatry. Many also have been led to believe in miracles performed by the image, a superstition resting upon mere delusion, or at most a diabolical deception. "And by such delusions of an adulterous generation which seeketh after a sign" (Matt. xvi. 4) are the people of Christ blinded more and more; and therefore must we preach against all such costliness, beauty, and other arts, which are employed more for the purpose of extracting gold from deluded strangers than to promote the religion of Christ among the people.[274]

"The effect of every image should only be this, to wake up the mind and heart of a man to attend to heavenly things; but when this effect has been produced, the sooner the imagination of the man drops all attention to the qualities of the image so much the better, for in the continued dwelling of the imagination upon these qualities lies concealed the venom of idolatry. As, now, the first and greatest commandment forbids us to pray to any work of man, insomuch that it was prohibited to the Jews to make any images whatsoever, it is manifest that we behove with the highest care to be on our guard against the poison under the honey,[275] *i.e.*, against an idolatrous worship of the image instead of the Divine being imaged." "The people, therefore, must be faithfully warned of the danger which lies in this matter, especially as merely nominal Christians, men of an animal nature, dismissing all faith in spiritual things, are wont at the present day to feed their senses to excess in religion, as, *e.g.*, their eyes with the sumptuous spectacle of the Church's ornaments, their ears with bells and organs and the new art of striking the hour of the day by the wonderful chimes, not to mention many other sensuous preparations by which their

other senses are moved, apart altogether from religious feeling."[276]

By far the largest number of images were representations of the saints, their acts, and their martyr deaths. What Wiclif thought of saint-worship has been much better known hitherto than his judgment respecting images, for he has given sufficient expression to his views upon it in the *Trialogus.* Vaughan remarked with truth that Wiclif became step by step more clear and decided in his repudiation of saint-worship,[277] and we are in a position to confirm this general statement by particular proofs. Thus, *e.g.*, it appears worthy of remark that in a sermon of his earlier life, preached on the Feast of the Assumption of Mary, he is still teaching, quite unsuspectingly, that the mother of our Lord is to her worshippers a mediatrix full of mercy. "Even pilgrims upon earth, moved by the love of their neighbours, come to their help in the time of need, but now the blessed Virgin in heaven beholds our necessities, and is still fuller of love, still richer in compassion; and all the more faithfully does she care for our needs, as she knows that she has attained to so high honour in order that she might become the refuge of sinners. What would men have more?"[278] The preacher makes only one condition, that we be the imitators of Mary's virtues, especially of her humility, purity, and chastity, for she loves so much only those who are like herself. If, however, the objection should be raised that any one who exercises these virtues will certainly obtain the eternal reward even without Mary's help, Wiclif replies—"It seems to me to be impossible that we should obtain the reward without the help of Mary. There are, however, degrees in her help. No one goes away from

her quite empty of her overflowing aid; even those who have done no good thing as yet shall have experience of her soothing power; for the sake of her humility and intercession for mankind they shall be more mildly punished. For she was herself in some measure the cause of the incarnation and passion of Christ, and so of the whole redemption of the world. There is no sex or age, no rank or position of any one in the whole human race, which has no need to call for the help of the Holy Virgin."[279] Thoughts these—which vie with the most ardent glorifications of Mary and her merits.

In his later years Wiclif's judgment was entirely different. There were two questions here which engaged his further reflections—first, the right of the Church to canonise certain personalities; and next, the moral value of the devotions and rituals which are offered to the saints.

The first question occupied Wiclif, as we are able to see, for a length of time. I find traces of this in his work *De Civili Dominio.* But here he still expresses himself with caution, even with a certain degree of reserve; for he maintains only the *possibility* that the Church in her canonisations may deceive both herself and others, either from the love of money, or from the inordinate love of those persons who stand in near relation to the individuals concerned, or through illusions of the devil. He puts, also, the case that many holy monks stand higher in blessedness than certain Saints whose festivals the Church celebrates. Still, however, it surpasses the judgment of man to decide upon this subject in individual cases, and therefore men must defer to the determination of the Church. It may, indeed, well be that the holders of the Primacy receive special directions from heaven in this matter.[280] Wiclif takes a step in ad-

vance of this in his work *De Ecclesia*, when he observes "that certainly no Christian can believe that it is necessary to salvation to believe of this or that person whom the Church canonises, that he is in glory on that account, especially in respect to certain modern saints."[281] But most strongly of all does he speak in the *Trialogus* when he puts into the mouth of others the assertion that it is nothing less than a blasphemous pretension of the Romish Curia when, apart from any special revelation, it pronounces persons to be saints, of whose holiness she can know as little as the priest-prince John in far-off Asia, or the Sultan of Turkey. And the hearing of witnesses in such a matter cannot possibly supply any proof.[282] Here the authority of the Church to confer canonisation is denied in the most distinct and decided way.

The second question concerns the moral value or the contrary, of the devotions and festivals celebrated in honour of the saints. On this subject Wiclif took up, in his later life, a position essentially different from that which we have seen him occupying in his earlier years; for now he lays down, with entire decision, the principle that a devotion or a festival offered to any saint is only of value, in so far as it is fitted to promote and to heighten the feeling of pious devotion towards the Saviour Himself.[283] And it is, at bottom, only another turn of the same thought when he says that the blessed saints in heaven look down with contempt upon the perverted praise which men offer to them, and upon the many commemorations and numerous festivals, often of a very worldly character, with which men desire to honour them; and they withdraw their assistance from all such worshippers.[284] In so saying, he expresses also an unfavourable judgment of the excessive number of saints' days, which he

looked upon as in no way promoting the good of the Church. "As the Apostles, without any such saints' days, loved Jesus Christ more than we do, it appears to many orthodox Christians a rash and dangerous thing to institute so many saints' festivals, and that it would be better not to have so many celebrations burdening the Church."[285] "It would be no sin in a parish priest," he says, "in dealing with people who did bodily labour on one of the saints' days appointed to be kept holy by the Church, but having no confirmation of their sanctity from holy Scripture, if he did not censure nor trouble them as transgressors of the Ten Commandments, *whereas he should rather preserve the liberty of the Christian Church within the limits prescribed by Christ Himself.*"

In these circumstances it would have surprised us if Wiclif had not also spoken with disapproval of the veneration of relics as well as of pilgrimages, both of which practices were so closely connected with saint-worship; and in fact he has done so in an unmistakeable way, although sometimes with much caution. The language, however, is sufficiently strong when he remarks that "a culpable blindness, an immoderate and greedy worshipping of relics cause the people to fall into gross error, as the punishment of their sin. Whence, in many countries, the love of money brings things to such a pass, that in numerous churches a portion of the body of some one who has been canonised as a confessor or martyr is more honoured with pilgrimages, and costly oblations, and ornaments of gold and precious stones lavished upon his grave, than the body of the mother of God, or the apostle Peter, or Paul, or any other of the acknowledged saints."[288] "For my part I condemn no act of this kind, but at the same time there are few or none which I can positively com-

mend, because those who go on pilgrimage, worship relics, and collect money, might at least occupy themselves more usefully, if they omitted these practices. From the Word of God it even appears to be the duty of all such persons to employ themselves better at the present time, and consequently that they are guilty of great sin in failing so to employ themselves. I say nothing of the sins which occur on these occasions, and how the practice itself is a pharisaical one, savouring of the Old Testament, but without any ground in the new law."[296]

It is a remarkable fact, psychologically, that in the same sermon on the feast of the Assumption, which is so strongly marked with Mary-worship, there already occurs a reference to the errors which develope themselves from the veneration of relics. As stated above, Wiclif is there investigating the question whether Mary went up corporeally to heaven, or was taken up after her death, and shows his leaning rather to the latter view. He then adds the remark, "and because the contrary might happen in consequence of erroneous worship and the covetousness of the clergy, it seems to me probable that God ordered it so that the bodies of Moses, of the Virgin Mary, of the Evangelist John, and of many other martyrs, should remain unknown to us on account of the errors which might result from such veneration." On the other hand, in a sermon delivered in the last year of his life, on the feast of John the Baptist, Wiclif expresses the thought that God and the Church triumphant regard the worshipping of corporeal relics at large with no approbation; and then he continues as follows:—"It would therefore be to the honour of the saints and the fit of the Church, if the costly ornaments, so foolishly lavished upon their graves, were divided among the poor. I

am well aware, however, that the man who would sharply and fully expose this error would be held for a manifest heretic by the image worshippers, and the greedy people who make gain of such graves; for in the adoration of the eucharist, and such worshipping of dead bodies and images, the Church is seduced by an adulterous generation.[287] The difference of tone between the two last mentioned passages falls so strongly on the ear, as to show clearly enough what important progress Wiclif must have made in the interval in his insight into the night side of saint-worship. Only *one* thought on the subject of pilgrimages may yet be touched here; it is this—that the Christian people would do better to stay at home, and keeps God's commandments in private, than to make pilgrimages and bring gifts to the thresholds of the saints.[288]

In quite a similar spirit Wiclif expresses himself on the subject of masses for the dead, and all that concerns them. He attaches little importance to them, and though he does not exactly deny that such masses and prayers for the dead, and foundations for their benefit, may be of some benefit to the departed, he yet affirms with all emphasis the view that in all circumstances the good which a man does in his lifetime, should it be only the giving of a cup of cold water, out of love and for the sake of Christ, is of more use to him than the spending of thousands on thousands of pounds by his executors after his death, for the repose of his soul.[289]

3. Another side of the life of the Church on earth in regard to which Wiclif's judgment may be of importance for us, is *the moral condition and character of the Church.*

Everywhere Wiclif sets out from ethical ideas, and applies to all conditions and actions the standard of morals. There are occasions also when he speaks under the influence of

strong feeling in the representations he makes and the censures he pronounces upon such subjects. At such times his discourse has a tone of deep earnestness, and becomes truly impressive, even incisive.

The judgment which he pronounces upon the religious and moral condition of Christendom, when he tries it by the standard of the first commandment, is sufficiently unfavourable. He finds that idolatry and creature worship are in the ascendant everywhere. "It is clear as day," says he, "that we so-called Christians make the creatures to be our gods. The proud or ambitious man worships a likeness of that which is in heaven (Exod. xx. 4), because, like Lucifer, he loves, above all things, promotion or dignity in one form or another. The covetous man worships a likeness of that which is in the earth beneath. And although going in sheep's clothing we hypocritically confess that our highest of all service is in the worship of God, yet it would very well become us carefully to inquire, whether we faithfully carry out this confession in our actions. Let us then search and examine whether we keep the first and greatest commandment, and worship God above all. Do we not bend and bow ourselves before the rich of this world, more with the view of being rewarded for this obeisance with worldly honour or temporal advantage, than for the sake of their moral good or spiritual profit? Does not the covetous man stretch out now his arms and now his hands to grasp the gold, and does he not pay court with all his pains to the men who have it in their power to hinder or to help his gains? Does not the sensual man, as though he were making an offering to the idol Moloch, cast himself down with his whole body before the harlot? Does he not put upon such persons worldly honour? Does he not offer to them the incense of purses of gold, in order to scent

the flow of sensual delight with the sweetest perfumes? Does he not lavish upon his mistress gift upon gift, till she is more wonderfully bedizened with various ornaments than an image of the Holy Virgin? And does not all this show that we love the flesh, the world, and the devil more than God, because we are more careful to keep their commandments? What violence do we hear of the Kingdom of Heaven suffering in our times (Matt. xi. 12), while the gates of hell are bolted? But, alas! broad and well trodden is the way which leadeth to hell, and narrow and forsaken the way which leadeth to heaven! This it is which makes men, for lack of faith, love what is seen and temporal more than the blessings which they cannot see, and to have more delight in buildings, dress, and ornaments, and other things of art and men's invention, than in the uncreated architypes of heaven." In the end Wiclif concludes that at least the greatest part of Christendom is infected with the prevailing idolatry, and in reality treasures the work of its own hands more highly than God the Head.[290]

Taking all things into view, Wiclif arrived at the conviction that the moral condition of the race was sinking lower and lower. As the world is forsaking the law of Christ, and in conformity to human maxims is surrendering itself to the lust of secular things, it cannot but be that offences and scandals will arise.[291] And when he compares the various classes of wicked men with one another, it appears to him that there is a threefold gradation of evil among them. The common people are bad, the secular rulers are worse, and the spiritual prelates are worst of all.[292]

It may be anticipated from this language that Wiclif would not be blind to the moral corruption of the clergy of his own

age. On the contrary, it is quite clear to him that the Church has much more to fear from enemies within than without, and especially from "a clergy who are given up to avarice, and therefore enemies to the Cross of Christ and the Gospel."[293] These few words alone are sufficient to show that while his eye was open to all the religious shortcomings and all the moral faults of the clergy of his time, he looked upon their worldly-mindedness and love of wealth as the proper root of all their evil. But this topic does not admit of being fully treated except in connection with the whole body of his teaching on the subject of the constitution of the Church.

NOTES TO SECTION X.

269. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 134, col. 2: Utinam non multiplicarentur tot cerimoniae et signa in nostra ecclesia!

270. *Ib.*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 192, col. 1: Sed in isto stat periculum militantis ecclesiae, quod judaizando secundum sensum carnalem signa illa cum traditionibus humanis plus suis signatis praeponderet, vel etiam legem Dei plus attendat judicio sensus corporei, quam oculo mentis vel etiam lumine fidei.

271. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XVI., MS. 3928, fol. 32, col. 1.

272. *De Blasphemia*, c. 6, MS. 3933, fol. 134, col. 4: Sed isti insensati Galatae volunt monstrose onerare Christi ecclesiam cum cerimoniis legis antiquae, dimissis Christi consiliis, etc.

273. *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe*, II., 296, f.

274. *Liber Mandatorum (Decalogus)*, c. 14, MS. 1339, fol. 133, col. 2, f. particularly 134, col. 1: Et de ista deceptione generationis adulterae signa quaerentis populus Christi continue plus caecatur, etc.

275. *Ib.*, fol. 134, col. 2: Ideo de quanto expeditius post expergefactionem ad cölestia imaginativa hominis dimittit accidentia imaginis, de tanto est melius, quia in mora imaginandi latet venenum idolatriae; . . . . patet, quod summa diligentia cavere debemus venenum sub melle, adorando idolatrice signum loco signati.

276. *Ib.*: Videtur mihi periculum diligentius exponendum, specialiter cum nomine tenus christiani tanquam animales vel bestiales dimissa fide credendorum spiritualium nimis hodie pascunt sensus, ut visum, spectaculis ornamentorum ecclesiae sumptuosis, auditum, campanis organis et novo modo discernendi horas diei per campanam mirabiliter tintinantem, et sensibilia, quibus irreligiose moventur sensus alii, sunt parata.

277. *Life and Opinions*, II., 293 f.

278. *XL. Miscell. Sermons*, MS. 3928, fol. 235, col, 2 ; fol, 36, col. 2, particularly 236, col. 1: Tertium, quod debemus credere de matre domini, quod ipsa est suis et veris cultoribus propitia procuratrix. Nam viatores ex impetu caritatis suffragantur egentibus. Sed b. virgo Maria videt in verbo (cōlo?) nostram egentiam, et est magis caritativa et magis misericors. Ideo credendum est, quod fidentius procurat contra nostram egentiam et eo specialius, quo noscit se adeptam tantum honorem, ut sit refugium pecatorum.

279. *XL. Miscell. Sermons*, fol. 236, col. 2 : Hic videtur mihi, quod impossibile est nos praemiari sine Mariae suffragio. . . . . Imo illi, qui nihil meruerunt, sentient ejus levamen, cum occasione suae humilitatis et interpellationis pro humano genere mitius punientur. Ipsa enim fuit quodammodo causa incarnationis et passionis Christi, et per consequens totius salvationis mundi.

280. *De Civili Dominio*, III., c. 10, MS., 1340, fol. 67, col. 1 : Contingit etiam, quod multi ss. monachi et fratres sint in beatitudine altiores quam dati sancti, quorum festa solemnisat ecclesia, verumtamen discretio hujus in particulari excedit humanum judicium. Ideo standum est determinationi ecclesiae.

281. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 134, cols. 1 and 2 : Absit christianum credere, quod de necessitate salutis oportet omnem fidelem credere explicite de isto et quocunque, quem ecclesia nostra canonizat, ut eo ipso sit beatus. De aliis autem modernioribus, qui canonizantur ratione parentelae, questus vel muneris, non oportet nos apponere tantam fidem, etc.

282. *Trialogus*, III., 30, p. 237 : Insuper videtur multis, quod curia ista sic canonizans sanctos blaspheme praesumit, cum subducta revelatione tam plane ignorat sanctitatem defuncti, quam plane ignorat Johannes presbiter vel Soldanus.

283. *Saints' Day Sermons* (delivered later than 1378), No. 1. 3928, fol. 1, col. 1 : Non valet festum vel devotio cujuscunque sancti citra dominum, nisi de quanto in ejus devotionem supereminenter persona solemnisans accenditur.

284. *Ib.*, No. II., fol. 3, col. 1 : Cum sancti viatores graviter ferunt exaltationem sui, multo magis beati despiciunt illam laudem eorum perversam ; et sic beati creduntur contemnere multas canonisationes ; et ita cum beati contemnunt quoscunque Deus contemserit, necessario subtrahunt suffragia a sic eos colentibus.

285. *Ib.*, No. I., fol. 1, col. 1 : Cum apostoli sine talibus festis sanctorum plus nobis dilexerunt Jesum Christum, videtur multis catholicum (pure Christian truth), tot sanctorum festa instituere esse temerarium ; unde videtur quibusdam, quod melius esset non fore tot solemnitates ad onus ecclesiae, etc.

286. *De Ecclesia*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 192, col. 4 : Unde talis culpanda caecitas, inordinatus ac cupidus cultus circa reliquias faciunt in pœnam peccati populum multum falli. Unde in multis patriis cupido pecuniae facit in multis ecclesiis, quod pars personae, emtae ut canonizetur pro confessore vel martyre, plus honoretur peregrinatione, sumptuosa oblatione et sepulcri ornatione auro et lapidibus preciosis, quam corpus matris Dei, etc. Comp. *Sermons on the Gospel*, No. XXXII., *Select Works*, I., 83.

287. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXII., MS., fol. 43, col. 3. The following words

occur at the end of the Sermon, fol. 44, col. 1 : Unde ad honorem foret sanctorum et utilitatem ecclesiae, quod distributa forent pauperibus jocalia (jewels) sepulcrorum, quibus stulte . . . sunt ornata. Scio tamen, quod acute et diffuse detegens hunc errorem foret a cultoribus signorum et avaris reportantibus ex talibus sepulcris lucrum, manifestus haereticus reputatus ; nam in cultu et veneratione eucharistiae, tali cultu mortuorum corporum atque imaginum, per generationem adulteram ecclesia est seducta.

288. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 10, MS. 1340, fol. 67, col. 1 : Melius occuparetur populus domi in praeceptorum Dei observantia, quam in peregrinatione et oblatione visitando sanctorum limina.

289. *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. VI., MS. 3928, fol. 203, col. 3: Licet mortuis prosint suffragia ecclesiae, veruntamen quantumlibet opus meritorium . . . factum a superstite est sibi magis utile, quam foret, ipso mortuo, quantumlibet magnum suffragium ; sic quod plus prodest homini viventi dare in caritate "calicem aquae frigidae" pro Christi nomine, quam pro ipso mortuo, in purgatorio punito, darentur ab executoribus millies mille librae. *Liber Mandatorum* (*Decalogus*), c. 23, MS. 1339, fol. 186, col. 2 : Si quaeritur de praestantiori modo juvandi mortuos, dicitur quod juvando vivos amplius indigentes, ut seminando opera misericordiae tam corporalia quam spiritualia secundum spiritum consilii. Non enim oportet imprudenter in uno globo una die celebrare tot missas, facere tot distributiones aut simul tot jejunationes.

290. *Liber Mandatorum* (*Decalogus*), c. 15, MS. 1339, fol. 136, col. 1 ; fol. 137, col. 2.

291. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 17, MS. 1341, fol. 238, col. 1 : Mundo quidem, relicta Christi lege, declinante secundum traditiones humanas ad cupiditatem temporalium, necesse est ut contumeliae et scandala oriantur.

292. *De Ecclesia*, c. 5, MS. 1294, fol. 142, col. 3 : Omnes praesciti constituunt unum corpus. . . . Ex quo patet, quod oportet esse unam generationem, quae fuit mala in vulgaribus, pejor in secularibus praepositis, sed pessima in praelatis.

293. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 2, MS. 1341, fol. 156, col. 1 : Si non fallor, longe plus infestatur ecclesia ab inimicis domesticis, ut clero avaritiae dedito et sic cruci Christi ac legi evangelicae inimico, quam a Judaeis paganis forinsecus.

SECTION XI.—*Constitution of the Church.*

THE first foundation-principle of the Roman Catholic Constitution is the division of the Church into two ranks—Clergy and Laity—or the division between the teaching and hearing Church—the governing and obeying Church. A distinction which the Reformation *à priori* abolished by putting the idea of office in the place of a distinction of rank, or in other words, by maintaining the universal priesthood of believers.

This fundamental principle of the Church of Rome Wiclif does not deny with any clear consciousness of the opposite conception, but nevertheless he puts forth views which are indirectly opposed to it. For the personal responsibility, and the consequent liberty of conscience of the private members of the Church, are principles which he is far from ignoring; on the contrary, he requires that every Christian should have knowledge of the truth, should in a sense be a theologian, for faith is the highest theology. The difference in knowledge between Church member and priest is only one of degree.[294] He goes further still. Not only does he think the case possible that theologians and priests might take a wrong direction in doctrine and life, while the laity remained steadfast in the truth, but he maintains the existence of this state of matters as a matter of actual fact. Upon occasion of his opposing the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he observes that God always preserves *natural knowledge* among the laity, and keeps up among some of the clergy the right understanding of the Faith, as in Greece and elsewhere, as seemeth to him good.[295] He does not even shrink from laying down the principle, however much offence it may excite, that the laity have the right, in case their spiritual rulers fail to do their duty, or give themselves up to certain vices and evil ways, to withhold from them the Church's revenues —a principle which undoubtedly rests on the assumption that the laity are in a position and are entitled to judge respecting the life of their spiritual superiors, and the way in which they execute the duties of their office.

To maintain such a principle would have been an astounding pitch of boldness if the Canon Law itself had not been on its side, and papal precedents had not conceded to

the congregations of the Church that right. And these facts Wiclif knew right well how to avail himself of in his own support. We mention only the measure which Gregory VII. had recourse to in his day in order to carry through his reforms, and, in particular, to root out the marriage of priests. For this end he laid his injunctions upon the congregations—that is upon the laity—that they should no longer hear masses read by married priests, that they should cease to visit the churches where such priests officiated, and should, so to speak, put a mark of infamy upon them—all by papal command.[296]

Wiclif, it is true, makes a different application of the principle from Hildebrand, but the principle in both cases is still the same, *i.e.*, that unfaithful and conscienceless clergy deserve the reprimand and actual repudiation of the laity. Wiclif emphasises the right of the laity so strongly that he puts it forward as a formal duty, the neglect of which cannot be justified. A member of the congregation who omits such a reprimand makes himself a partner of the sin of his spiritual rulers;[297] while laymen, who withhold the temporalities of the Church from an unworthy object, take them from him not as a spiritual ruler or Church minister, but as an enemy of the Church.[298] And Wiclif does not think of such a case as a mere possibility which might occur in single exceptional instances, but believes that abuses of all kinds — the incorporation of benefices with foundations — the granting of indulgencies — the neglect of necessary censures—may be pushed to such a length that the so-called clergy would become an utterly worldly body.[299] But, on the other hand, he holds it as no inconceivable thing that the Church might consist for a time of lay members alone.[300]

From the foregoing it appears clearly enough that Wiclif by no means accepted of the Romish division of the Church into two ranks—the clergy and the laity—according to which the laity have only to hear and obey, and should be destitute of all independent judgment and free self-decision in ecclesiastical matters. On the contrary, he recognises the general priesthood of believers, although he never makes use of this phrase. His conception of the Church as "the whole body of the Elect" is itself an indirect proof of this, for it is as clear as day that measured by this conception the chasm which exists between the "Elect" and the "Foreknown" must be thought of as incomparably greater than that which is placed between a cleric and a laic. And, undoubtedly, an "Elect" man — a believing and earnest Christian (trew man), layman though he is, yet stands before God infinitely higher than a priest, or a bishop, or even a pope, when the latter, however high-placed in "the mixed Church," in virtue of priestly consecration and hierarchical order, is yet only in name a Christian and priest, but in truth an enemy of the Church and a limb in the body of the wicked fiend.

This dualism between "Elect" and "Foreknown," between members of Christ and members of Anti-Christ, runs through the whole ascending scale of the hierarchy. To the pastoral office, as we have already shown in chapter 6th, Wiclif devoted the most unremitting pains, as well in the practical fulfilment of his own calling, as in the labour of thought and the exercise of his influence upon others, by speech and writing. In particular, his whole tractate, *Of the Pastoral Office*, is devoted to it; but in addition to this, there is scarcely one of his writings, large or small, in which he does

not return to the subject, describing the actual condition into which the office had fallen, and striving that it should again become what it ought to be. With great outspokenness he brings to light the negligences and sins of the "false shepherds."[301] Above all he complains of their neglect of the chiefest duty of the office—the preaching of God's word; they take no heed to feed the sheep; the pastors are often dumb dogs.[302] Oftentimes and bitterly enough he rebukes the total worldiness of many pastors, who postpone the service of God to the service of noblemen, or waste their time in hunting, drinking, boon companionship, and such like; men so utterly earthly-minded that they can be compared only to moles; they give themselves up wholly to money-gathering, partly by preaching only for gain, partly by fleecing the poor of whom they should rather be the protectors.[303]

Let it not be supposed, however, that Wiclif had the same bad opinion of all the parish priests. He was himself a conscientious curate of souls, and may very well have known many like himself in the land. He knows well how to make the right distinctions. "There are three kinds of pastors," he observes in one place, some who are true shepherds both in name and in truth, and some who are only shepherds in name. And these latter again divide themselves into two sorts—there are some, namely, who preach and do the work of a shepherd, but they do it chiefly for worldly fame or profit; and these Augustin calls "hirelings." Men of the second sort fail to fulfil their pastoral office, but at the same time inflict upon their flocks no visible damage or wrong; and, yet, they are described by Christ as thieves and robbers (Matt. vii. 15), because in virtue of their office they defraud their parishioners of a full return for those Church

revenues which are the inheritance of the poor. But the third sort not only rob openly the goods of the poor, without rendering any corresponding service, but like wolves they also attack and destroy their flocks, and incite them in many ways to sin; and these are "the ravening wolves" (Matt. vii. 15). But a "shepherd" enters into office through the door, which is Christ, in order to serve God and his Church in humility, and not for the sake of earthly gain or worldly advantages. Such an one leads the sheep upon the way which conducts to heaven, by the example of a holy life; he heals the sick, by application of the sacramental means of grace; he feeds the hungry, by reaching to them the food of holy preaching; and finally he gives drink to the thirsty, by opening up to them the wisdom of the Scriptures with the help of the reading of holy commentary.[304]

On the subject of the Celibacy of the Priesthood, Wiclif gives repeated expression to his views. In several places he characterises the Church law which enjoins it, as an ordinance plainly unscriptural, hypocritical, and morally pernicious. Neither Christ nor his apostles have forbidden the marriage of priests; they have rather approved it.[305] He points not only to the usage of the most ancient Church to consecrate married men as bishops, but also to the still existing practice of the marriage of the clergy in the Greek Church.[306] And as concerns the present, he confesses himself unable to see why in all parts of Christendom allowance should not be given to married men to continue in the priesthood, especially if no candidates of equal qualifications for the priesthood should be forthcoming. In particular, he urges that it would undoubtedly be the lesser evil of the two, that men who are living in honourable matrimony, and who are ruling equally well the Church and their own houses, should

be consecrated to the priesthood without disturbance to their married life, than that priests should be living, indeed, out of the married state, but should be practising unchasity in spite of their vows, with wives and widows and virgins.[307] The hypocrites, it is true, who set the ordinances of men above the word of Scripture, abhor the marriage of a priest as poison, while allowing themselves in uncleanness of the most shameful kind. And yet Scripture nowhere forbids the marriage of a priest, but prohibits unchastity to all without exception, even to every laic.[308] But even apart from such sins and vices, Wiclif is of opinion that in all cases it would be better that a priest should live as a married man, than that while remaining out of matrimony, he should live, along with this, a wholly secular life, addicted to ambition and the love of money.[309] But let this be as it will, Wiclif never allows himself to be shaken in his conviction that the pastoral office, more than any other, when rightly exercised, is the most useful, and for the Church the only indispensable office; that all the other grades of the hierarchy may fall into disuse, but that the cure of souls must always be continued and steadfastly upheld in the congregations of the Church.[310]

This last declaration is in accord with Wiclif's view of the higher gradations of the hierarchy, especially with his conviction, to which he had before given expression, that between priest and bishop there is no difference arising from consecration—that, on the contrary, every priest regularly ordained possesses full power to dispense in a sufficient manner all the sacraments. Among the nineteen propositions of Wiclif which Pope Gregory XI. rejected in 1377, this one now stated is already found; and I find that it was extracted from his work, *De Civili Dominio*.[311]

This conviction was not only always held fast by him from that time forward, but was developed still more boldly and logically, as may be seen from his later writings; and he was confirmed in it partly by holy Scripture and partly by the history of the Church. From Scripture he derived the knowledge that the Church of the apostles knew exclusively the distinction between Presbyters and Deacons, but made no difference between Presbyter and Bishop, which in the apostolic age were identical.[312] And the history of the Church revealed to him the further fact, that even for some considerable time after the apostolic age, the equality of the presbyterate and the episcopate continued to subsist—a fact for which Wiclif appeals to the testimony of Jerome, and which was known to the middle age chiefly from the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, which contained the passage from Jerome just referred to.[313]

Wiclif, it is true, had an erroneous idea of the manner in which this original equality of the two offices passed into the tage of the superiority of the bishop above the presbyter, and into the further development of the hierarchy in all its gradations. But if his conception of this differed from what actually took place, according to the testimony of history, the blame of his error lay not in himself, but in the time when he lived—when the unhistorical and mythical traditions of the middle age were still in possession of unchallenged prevalency.[314] Wiclif, that is to say, proceeds on the assumption that Constantine the Great not only endowed the Bishop of Rome, in the person of Silvester I., with rich temporal possessions, but also with new power and dignities—a consequence of which was the elevation of the bishops above the presbyterate not only in the Roman See, but everywhere in the Church, and the development of a graduated hier-

archy, including the Papal Primacy itself.[315] Hence Wiclif in numberless places speaks of the *imperial* plenary power of the Pope—*e.g.*, *Trialogus*, iv. 32; *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 10—whereby he took occasion to exalt himself, allowed himself to be blinded, etc. And when Wiclif speaks of Cesarean bishops (*Episcopi Cæsarei*) the alleged donation of Constantine is, in like manner, present to his mind as that which was the first occasion of the original equality of bishops and presbyters being disarranged, and a power being attributed to bishops which did not belong to them, and was without warrant. Wiclif's ideas of the Papacy are assumed to be known with exactitude, and yet, up to the present time, they have been known only from his latest writings, and, on this account, only very incompletely. When I bring into view his earlier writings as well, I find that his opinions on this subject underwent no unimportant amount of change; so much so, indeed, that we are able to trace a steady progress in his judgments respecting it.

I think I am able to distinguish three stages in this development. These admit of being distinguished from each other both chronologically and substantively. In point of time, the first stage reaches down to the outbreak of the Papal schism in 1378; the second stage embraces the years from 1378 to 1381; and the third extends from thence to his death in 1384. In substance the successive stages may be clearly and briefly discriminated thus—first, the recognition within certain limits of the Papal primacy; next, emancipation from the primacy in principle; finally, the most decided opposition to it. I have now to point out this in detail.

The first stadium, beginning with the earliest appearance of Wiclif in ecclesiastico-political questions, and extending to the year 1378, is marked by a recognition of

the Papal primacy within certain limits. Here Wiclif is still far removed from attacking the Papacy as such in its very core and essence. As the central power of the Church, he still accords to it a real recognition and a sincere reverence, but only within certain limits, on the maintenance of which he lays great stress; and in these is discerned the free, reformative tendency which is characteristic of even the earliest stadium. What are these limits? They are of two kinds: First, in relation to the State, they bar all attacks of the Papacy upon it, whether on questions of finance or of civil jurisdiction. Here belong the investigations which Wiclif at the outset of his public career set on foot respecting the claims of the Papacy to the payment of a feudal tribute on the side of England—and partly in regard to other questions of the like kind. Of the same character was the part he took in the transactions at Bruges in 1374-75. In this direction he speaks here and there with great caution and reserve, though sometimes also with emphasis.[316] As a rule it is in reference to the financial spoilation of countries that Wiclif expresses himself in a sharper tone—calling it downright theft—a robbery of the Church.[317] Then, as concerns the purely ecclesiastical and spiritual domain, Wiclif in so far imposes a limit upon the Papacy as he denies its pretended necessity for the ends of salvation, and its unconditioned plenary power. It is itself an indication of this opinion that he maintains the moral right of entering into a scientific inquiry into this plenary power.[318]

In more than one place he disputes with clearness and decision the proposition that the place and Church-authority of the Pope is absolutely indispensable and necessary to salvation.[319] Wiclif reaches the same result which Melancthon

expressed in the words, that the Pope may be recognised to be the Head of the Church *jure humano*, but not *jure divino*. Of course, on the assumption of such views Wiclif could not possibly concede the infallibility and the plenary power of the Pope in spiritual things. On the contrary, he declares quite explicitly that the Pope may err in judgment. God alone is without sin. Godhead alone is infallible.[320] An "elect man" may believe that the Pope and the Roman Church are guilty of injustice in putting him to the bann; and this assertion he bases on the proposition that it is possible that not only the Pope but the whole Roman Church may fall into mortal sin and be damned; it follows that he may also abuse his power by putting men under the bann in an unlawful manner, from motives of avarice and ambition. Even Peter three times sinned after his consecration, and the conveyance to him of representative power; and therefore still more may a later successor in his office be capable of sinning. These are views which are still held by many decided Episcopalians, *e.g.*, among the Gallican clergy. But although Wiclif contested with head and heart the doctrines of the Curialists and flatterers of the Pope touching his absolute power,[321] he was still very far, during this first stadium, and as late as 1378, from impugning the prerogatives of the Roman Church. On the contrary, he expressly concedes them, and defends himself in the most earnest manner against every suspicion of his meaning in this respect.[322]

We must not forget indeed on this point, that the Pope and the Roman Church are always two distinct things; as, in fact, Luther still held fast his veneration for the Romish Church at a time of his life when he had already taken up a sufficiently decided position against the Pope.

But even towards the Pope himself Wiclif at that stage still cherished a confidence which is really touching. I am able to produce in proof of this an expression of Wiclif which has hitherto remained unknown. After the election of Urban VI., on the 8th April 1378, the news of his first speeches and measures was quickly conveyed to England, and these evidently made upon Wiclif a quite extraordinary impression. How he rejoiced in every sign of good intention and moral earnestness in that quarter! He conceived the hope that the man who had just ascended the Papal chair would prove a reformer of the Church. Under the fresh impression of the news he breaks out into the words, "Blessed be the Lord who in these days has given to his Church, in Urban VI., a Catholic head, an evangelical man, a man who in the work of reforming the Church, that it may live conformably to the law of Christ, follows the due order by beginning with himself and the members of his own household. From his works, therefore, it behoves us to believe that he is the head of our Church."[323] Wiclit's soul is filled with true enthusiasm and joy. He believes that in Urban VI. may be recognised a Pope of evangelical spirit and true Christian earnestness, who has a clear knowledge of the moral disorders of the Church at the present time, and who possesses as well the courage as the self-denial to begin the necessary reform with himself and the Curia. One might indeed be disposed to attach the less weight to this language, on the ground that it is only the presumed evangelical and reformative spirit of Urban that he so joyfully salutes. But what fills him with such exalted feeling and hope is precisely this circumstance that it was in a Pope that he saw such a spirit. On one point alone

he has still his misgivings, whether this worthy head of the Church will persevere in the good way to the end.[324]

What Wiclif had foreboded came only too soon to pass. Urban's efforts for reform, however well-meant, were carried out in so high-handed a manner, and with such reckless severity, that they gave offence to a portion of his cardinals in such a degree as not only to alienate them, but even to convert them into open enemies. In the end, in August 1378, under pretence of doubts regarding the regularity and validity of his election to the See—which they alleged had been forced upon them by terrorism—they proceeded to the election of a rival Pope in the person of the Cardinal of Geneva, Clement VII. With this step began the Papal schism which continued for nearly forty years. The consequences were that the one Pope put the other to the bann, they fought each other with all the weapons they could think of and the whole of Western Christendom was split asunder by a deep rent. This is not the place to follow out the moral and religious effects of this mischievous event. We have to examine here only the effect which it had upon Wiclif, on his view of the Papacy, and on his moral attitude towards it. We have remarked above that, from the year 1378, Wiclif emancipated himself from the Papal primacy as a question of principle, and this is what we have now, with more particularity, to show.

This second stage of his conviction and judgment in reference to the Papacy was only gradually reached as we might beforehand expect. In the time immediately succeeding the outbreak of the Papal schism, he was still inclined to recognise Urban VI. as the legitimate Pope—as, in fact, all England remained attached to him and to his successors in Rome as long as the schism lasted—and refused to recognise

the French anti-Pope. But notwithstanding this, Wiclif even thus early expressed his opinion, that in case Urban also should fall into evil ways, it would then be better and more wholesome for the Church to dispense with both Popes together. To this date, which may probably fall towards the close of 1378, I believe I may assign several declarations which Wiclif made use of, partly in one of his scientific writings, and partly in a Latin sermon delivered by him, no doubt, in Oxford.[335]

But when Urban VI. allowed himself to adopt the extreme measures against Clement VII. and the cardinals and national churches that supported his cause, of not only laying them under the bann of excommunication, but also of using against them all other possible means of hostility, Wiclif went farther, and casting off his allegiance to Urban, took up a position of entire neutrality. He now declared it to be probable that the Church of Christ would find herself in better case, and in particular would enjoy a greater degree of peace than she did at present, if both the Popes were set aside or condemned, as it was a probable conclusion which many were drawing from the lives of both, that they had nothing in common with the holy Church of God.[336] By the experience which resulted from the Papal schism Wiclif was brought step by step to the conclusion of cutting himself off from all moral connection with the Papacy as such.

The third stage was only a further development and culmination of the second. Having already gone so far, Wiclif found it impossible to remain in a position of bare neutrality. It was inevitable from the nature of the case, that an ever-sharpening antagonism, and a polemic against the Papacy becoming ever more fearless, should develop itself. And to

this the controversy concerning the Lord's Supper essentially contributed, in which Wiclif began to engage in the year 1382. The more violently he was calumniated and attacked by the friends of the Papacy on account of his criticism on the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, all the more did the Papacy itself appear to him to be a limb of Antichrist. To this period of his life belong all the strong assaults upon the Church which have been heretofore known to the world from his *Trialogus* and several popular writings in English. But these attacks become better understood, both psychologically and pragmatically, only when we think of them as a climax gradually realised. All the usurpations of the Papacy hitherto censured and opposed by Wiclif were now seen by him, for the first time, in the light of a corruption of Christianity of the widest extent, and immeasurably deep, for which he could find no more appropriate name than Antichristianism. The systematic spoilation of the national churches—the haughty pride—the worldly character of the Papal Government—the claims to hierarchical domination over the whole world—all these features of the degenerate Papacy were attacked by Wiclif after this date as well as before, but were now for the first time seen by him in their connection with what was the worst feature of all, with an assumption of Divine attributes and rights which seemed to him to stamp the Pope as the Antichrist.

The Pope's claims to absolute power, and to a heaven entirely special to himself, appeared to Wiclif all the more astounding, because he held fast to the fundamental principle that, in point of right, there are only deacons and priests in the Church of Christ, and that the whole graduated hierarchy within the priesthood had no other basis than the illegitimate smuggling of secular arrangements into the

Church, and grants obtained from imperial patronage. It is therefore, says Wiclif, truly ridiculous or rather blasphemous when the Roman Pontiff, without any foundation to stand upon, says, "It is our will, so must it be."[327] From this time forward, however, he handles the Papacy much more as a God-blaspheming institution than as a subject of ridicule. In earlier years, indeed, Wiclif had censured absolutistic ideas of Papal dignity and power, but only as the ideas of individual administrators and flatterers of the Pope. But now he regards the assumption of such absolutism as the very kernel of the Papacy itself. For the claim to the dignity of a vicegerent of Christ upon earth, taken along with the strongest contrast to Christ in all respects, in character, teaching, and life, was a combination which appeared to him to be only fully expressed in the idea of the Antichrist; and this name Wiclif applied to the Pope in numberless passages of the writings of his latest years. He now not only called both Popes alike "false Popes,"[328] and gave the name of Antichrist in the roundest style to Clement VII. in particular; he also applied this name to "the Pope," taken generally, that is to all the Popes collectively; for, says he, "they come in the name of Christ, and declare themselves to be His immediate vicegerents, and claim unlimited power in spiritual things, while their whole position rests exclusively upon the imperial grant of Constantine."[329] But with special frequency he applies to the Pope the well-known words of the apostle Paul (2 Thess. ii. 3) concerning the apostacy, when the Man of Sin is revealed who exalts himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped. "But now," he remarks, "it is nothing else but blasphemy when the Pope puts forward claims to Divine rights and Divine honours, and almost raises himself above

Christ, whose position upon earth he pretends to represent."[330] No wonder that Wiclif, when he once went so far as this, did not shrink even from the thought that the Papal office itself is of the wicked one, seeing no divine warrant existed for more than the pastoral care of souls, and an exemplary walk in humility and sanctity, along with faithful contendings in the spiritual conflict, but none at all for any worldly greatness and dignity.[331] The veneration, therefore, which is rendered to the Pope, appears to him to be an idolatry, all the more detestable and blasphemous (*plus detestanda atque blasphema idolatria*), because hereby divine honour is given to a limb of Lucifer, who is an abominable idol, a painted block, etc.[332]

The roughness and unmeasured tone of this polemic may have in it, at first sight, something offensive. But we will judge it more mildly if we remember that it was by no means a new thought, or one never heard of before in its application especially to the Papacy, which Wiclif now expressed. We point to the fact mentioned above that Gregory VII., as appears from his collected letters, was accustomed to distinguish between the "Members of Christ" and the "Members of the Devil or of the Antichrist." Of course it was the enemies of his own aims and designs whom Gregory looked upon as the members of Antichrist. But it was only an application of the same thought from an opposite standpoint, when the opposition party in the Church gave the name of Antichrist to a holder of the Papal dignity himself. And this was what was done in high places in an instance lying close at hand. The same cardinals who opposed themselves to Urban VI., before proceeding to the election of a rival Pope, issued a manifesto against Urban, wherein they roundly declared that Urban ought to be called

Antichrist rather than Pope. Is it to be wondered at, if Wiclif walked in the footsteps of Their Eminences, and declared to be the Antichrist, first the Pope set up by themselves Clement VII., and afterwards Urban VI., and finally the Popedom at large. He operated with ideas traditionally handed down to him, and he carried the application of these to the highest place in Christendom, but only under the pressure of conscience, and for the honour of Christ as the alone Head of the Church.

In setting forth the doctrine of Wiclif regarding the Church, it would be a serious omission not to iuclude his thoughts on the subject of the Monastic Orders.

Wiclif's controversy with the Mendicant Orders takes so prominent a place in his writings, especially in the *Trialogus*, that it became usual, even at an early period, to look upon this polemic as one of the most distinctive features of his thought and practical activity. In particular, since the days of Anthony a Wood and John Lewis,[334] it has been taken as an established fact that Wiclif put himself forward as the adversary of the Mendicant Friars as early as 1360, *i.e.*, in the very commencement of his public career. Even Dr. Vaughan, to whom we are so much indebted for our knowledge of Wiclif, concedes no more than this in his latest work upon his life, that no documentary proof is to be found in the extant writings of Wiclif to show that he had at so early a date as 1360 engaged in any discussion respecting these orders. But nothwithstanding this admission, he still represents the matter in such a manner as to imply that Wiclif, from the very commencement of his work, appeared as their opponent.[335] It was Professor Shirley who was the first to discover that the prevailing assumption was groundless, and in fact contra-

dicted by one of Wiclif's contemporaries. For a well-known opponent of his, William Woodford, states expressly, that before he drew upon himself the disapprobation of the Mendicants by his erroneous teaching concerning the Sacrament of the altar, he had never meddled with them, but had afterwards often made them the objects of his attacks.[336] When Woodward adds that Wiclif's hostilities against the Friars were therefore prompted by personal vexation, we may regard such an imputation of motive as purely subjective on our informant's part, without the weight of the facts which he gives as purely historical being thereby at all diminished. Shirley, therefore, takes at least a first step towards a correction of the hitherto prevailing view, when he pronounces the tradition to be a fable which relates that on the death, in 1360, of Richard Fitzralph, the active Archbishop of Armagh, Wiclif inherited, so to speak, his spirit and work, and took up and carried forward the conflict which he had so earnestly urged against the Begging Orders. This correction, however, of Shirley's, has not yet attracted so much attention as was to be wished; and Shirley himself, besides, with the materials at his command, has only been able to prove a negative in opposition to the tradition hitherto received. A *positive* exposition of Wiclif's whole mode of thought and feeling on the subject of Monasticism, can only be furnished by making use of those chief writings of Wiclif which still exist only in manuscript.

When these documents are laid under contribution, the following well-established results are obtained. As matter of fact, there is no truth in the tradition that Wiclif, from the very first, was in conflict especially with the Mendicant Orders. On the contrary, I find in his earlier writings evidence to show that to a certain extent he regarded them with moral

esteem and sympathy. In the same writings, on the other hand, there is not wanting some polemic against the endowed orders—*e. g.*, the Benedictines. At a later period, say from the year 1378, he began to attack the former also in part, and finally, from 1381, he carried on against them a war of fundamental principle. These three periods correspond to those which have been pointed out above in reference to Wiclif's position on the question of the Papacy. In the *first period*, in writings where he developes his "Scriptural theology," without any application to Roman Catholic dogma, but rather around the central idea of *Dominium*, and in which he is chiefly occupied with *Temporalia*, it is chiefly the endowed Monastic Orders that he keeps in view. It was principally men belonging to these orders who stood forward to oppose his views; and of course he did not fail to meet them with suitable rejoinders. For example, in his book, *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture*, which must have been written in 1378, I find that Wiclif speaks almost exclusively, or at least mainly, of monks of these orders, as men who deny both in word and deed the doctrine of Scripture, and are apostates from it. It is also only members of these orders whom he speaks of as his personal opponents, sparing no trouble and money to blacken him in the eyes of the Papal Court, in order to obtain the Pope's condemnation of certain doctrines which he has set forth. It is manifest that the reference here is to several of the nineteen propositions which were condemned in 1377 by the decree of Gregory XI.[337] In other places also he names as persons who derogate from the Word of God and its authority "the modern theologians," "the monks of the endowed orders" (*religiosi possessionati*), and "the Canonists" (*sacerdotes causidici*).[338] In the enumeration of these three classes the Mendicants are con-

spicuous by their absence. But this is not all. I find even language which amounts to positive proof that Wiclif at that time was inclined to give a preference to the Rule of the Mendicants over that of the Endowed orders, as well as over the religious and moral standing of the richer portion of the parochial clergy. In one passage he even places St. Francis of Assisi with his mendicancy side by side with the Apostles Peter and Paul with their hand-labour, in opposition to the worldly possessions and honours of the clergy of his time.[339] And in other places he expresses himself in such terms as to show that he looks upon the Foundations both of St. Francis and St. Dominic as a species of reformation of the church, yea, as a thought inspired by the Holy Ghost himself. It is possible, however, he concedes, that the Mendicants too may become degenerate and worldly like the rest.[340]

From 1378 we date a period of a few years in which Wiclif began to attack the Mendicants upon single points of error and abuse. But from the year 1381, when he began to make a definite application of his theological principles, and especially of his Scripture principle, to the Roman Catholic dogmatic system in a critique of its doctrine of the Sacraments, and in particular of the dogma of Transubstantiation, not only did his judgment respecting the Papacy become, as we have seen, much more severe, but he also opened at the same time a conflict with the Mendicant monks, which went on from that time till his death with ever-increasing violence. It may well be, as in fact we cannot doubt it was, that in this matter the circumstance had some influence, that it was the Mendicants who charged him with heresy for his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But certainly this was not the sole cause of the phenomenon. Mani-

festly another co-operated in producing the effect, viz., that Wiclif had now come to recognise in the Begging Friars the most zealous promoters of Papal absolutism, and the most systematic defenders of Church errors and abuses. Now it was that he reached the stand-point which we have long been familiar with in the *Trialogus*. Whether it is the scholastic system which he exposes in its nakedness (*sophistæ theologi*), or the practical worldliness of the Church; whether he has to do with scientific ideas, or with life and manners, —always it is against the new orders (*sectæ novellæ*), or the private religions (*religiones privatæ*), as he calls the Mendicant Orders in opposition to the religion of Christians in general, that he deals his blows. Not only in passages where he censures the proceedings of the Friars themselves, or the vices which attached specially to their convents, but also in places where he blames the usurpations of the Papacy, the sins of the clergy, and the theological errors of his time, all concentrates itself in a violent polemic against the Begging Orders. These appeared to him in that age nearly in the same light as that in which we regard the order of the Jesuits of the present day, as the most ready instruments of Papal despotism, the promoters of an anti-scriptural theology, etc. But, instead of following his polemic against them through its various turns, let a single point be here mentioned, which is significant of the evil opinion which Wiclif had conceived of them as a body. He sees in Cain the Bible original of the four Mendicant Orders, and he is of opinion that when the blood of Abel cried from the earth to heaven for vengeance on the fratricide, that heinous deed was a type of the wickedness of these fraternities. This somewhat odd thought is connected with a certain play upon the letters of the name Caim (so written instead of

Cain), viz., that these four letters are the initials of the names of the four Orders—the Carmelites, the Augustinians, the Jacobites or Dominicans, and the Minorites or Franciscans.[341]

Wiclif, however, did not allow himself to be carried away so far by his controversy with the Begging Friars, as to see in them nothing but error and wickedness, and to expect from them only what was evil in all time to come. On the contrary, he makes the following explicit declaration: —"I anticipate that some of the friars whom God shall be pleased to enlighten will return with all devotion to the original religion of Christ, will lay aside their unfaithfulness, and with the consent of Antichrist, offered or solicited, will freely return to primitive truth, and then build up the church, as Paul did before them.[342] This thought of Wiclif was a presentiment, a prophecy of the Reformation. Let us remember that not only Luther himself was an Augustinian, but that a number of his most active fellow-workers belonged to houses of that order; that Eberlin of Günzburg, and Francis Lambert of Avignon, were Franciscans; that the other Mendicant Orders in like manner contributed no unimportant promoters of the work; while the last prophet of the Reform was Savonarola, a Dominican.[343] Let us further keep in view that the founders of the Reformation, Luther himself before all, owed their evangelical insight, in the main, not to themselves, and not to others, but as a matter of fact to God Himself; and that their own personal enlightenment and conversion led the way to, and qualified them for, the task of renovating the Church. Let us also reflect on the fact that the Reformers of the sixteenth century, with a consciousness more or less clear, aimed at nothing else but the restoration of primitive Apostolic Christianity; and that in

the person of Luther especially, the Pauline spirit revived and worked out not only a purification of the Church, and an effectual edification of it, but also its elevation to a higher level of faith and life. Taking all this together, and comparing it with that presentiment of Wiclif, we cannot fail to see in the Reformation a remarkable fulfilment of what he presaged; and we have no difficulty, in view of the promise of Christ, that the Holy Spirit would show his servants things which were to come (John xvi. 13), in regarding the above declaration of Wiclif as a prophecy, the like of which the history of Christ's church has many more to show. True, indeed, the fulfilment in more than one particular went beyond Wiclif's personal and conscious thought when he penned those words; in particular his *sicut Paulus* was no doubt conceived much more narrowly than what appeared of the Pauline spirit in the Reformation. But that such a prophetic presentiment of the Reformation fruits which were to spring from the bosom of the Mendicant Orders should have come from the pen of so determined and implacable an enemy of these Orders, was a fact all the more astonishing and remarkable.[344]

This is perhaps no unsuitable place to add something touching Wiclif's views in other parts of his works on the necessity and means of a Reformation of the Church. He declares in many places that such a Reformation is a pressing and indispensable necessity. And upon what ground? Because the Church as she is is not what she ought to be. For the Church is departed from the Institution and the Word of Christ—from the Bible—is corrupted from its original condition in apostolic times.[345] If we inquire into the view he took of the historical course through which the Church passed in its progress of corruption, it must, on

the one hand, be confessed that in many particulars of the subject he thinks unhistorically, *e.g.*, when he carries back the whole secularisation of the Church exclusively to Constantine the Great,—a notion which he shares indeed with Dante and other enlightened minds of his century. But on the other hand, he knows with entire accuracy that the corruption and depravation of Christianity came in quite gradually, and from step to step. In answer to the plea of a false conservatism that the Church from time immemorial had stood in the faith which the Church of Rome teaches, and that therefore it is heresy and impiety to depart from this religion,[346] he points not only to the earlier Roman Church,[347] but goes much further back, and lays down the principle that the errors of the present age ought not to be measured by the nearest and latest error which has received Church approval, but by the institution and life of Christ as the primary standard. Men would then perceive immediately how far our priests depart from the first rule or measure, in their law and life and preaching of the gospel.[348] Considered broadly and on the whole, nothwithstanding the fact that the secularisation of the Church had already begun through the alleged Donation of Constantine, the first thousand years of Church history appear to him as the millennium of Christ (*millenarium Christi*); but from that date Satan was let loose, and the millennium of lies broke in (*millenarium mendacii*).[349] Wiclif, moreover, is persuaded that upon the inclined plane on which Christianity now finds itself, it will descend lower still, even to the deepest point. "The Antichrist (here the personal Antichrist himself) will not come before the law of Christ is dissipated and cast away both in thought and feeling."[350] Still even here, looking out upon the deepest and latest apostacy, God's word

stands out clearly before his mind, not only as the measure of the Church's fall, but also as the principal means of her restoration.

If now we farther inquire what were Wiclif's thoughts touching the means by which a reformation of the Church was to be brought to pass, it follows from what has already been stated, that this Reformation, according to his ideas, could only be on the one hand a purification of the Church from the errors and abuses which had invaded her, and on the other hand, a restoration of primitive Christianity in its purity and perfection.[351] As now Wiclif, along with many true Christians of those centuries, regarded the secularisation of the Church as its worst evil, and saw this secularisation chiefly in the worldly possessions of the Church, so it seemed to him that the most indispensable means of reform, and as he hoped the richest in blessing, was the unburdening of the Church of her worldly goods and property.

Innumerable times, and almost from every conceivable point of view, Wiclif returns to this thought, either in the form of calling for the withdrawal and secularisation of the Church's endowments, if need be by force, or in the form of suggesting thought of a voluntary renunciation by the bishops, abbots, and others, of all their worldly lordships, in conformity with the example of Christ and the standard of His word.[352] It is due to the truth that we should express frankly our conviction that in this thought Wiclif deceived himself. We share with him indeed the faith which he expresses in these words —"It is impossible that the Lord should forsake His priest, or suffer him to want for food and clothing; and therewith, according to the apostles' rule (1 Tim. vi. 8), should he be content."[353] But Wiclif was unquestionably in error when

he so confidently assumed that the single external measure of a secularisation of the Church's endowments would have the effect of carrying back the clergy and the Church at large to the Christianity of the apostles. That was not only a too sanguine hope, resting upon notions all too ideal, but it proceeded from a reformation-zeal which was over hasty and deficient in depth of insight. It seems never to have occurred to him that by the dissolution of monasteries and the calling in of Church property, the selfishness of Christendom would be woke up, passions stirred, and pious endowments alienated from their original objects.

In order to have a full knowledge of Wiclif's idea of Church reform, we must direct our attention also to the personal question,—"Who can, and should undertake the reform?" To this question he replies—"Every one can do something to help in it. Some should help by setting forth reasons for it taken out of God's Word; others should help by worldly power, such as the earthly lords whom God has ordained; and all men should help by good lives and good prayers to God, for it is in Him stands our help against the wiles of the wicked fiend. And so should Popes, bishops, and begging monks give help in this work to reform themselves."[353] He assigned no small share in the work, as already indicated, to earthly princes and lords, or in one word, to the State. He maintains that worldly lords have not only power to take away the Church's temporalities when she is habitually at fault (*habitualiter delinquente*), but that they are even bound to do it.[35] Wiclif indeed means this in no other sense than that the Church and cloister endowments should be applied to other pious uses, especially to the relief of poverty. He holds it, therefore, to be advisable that the King should call a synod

in order to proceed in the matter with the aid of its advice, in the manner most suitable to the object in view.[355] But he holds that princes and lords have not only authority to withdraw monastic and Church endowments and to dissolve monasteries,[356] but also to deprive clerics of their office who, in a spirit of worldliness, have estranged themselves from the pure religion of Christ.[357] And how much in earnest he was in the opinion that princes and lords are not only empowered to adopt such measures, but are even bound in duty to have recourse to them, in virtue of the obligation laid upon them to protect the Church and their own subjects, appears from the manifold calls which he makes upon them to take action, and especially from the fact that he charges them with blindness and indifference to the Church's interests,—that they in truth are chiefly to blame that the wholesome reform of the Church is so long delayed.[358] Still, on the other hand, he desires to prescribe certain limitations as a bar against despotism and arbitrary power. He lays it down as an express principle that no priest or cleric should be subjected to punishment by the secular arm in the shape of the loss of his endowments, except by full authority of the Church (when his ecclesiastical superior fails in his duty), and only in the case when he falls away from the true faith.[359] If the clergy would do their duty by brotherly punishment and censure, the calling in of the secular arm could be entirely dispensed with.[360] On the other hand, when churchmen are notoriously delinquent, it would be a sin to defend them, especially against pious princes, when they, in the exercise of their catholic duty, apply coercion to them in a way in which prelates have no power to do so.[361]

This view of the right and the duty of princes, to proceed

in certain circumstances against clerics with pains and penalties, not because guilty of any civil offences, but for unfaithfulness to their ecclesiastical office and for departure from the faith, is sufficient of itself to show that Wiclif was no adherent of the Romish view of the relation between Church and State. But it is in other ways unmistakeable that he is already under the influence of the modern idea of the State, as this began to develope itself since the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Not only so,[362] he has in his eye an *ideal* of the State; and that is the "Evangelical State"—which he evidently figures to himself as a commonwealth or commune, in which not rigid right and private property, but love is in the ascendant, and all is common good[363]— an idea which cannot be absolved from the charge of sanguine idealisation.

But besides the State, Wiclif assigns to all true evangelically minded Christians an important part in bringing about that reform of the Church which was so urgently needed, and so much to be aimed at. And here it is that he brings into view that the "men of the Gospel" (*viri evangelici*)—the "evangelical doctors"—or the "apostolic men," as he also calls them, are the men on whom he places his reliance. He is well aware what a single man, if true and steadfast, can accomplish. But he also bethinks himself of the power which lies in united forces, and therefore he requires of evangelical men, that when locally separated they should in will and action stand together as one man, and steadfastly defend the word of Christ which they have among them.[364] His language sounds in fact like the trumpet call of a leader who is collecting a party, and leading them in closed ranks into the battle. And Wiclif in truth has the consciousness of being such a leader in the

struggle for Church reform. Indeed, in an important passage of the Appendix to the *Trialogus*, now first published, he acknowledges quite openly that he has formed the design to lead back the Church to the institution of Christ, and in pure conformity to His word.[365] Nor does he conceal from himself that in such an undertaking he will meet with the most violent opposition, and perhaps will encounter the martyr's death; for not alone Antichrist (the Pope) and his disciples, but the devil himself and all his evil angels are full of hate against the institution of Christ having any place on the earth.[366] A thought which is by no means an isolated one in his writings, aud which vividly reminds us of Luther, who knows himself in conflict with the wicked fiend. But in view of this mighty and imminent battle, Wiclif is strong and of good courage, not only because he can depend upon the good comrades who have hitherto stood side by side with him in God's cause, that they will abide by him to the end, for they have nothing in common with apostates,[367] but chiefly in the unshakeable assurance that it is God's cause and Christ's cross for which he is contending, and that God's cause in the end must always carry off the victory. "O that God," he exclaims in one place, "would give me a docile heart, persevering steadfastness, and love to Christ, to His Church, and to the members of the devil who are butchering the Church of Christ, that I might out of pure love encounter and lay hold of them (*ipsa corripiam*). What a glorious cause for me to give up the present miserable life for! For this same was the cause of the martyr-death of Christ."[368] And in another passage, which has long been well-known, he says: "I am assured that the truth of the Gospel may indeed for a time be cast down in particular places, and may for a while abide in silence in consequence

of the menaces of Antichrist; but extinguished it can never be, for the truth itself says, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall never pass away.'"[369]

But in the last resort his hope of the accomplishment of the necessary reformation of the Church rests upon the help of God and the workings of His grace. However true and steadfast believing men may be to God's cause, God alone has power to awaken and to enlighten men for this work, and with God alone stands our help against the coming of the evil one.[370] And it is for this reason that he even concedes the possibility that the reformation of the Church, which he so earnestly longs and confidently hopes for, may be brought to pass in ways which he has no conception of, and by a miracle of God, with whom is no respect of persons, for among every people and in every land he who loves Him is accepted of Him.[371] These last words sound almost like a far-off presentiment of the event, that the decisive battle of souls for the reform of the Church of Christ would be fought out in another land than his own and in the midst of another people. At all events, Wiclif is conscious that the fulfilment of his dearest hope is for himself a mystery, and will come to pass in the end only by a miracle of God's power.

Taking all this into one view—what Wiclif thought and said of the necessity of a reformation, of the ways and means by which it was to be effected, and of the personalities by whom it was to be introduced—it is impossible for us not to receive this as our total impression—that his soul is full of longing and pressure after a God-pleasing restoration of the Church's purity; the vision of it is continually before his eyes; for this he engages his whole powers—for this, if it should be God's will, he is resolved to endure persecution and even

a martyr's death. It cannot, therefore, admit of a doubt that Wiclif was a Church reformer of the true evangelical type.

NOTES TO SECTION XI.

294. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 24, MS. 1294, fol. 78, col. 2: Omnem christianum oportet esse theologum, quia necesse est omnem Christianum addiscere fidem ecclesiae, vel scientia infusa vel cum hoc scientia humanitus acquisita; aliter enim non foret fidelis, fides autem est summa theologia. Ideo oportet omnem catholicum esse theologum; sed sacerdotem, in quantum superior, secundum quandam excellentiam. Comp. *De Civili Dominio*, I, 44, MS. 1341, fol. 130, col. 2: Omnis homo debet esse theologus et legista; nam omnis debet esse christianus, quod tamen non potest esse nisi legem mandatorum Dei cognoverit, II., c. 13, fol. 210, col. 2. Every Christian is bound to follow the counsels of Jesus Christ, at least some of them, ad quod judicandum erit discretus sibi ipsi judex optimus.

295. *Trialogus*, IV., 5, 261: Sed Deus sicut semper servat notitiam naturalem in laicis, sic semper servat sensum catholicum in quibusdam clericis, ut in Graecia vel alibi, ubi placet. In his piece, *Cruciata*, MS. 3929, fol. 237, col. 2, Wiclif maintains that it is possible that a time may come when the militant Church may consist only of poor believers, scattered in many lands, of people who follow Christ more faithfully in their moral walk than Pope and Cardinals.

296. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 25, MS. 1294, fol. 82, col. 4: Ex istis colligi potest sententia, quam saepe inserui, licet sit mundo odibilis, quod licet laicis in casu tam subtrahere quam auferre bona ecclesiae a suis praepositis. Et voco praepositos quoscunque, qui debent juvare suos subditos spirituali suffragio, ... ut patet de episcopis et clericis, etc. In the sequel Wiclif refutes, fol. 86, col. 2, the objection that laymen are not at all entitled to sit in judgment upon the life and official conduct of their spiritual superiors. This idea he repudiates with the remark, that this would be as much as to say that it was not competent for the laity to concern themselves about their own salvation.

297. *De Veritate Scripturae s.*, 26, fol. 88, col. 2: Non excusatur parochianus tali praeposito innuitive consentiens; quin participat peccatis praepositi, qui sic favet.

298. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, MS. fol. 88, col. 4: Laici legitime auferentes bona ecclesiae ab indigno non auferunt ab eo tanquam praelato vel ministro ecclesiae, sed, ut vere debent credere, ab ecclesiae inimico.

299. *Ib.*, c. 24, fol. 80, col. 2.

300. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 127, col. 2. Wiclif remarks here that when men comfort themselves with the thought that "Peter's little ship" can never go down, it will depend upon the way in which this is understood, whether it is not a piece of sophistry. The Church militant may exist sometimes among one people and sometimes among another, and sometimes among a very small

number of persons. Nec video, quin dicta navis Petri possit pure pro tempore stare in laicis.

301. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 23, MS. 1294, fol. 77, col. 2, and fol. 78, col. 1 (pseudopastores) after Ezech. xxxiv.

302. *De Officio Pastorali*, II., c. 1-4, p. 31 f. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 30 : Clerici caecantur ignorantia proprii officii, quod est praedicatio verbi Dei. *XI. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. XXIX., MS. 3928, fol. 238, col. 3 : Quidam sunt canes muti non valentes latrare, etc.

303. *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 10, MS. 1339, fol. 114, col. 2 ; c. 26, fol. 205, col. 1. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 25, MS. 1341, fol. 59, col. 1. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. V., MS. 3928, fol. 141, col. 2. *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. XXIX., fol. 238, col. 3. *Select Works*, I., 11 f ; II. 60.

304. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 23, MS. 1294, fol. 75, cols. 2 and 3.

305. *Of Weddid Men and Wifis* in *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, ed. Arnold, Oxford 1871, III., 189 f. *On the Seven Deadly Sins*, ib. c. 29 f.

306. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 24, fol, 81, col. 2 : In primitiva ecclesia ordinati sunt monogami in episcopos, . . . et sic continuata est talis copula in Orientali Christianismo.

307. *Ib.*, fol. 81, col. 3 : Numquid credimus communius malum fuisse conjugatos literatos et castos gubernationi ecclesiae et domus suae intentos, stante conjugio ordinari presbyteros, quam nos extra conjugium post votum continentiae cognoscere omne genus mulierum ut meretrices, conjugatas atque viduas et virgines, imo proprias filias speciales ?

308. *Responsiones ad Argumenta Radulphi de Strode* ; MS. 1338, fol. 120, col. 4.

309. *De Officio Pastorali*, II., 11, p. 46 : The disciples of Christ are turned into Pharisees, who strain at gnats and swallow camels. Nam conjugium secundum legem Christi eis licitum odiunt ut venenum, et seculare dominium eis a Christo prohibitum nimis avide amplexantur. Quite similarly *De Officio Regis*, c. 2, MS. 3933, fol. 8, col. 1. Comp. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 13, MS. 1341, fol. 105, col. 1 : Unde, si non fallor, minus malum foret clericum uxorari, quam circa mundum esse sollicitum.—*Of Weddid Men and Wifis* in *Select Works*, III., 190.

310. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVI., MS. 3928, fol. 93, col. 3 : Ratificari quidem debet status residentium curatorum, et subtrahi totum residuum.

311. In the schedule added to the Papal Brief of 22d May 1377, No. 16 reads as follows:—Hoc debet catholice credi, quilibet sacerdos rite ordinatus habet potestatem sufficienter sacramenta quaelibet conferendi et per consequens quemlibet contritum a peccato quolibet absolvendi. And the original passage to which this refers is plainly the following (*De Civili Dominio*, I., 38, MS. 1341, fol. 93, col. 1) : —Hoc ergo catholice credi debet, quod quilibet sacerdos rite ordinatus habet potestatem sufficientem quaelibet sacramenta conferendi . . . . absolvendi, nec aliter potest papa absolvere. Nam quantum ad potestatem ordinis omnes sacerdotes sunt pares, licet potestas inferioris rationabiliter sit ligata.

312. *Trialogus*, IV., 15, p. 296 : Unum audacter assero, quod in primitiva ecclesia ut tempore Pauli suffecerunt duo ordines clericorum, scilicet sacerdos atque

diaconus. Secundo dico, quod in tempore apostoli fuit idem presbyter atque episcopus; patet 1 Timoth. iii. et ad Titum i. Comp. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 6, p. 438: ut olim omnes sacerdotes vocati fuerunt episcopi. *De Officio Pastorali*, I., 4, p. 11: Apostolus voluit episcopos, quos vocat quoscunque curatos.

313. *Trialogus*, IV., 15. p. 296. Comp. *Decreti Pars*, I., *Distinct.*, 95, c. 5, and Hieron. Comm. in ep. ad Tit. i. 5, Opp., Vol. VII., 694 f., ed. Vallarsi Venet. 1766.

314. Comp. Dollinger, *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, 2, Aufl. p. 186.

315. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVI., MS., 3928, fol. 93, col. 3. Tertio introducta est secundum ordinationem caesaream praesidentia episcoporum. Comp. *Trialogus*, IV., 15, p. 296 f. Verum videtur, quod superbia Caesarea hos gradus et ordines adinvenit. He names immediately before Pope and Cardinals, patriarchs and archbishops, bishops and archdeacons, officials and deans, besides the other officers, quorum non est numerus neque ordo. In like manner in many other places, *e.g.*, *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XL., fol 81, col. 3: Licet Constantinus Imperator decrevit, suum episcopum atque clerum esse superiorem in mundana gloria quam reliquos in privatis aliis provinciis, et licet Antichristus sequens in hoc errore ampliavit istam haeresim, tamen fidelis debet recognoscere fidem Christi dictam Gal. ii. 6.

316. *E.g.*, In *De Civili Dominio*, II., 4, Vienna MS. 1341, fol. 164, col. 2, he mentions, it is true, the infeftment of John Lackland with the crown of England on condition of the payment of feudal tribute, the transfer of the crown of Castile from Peter the Cruel to Henry the bastard by Urban V. (1366), but he remarks immediately upon these and other cases, in which the Pope claimed the right, as Peter's successor, to dispose of kingdoms, that it was not his business to inquire whether the Pope thus acted from fatherly affection or in love to his allies, or to censure the abuses of secular princes (non est meum discutere). One of the most emphatic passages is that in Book I., 19, of MS. 1340, fol. 160, col. 1, where he remarks that the greatness of the Pope stands in his humility, poverty, and readiness to serve. When he becomes degenerate and secularised, and an obstinate defender of his worldly greatness, then it seems to the author that the Pope becomes an arch heretic, and must be put down from his spiritual dignity as well as his earthly dominion.

317. In *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 26, MS. 1339, fol. 205, col. 1, he treats of this subject, under the commandment "Thou shalt not steal."

318. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 11, MS., 1296, fol. 30, col. 3.

319. In one of his earliest writings (*De Civili Dominio*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 123, col. 11, he maintains that no person in the Romish Church is absolutely necessary to the government of the Church; and in the book *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, which he wrote in 1378, he treats it as a mere fiction when it is pretended esse de necessitate salutis credendum, quod papa quicunque sit caput universalis ecclesiae, etc.—Vienna MS. 1294, c. 20, fol. 65, col. 4.

320. *De Civili Dominio*, Vienna MS. 1341, I. 35, fol. 84, col. 1. Wiclif observes that he who maintains that all bulls and instruments of the Pope are absolutely right and just gives it indirectly to be understood that the Pope is without sin,

and therefore God (implicat, papam esse impeccabilem, et sic Deum; potest ergo errare in judicio). Comp. 3. 43, fol. 120, col. 1.

321. *E.g., De Ecclesia*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 164, col. 3: Blasphemant quidam extollentes papam sophistice super omne quod dicitur Deus, etc. Comp. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 20, fol. 65, col. 4: they break out in blasphemiam summe execrabilem, quod dominus papa—sit paris auctoritatis cum Christo humanitus, cum sit Deus in terris, etc.

322. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 43, col. 3. *vide* Appendix.

323. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 3929, fol. 7, col. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 133, col. 2: Benedictus dominus matris nostrae, qui nostrae peregrinanti juvenculae (an image of the Church from the Song of Songs) diebus istis providit caput catholicum, virum evangelicum, Urbanum sextum, qui rectificando instantem ecclesiam (the Church of the present), ut vivat conformiter legi Christi, orditur ordinate a se ipso et suis domesticis; ideo oportet ex operibus credere, quod ipse sit caput nostrae ecclesiae. Comp. c. 15, fol. 178, col. 4.

324. *Ib.*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 133, col. 2: Ista autem fides de nostro capite tam gratiose et legitime nobis dato est credenda cum quadam formidine de corona suae finalis perseverantiae. . . . . Nec dubium, quin nos omnes tenemur subesse sibi (sc. Urbano), de quanto tanquam verus Christi vicarius mandat magistri sui consilia et non ultra.

325. *Ib.*, c. 15, MS. 1294, fol. 178, col. 1: Si nos Anglici gratis tantum obedimus papae nostro Urbano VI. tanquam humili servo Dei, sicut schismatici obediunt Clementi propter dominium et potestatem secularem: quis dubitat, quin ut sic habemus rationem meriti amplioris? *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. X. (on Matthias's Day), MS. 3928, fol. 19, col. 1. The preacher maintains that the election of Matthias to be an apostle was legitimate and well done. Would that men now-a-days would proceed in like manner in elections, especially to high places. That was not the case in the election of Robert of Geneva, although it certainly was so in the election of Urban VI. Ideo maneat Urbanus noster in justitia verus Petri vicarius, et valet sua electio. . . . . Quod si Urbanus noster a via erraverit sua electio est erronea, et multum prodesset ecclesiae, ultroque istorum carere.

326. *Cruciata*, c. 3, MS. 3929, fol. 238, col. 1: Probabiliter creditur, quod utroque istorum subtracto de medio vel damnato, staret ecclesia Christi quietius, quam stat modo, cum multi supponunt probabiliter ex vitis eorum, quod nihil illis et ecclesiae sanctae Dei.

327. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. LVI., MS. 3928, fol. 116, col. 3: Revera tam derisorium vel blasphemum est, quod romanus presbyter dicat sine fundatione: "Nos volumus ita esse!" Comp. 117, col. 1.

328. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 9, p. 450: Manifeste patet, quod uterque istorum pseudopaparum tanquam membrum diaboli in causa stultissima provocat homines ad pugnandum, etc.

329. *Trialogus*, IV., 32; *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 4, p. 423, f. 447, 450. He carries out these thoughts even in sermons—*e.g.*, in *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLIV., on Matt. xxiv. 3, where the subject is false prophets and false Messiahs: Omnes isti pseudo-papae "veniunt in nomine Christi" dicentes, se esse immediatos

vicarios ejus, sic quod infinitum plus possunt de dispensatione quoad spiritualia quam alius christianus. . . . Sed fundamentum tacitum stat in donatione caesarea et concessione quadam Constantina. Comp. *Select Works*, II., 394 f.

330. *De Blasphemia*, c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 117, col. 2 : Videtur multis ex fide scripturae et facto hominum, quod in Curia romana sit radix hujus blasphemiae, quia homo peccati antichristus insignis loquitur, quod sit summus Christi vicarius, in vita et opere inter mortales sibi simillimus *Trialogus*, IV., 32, p. 359 : Extollitur—super omne quod dicitur Deus, quod declarat apostolus competere antichristo, etc. *De Apostasia*, c. 1, MS. 1343, fol. 37, col. 1 : If the Pope breaks his covenant (liga) by which he is bound conscientiously to follow Christ in his acts, non apostolicus sed apostaticus habeatur.

331. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. IX., MS. 3928, fol. 152, col. 1 : Breviter totum papale officium est venenosum ; deberet enim habere purum officium pastorale, et tanquam miles praecipuus in acie spiritualis pugnae virtuose procedere, et posteris, ut faciant simpliciter (Conj. ; Hs. similiter), exemplare. Sic enim fecit Christus in humilitate et passione, et non in seculari dignitate vel ditatione. Et haec ratio, quare praelati versi sunt in lupos, et capitaneus eorum sit diabolus vita et opere antichristus, etc. Wiclif even goes so far as to have no difficulty in maintaining that no man upon earth is better fitted to become Antichrist and vicar of Satan than the Roman Pontiff himself, ut sit vicarius principalis Satanae et praecipuus antichristus, just because he can easily deceive the Church with hypocrisy and every kind of lie. *De Blasphemia*, c. 3, Vienna MS. 3933, fol. 126, col. 1. The idea of Antichrist becomes in the end so common with him that he uses the name as convertible without more ado with the name of the Pope. He speaks of legates a latere antichristi, and more in the same style—*e.g.*, *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. V., MS. 3928, fol. 8, col. 2 : legatos cum bullis missos a latere antichristi.

332. *De Blasphemia*, c. 2, MS. 3933, fol. 123, col. 3.

333. Raynaldi, *Annales ad. ann.* 1378, No. 48.

334. Wood, *Antiquitates Oxonienses*. Lewis, *History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wiclif*, 1820, 6 f.

335. R. Vaughan, *John de Wycliffe. a Monograph*, London 1853, 87 f.

336. Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, Introduction, xiv. The passage of Woodford occurs in his unprinted 72 *Questiones de Sacramento Altaris*, Qu. 50, dub. 7.

337. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 20, MS. 1294, fol. 65, col. 3 : Religiosi autem possessionati, ut defendant (instead of defending) in vita et verbis legem scripturae patenter apostatant, cum laboribus et expensis laborant ad curiam romanam pro dammanda sententia dicente, multas cartas humanitus adinventas de hereditate perpetua esse impossibiles. Et tamen Oxoniae tam publice quam procuratorie dicunt testamenta Dei et legem Christi impossibilem et blasphemam. Quodsi legem scripturae diligerent plus quam cartas proprias de dotatione in perpetuam elemosynam, laborarent forte in contrarium, etc.

338. *Ib.*, c. 20, fol. 65, col. 2 : Videtur,—quod magis culpandi sunt nostri theologi, nostri religiosi possessionati, et nostri sacerdotes causidici, etc. Wiclif is wont to give this name, causidici, to the reverers of canonical law, whose spirit was more juristic than theological, particularly the advocates of Papal absolutism.

339. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 23, MS. 1340, fol. 200, col. 1 : Veritas quam saepe inculcavi, scilicet quod status religiosorum viventium secundum paupertatem evangelicam est perfectissimus in ecclesia sancta Dei. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 13, MS. 1341, fol. 208, col. 1. In this latter place he speaks of such an one who is utterly disinclined to give up worldly power and splendour for the sake of Christ, and maintains that such a man's faith is plainly not of the right sort. Such a man has no fancy to go afishing with Peter, or to make tents with Paul, nec mendicare cum Francisco. There is only one thing that troubles him, that he is not ruler of the world like Augustus.

340. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 2, MS. 1340, fol. 7, col. 2 : Necesse fuit Spiritum s. fratres de ordine Dominici et Francisci statuere ad aedificationem ecclesiae, etc. Comp. c. 1, fol. 5, col. 1.

341. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 33, p. 362. Comp. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 8, p. 444. *De Officio Pastorali*, II., c. 16, castra Cainitica. Hence the name he gives to the mendicant monks at large, Caïnitïae, in *Suppl. Trial.*, c. 6, p. 437, and to the whole institution. *Cainitica Institutio Trial.*, IV., 17, p. 306. In his English tracts, Wiclif calls the cloisters of the begging monks Cain's castles—*e.g.*, *The Church and her Members*, c. 5, *Select Works*, III., 348 ; and *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars*, c. 2, p. 368. The name Jacobites for the Dominicans sprang from the circumstance that their first monastery in Paris stood near the gate of St. Jacques. But the fastening of the name upon them as a mark of Cain was very ill taken by the monastic orders and their friends, which it would be easy to prove from Wandford and Walsingham if it were worth the pains.

342. *Trialogus*, IV., 30, p. 349 : Suppono autem, quod aliqui fratres, quos Deus dignatur docere, ad religionem primaevam Christi devotius convertentur, et relicta sua perfidia, sive obtenta sive petita antichristi licentia, redibunt libere ad religionem Christi primaevam, et tunc aedificabunt ecclesiam sicut Paulus. A similar but much vaguer expression I find in the treatise *De Apostasia*, c. 2, MS. 1343, fol. 51, col. 1 : Si—placet benefacere istis sectis, tribueter eis abscondite seorsum elemosyna, ut dissolvantur colligationes impietatis, et reducantur ad perfectionem religionis primaevae.

343. Comp. *On the Co-operation in Reformation Efforts of the Augustinians in the Netherlands, the Lower Rhinelands, and Westphalia*, C. A. Cornelius, Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs, 1855, I., 33 f. Friar Barnes in London, also, to whom, in 1528, two Wicliffites out of Essex came to purchase from him a printed English New Testament, was an Augustinian. *Strype Ecclesiastical Memorials.* Oxford, 1832, I., 2, p. 54.

343. Comp. Leopold Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte in Zeitalter der Reformatum*, II., 66 f.

344. Neander was the first to call attention to this passage, as a prediction that the Reformation would proceed from the Mendicant Orders. Böhringer, *Wycliffe*, p. 568, and Oscar Jager, *John Wicliffe*, Halle 1854, p. 57 f., have observed in opposition to Neander's view and my own expressed in *Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie*, 1853, p. 452 f., that this is going too far. But if, as Jager himself admits, we see "in Wiclif's whole personality a comprehensive fact-prophecy of

the Reformation," is there anything impossible or even improbable in the idea that there should have been also a word-prophecy of it? And if Wiclif says no more than *I suppose*, and not *I prophecy*, does it follow that there is no question here of prophecy at all?

345. It cannot be attempted to bring together all the passages in which Wiclif has given expression to this judgment. A few may suffice, *instar omnium*. Beginning with external matters, it is to such he refers when, in the *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 8, MS. 1339, fol. 108, col. 1, he says that the stiff demand of the Church for its temporalities far out-goes the example of the primitive Church (ultra exemplum primitivae ecclesiae). The Apostolical Church, that church of martyrs, was also a church of poor confessors (ecclesia pauperum confessorum), but on that very account it did a much greater work than the richly-endowed Church of later times. *De Civili Dominio*, III., c. 22. MS. 1340, fol. 193, col. 1. That Wiclif, in the matter of worship, affirmed that the Church had departed from ancient usage, to which the use of so many images and saints was unknown, has been already noticed above, *vide* p. 110 f. The hierarchial despotism to which the Popes had reached, he paints in the strongest colours. *De Officio Regis*, c. 7, MS. 3933, fol. 37, col. 3: But not only in life but in doctrine also has this departure taken place from the word of God and the true Christian standard, and it is here that he lays the main stress. *Saints' Day Sermons*, XXI., MS. 3928, fol. 41, col. 4: At the time of the first advent of Christ the synagogue was manifestly corrupt. Scriptural doctrine was hidden away or perverted—human traditions multiplied, etc. At His second advent the antichrist will be still more deeply and manifoldly apostate. But the priests and Pharisees of the Old Testament were more excusable than the Romish Church—non enim tantum a lege Mosaica declinaverant, quantum nostri prelati declinant tam vita quam scientia a lege et regula Christiana. They deceive others, indeed, and themselves by assuming that they are the Holy Church to which Christ has promised that it shall endure to the end. But in the Old Testament times men had indulged in like false confidences. "The temple of the Lord are we," Jerem. vii. 4. But the principal cause of this falling away from true Christianity lies here, as Wiclif sets forth in *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 29, MS. 1294, fol. 101, col. 4, that men have set aside the one only Lord and Master, and have given heed to many other masters who are opposite to Christ—that the corrupt traditions of men have been followed and not the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

346. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XL., MS. 3928, fol. 8, col. 4.

347. Prior Romana ecclesia cui magis debemus credere. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 128, col. 4. He refers here to the eleventh in comparison with the twelfth and fourteenth centuries.

348. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXI., MS. 3928, fol. 65, col. 2: Because the antichrist is aware of the great importance of the institution of Christ, he has managed that it should be departed from only gradually but craftily; and under his blinding influence, worldly-minded people have been thus led to look upon errors which were still not excessive, as of no consequence, or as no errors at all.

349. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. 1, MS., 3928, fol. 130, col. 1: Aliter errarent tam ecclesia quam doctores de millennario Christo, qui sic esse credendnm docuerant.

Saints' Day Sermons, No. XL., fol. 80, col. 4 : Istis ducentis annis et amplius fuit cursus talis antichristi cum sectis suis—nam par tantum temporis et amplius diabolus est solutus. In the *Trialogus*, the period when the devil was set loose is assumed to be well known—almost as much so as an established era in chronology, *e.g.*, B. III., c. 7, p. 153 ; c. 31, p. 240 ; B. IV., c. 2 and 33, p. 249, 362 : Ante solutionem satanae, post solutionem satanae, etc. This apocalyptic view was everywhere prevalent in the Middle Age. To quote only one document in illustration of this fact, I refer to the letter from Liege, which was addressed to Paschalis II. during the Investiture controversy. There the same thought occurs more than once—Satan is loose, and has great wrath—Satanas solutus . . . . jam divisit regnum et sacerdotium.

350. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 15, MS. 1294, fol. 45, col. 2 : Antichristus non veniet antequam lex Christi sic dissipata tam intellectu quam affectu.

351. *De Blasphemia*, c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 118, col. 4 : Purgatio gloriosa ecclesiae ab antiqua blasphemia, etc. *De Ecclesia et membris ejus*, ed. Todd, c. 6, p. xli. : purging of the churche. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 22, MS. 1340, fol. 193, col. 2 : Ecclesiae ad primam perfectionem restitutio. *De Ecclesia*, c. 3, MS. 1294, fol. 135, col. 1 : Correctio nostra secundum statum primaevum.

352. A single passage for a thousand may here find a place. In the *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXXVI., MS. 3928, fol. 72, col. 4, Wiclif says : Medicina necessaria ad extinguendum venenum diaboli foret, totum clerum exproprietarium facere, et ordinationem Christi quoad suam ecclesiam innovare, etc. Comp. *De Officio Pastorali*, II., 11, p. 45 ; *Trialogus*, IV., 28, p. 310 ; *Dialogus*, c. 34, MS. 1387, fol. 159, col. 2 : Si autem ipsi episcopi . . . . et alii dotati praepositi conciperent in hoc vitam et legem Christi, et sic gratis renunciarent omnibus mundanis dominiis, foret illis magis meritorium et gloriosior triumphus ecclesiae militantis super diabolum et alia membra sua. The whole tractate *De Officio Pastorali* turns in like manner upon the thought that it would be more wholesome for the parish clergy, but, at the same time, quite sufficient for their worldly comfort, to live upon the voluntary gifts of their congregations ; food and clothing would not be wanting to them.

353. *The Church and her Members*, cap. 6 ; *Select English Works*, III., 351 f.

354. *Trialogus*, IV., 18, p. 310 : Nos autem dicimus illis, quod nedum possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia habitualiter delinquente, nec solun quod licet illis hoc facere, sed quod debent, etc. *De Civili Dominio*, c. 22, MS. 1340, fol. 183, col. 2 : Licet dominis temporalibus aufferre a religiosis (Monks) collatas elemosinas progenitorum suorum (*i.e.*, endowments) in casu quo habitualiter eis abusi fuerint.

355. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 22, MS. 1340, fol. 176, col. 2 : Si . . . . sit rationabile, ut retrahatur elemosyna regis nostri in alios pios usus, non oportet currere Romam ad habendum consensum sui pontificis . . . . ne tamen illud fiat indiscrete, congreganda est synodus auctoritate regis, etc.

356. *Ib.*, 193, col. 2 : Claustrorum dissipatio . . . . posset verisimilius esse eorum (claustralium) correctio, etc.

357. *Ib.*, c. 19, fol. 163, col. 1 : Expediens est . . . . seculares dominos aufferre a clericis onus ministerii hujusmodi, si viderint eos a religione Christi aversos, etc.

358. *De Simonia*, c. 5, MS. 1343, fol. 21, col. 1 : Nec dubium, qui caecus torpor dominorum secularium sit in causa, quare tam gloriosus fructus et emendatio ecclesiae retardatur. In the *Saints' Day Sermons*, MS. 3928, fol. 117, col. 2, the LVIth closes with the wish, "O that kings would wake up and shake off this faithlessness of the antichrist, and in divine things take the sense of scripture pure and undefiled."

359. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 8, MS. 1341, fol. 177, col. 2: Nullus sacerdos vel clericus debet per coactam ablationem bonorum corripi per brachium seculare, nisi auctoritate ecclesiae, in defectu spiritualis praepositi, et casu quo fuerit a fide devius.

360. *Ib.*, fol. 178, col. 2.

361. *Ib.*, I., 39, MS. 1341, fol. 95, col. 2 : Et quum notabiliter delinquunt, peccatum esset ipsos defendere, specialiter contra pios principes catholice coërcentes, qualiter praelati non sufficiunt.

362. I bring into view here two particulars—first. The way in which Wiclif emphasizes the inherent rights of the crown, according to which the claim of the Pope to the first fruits of a prelacy, and also the pretended exemption of the clergy in their person and property from the king's jurisdiction, are both irreconcileable with the *integritas regaliae regis nostri*. *De Ecclesia*, c. 15, MS. 1294, fol. 176, col. 2. Comp. *De Officio Regis*, c. 4, MS. 3933, fol. 15, col. 2 ; Omnis rex dominatur super toto regno suo ; omnis clericus regis legius (vassal or liege) cum tota possessione sua est pars regni ; ergo dominatur super omnibus istis. Secondly, The way in which Wiclif sets forth the dignity of the king as derived immediately from God, and as independent of the Church, and even of the Papacy. The governing power of the king is conferred by God, and acknowledged by the people. *De Officio Regis*, as above, fol. 176, col. 3: Rex, in quantum hujusmodi, habet privilegium concessum a Deo et acceptum a populo ad regnandum. The king, therefore, is a vicar of God, as good as the pope, who should exhibit divine justice in his actions ; ista exemplaris justitia in Deo, debet esse exemplar cuilibet ejus vicario tam papae quam regi, etc. Rex enim est Dei vicarius. This is properly the ground-thought of this whole book. In connection with this subject, Wiclif more than once supports himself upon a thought of Augustin's, Epist. 185, according to which a king is a representative of God, but a bishop a representative of Christ. *Trialogus*, IV., 15, p. 297 ; *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XL., MS. 3928, fol. 81, col. 4, in the latter of which two places *episcopus* is the word used, in the former *papa*. Comp. *De Blasphemia*, c. 7, MS. 3933, fol. 140, col. 3. As a fruit of the contest between Church and State which went on from the end of the thirteenth century between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, we especially must regard the judgment expressed by Wiclif in *Liber Mandatorum*, c. 26, MS. 1339, fol. 205, col. 2, in the following terms:—The king in temporal things stands above the pope, and, therefore, the pope must acknowledge him as in this respect the higher upon earth, though in spiritual things the pope has the superiority : Rex autem est in temporalibus supra papam ; . . . . ideo quoad istud oportet papam superiorem in terris cognoscere, licet in spiritualibus antecellat. Wiclif defines the relation between Church and State, between temporal and spiritual government, sharply and clearly, as follows :—

Secular princes govern their subjects directly and immediately in reference to the body and temporal goods, but only mediately, or in the second line (accessorie) in relation to the soul, which latter interest, however, in the order of the two objects or ends of government, should be the first. On the other hand, the priests of Christ exercise government chiefly and directly in relation to spiritual gifts, *e.g.*, the virtues ; yet along with this, and in the second line, in relation to temporal things. But both jurisdictions must take hold of each other and render each other reciprocal support. As the Church has two estates, clergy and laity—so to say soul and body—so she has two sorts of censure and discipline—spiritual, in the shape of admonition ; corporeal, in the shape of compulsion ; of which the former takes effect by the preaching of the law of Christ and conviction of reason, and belongs to the doctors and priests of Christ, while the latter takes effect by the deprivation of the gifts of nature and temporal goods, and is exercised in the hands of the laity. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 8, MS. 1341, fol. 178, col. 1 ; fol. 179, col. 1.

363. *De Civili Dominio*, II., 16, MS. 1341, fol. 235, col. 2 : Tunc necessitaretur republica redire ad politiam evangelicam, habens omnia in communi.

364. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXXI., MS. 3928, fol. 65, col. 2 : Viri quidem evangelici debent in voluntate et in conversatione tanquam vir unus concurrere, quanquam loco distiterint (MS., destituerint), et legem Christi sibi praesentis constanter defendere. Doctores evangelici. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 19, MS. 1340, fol. 163, col. 1.

365. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 8, p. 447 : Tunc foret facilius . . . errores corrigere, et statum ecclesiae ad ordinationem Christi pure secundum legem suam reducere, quod attendere desidero. Comp. *Dialogus*, c. 18 : Intendimus purgationem et perfectionem cleri, quam scimus non stare in multitudine personarum, sed in observantia status, quem Christus instituit.

366. Hoc tentans pro parte Christi habebit plurimos adversantes, quia non solum antichristum et omnes ejus discipulos, sed ipsum diabolum et omnes suos angelos, qui summe odiunt, quod Christi ordinatio stet in terris : *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. III., MS. 3928, fol. 6, col. 1.

367. *De Apostasia*, c. 2, MS. 1343, fol. 52, col. 1 : Confido de bonis sociis, qui mihi confidenter in causa Dei astiterant, quod . . . usque in finem assistent, quia nihil illis et dictis apostatis.

368. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 23, MS. 1294, fol. 78, col. 1 : O si Deus dederit mihi cor docile, perseverantem constantiam et caritatem ad Christum, ad ejus ecclesiam et ad membra diaboli ecclesiam Christi laniantia, ut pura caritate ipsa corripiam ! Quam gloriosa causa foret mihi praesentem miseriam finiendi ! Haec enim fuit causa martyrii Christi. Comp. the beautiful conclusion of the II. Book, *De Civili Dominio*, c. 18, MS. 1341, fol. 251, col. 2 : Concedat Deus nobis clericis arma apostolorum et patientiam martyrum, ut possimus in bono (the evil with good) vincere adversarios crucis Christi ! Amen.

369. *Trialogus*, IV., 4, p. 258. Comp. *Dialogus*, c. 25, MS. 1387, fol. 156, col. 1 : Dicam ergo istam sententiam pro bono papae atque ecclesiae, et si occisio vel alia

poena inde eveniat, rogo Deum meum dare virtutem ad constanter et humiliter patiendum.

370. *De Blasphemia*, c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 119, col. 1: Verum potens est Deus illuminare et excitare mentes paucorum fidelium, qui constanter detegant et moneant, si digni sumus, ad destructionem hujus versutiae antichristi. Sic enim incipiendo a femina convertit per paucos apostolos totum mundum.

371. *Ib.* (one of Wicliff's latest writings), c. 1, MS. 3933, fol. 120, col. 4: Ideo videtur tutius a generatione ista saltem in mente aufugere et ad protectionem Christi confugere, relinquendo destructionem antichristi cum suis satrapis Dei miraculo. Scimus quidem, quod oportet, ut viis nobis absconditis istud eveniat; sed scimus, quod personarum acceptio non est apud Deum, sed in omni gente vel loco, qui ipsum dilexerit, acceptus est illi.

Section XII.—*Doctrine of the Sacraments.*

Of the doctrinal system of Wiclif, there still remains for us to examine that chief head wherein he placed himself in strongest opposition to the teaching of the Church of Rome—namely, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper—and generally of the Sacraments. We shall, however, handle the doctrine of the other sacraments with comparative brevity, because we are able to refer upon this subject to the full and satisfactory treatment which it has received from Lewald.[372] Several points, however, still need more precise definition and some degree of correction.

A.—*Of the Sacraments in general.*

Here the three following questions come under consideration:—1. What is the notion and nature of a sacrament? 2. What are the several sacraments? or, in other words, how many sacraments are there? 3. What view is to be taken of the efficacy of the sacraments?

With regard—(1) to the notion of a sacrament, it is to be premised that Wiclif has devoted the first half of the fourth book of the *Trialogus* to the doctrine of the sacraments, in

the first chapter of which he treats of the sacraments in general, and especially of the notion of a sacrament.

He sets out from the generic idea of the *sign;* a sacrament is a sign; to every sign there corresponds a thing signified, the object of which the former is a sign. But this, as Wiclif himself allows, is so general an idea, that it must be said that everything which exists is a sign—for every creature is a sign of the Creator, as smoke is a sign of fire. But God Himself is also a sign—viz., of everything which can be named; for He is the book of life, wherein everything that can be named is inscribed (an allusion to the doctrine of the ideas of all things in God). This generic notion of a sign, therefore, is too general. Wiclif accordingly advances to a more precise definition of the notion—a sacrament is a sign of a *holy thing.* But this definition also appears to our Thinker to be too wide, for every creature is a sign of the Creator and of its creation—existence—and therefore a sign of a holy thing.[373] But even if we advance still further, and define a sacrament with yet more precision as "the visible form of an invisible grace," so as that the sacrament bears in itself a resemblance to, and becomes a cause of the grace, even this definition appears to Wiclif to be of such a kind that every possible thing might be called a sacrament; for every creature perceptible by the senses is the visible appearance of the invisible grace of the Creator, carries in itself a resemblance to the ideas embodied in it, and is the cause of their resemblance and of the knowledge of the Creator (who is known to man from the creature). Here too, accordingly, we find again those metaphysical ideas which lie at the foundation of all Wiclif's thoughts and views of God and the world.

(2.) From what he has observed regarding the idea of the

sacrament results, of itself, his judgment concerning the number of the Sacraments. The sacramental idea, according to his view, is much too wide to allow of his conceding that only the so-called seven sacraments are really such. In other words, Wiclif holds that there are more than seven sacraments.[374] He thinks, *e.g.*, that the preaching of the Divine Word is as truly a sacrament as any one of those seven well-known actions. He makes it clearly understood that he looks upon it as an arbitrary limitation—as an artificially constructed dogma—when no more than the *septem sacramenta vulgaria* are recognised as sacraments.[375] It is a mere irony when he complains that it is owing to his poverty of faculty that he conceives that many things on this head of doctrine rest upon too weak a foundation; nor has he yet become acquainted with the labels which must be affixed if the name of sacrament is to be limited to these seven in one and the same sense.[376]

While Wiclif in most places inclines to the opinion that the seven sacraments had no exclusive right to be regarded as such, *i.e.*, that seven is too small a number for them in case we set out from the generic idea which is common to them all, he nevertheless also indicates an opinion that the number seven is too large, namely, when tried by the standard of Scripture authority. This thought indeed he does not express in plain terms. He only hints at it — at one time by the order in which he treats of the several sacraments, placing the Lord's Supper and Baptism first in order, while leaving the remaining five to follow; while, in another place, he observes expressly that the right order of the sacraments is determined by the measure in which they have for their warrant the express foundation of Scripture.[377] In particu-

lar he says of the Lord's Supper, which he handles as first in order, that he does so, among other grounds, upon this one, that it has the strongest Scripture warrant of all;[378] whereas of Extreme unction, which is the last of the seven to be examined by him, he remarks that it has too weak a foundation in that passage of Scripture (James v.) upon which it is commonly rested.[379] When, notwithstanding this, he abstains from entering into any proper critique of the other sacraments, with the exception of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but follows, on the whole, the same manner of teaching which had been in fixed use since Peter the Lombard, this circumstance was owing to the fact that Wiclif's attention, within the area of this whole *locus* of doctrine, was directed to *one* definite point and concentrated upon it.

3. The third question touches the efficacy of the Sacraments.

That by virtue of God's ordinance a certain efficacy, a real communication of grace, is connected with a sacrament, Wicliff has an assured belief. He takes notice how, in contrast with actions and arrangements of human origination, such as the Pope's election, which have no promise of God that He will connect grace with them, God has given the covenanted promise really to communicate grace with the sacraments of Baptism and Repentance, which are obviously named only by way of example.[380] And on another occasion, he lays down quite generally the principle that "all sacraments, when rightly administered, possess a saving efficacy."[381] True, this saving efficacy is conditional; and what are the conditions and limitations according to Wiclif within which they have this effectual working? One condition, the most undoubted of all, and

recognised in the teaching of the evangelical Church, is already mentioned in the passage last quoted, viz., that the sacraments put forth a saving efficacy only when rightly administered (*rite ministrata*), *i.e.*, only then do they serve to the real communication of divine strength when they are administered conformably to their first institution. Wiclif is likewise thoroughly aware of the truth that a further condition of the gracious working of every sacrament lies in the mind and spiritual state of the receiver.

On this subject there is room for doubt on a single point only, whether Wiclif required a positive preparedness and receptivity in virtue of a penitent, believing, and devout spirit, as a condition of the sacrament's possessing a saving efficacy; or whether he held it to be sufficient that the receiver should not oppose a positive hindrance thereto, by an ungodly state of mind and feeling. Expressions occur which seem to favour the latter idea. But in by far the most numerous instances Wiclif demands a positive receptivity on the side of the person to whom the sacrament is administered, if a gift of grace and a blessing are to flow to him therefrom.[383] Manifestly he is not satisfied with the conditions first formulated by Duns Scotus, that only no barrier should be put in the way of the efficacy of the sacrament by mortal sin in the receiver, or by the set purpose to commit such; but he prescribes a truly penitent and pious frame of mind as a condition of the blessing which should accrue to the receiver.

These explanations stand in a certain connection with the other question, whether the saving efficacy of a sacrament is conditioned by the worthiness and the grace-standing of the priest who dispenses it? It is usual to assume, and for sometime back it has been the settled opinion, that Wiclif

answered this question in the affirmative. This assumption has even passed into the confessions of our evangelical Lutheran Church.[383] This, however, is no proof of the point. Our German Reformers, if I am not quite mistaken, came into possession of this thesis as one alleged to have been held by Wiclif, from no other source but the Council of Constance. In the list of those articles of Wiclif upon which this Council pronounced its condemnatory judgment, it set forth no fewer than four articles all bearing upon the principle in question.[384] But it is well known with how little conscientiousness and trustworthiness this Council went to work with the question whether a certain article had been really set forth and defended by Wiclif or by Huss? If we go still farther back, I find that the enemies of Wiclif, in his lifetime, on only one occasion brought under discussion the particular thesis which is now before us, namely, in the list of twenty-four articles which Archbishop Courtenay procured to be condemned at the so-called Earthquake Council held on 24th May 1382. Among these is condemned as heretical the article (No. 4), that a bishop or priest, standing guilty of mortal sin, has no power to ordain, or consecrate, or baptise.[385] It is to be remarked, however, that Wiclif is not here named expressly as the holder of this doctrine. Among the eighteen articles of Wiclif, which a provincial Synod under Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury, in February 1396, declared to be in part erroneous, in part heretical, there is not found any article of the content in question, although that whole series of articles with few exceptions relates precisely to the doctrine of the sacraments.

But Thomas of Walden, no doubt, makes mention of a doctrine of this kind. He opposes it as a Donatistic error and as a wrong against all the sacraments taken together, when Wiclif

puts it as doubtful whether Christ supports and owns in the administration of the sacraments a priest whose walk is contrary to the life of Christ.[386] But it must be remembered that it was not till 1422, and the following years, that Walden wrote his great polemical work—nearly forty years therefore after Wiclif's death, and several years after the Council of Constance which he himself attended. And this enemy of the Wiclifites, when dealing with the question now before us, has unmistakeably in his eye the form of the first of those articles which the Council had set forth as Wiclif's doctrine "of the sacraments in general."[387] Still, of course, the matter can only be brought to a decision by the authentic language of Wiclif himself. But now, so far as my knowledge of the writings of Wiclif reaches, there is not to be found in them a single expression in which the saving efficacy of the sacraments is made dependent, in language free of all ambiguity, upon the moral and religious worthiness of the administrant priest. True, he says, in one place of the *Trialogus*, when treating of the doctrine of the Mass,—so often as Christ works along with a man, and only in this case, does He bring the sacrament to effect; but Wiclif immediately adds, "and this must be assumed and pre-supposed of our priests."[388] Still more clearly does he express himself in reference to baptism, to the effect that children who have rightly received water baptism are partakers of baptismal grace, and are baptised with the Holy Ghost.[389]

It is true indeed, that when we start with the idea of the Church as the whole body of the elect, which Wiclif lays as his foundation, and then draw out with logical strictness the conclusions which ensue, we must then arrive at the view that a minister of the Church who does not belong to the elect, can as little be a

rightly conditioned steward of God's mysteries and means of grace. But we must be on our guard against drawing abstract consequences from that principle. Wiclif himself proceeds with caution and moderation in this respect. He declares, *e.g.*, in his work on the Church, that it is a point of undoubted certainty to him that no *reprobate* man is a member or office-bearer of the holy Mother Church, and yet immediately after he remarks, that such a person may nevertheless possess certain offices of administration within the Church to his own condemnation and to the utility of the Church.[390] If the official ministrations of a priest who has no standing in grace can yet be to the utility of the Church, this evidently implies the saving efficacy of the means of grace dispensed by him. The efficacy therefore is independent of the worthiness of the dispensing Church minister.

But most decisive of all is an expression occurring farther on in the same chapter, in which Wiclif declares his conviction that a reprobate, even when he is standing in actual mortal sin, administers the sacrament to the utility of the faithful entrusted to him, although it be to his own damnation.[391] From this and other similar passages, it appears with a clearness which does not admit of doubt that Wiclif requires indeed of every office-bearer of the Church who has the sacraments to administer, that for the sake of his own salvation he should be a veritable member in the body of Christ, but he by no means on this account makes the efficacy of the sacraments for the soul's health of those to whom they are dispensed, dependent upon the grace-standing of the ministrant priest. Wiclif, however, knows clearly enough that it would be to ascribe much too great an importance to the powers of a minister of the Church, and

to attribute to him what belongs singly and alone to God as His sovereign prerogative, if it should be supposed that by the ill mental condition of an unconscientious priest, the congregation would incur the loss of the blessing which is communicated to it of God by virtue of the means of grace. Wiclif knew much better how to distinguish between the objective and subjective in Christianity, between the grace of God in Christ, which is laid in word and sacrament, and the mental condition of the acting and dispensing Church-minister, than has for a long time back been supposed. The objection of a Donatistic mode of thought which Melancthon brought against the Wiclifites is, therefore, so far as it was meant to affect Wiclif himself, and not only the Wiclifites, to be set aside as unfounded and unjust, on the ground of a more accurate understanding of the actual teaching of Wiclif.

B.—*Of the Lord's Supper.*

WICLIF always gave a high place to the Lord's Supper, as the holiest and most honourable of all the sacraments. He was convinced in particular that no other sacrament has so strong a foundation in the Word of God. But holding it in such high honour, he watched over its Scriptural purity with the greatest care, and when he came to see that the Eucharistic doctrine which was prevalent in the Church of his time, was perverted and corrupt, he set himself to oppose it with unsparing severity and indefatigable zeal. It was the doctrine of Transubstantiation against which he contended with all his power.

Coming nearer to the subject, there are three questions here which require to be answered.

1. How was Wiclif led to the examination of this particular question?

2. With what arguments did he attack the doctrine of Transubstantiation?

3. What is his own view of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper?

---

1. How was Wiclif led to a critical examination of this question?

It has long been known that it was in the year 1381 that Wiclif came forward with an incisive polemic against the scholastic doctrine of "The Change of Substance;"[392] that this polemic became from that date the centre of his Reformational exertions, in so far as these had reference to the doctrinal system of the Church; and that his antagonism to this doctrine became the target chiefly aimed at on the side of his enemies, both by scientific attacks and by actual persecutions.

As may be supposed beforehand, it was only gradually, and not without vacillations and inward struggles, that Wiclif arrived at the point of opening an earnest attack upon the doctrine of the Mass which had been long sanctioned in the Church, and which was still the culminating point of the whole Roman Catholic worship. But it has not hitherto been possible to arrive at any exact understanding of the course of thought which brought him at last to this result.[393] Let us see whether more light upon the present question is to be gained from the documents which are now lying before us.

First of all, we are able positively to prove that Wiclif for a long time did not stumble at all at the doctrine, but rather received it in simple faith in common with other doctrines

of the mediæval Church. He confesses, in a controversial piece which appears to belong to the year 1381, that he had for a long time suffered himself to be deceived by the doctrine of "accident without substance."[394] We have found more than one passage of his earlier works, in which he still adheres to the doctrine without any misgiving. Especially do such passages occur in his work, *De Dominio Civili*. The usual doctrine of the change of substance in the Supper, of the "making" of the body of Christ by priestly consecration, is plainly assumed in *naive* fashion when Wiclif, in a passage where he is describing Christ as eternal priest, prophet, and king, says, among other things, —"He was a priest when in the Supper He made His own body (*corpus suum conficiens*).[395] But a remark occurring in the first book of the same work is still clearer. He is there censuring the practice of departing from biblical language in a spirit of undue exaltation of the creature, *e.g.*, when men say "The priest absolves the penitent," instead of saying, "he declares him before the congregation to be absolved by the act of God's forgiveness"—an act which is incompetent for any creature; and the case is similar to this in the Supper of the Lord, where the priest is said "to make the body of Christ"—which is to be understood of the priest only instrumentally, *i.e.*, that the priest in a ministerial way, and by the virtue of the holy words of institution, brings it to pass that the body of Christ is present under the accidents of bread and wine.[396] These words express with the most entire precision what is decisively characteristic in the doctrine of Transubstantiation—namely, that by virtue of the consecration, bread and wine are alleged to be changed into the body and blood of Christ, so that now only the sensible properties of bread and wine are present—the accidents,

without the substance or their underlying basis. Nothing can be clearer or more unambiguous than this language, from which it is certain that up till 1378 (for in this year at the latest must this work of *De Dominio* have been composed), Wiclif was still attached without any misgiving to the doctrine of the Mass.[397]

We have now two certain dates—the year 1378 and the year 1381. At the former date, Wiclif still adheres to the scholastic doctrine of Transubstantiation with unbroken confidence; at the latter date he already enters into public conflict with the same doctrine with entire decision. In the interval, therefore, from two to three years, falls the change which took place in his convictions; and the shortness of the interval gives additional interest to the inquiry, how this change in his convictions came to pass.

In order to reach a satisfactory answer to this question, there is unfortunately no adequate amount of documentary material at our command. One solitary expression of Wiclif is all that has as yet been found which throws any light upon that transition stage. It occurs in a sermon on John vi. 37. Here, among other matter, the preacher explains the words of the Redeemer, v. 38, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him who sent me." Upon this he remarks that it is not the meaning of Christ in these words to deny that he has a personal will of His own, but only to say that His own will is at the same time the will of His Father. For that, he adds, is the way in which Holy Scripture expresses itself, so that often in negative sentences a word, such as "only" or "chiefly," requires to be supplied, *e.g.*, Mark ix. 37, "He that receiveth me receiveth not me, but Him that sent me;" Eph. vi. 12, "We fight not against flesh and blood, *i.e.*, only or chiefly, but against princi-

palities and powers." This usage of speech must be also kept in view in interpreting the expression of Ambrose, that after the consecration of the Host, the bread remains no longer, but what had been bread must be called the body of Christ. That is, according to Wiclif's understanding of the words of Ambrose, we must say what remains after consecration is *in the main* or *chiefly* only the body of Christ. Why, then, should it be denied that the bread remains after consecration, in consequence of the fact that it is chiefly the body of Christ that remains.[398]

In this passage manifestly the new view of Wiclif regarding the Lord's Supper is laid down on its positive side. At first the negative exists only in germ, which in the course of years developed itself into the sharpest polemic against the scholastic doctrine of Transubstantiation,—especially against the assumption of "accidents" without "substance." But the positive side of his new view is already distinctly expressed. We recognise clearly this twofold proposition—1. After consecration, the bread is still bread as before; 2. After consecration, the Body of Christ is present in the Supper, and that, too, as the principal thing therein.

These thoughts occurring in the transition stage of Wiclif's convictions, are characteristic in more than one respect. The following three points come out clearly from them. 1. The motive principle of his subsequent polemic against the scholastic doctrine by no means lay in a preponderant inclination to deny or pull down, but on the contrary, in an earnest striving after *positive* truth in divine things. 2. In laying down the proposition that after consecration the bread remains what it is, his meaning was not to profane a holy thing, to empty the

sacrament of its deep content, but to put in the place of a baseless and unreal notion a solid and substantial idea. Besides, it is not to be overlooked that the proposition in question does not stand in the position of a chief proposition, but comes in only as a corrective, subsidiary proposition in connection with the other proposition which follows it. The truth that after consecration the body of Christ is present and forms the chief element in the sacrament, gives by no means a warrant to the inference that in virtue of the consecration the bread ceases to be bread. 3. How this presence of the body of Christ in the Supper is conceived of cannot be fully understood from some short words occurring in one division of a sermon. In any case, the declaration before us furnishes no sufficient ground to assume that Wiclif, notwithstanding his opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation, always and absolutely held fast to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. For as we have now before us the transition stage of his opinions, it is, at least, supposable that Wiclif, after he had once attacked the Church-doctrine, was only gradually carried farther in his thoughts. We shall do well to keep this in view in our further investigations of the subject. But first we have to answer the question —What reasons Wiclif brought into the field in opposition to the doctrine of the change of substance?

He opens his inquiry into the doctrine in the *Trialogus* with these words,—"I maintain that among all the heresies which have ever appeared in the Church, there was never one which was more cunningly smuggled in by hypocrites than this, or which in more ways deceives the people; for it plunders the people, leads them astray into idolatry,

denies the teaching of Scripture, and by this unbelief provokes the Truth Himself oftentimes to anger.[399] Here several points of view are brought together from which the doctrine is tested, and in every case rejected.

Before everything else, it is with Wiclif a weighty objection to the dogma that it is contrary to Scripture. How it could ever have come to be received as true, Wiclif can only explain by the overvaluing of tradition and the undervaluing of the Gospel itself.[400] For he sets out from the fact that, according to all the fundamental passages of holy Scripture which treat of the institution of the Supper (Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv., Luke xxii., 1 Cor. xi.). "Christ declares that the bread which He took into his hand is in reality his body (*realiter*), and this must be truth because Christ cannot lie."[401]

In particular, Wiclif brings into prominence the fact that the Apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. x. 16, and in chapter xi., describes the Supper with the words, "The bread which we break." And who would be so bold as blasphemously to maintain that "a chosen vessel" of God so great as he applied a false name to the chief sacrament? If Paul knew that this sacrament is not bread, but an "accident" without "substance," he would have acted with too much heedlessness towards the Church, the Bride of Christ, in calling the sacrament so often by the name of bread, and never by its true name, while yet he knew prophetically that so many errors on this subject would arise in after times.[402] Further, Wiclif appeals to the way and manner in which Scripture is often to be observed expressing itself. When Christ says of John the Baptist that he is Elias, it is not His meaning that he has ceased to be John in virtue of the word of Christ, but that continuing to be John, he has become

Elias in virtue of the ordination of God. And when John himself, being asked whether he was Elias, denied that he was, this is no contradiction to that word of Christ; for John understands it of the identity of his person, while Christ understands it of the property or character which he bore.[402] And when Christ says, "I am the true Vine," Christ is neither become a corporeal vine—nor has a corporeal vine been changed into the body of Christ; and even so also is the corporeal bread not changed from its own substance into the flesh and blood of Christ.[403] According to all this, Wiclif is persistent in maintaining that the scholastic doctrine is contrary to Scripture, for according to Scripture, in the sacrament after consecration *true bread* is truly the body of Christ,—and therefore not the mere appearance of bread, or the accident of the same. On the other hand, he asserts that nowhere in the whole Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalypse, does a word stand written which speaks of the *making* of the body of Christ—but only to this effect—that He, the only-begotten Son of the Father, took unto Himself flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary.[404]

But not only does Wiclif declare the doctrine to be contrary to Scripture,—he misses also the testimony of tradition in its support, and lays great stress upon the fact that the doctrine handed down from the better age of the Church stands opposed, as well as Holy Scripture, to the Roman dogma, which is in fact of comparatively recent date. Even the Curia itself, in the period preceding the "letting loose of Satan," adhered to Scriptural doctrine; and the holy doctors of the ancient Church knew nothing of this modern dogma. In particular, Wiclif mentions that Jerome, that excellent Scripturist and divine,

held the biblical idea of the Supper; and on another occasion he observes that the doctrine of "accidents without subject" was as yet no part of the Church's faith in the days of Augustin. It was not till Satan was let loose (*i.e.*, two or three hundred years back), that men set aside Scripture teaching and brought in erroneous doctrines.[405] God, however, knows even at the present day how to uphold the orthodox doctrine of the Supper, *e.g.*, in Greece and elsewhere, where it pleases Him.[406]

In addition to Scripture and the tradition of Christian antiquity, Wiclif also appeals to the concurrent testimony of the senses and of sound human understanding. in proof of the fact that the consecrated bread is bread after consecration as it was before it.[407] Yea! even irrational animals, such as mice, when they eat a lost consecrated wafer, know better than these unbelievers do,[408] that the Host is bread, after as well as before. But this appeal to the instinct of the brutes appears to be only a humourous episode, for no serious stress is anywhere laid upon it.

Much more value is attached by Wiclif to the dialectical testing of the ideas, taken intrinsically, with which scholasticism here goes to work. As the effect of consecration, it alleges, Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ in such a manner that the substance of bread and wine is no longer present; that only appearance, colour, taste, smell, etc.—in a word, only the accidents of bread and wine, without the substance of them are present (*accidentia sine subjecto*). In opposition to this, Wiclif takes notice that "accidents," such as softness or hardness, toughness or bitterness in the bread, neither exist for themselves nor can possibly exist in other accidents, and therefore presuppose a

substance in which they inhere, such as bread or some other. It is a contradiction—an unthinkable idea—a fiction as in a dream when men maintain "accidents without a substance."[400] He goes further and assumes the offensive against the upholders of the dogma of the change of substance; he demands of them, *what* then is properly the element which remains after consecration? and as the defenders of the doctrine in that age, especially the learned men of the Mendicant Orders, gave different answers to this question—one saying it is quantity, a second quality, and a third nothing,[410] so Wiclif recognises in this disagreement a symptom of the untruth and untenability of the whole doctrine, and applies to it the word of Christ—"Every kingdom divided against itself goes to ruin"[411]—(Matt. xii. 22). And even granting that the idea of "accident without a subject" were possible and tenable, what would be its use?[412] Why then must the bread be annihilated, in order that Christ's body may be present? When any one becomes a prelate of the church or a lord, he does not cease on that account to be the same personality; rather he remains in every respect the same being, only in a higher position. Does the manhood of Christ then cease to be man because it became God? So also is the substance of the bread not destroyed on account of its becoming the body of Christ, but elevated to something of a higher order.[413] And what sort of blessing would that be whose working is alleged to be of a destructive and annihilating character? For when they consecrate, they reduce the substance of the bread and wine, according to their own doctrine, to nothing; whereas Christ, when He pronounces a curse, does not annihilate the substance of anything, as *e.g.*, of the fig-tree.[414]

But with the greatest amount of emphasis and moral earnestness, Wiclif opposes the doctrine on account of the consequences which it leads to, and especially of the idolatry which springs from it, partly through the adoration of the consecrated Host, and partly through the blasphemous self-exaltation and deification of man implied in the priests pretending "to *make* the body of Christ," the God-man. We only touch, in passing, the allusions of Wiclif to the spoliation practised by the priests upon the people by means of the masses;[415] but much more frequently and urgently does he do battle with the idolatry which is practised with the consecrated Host, when men render to it truly divine worship and devotion. He allows no force to the defence brought forward by some theologians of the Mendicant Orders, that the Host is not worshipped, but only venerated, on account of the presence of the body of Christ. They must in reason admit that the people, who as a matter of fact worship the Host as the body of Christ, are destitute of the light of faith, and idolatrous.[416] In the presence of the Christian faith, which recognises the tri-une God as God alone, Wiclif can only regard the worship of the Host as unscriptural and utterly without warrant;[417] and this all the more, because the object to which this divine honour was addressed, was alleged to be only an accident without underlying essence. In fact, it is worse, he remarks, than the fetish-worship of the heathen, who give worship throughout the day to whatever object they chance first to see in the early morning, when many so-called Christians habitually take to be their very God that *accident* which they see in the hands of the priests in the mass.[418] The indignation of Wiclif against the idolatry committed in the worshipping of the Host, is

all the stronger that he cannot avoid the conviction that the authors of this deification of a creature are perfectly well aware of what their God really is.[419] Such priests, accordingly, he does not scruple to call plainly Baal-priests.[420] Not seldom he adds to his protest against the worship of the Host a personal reservation, and a general observation. The reservation is to the effect that for his own person, Wiclif conforms himself to the custom of the Church (in kneeling before the Host), but only in the sense of addressing his devotion to the glorified body of Christ, which is in heaven.[421] The general observation is, that with the same right as the consecrated Host would every other creature lay claim to divine honours; yea with much superior right—first, because the Host, according to the modern church doctrine, is not a substance but only an accident; and in addition, because in every other creature the uncreated Trinity itself is present, and this is infinitely more perfect than a body, because it is the absolute Spirit itself.[422]

Last of all, the most emphatic protest is made by Wiclif against the delusion that the priest *makes* the body of Christ by his action in the Mass. This thought appears to him to be nothing less than horrible, first, because it attributes to the priests a transcendental power, as though a creature could give being to its Creator—a sinful man to the holy God;[423] again, because God Himself is thereby dishonoured, as though He, the Eternal, were created anew day after day;[424] and lastly, because by this thought the Sanctuary of the Sacrament is desecrated, and an "Abomination of Desolation is set up in the holy place."[425]

If we cast another look over the whole of Wiclif's polemic against the Romish doctrine of the Supper, we perceive that

it is exclusively directed against the doctrine of the change of substance, with all its presumptions and consequences. The denial of the cup to the laity is never once expressly mentioned by him in any of his works, printed or still in manuscript. In Wiclif's time the practice had not yet received the sanction of the Church. And as little has he applied any searching critique to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. I find even an express recognition and approval of the idea of the Mass-sacrifice in a work which certainly belongs to his latest years, and throughout opposes the doctrine of the change of substance. The connection, however, lets it be seen without difficulty that the sacrifice meant is only the thank-offering of a grateful feast of commemoration, not the effectual oblation of a sacrifice of atonement.[426]

The holy Supper had been alienated from its institutional purity by three chief corruptions—the denial of the cup, the change of substance, and the sacrifice of the Mass. These three particulars Luther, in his principal reformational work, *De Captivitate Babylonica*, 1520, designated as a three-fold captivity of the sacrament. Its first captivity relates to its perfection or completeness of parts—it is a Romish despotism to deny the cup to the laity; the second captivity is the scholastic doctrine of the change of substance; the third consists in converting the Mass into a sacrifice and a meritorious work.[427] As these corruptions had crept in gradually in the course of centuries, so also the recognition of them as such, and the re-discovery of the original truth of the case was only reached step by step. First, the doctrine of the change was attacked, then the denial of the cup, and last the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, with all the errors and abuses therewith connected. And in every

instance new leaders and captains must needs step into the field. It was the doctrine of the change of substance that Wiclif attacked, along with all its presumptions and consequences; and he did this from the moment when he got new light upon the subject, with an indefatigable zeal and a holy earnestness of conscience inspired by his concern for the honour and glory of God.[428]

In this he was followed by the numerous host of his disciples. From the end of the fourteenth to the third decade of the sixteenth century, the protest against transubstantiation continued to be a characteristic peculiarity of the English Lollards. In the fifteenth century the Hussites contended against the denial of the cup,[429] and, with the fiery zeal characteristic of them, knew how to conquer again for themselves the *calix*, which became their ensign. Last of all, Luther, with all the might of his genius and his conscience, bound fast by the Word of God, assailed the conception and handling of the Supper as a Mass-sacrifice and a good work. The denial of the cup he also regarded, as before stated, as a captivity of the sacrament; but he expressed himself on that point with moderation;[430] and milder still was his judgment on the doctrine of the change of substance, although he denied that it had any ground in Scripture, and regarded it likewise as a captivity of the sacrament.[430] But the most godless abuse and error of all, and one drawing after it, as its consequences, many other abuses, he declared to be the conversion of the Mass into a meritorious work and a sacrifice.[431] Now, it was on precisely the same grounds which moved Luther to protest against the sacrifice of the Mass, that Wiclif 140 years before saw himself constrained to stand forward against the doctrine of transubstantiation; viz., because it had no foundation in

Scripture, because it leads men astray into idolatry, and because it draws after it a whole chain of errors and abuses. He went to work, however, as little as Luther did, in a merely negative and destructive way. He put forward a positive doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

3. What is the positive view which Wiclif adopted of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper?

In place of the Romish theory of the change of substance, he lays down the two-fold proposition: in the sacrament of the altar there is (*a*), true bread and true wine; (*b*), but at the same time the body and blood of Christ.

The first proposition, from the time when he began independently to examine the doctrine of the Supper, Wiclif always lays down with distinctness, establishes with clearness, and defends without any vacillation. The grounds upon which he rests it, we have already seen from his criticism of the opposite doctrine. He takes his stand first of all upon holy Scripture, in as much as Christ's words of institution, and the language of St. Paul in agreement therewith, speak of the real bread (and the wine) as the body of Christ (and the blood.) The proposition is next confirmed by the testimonies of many fathers and teachers of the first thousand years of the history of the Church;[432] and farther, Wiclif throws light upon it by the analogy of a central truth of the Christian faith. He places his doctrine of the Supper in the light of the foundation truth of the person of the God-man. The orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ is that He is both God and Man, both creator and created,—neither solely creature, nor creator solely. In like manner, the sacrament of the altar is both earthly and heavenly—at once real or very bread,

and the real or very body of Christ.[433] This latter is, according to his showing in several places, the true and orthodox view of the sacrament (*catholici dicunt*), whereas the view which maintains that in the Supper there is exclusively present the body of Christ, and not bread, at least only the accidents and therefore only the appearance of bread, is heretical, and infected with a certain Docetism which is even worse than the ancient Docetism in reference to the humanity of Christ.

The second proposition, which forms, in connection with the first, the Wiclif-doctrine of the Supper, could not miss being touched upon already in what precedes. It declares that "the sacrament of the altar is Christ's body and blood." But how is this meant? The question is a difficult one to answer. That Christ's body and blood are in the Sacrament Wiclif has always maintained; but *how* he conceived of the relation between the body and blood and the consecrated bread and wine has, down to the present time, remained much in the dark. Is his meaning possibly this—that the body of Christ is only represented by the consecrated bread; in other words, that what is visible in the Supper is merely a figure—a sign of the invisible? or does Wiclif mean to maintain a real existence, the actual or very presence of the body of Christ in the Supper? Does Wiclif's view stand related intellectually to Zwingli's or to Luther's? This is the question.

Now the fact indeed is indisputable that Wiclif in repeated instances expresses himself as though his view was that the visible in the sacrament of the altar was simply and only a sign and figure of the invisible. He says, *e.g.*, "The sacramental bread represents or exhibits, in a sacramental manner, the body of Christ Himself," or, "The bread is the figure

of Christ's body."[434] He who looks at such expressions superficially can easily think himself justified in assuming that Wiclif held a view which approximates to the Zwinglian opinion. That would, however, be a hasty judgment. For, not to look as yet at expressions used by him of quite a different content, in the passages given above, it is by no means said that the visible in the sacrament is nothing more than a sign, or figure, or memorial of the invisible, of the body and blood of Christ. Add to this that the connection in which these passages stand, especially in the *Trialogus*, has always a polemical bearing, and is by no means intended to set forth directly and categorically the view entertained by the author himself. But what is of decisive weight is the circumstance that, in by far the largest number of places, Wiclif expresses himself *positively* in the sense of a real presence of the body and blood of Christ. It does not amount to much, indeed, when in one place he declares his readiness to believe in a deeper sense of the sacrament than the figurative one, in case he shall have been taught it by the Word of God or by sound reason (*si ex fide vel ratione doctus fuero*),[436] for this readiness is one very stringently conditioned. But, on the other hand, there are not wanting expressions in which Wiclif very plainly discards the view that the bread is *only* a figure of the body of Christ, and declares on the contrary that the bread *is* Christ's body. In one passage he reminds the reader that the question relates to a subject of the faith which has been revealed to us, and that men therefore must give heed to the teaching of Scripture upon it; and, just as it is admitted, on Scripture grounds, that this sacrament *is* the body of Christ, and not merely a sacramental figure of His body, so must it be unconditionally conceded, upon the same authority, that the

bread which is this sacrament is in very truth the body of Christ.[436] In another work (*De Apostasia*) Wiclif says precisely, that if it is denied that the bread in the sacrament is the body of Christ, men fall into the error of Berengarius, who placed himself in opposition to the Word of God and the four great doctors of the Church.[437] Accordingly, we venture to maintain with all decision that Wiclif does not satisfy himself with the idea of a presence of Christ's body, which is only represented by signs, and subjectively apprehended by the communicant, but believes and teaches a true and real objective presence of the same in the Supper.[438]

There is then a real presence of Christ's body in the Supper; yet is not this to be understood as if the body of Christ were present in a local or corporeal manner. This Wiclif denies with the utmost decision. In a substantial, corporeal, and local manner the body of Christ is in heaven, but not in the sacrament. Only the bread (the Host) is substantially, corporeally, locally, and quantitatively in the sacrament, but not Christ's body.[439] Of course the question then arises, If not in a corporeal and local manner, then in what manner is Christ's body (and blood) present in the sacrament, as it is still maintained to be really present? To this question Wiclif does not omit to supply an answer. He distinguishes a threefold manner of presence of Christ's body in the consecrated Host, an effectual, a spiritual, and a sacramental presence: *effectual* (*virtualis*), as He is in His kingdom, everywhere, doing good, dispensing the blessings of nature and of grace; *spiritual*, as He graciously indwells in the souls of the faithful; *sacramental*, as He is present in a peculiar manner in the consecrated Host. And while the second manner of presence presupposes the first, the third manner again presupposes the second.[440] The glorified body

of Christ is operative and spiritual. Christ, as to His human nature, is present at every point of the world, therefore also in the Host; but the distinctive manner of presence, which belongs exclusively to the latter, is the sacramental presence of the body of Christ.[441]

But what does this last mean? So must we needs ask once more; and here Wiclif's answer is simple—This presence is a miracle. It rests upon the divine ordinance—upon the words of institution. By virtue of the sacramental words, a supernatural change takes place, by means of which bread and wine remain indeed what they are in their own substance, but from that moment are in truth and reality Christ's body and blood.[442] Not as if the glorified body of Christ descends out of heaven to that Host which is consecrated anywhere in a church; no! it remains above in heaven fixed and immovable, and only in a spiritual, invisible manner is it present in every point of the consecrated Host, as the soul is present in the body.[443] And on this account we are able to see the body of Christ in the sacrament, not with the bodily, but only with the spiritual eye—that is, with the eye of faith; and when we break the consecrated Host we break not the body of Christ—we handle Him not with the bodily touch—we do not chew and eat Him corporeally, but we receive Him spiritually.[444] The Host is not itself Christ's body, but undoubtedly this latter is in a sacramental manner concealed in it.[445] In scholastic language, it is not a question about identification or about impanation. Both of these ideas Wiclif rejects,[446]—not only the former, according to which two things differing in kind and number were alleged to become one and the same in kind and number, but also the latter. The idea of impanation supported itself upon that of the incarnation. In like manner

as the Son of God became man without ceasing to be God, or without the human nature passing into the divine, but in such wise that the Godhead forms with the manhood one inseparable God-manhood; so analogously, it was thought, did the body of Christ become bread in the Supper; not in the sense of the bread ceasing to be bread, but in the sense of the glorified body of Christ entering into a perfect union with the real bread. This theory Wiclif sets aside as well as the other of the identification of the bread with the body of Christ.[447] Neither "impanation" nor "identification" was Wiclif's contention, but only a sacramental presence of the body of Christ in and with the consecrated Host, wrought by the virtue of the words of institution—what he also calls a "spiritual," *i.e.*, an invisible presence. He expresses his doctrine of the Supper compendiously in the proposition,—"As Christ is at once God and man, so the sacrament of the altar is at once Christ's body and bread—bread in a natural manner, and body in a sacramental manner."[448] Still more compactly does he concentrate his thoughts in the short expression, "The sacrament of the altar is the body of Christ in the form of the bread."[449]

Returning to the characteristic touched upon above, according to which the presence of the glorified body of Christ in the Supper is a spiritual presence—like the indwelling of the soul in the body—it follows from this view, as already mentioned, that we see Christ's body in the sacrament not with the bodily, but only with the spiritual eye—that we do not touch Him corporeally, and therefore, also, cannot receive and enjoy Him corporeally, but only spiritually. To this circumstance Wiclif more than once refers, emphasizing it intentionally, and drawing from it without reserve the conclusion which is its necessary out-

come.[450] He remarks that the believer's desire is to partake of the body of Christ not corporeally, but spiritually; and therefore it is that the Omniscient has connected that spiritual manner of presence with the Host which is to be eaten by the believer, and has set aside another manner of the presence because it would be superfluous. Only unbelievers, or persons of a Jewish spirit, join in the murmur of those who, in John vi. 60-61, went back and said, "It is a hard saying," because they understood him to say that a body behoved to be corporeally eaten.[451] In more than one place Wiclif appeals to the word of Christ in John vi. 63—"It is the Spirit that quickeneth—the flesh profiteth nothing."[452] I might go the length of maintaining that this expression appears to him, taken along with the words of institution, "This is my body," as the fundamental passage on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The corporeal eating of the bread in the sacrament and the spiritual eating stand as wide asunder from one another, in his view, as the heaven from the earth. A swine or a shrew-mouse is able to consume it carnally,[453] but spiritually they are incapable of enjoying it, because to them faith and soul are wanting.

As Wiclif makes the actual receiving of the body of Christ in the sacrament dependent upon faith, he must necessarily, as a consequent thinker, have held that only the believing communicants are partakers in fact of the body and blood of Christ — while the unbelieving receive exclusively only the visible signs, and not the invisible body of Christ. Up to the present time, it is true, no passage had been found in which this latter thought was expressed in clear and unambiguous terms.[454] But in the sermon on the Sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel, which has already been repeatedly quoted, I find also this thought

declared without disguise. Here Wiclif distinguishes sharply between corporeal and spiritual tasting of the sacramental food. And in accordance with this, he not only maintains that any one who has not received the sacramental food, may, notwithstanding, truly partake of the flesh and blood of Christ by means of faith—*e.g.*, John the Baptist; but he also declares his belief that the non-elect do not in fact partake of Christ's body and blood, as little as Christ is a partaker of the non-elect—and as little as the man who has partaken of indigestible food can be said to have really consumed it.[455]

Taking a survey once more of Wiclif's whole investigation of the Lord's Supper, to which he almost constantly returned during the last four years of his life, whatever was the point of Christian doctrine he was discussing at the time, and which he treated of in sermons and popular tracts, as well as in disputations and scientific works, it is impossible not to be impressed with the intellectual labour, the conscientiousness, and the force of will—all equally extraordinary, which he applied to the solution of the problem which he proposed to himself in this particular. With a courage drawn from the sense of duty and from the might of truth, he nobly dared to undertake the dangerous conflict with doctrine which he had come to look upon as a heresy opposed to the teaching of Scripture, dishonouring to God, and the source at the same time of numerous errors, abuses, and mischiefs. His attack upon the dogma of transubstantiation was one so concentrated, and delivered from so many sides, that the scholastic conception was shaken to its very foundations.[456]

The animated polemic which was directed against Wiclif, and the strong measures which were taken by the hierarchy

against him and his party, are the loudest testimonies to the importance of the attack which called forth this resistance. Although Huss and the Hussites, the Calixtines at least, did not continue Wiclif's opposition to transubstantiation, his early labours in this field bore fruit in the sixteenth century. The theory which he had so violently shaken fell to the ground as the result of the German and Swiss Reformations; and it is well worth remarking that Luther's judgment of transubstantiation, although he considered it to be a milder kind of bondage of the sacrament, yet agrees in many parts with that hostile criticism which Wiclif had developed against it 140 years before.[457]

As to Wiclif's positive doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it will hardly be denied either that it is thought out with an uncommon amount of acuteness, or that it does justice to the holiness of the sacrament and its dignity as a real means of grace. It consists, to recur to this once more, of a twofold proposition. The *first* proposition, "The sacrament of the altar after consecration, as well as before, is true bread and true wine," requires no further elucidation, especially as it has found recognition in all the Protestant confessions. The *second* proposition, "The sacrament of the altar after consecration is the body and blood of Christ," affirms the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, but not on that account a local and corporeal, but a sacramental and spiritual presence of the same, similarly as the soul is present in every part of the human body. When it is affirmed here with emphasis that the body of Christ in the Supper can only be spiritually seen, received, and enjoyed, but not corporeally, because it is only present spiritually, and when, in consequence, it is only to believers that a real participation of the body of Christ in the Supper is attributed, while to the un-

believing, on the contrary, such participation is denied, it is at this point that the difference of Wiclif's eucharistic doctrine and Luther's falls with the strongest light upon the eye. For it is certain that Luther, at least from the time of his controversy with Carlostadt, taught a corporeal receiving of Christ's body and blood, and as connected with this, a partaking of the body of Christ on the part both of worthy and unworthy communicants. In close connection with the corporeal receiving of Luther, and as a necessary preliminary to it, stands Luther's doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ; whereas Wiclif firmly and distinctly maintains the contrary view, that the body of Christ remains in heaven, and does not descend into every consecrated Host. But notwithstanding these points of difference, Wiclif's doctrine of the Eucharist, with its real but spiritual presence of Christ's body stands nearer to the Lutheran doctrine of the Supper than it does to the Zwinglian, or even to the Calvinistic doctrine; in so far, at all events, as Wiclif understands an immediate presence of the body and blood of Christ, instead of assuming only a communion with Christ's body and blood effected by the Holy Ghost (*spiritus sancti virtute*). Wiclif's doctrine of the Supper deserves at least sincere recognition and high estimation, on account of the harmonious union which it exhibits of the power of original laborious thought with the energy of a mature and solid Christian faith.[458]

NOTES TO SECTION XII.

372. *Vide Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1847, pp. 597-636.

373. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 1, p. 244: Signum; sacrae rei signum; invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma, ut similitudinem gerat et causa existat.

374. *Ib.*: Quomodo ergo sunt solum septem sacramenta distincta specifice? . . p. 245: Mille autem sunt talia sensibilia signa in scriptura, quae habent tantam rationem sacramenti, sicut habent communiter ista septem.

375. *Trialogus*, p. 246.

376. *Ib.*, p. 245 f. : Nec didici pictatias, ex quibus adjectis hoc nomen sacramentum limitari debet univoce ad haec septem.

377. *Ib.*, IV., 11, p. 281: Secundum ordinem, quo sacramenta in scriptura sacra expressius sunt fundata. The difference among the sacraments in this respect was never entirely forgotten even in the Middle Ages, at least not in scientific theology. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were always recognised as sacraments of the first rank, so to speak, inasmuch, especially, as they were instituted personally and directly by the Redeemer Himself, a fact which was prominently put forward by Alexander of Hales.

378. *Ib.*, IV., c. 2, p. 247.

379. *Ib.*, IV., c. 25, p. 333 f.

380. *De Civili Dominio*, I., 43, MS. 1341, fol. 120, col. 2 : Sacramenta baptismatis et pönitentiae, cum quibus Deus pepigit realiter conferre gratiam, ... quodcunque officium humanitus limitatum, cum quo Deus non determinavit se conferre gratiam.

381. *De Ecclesia*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 192, col. 1 : Non nego, quin necesse sit, nos in vita intendere signis sensibilibus, in quibus stat modo suo christiana religio, cum debemus credere, quod omnia sacramenta sensibilia, rite administrata habent efficaciam salutarem.

382. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 33, col. 3 : He speaks of *capaces*, communicants to whom the sacrament is of profit ; and in *De Ecclesia*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 193, col. 3, he speaks of the faith of the communicants, of *fidelcs, pii fideles*, to whom the Lord's Supper brings blessing, although the ministrant priest be wicked.

383. The Augsburg Confession, indeed, in Art. 8, expressly mentions only Donatists and the like as those qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse. But the *Apology* expresses itself, in Art. 4, p. 150, ed. Rechenberg, more clearly and fully. It remarks in the style of an authentic interpretation : Satis clare diximus in Confessione, nos improbare Donatistas et Viglevistas, qui senserunt homines peccare accipientes sacramenta ab indignis in ecclesia. Even here, indeed, Wiclif himself is not named, but in all probability the Wiclifites are meant in the sense of including their Master, not the reverse.

384. Orthunius Gratius, *Fasciculus Rerum Expetend. ac Fugiend*, 1535, fol. CXXXIII. Mansi, *Conciliorum Nova Collectio*, Vol. XXVII., 632 f.

385. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 157 ; Lewis, p. 107.

386. *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesia Cath.*, Venet. 1571, III., 11 f.

387. The proposition runs thus in the *Acts of the Council:* Dubitare debent fideles si moderni haeretici conficiunt vel rite ordinant vel ministrant alia sacramenta. Quia non est evidentia, quod Christus assistit tali pontifici, propter hoc quod tam hianter super illam hostiam sic mentitur, et in sua conversatione dicit contrarium vitae Christi.

388. *Trialogus*, IV c. 10, p. 280 f. : . . . . quandocunque Christus operatur

cum homine, et solum tunc conficit sacramentum, quod reputari debet de nostris sacerdotibus et supponi.

389. *Trialogus*, c. 12, p. 286: Reputamus . . . absque dubitatione, quod infantes rite baptisati flumine sint baptisati tertio baptismate (scil. baptismo flaminis), cum habent gratiam baptismalem.

390. *De Ecclesia*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 189, col. 4: Hic videtur mihi indubie, quod nullus praescitus est pars vel gerens officium tanquam de s. matre ecclesia; habet tamen intra illam ecclesiam ad sui damnationem et ecclesiae utilitatem certa officia, etc.

391. *Ib.*, fol. 190, col. 3: Videtur autem mihi, quod praescitus, etiam in mortali ocato actuali, ministrat fidelibus, licet sibi damnabiliter, tamen subjectis utiliter sacramenta. Wiclif expresses himself to the same effect, and quite unmistakeably in *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, MS. 1294, fol. 33, col. 3: Nisi christianus fuerit Christo unitus per gratiam, non habet Christum salvatorem, nec sine falsitate dicit verba sacramentalia, licet prosint capacibus. And in an English Tract: How preiere (prayer) of good men helpeth moche (much), he says, c. 4, In prayer, it is true, everything depends upon the spirit and character of the praying man; but the case is otherwise with the sacraments and their administration: Thes (these) Antichristis sophistris (sophisters) schulden knowe well, that a cursed man doth fully the sacramentis, though it be to his dampnynge, for they ben not autouris (authors) of thes sacramentis, but God keepith that dignyte to hymself. *Select English Works*, III., 227. In the work *De Dominio Divino*, III., c. 6, Wiclif had already set forth the principle roundly and fully, that the efficacy of the means of grace upon the congregation was not injured by the moral character of the ministrant who administered them, MS. 1294, fol. 251, col. 3: Et si praedico appetitu indebito coactus ex commodo temporali, adhuc cum credita sint mihi ex officio eloquia praedicandi, adhuc est officium utile auditori, cum ministerium sacramenti non inficitur ex ministro.

392 Not so early as 1379—as Böhringer makes it, *Kirche Christi*, II., p. 340—it was not till two years later that he first stood forward against that dogma.

393. Vaughan, in *Life and Opinions, etc.*, Vol. II., 58, limited himself to the remark "Of the steps which determined his hostile movements relating to it, we are only partially informed. He knew of nothing further to say than that Wiclif was led to this result by his studies of Scripture."

394. *Responsiones ad argumenta cujusdam æmuli veritatis*, MS., 3929, c. 16, fol. 114, col. 3: Confiteor tamen, quod in haeresi de accidente sine subjecto per tempus notabine sum seductus.

395. *De Dominio Civili*, II., c. 8, MS. 1341, fol. 179, col. 2: Sacerdos fuit in coena corpus suum conficiens.

396. *Ib.*, I. c. 36, MS. 1341, fol. 85, col. 2: Proportionabiliter de eucaristiae confectione. . . . . et sibi similibus est dicendum; sacerdos enim "conficit corpus Christi," *i.e.*, facit ministratorie, quod corpus Christi sit sub accidentibus per verba sacra.

397. No doubt the same dogma is assumed as often as we meet with expressions

such as *Christum conficere*, and the like, *e.g.*, *De Civili Dominio*, II., c. 18, MS. 1341, fol. 249, col. 2: sacerdos, qui debet quotidie praeparare templum Christo, quem conficit.

398. *Evangelia de Sanctis, i.e., Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XL., MS. 3918, fol. 127, col. 1 f. These sermons, and particularly the sermon in question, the last of the series, belong, as is known by several marks, to the year 1380. To aid in the understanding of the passage, it is further to be presumed that it relates to the interpretation and sense of an expression of Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, IV., c. 4 (which was admitted into the Corpus juris canon. *De Consecratione, Distinctio*, II., c. 55). The words of the Father are these, "Et sic quod erat panis ante consecrationem, jam corpus Christi est post consecrationem." It is a passage which was often discussed in the Middle Age, and one which Berengar of Tours, *De Sacra Coena*, often occupied himself with. Comp. Vischer's Edition of Berengar, Berlin, 1834, p. 132 f., 178 f. Wiclif calls his own interpretation of Ambrose's words, *glosa Ambrosii*, and defends it against the charge of being heretical. In answer to which Wiclif takes his stand upon the language of Holy Scripture: Et notitiam istius modi loquendi vellem haereticos illos attendere, qui abjiciunt glosam istam Ambrosii tanquam haereticam, quod post consecrationem hostiae non remanet panis, sed quod fuit panis, dicendum est esse solummodo corpus Christi. Hoc est, secundum glosam verborum Ambrosii dicendum est, esse solum principaliter corpus Christi. Est enim modus loquendi scripturae, subintelligendo adverbium "simpliciter" exprimere hujusmodi negativas. Then follow the passages, Mark ix. 37; Eph. vi. 12; Joh. vi. Nunquam ergo glosa sufficiens pro evangelio sufficit et Ambrosio, qui in modo loquendi fuerat assiduus ejus sequax. [In this sentence there is certainly an error of the copyist; it should perhaps be read: Numquid . . . . sequax? or Nonne, etc.] Quomodo ergo negandum foret, quod panis remanet post consecrationem, ex hoc, quod remanet principaliter corpus Christi?

399. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 2, Oxford, 1869, p. 248: Inter omnes haereses, quae unquam in ecclesia pullularunt, nunquam considero aliquam plus callide per hypocritas introductam et multiplicius populum defraudantem; nam spoliat populum, facit ipsum committere idolatriam, negat fidem scripturae, et per consequens ex infidelitate multicipliciter ad iracundiam provocat veritatem. Comp. c. 5. p. 261: Antichristus in ista haeresi destruit grammaticam, logicam et scientiam naturalem; sed quod magis dolendum est, tollit sensum evangelii.

Ib., IV., c. 6, p. 262: Istam . . . . reputo causam lapsus hominum in istam haeresim, quod discredunt evangelio, et leges papales ac dicta apocrypha plus acceptant. Comp. c. 7, p. 266: cujus causa est, quod praelati . . . . non sint propter legem antichristi in lege Domini studiosi. Comp. c. 5, p. 261: Antichristus in ista haeresi . . . . quod magis dolendum est, tollit sensum evangelii. *Responsiones ad argumenta cusjusdam aemuli veritatis*, c. 16, MS., 1338, fol. 114, col. 3: Fides scripturae, cum rationes humanae hic deficiunt, est specialiter attendendum (*sic*).

401. *Ib.*, IV., c. 2, p. 250.

402. *Ib.*, IV., c. 4, p. 257. *XXIV. Miscel. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 130, col. 2.

403. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 4, p. 256, and more fully, c. 9, p. 247 f.

404. *Wyckett*, p. 18, in the new reprint, Oxford, 1828.

405. *Ib.*, p. 11 : In all holy scripture from the begynnyng of Genesis to the end of the Apocalips there be no wordes wrytten of the makyng of Christes bodye, etc.

406. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 2, p. 249 : Ipsa curia ante solutionem diaboli cum antiqua sententia . . . . planius concordavit . . . . et sic est de omnibus sanctis doctoribus, qui usque ad solutionem Sathanae istam materiam pertractarunt. Comp. p. 250, and c. 3, p. 254. *XXIV. Miscel. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 128, col. 3 : Et ista est sententia Jeronimi in Epistola ad Elvidiam, qui indubie plus scivit de sensu evangelii, quam omnes sectae modernae noviter introductae. *Dialogus*, c. 15, MS. 1387, fol. 153, col. 1 : The reader is reminded of what wa remarked above, of Wiclif's view of the course of the history of the Church at large, viz., that the first 1000 years of that history was the millenium of Christ since which date Satan is loosed.

407. *Ib.*, IV., 5, p. 261. *De Eucharistia*, c. 2, MS. 1387, fol. 6, col. 2 : Novella ecclesia ponit transsubstantiationem panis et vini in corpus Christi et sanguinem ; fol. 7, col. 1 : Ecclesia primitiva illud non posuit, sed ecclesia novella, ut quidam infideliter et infundabiliter sompniantes baptisarunt terminum, etc.

408. *Ib.*, IV., 4, p. 257 : Ideo vel oportet veritatem scripturae suspendere, vel cum sensu ac judicio humano concedere, quod est panis. Comp. c. 5, p. 259 : Inter omnes sensus extrinsecos, quos Deus dat homini, tactus et gustus sunt in suis judiciis magis certi ; sed illos sensus haeresis ista confunderet sine causa, etc.

409. *Ib.*, p. 257 ; c. 5, p. 260 : Mures autem habent servatam notitiam, de panis substantia sicut primo, sed istis infidelibus istud deest.

410. *Saints' Day Sermons* (*Sermones de Sanctis*), No. LIX., MS. 3928, fol. 124, col. 1 : Facit miraculosa ipsa accidentia per se esse ; cujus somnii causam ego non video, nisi quia deficiunt eis miracula sensibilia, ... fingunt false insensibilia miracula, etc. Wiclif repeatedly calls the proposition in question a fiction, *e.g.*, *Trialogus*, IV., 3, p. 253.

411. *Ib.*, No. XLVII., MS. 3928, fol. 96, col. 2 : Nescit ista generatio, quid sit sacramentum altaris . . . . dicit unus, quod est quantitas, et alius, quod est qualitas, et tertius, quod est nihil.

412. *Trialogus*, IV., 6, p. 263 f. Comp. *XXIV. Miscel. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 130, col. 2 : Et reperi multos in fide sua diabolica variari, sic quod vix duos reperi in eandem sententiam consentire.

413. *Ib.*, IV., 6, p. 258 : Deus nec destruit naturam impeccabilem nec confundit notitiam naturaliter nobis datam, nisi subsit major utilitas et probabilitas rationis.

414. *Ib.*, IV., 4, 255 f.

415. *Ib.*, IV., 6, p. 264 : Comp. *Sermones de Sanctis*, No. XII., MS., 3928, fol. 22 col. 2 : Sed dicunt, se esse consecratores, accidentium, et virtute suae benedictionis panem oblatum destrui, non sacrari.

416. *Ib.*, IV., 5, p. 261 : O quis posset fratres et alios apostatas excusare, quod . . . . nolunt . . . . populum docere, de quo . . . . accipiunt tantum lucrum ; c. 6, p. 264 : Praelati praesumunt propter pecuniam benedicere a Domino maledictis.

417. *Trialogus*, IV., 7, p. 279: Nec prodest fratribus negantibus istam hostiam adorari, sed propter assistentiam corporis Domini venerari. . . . . Ideo oportet hos fratres dicere, quod populus adorans hanc hostian ut Corpus Domini sit idolatra de lumine fidei desolatus. It is worthy of remark that zealous defenders of the Roman doctrine of the Supper were still shy of committing themselves to the proper devotion of the monstrance. Two centuries later the Council of Trent had no longer any hesitation in claiming for the sanctissimum the full worship which is due to the true God. *Sessio* XIII., *Decr. de ss. Eucharistiae Sacramento*, cap. 5: Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in catholica ecclesia semper recepto latriae cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant. Concilii Trid. . . . canones et decreta, cura Guil. Smets, ed. 4, Bielefeld, 1854, p. 58.

418. *Wyckett*, Oxford 1828, p. vi.: For where fynde ye, that ever Christ or any of his disciples or apostels taught any man to worshipe it (*sc.* the secret hoost—sacred host).

419. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 4, col. 2: Et forte multi christiani nomine infidelitate paganis pejores; nam minus malum foret, quod homo id quod primo videt mane, per totum residuum diei honorat ut Deum, quam regulariter illud accidens, quod videt in missa inter manus sacerdotis in hostia consecrata, sit realiter Deus suus. In his confession on the Supper Wiclif calls his opponents cultores accidentium, Lewis, *History*, 328.

420. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 4, p. 258: Certu sum, quod idolatrae, qui fabricant sibi Deos, satis noscunt, quid sint in suis naturis, licet fingant, quod habeant aliquid numinis a Deo Deorum supernaturaliter eis datum.

421. *De Blasphemia*, c. 15, MS. 3933, fol. 165, col. 4: Sic indubie faciunt (*i.e.*, blasphemiam Christo imponunt) hodie sacerdotes Baal, qui dicunt se esse accidentium factores. Comp. 167, col. 3: illud accidens, quod sacerdotes Baal consecrant. Confessio, in Lewis, *History*, 332, and in *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, 134: sacerdotes Baal, in opposition to sacerdos Christi.

422. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 10, p. 281: Visa hostia adoro ipsam conditionaliter, et omnimode deadoro corpus Domini, quod erst sursum; as above, c. 7, p. 269: Et tamen nos ex fide scripturae evidentius et . . . . devotius adoramus hanc hostiam vel crucem Domini vel alias imagines humanitus fabricatas.

423. *Ib.*, IV., c. 7, p. 269: Certum est, quod in qualibet creatura est Trinitas increata, et illa est longe perfectior, quam est corpus. The reading *corpus Christi* is evidently a gloss. Confessio in Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, 125: Nam in quacunque substantia creata est Deitas realius et substantialius quam corpus Christi in hostia consecrata. *XXIV. Miscel. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 132, col. 2: Ipsi autem dicunt, quod est (scil. hoc sacramentum) accidentium congregatio, quorum quodlibet in natura sua est infinitum imperfectius, quam materialis substantia signanda.

424. *Wyckett*, ed. Oxford, 1828, VI.: And thou then, that art an earthely man, by what reason mayst thou saye, that thou makest thy maker? p. 16: By what reason then saye ye that be synners, than ye make God?

425. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 2, col. 2: Nihil enim horribilius, quam

quod quilibet sacerdos celebrans facit vel consecrat quotidie corpus Christi. Nam Deus noster non est Deus recens. In *Trialogus*, IV., c. 7, p. 268, it is remarked, but still with some reserve, that what is said in Matt. xxiv. 15 of "the abomination of desolation in the holy place," seems to have its terminating application to the consecrated Host. Whereas in the English popular tract called the *Wyckett*, the thought that transubstantiation is the abomination in the holy place foretold by Daniel xi. 31, xii. 11, is the thread which runs through the whole. The tract takes its title *Wyckett* from the Redeemer's language concerning the strait gate and the narrow way which leadeth unto life; for the tract sets out from that language and comes back to it at its close. Its substance is in brief the following:—"Christ hath revealed to us that there are two ways, one leading to life, the other leading to death; the former narrow, the latter broad. Let us therefore pray to God to strengthen us by His grace in the spiritual life, that we may enter in through the strait gate, and that He would defend us in the hour of temptation. Such temptation to depart from God and fall into idolatry is already present, when men declare it to be heresy to speak the Word of God to the people in English, and when they would press upon us, instead of this, a false law and a false faith, viz., the faith in the consecrated Host. This is of all faiths the falsest." The latter thesis is proved by a series of reasons which constitute the largest part of the tract. It closes with the exhortation to earnest prayer, that God may shorten this evil time, and close up the broad way and open up the narrow way by means of holy Scripture, so that we may come to the knowledge of God's will, serve Him in godly fear, and find the road to everlasting bliss. Thus the warning against the doctrine of change of substance in the Eucharist forms the substance of the whole tract, and this doctrine is contested as "the abomination of desolation in the holy place"—*i.e.*, the profanation of the sanctuary by heathenish idolatry. "Truly this must needs be the worst synne, to say that ye make God, and it is the abhominacion of dyscomforte that is fayd in Daniel the prophete standynge in the holy place" (p. 2, XVI.). Comp. p. 17. This small tract is conjectured by Shirley to have been originally a sermon (*Catalogue*, p. 33), and appeared in print first in Nuremberg, 1546, and this original edition is closely followed by the new edition prepared by Mr. Panton, a successor to Wiclif in the parish of Lutterworth, which appeared in Oxford in 1828. I am inclined to believe, however, that the use of the name of "Nüremberg" was only a feint, and that the tract may really have been printed in England; for the original edition, so far as my researches go, is not to be found either in Nuremberg nor in any other library of Germany, a fact which would be quite unaccountable if it had really proceeded from a German press. Add to this the circumstance that 1546, the last year of Henry VIII.'s life, was a year marked by many persecutions of Protestants by Protestants, so that the concealment of publications and the intentional misleading of inquisitorial search by the fiction of foreign printing places might well be thought advisable. These reasons for thinking that the tract may have been printed in England itself find a strong confirmation in the whole style of the original edition, the typography of which, as Mr. Thomas Arnold has kindly communicated to me in answer to my inquiries, and as he has been assured by learned bibliographers, points either to the English presses of the 16th century or to those of Antwerp.

426. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 2, col. 3 : Sicut laudative, non effective benedicimus tam Deo quam Domino, sic et benedicimus corpori Christi et sanguini non faciendo illum esse beatum vel sanctum, sed laudando et promulgando sanctitatem, quam in corpore suo instituit ; et sic ymmolamus Christum, et ipsum offerimus Deo patri.

427. *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae Praeludium*, in *Lutheri Opera lat. ad Ref. Historiam Pertinentia, curavit* Henr. Schmidt, Francof. ad Moen. 1868, vol. V., 28 : Prima ergo captivitas hujus sacramenti est quoad ejus substantiam seu integritatem. etc.

428. In all his writings from 1381 onwards in Latin and English, learned and popular, also in his sermons, Wiclif continually recurs to this doctrine, which had now become the hinge or the pole of all his thoughts, and he lives in the conviction that "for this righteous contention, when this brief, poor life is over, the Lord in his mercy will most bountifully reward him."—*Trial.*, c. 6, p. 262.

429. *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus.* . . . . ed. Franciscus Palacky, Prag. 1867, p. 124, f., a letter to his friends in Constance, No. 78, den 16, Juni 1415 ; and to Hawlik in Prag, den 21, Juni, No. 80.

430. *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae.* Opp. lat., V. 29 : Itaque non hoc ago, ut vi rapiatur utraque species, quasi necessitate praecepti ad eam cogamur. . . . . Tantum hoc volo, ne quis romanam tyrannidem justificet, quasi recte fecerit, unam speciem laicis prohibens, etc.

430. *Ib.*, p. 29 : Altera captivitas ejusdem sacramenti mitior est, quod ad conscientiam spectat.

431. *Ib.*, p. 35 : Tertia captivitas ejusdem sacramenti est longe impiissimus ille abusus, quo factum est, ut fere nihil sit hodie in ecclesia . . . . magis persuasum, ... quam missam esse opus bonum et sacrificium. Qui abusus deinde inundavit infinitos alios abusus, etc. This language becomes still stronger in the piece *Of the Abuse of the Mass*, written in 1522. Jena. ed. 1588, fol. 10, that the priesthood and mass-offering is no doubt the work of the devil, wherewith he has misled and deceived the world.

432. In the *Confessio Magistri Jo. Wiclif*, in Lewis' Appendix p. 329 (comp. Vaughan's *Life and Opinions*, etc., II., 432. *Fasc. Zizan.*, Shirley, p. 126, f.), seven witnesses are produced with their statements, Ignatius, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustin, Hieronymus, the Roman Church itself in a Decretal under Nicolaus II., and the Canon of the Mass as expressive of the use of the Church. The same citations word or word I find in Wiclif's book, *De Apostasia*, c. 17, MS. 1343, fol. 114, col. 2.

433. It is an apt and happy thought of Wiclif to put the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and that of the person of Christ in parallelism with each other. For both these articles of doctrine stand, in point of fact, in a near relation and alliance. On one occasion Wiclif goes into this parallel in a sermon, viz., the 59th of the *Saints' Day Sermons*, MS. 3928, fol. 123, col. 4 : Sicut Christus est duarum naturarum, et haeretici circa ejus personam dupliciter errarunt, sic est de materia de sacramento altaris. Quidam autem haeretici posuerunt, Christum esse verum Deum vel angelum, et non hominem sive corpus, sed assumpsisse corpus fantasticum ad communicandum cum hominibus (Docetism). Alii autem sensibilius crediderunt,

quod Christus fuisset vere et pure homo, sic quod non Deus. . . . Et proportionaliter, sed gravius, delirant haeretici. . . . ipsum sacramentum credunt non esse corpus fantasticum, sed unum accidens sine subjecto, quod nesciunt, sive nihil. This is as much as to say that the theory of Transubstantiation is still worse than Docetism. In the English confession of the Lord's Supper, *Select Works*, III., 502, Wiclif says positively: Right so as the persoun of Christ is verrey God and verrey mon—verrey Godhead and verrey monhed—right so—the same sacrament is verrey God's body and verrey bred. Also in *De Apostasia*, MS. 1343, c. 10, fol. 73, col. 1: Wiclif sees this parallel: Unde sicut errant haeretici de Christo, alii quod est pure creatura, et alii quod est creator et non creatura, sic est duplex haeresis de sacramento altaris: ut illi dicunt, quod est panis et vinum qui praefuit (=antea fuit), sed in natura imperfectius quam panis furfureus vel venenum, alii autem remissius haeretici dicunt, quod hoc sacramentum non est terrena substantia collecta de terrae fructibus, sed omnino identice corpus Christi. Catholici autem dicunt, quod sicut Christus est duplex substantia, scilicet deitas et humanitas, et sic creator et creatura, sic sacramentum altaris in natura non abjectum accidens, sed terrena substantia,—et in signatione, figura vel modo quo aptius vocari potest, est sacramentum corporis Christi, ad quem sensum fidelis omnino debet attendere.

434. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 7, p. 267: Sic autem dici potest quod panis ille sacramentalis est ad illum modum specialiter corpus Christi. Ad illum modum, *i.e.*, in such a way that the bread sets forth in figure the body of Christ. Immediately thereafter Wiclif remarks that opponents could have nothing to object to this, in so far as they see that the sacrament is the body of Christ, *i.e.*, sacramentally signifies or figures the body itself. In this sense the *Wyckett* strongly expresses itself—"So the breade is the fygure or mynde, *i.e.*, minding or remembrance of Christes bodye in earth," p. 14, ed. Oxford.

435. *Ib.*, IV., c. 7, p. 267: Paratus sum tamen, si ex fide vel ratione doctus uero, sensum subtiliorem credere.

436. *Ib.*, IV., c. 4, p. 255; Et sicut virtute verborum fidei scripturae conceditur, quod hoc sacramentum est corpus Christi, et non solum quod erit vel figurat sacramentaliter corpus Christi, sic concedatur eadem auctoritate simpliciter, quod iste panis, qui est hoc sacramentum, est veraciter corpus Christi.

437. *De Apostasia*, c. 7, MS. 1343, fol. 64, col. 1: Si autem negatur, panem illum, qui est sacramentum, esse corpus Christi, inciditur in errorem Berengarii . . . quod est contra fidem scripturae et quatuor magnos doctores. *Confessio*, in Lewis, p. 324: Simul veritas et figura.

438. *Confessio Mag. Joannis Wiclif*, in Lewis, p. 324 (in Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 428, in *Fasc. Zizan.*, ed Shirley, p. 116): Modus essendi, quo corpus Christi est in hostia, est modus verus et realis. Hence he appeals to the church-hymn which Thomas Aquinas is known to have composed, *Pange lingua;* for the words—

> "Verbum caro panem verum
> Verbo carnem efficit,
> Fitque sanguis Christi merum,
> Etsi sensus deficit"

he interprets entirely in favour of his own view. *De Apostasia*, c. 3, MS. 1443, fol

53, col. 2; so also in *XXIV. Miscell. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 130, col. 1.

439. *Confessio*, in Lewis, p. 324: Sunt alii tres modi realiores et veriores, quos corpus Christi appropriate habet in cölo, scil. modus essendi substantialiter, corporaliter et dimensionaliter. . . . . Nullo istorum modorum trium est corpus Christi in sacramento, sed in cölo.

440. *Ib.*, p. 323, text after Shirley, p. 115 f.: Credimus enim, quod triplex est modus essendi corporis Christi in hostia consecrata, scilicet virtualis, spiritualis et sacramentalis. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 8, p. 272. Here the same thought is expressed, but less clearly than in the passage of the Confession just quoted.

441. Luther also makes use of the epithet *sacramental* to express the peculiar and, in its kind, unique union of the body of Christ and the eucharistic elements.

442. *De Apostasia*, c. 8, MS. 1343, fol. 65, col. 1: Sic in translatione ista supernaturali remanet tam panis quam vini essentia, et cum sit miraculose corpus Christi et sanguis, sortitur nomen excellentius secundum religionem, quam ex fide scripturae credimus; tamen vere et realiter ex virtute verborum sacramentalium fit corpus Christi et sanguis. Quomodo autem hoc fiat, debet fidelis sedulo perscrutari. Ego autem intelligo hoc fieri per viam sacramentalis conversionis, aut quocunque alio nomine ista mutatio catholice sit detecta.

443. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 8, p. 272: Non est intelligendum, corpus Christi descendere ad hostiam in quacunque ecclesia consecratam, sed manet sursum in cölis stabile et immotum; ideo habet esse spirituale in hostia et non esse dimensionatum et cetera accidentia quae in cölo. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 2, col. 1: Ipsum (corpus Christi) est totum sacramentaliter et spiritualiter vel virtualiter ad omnem (*sic*) punctum hostiae consecratae, sicut anima est in corpore.

444. *De Eucharistia*, as above: Et concedimus, quod non videmus in sacramento illo corpus Christi oculo corporali, sed oculo mentali, scilicet fide. Shortly before he cites the objection brought against the Christian faith by its enemies, that "the priests break the body of Christ, they break, therefore, His neck and His limbs, and that we should do this to our God is shocking." To which Wiclif replies—we break the holy sign or the consecrated Host, but not the body of Christ, for that is a different thing: frangimus sacramentum vel hostiam consecratam, non autem corpus Christi, cum distinguuntur; sicut non frangimus radium solis, licet frangamus vitrum vel lapidem cristallum. Et haec videtur sententia cantus ecclesiae, quo canitur—

> Fracto demum sacramento
> Ne vacilles, sed memento,
> Tantum esse sub fragmento,
> Quantum toto tegitur

from the 10th Strophe of the Sequenz of Thomas Aquinas: Lauda Sion Salvatorem, cf. Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, Vol. II., 97 f.

445. *Ib.*, fol. 2, col. 4: Visa hostia debemus credere, quod ipsa non sit corpus Christi, sed ipsum corpus Christi est sacramentaliter in ipsa absconditum.

446. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 8, p. 269 f.

447. It rests entirely on a misunderstanding when the Carthusian prior, Stephen

of Dolan, in his *Medulla Tritici seu Anti-Wikleffus*, Pars. IV., c. 3, *vide* Pez, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus*, Vol. IV., fol. 316, expresses the opinion that Wiclif himself first broached both the idea and the technical expression of *impanatio:* Confingis tibi (so he apostrophizes Wiclif) adinventionis terminos novo preversitatis loquendi modo . . . . impanationem videlicit corporis Christi tibi fabricans, referring to the words in *Trialogus*, IV., 8, p. 271. Woodford before Stephen knew better than this, when he quotes the word *impanari* from a controversial treatise against Berengar, written by Guitmund, Bishop of Aversa, and states that this was one of the phrases made use of by Berengar. *Vide Woodfordus adv. Jo. Wiclefum*, in *Fasciculus Rerum, etc.*, by Ortuinus Gratius, 1535, fol. 96, col. 2, edition of Edward Brown, 1690, London, fol. 192.

448. *Sermones de Sanctis*, No. LIX., MS. 3928, fol. 124, col. 2 : Veritas quidem est et fides ecclesiae, quod, sicut Christus est simul Deus et homo, sic sacramentum est simul corpus Christi et panis, panis naturaliter et corpus sacramentaliter. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 4, p. 258 : Hoc sacramentum venerabile est in natura sua verus panis et sacramentaliter corpus Christi. *Confessio*, in Lewis, 328 : Ponimus, venerabile sacramentum altaris esse naturaliter panem et vinum, sed sacramentaliter corpus Christi et sanguinem.

449. *De Apostasia*, c. 18, MS. 1343, fol. 116, col. 2 : Supponendum est, sacramentum altaris esse corpus Christi in forma panis. *Of Feyned Contemplatif Lif*, MS. in Lewis, *History*, p. 91 f. : The Eucharist is the body of Christ in the form of bread. In English *Confession of Wiclif*, in Knighton's *Chronicle: De Eventibus Angliae*, ed. Twysden, London 1652, Vol. III., p. 2650. We give the words according to the original MS. accurately printed in *Select English Works:* I knowleche, that the sacrament of the auter (altar) is verrey Goddus body in fourme of brede.

450. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 3, col. 1 : Nota ulterius ad acceptionem corporis Christi, quod non consistit in corporali acceptione—vel tactione hostiae consecratae, sed in pastione animae ex fructuosa fide.

451. *Confessio*, in Lewis, 325 : Cum ergo fidelis non optaret comedere corporaliter sed spiritualiter corpus Christi, patet quod Omnisciens aptavit illum modum spiritualem essendi corporis sui cum hostia, quae debet comedi a fideli, etc.

452. *XXIV. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 128 f. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 3, col. 1. *Confession of the Sacrament*, in Lewis, 328 ; in *Fasc. Zizan.*, ed. Shirley, 124 ; Joh. vi. 63, dicit Christus : Caro non prodest quicquam, cum nec sumptio corporalis, nec manducatio corporalis corporis Domini quicquam prodest.— *Wyckett*, Oxford, 1828, p. VII.

453. *XXVI. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 129, col. 4 : Et patet, quod, quantum differt cölum a terra, tantum differt manducare panem sacramentalem spiritualiter et manducare ipsum corporaliter. Stat enim, suem vel soricem manducare ipsum carnaliter, sed non possunt manducare spiritualiter, cum non habent fidem vel animum, quo manducent. In *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 2, col. 1, Wiclif remarks that as a lion, when he devours the body of a man, does not devour his soul along with it, although it is everywhere present in the body ; so an animal can, it is true, consume a consecrated Host, but not the body of Christ, in the sacrament.

454. Lewald, indeed, mentions it as a thought of which Wiclif is fairly convinced, that only the believer enjoys the body of the Lord. *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1846, p. 611 f. But the sentence from an Easter sermon of Wiclif quoted in an essay of the well known Hussite Jacobell (Jakob von Mies)—*Vide* Von der Hardt, *Constantiense Concilium*, Vol. III., fol. 926—is not sufficient to prove that thought, especially when the connection in which the sentence stands is observed. The sermon from which Jacobell took the sentence is the second of the *XL. Miscellaneous Sermons*, and stands in the Vienna MS. 3928, fol. 225, 226. The sentence itself occurs in fol. 236, col. 2.

455. *XXIV. Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol, 129, col. 1 : Nec dubium, quin saepe contingit hominem non cibatum sacramentaliter, verius manducare hoc corpus, ut patuit de Baptista. . . . . col. 3 : Sed sicut homo proprie non comedit cibum indigestibilem, sic praesciti nec Christum comedunt, nec ipse illos, sed tanquam superflua et indigestibilia mittit foras.

456. Even Cardinal Peter d'Ailly, †1425, expressed the opinion that the assumption of true bread and wine in the sacrament, and not of mere *accidentia*, would have much more in its favour, and would infer fewer superfluous miracles, if only the Church had not decided against it. *Vide* Luther, *De Captivitate Babylonica*, p. 20, opp. Lat. ed. Schmidt, 1868.

457. *De Captiv. Babylon*, p. 29, 30.

458. *Calvini Institutio Relig. Christ.*, IV., c. 17, s. 31, 33, in the last passage, *e.g.* : Fit incomprehensibili spiritus sancti virtute, ut cum carne et sanguine Christi communicemus.

CHAPTER IX.

THE EVENTS OF THE LAST YEARS OF WICLIF'S LIFE, 1378–1384.

SECTION I.—*The Papal Schism and its Effect upon Wiclif.*

IN the Fourth Chapter we followed the personal incidents of Wiclif's life down to the beginning of the year 1378. In this year and the preceding one the hierarchy had twice over attacked him—in 1377 the English episcopate, and in 1378 the Roman Court itself, under Gregory XI. On both occasions Wiclif had personally appeared, but on both his enemies were able to effect nothing against him. In the one case the Duke of Lancaster had stepped in to his protection, not without violence—in the other the Princess Regent had shielded him, while the citizens of the capital had stood by him with their sympathies. For three full years from this time he remained exempt from all serious annoyance.

An event, besides, took place soon after Wiclif's last examination, which seemed likely to induce on his part an abstention from all further opposition to the Church. On 27th March 1378 Pope Gregory XI. died in Rome—a year and two months after his festive entry into the city. On the twelfth day after his death, the Archbishop of Bari, Bartholomaus of Prignano, was elected Pope, who took the name of Urban VI.; and the strong moral earnestness which marked his very earliest proceedings produced so

favourable an impression in England, and upon Wiclif especially, that he indulged the joyful hope that the new Pope would put his hand energetically to the necessary reform of the Church.[1]

But Wiclif's joy over the reforming spirit of the new Pope, his uplifted and hopeful feeling was of short duration. Only too soon several of the cardinals were so much disgusted by Urban's well-meant but inconsiderate zeal, and by his haughty imperious bearing, that in the middle of May they withdrew to Anagni, where their opposition to his measures became more and more determined. Towards the end of July 1378 the French cardinals assembled at Anagni, drew up a public letter to Urban VI., in which they declared his election to have been illegal, because it had been compelled by the terrorism of the Roman mob, and called upon him to renounce his pretended Papal dignity, which he had usurped contrary to law.[2] And when this attempt proved futile, as was to be expected, and was answered by Urban in a letter of the most fanatical and peremptory kind, which he addressed to the cardinals who remained true to him,[3] the opposition took the final step of electing on 20th September at Fondi, in the Neapolitan territory, a rival Pope, in the person of the Cardinal Bishop Robert of Cambray, Count of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII.

Both parties had sued for the favour of England, even before the election of the rival Pope. When Parliament met in October 1378 in Gloucester, legates appeared from Urban VI. complaining of the injustice which he had received at the hand of many of the cardinals; and commissioners also, from the opposition party of the College of Cardinals, bringing several writings, in which it was attempted to win over to their side the English Church.[4] These writings, in-

deed, took no effect, for the Church of England continued to adhere to Urban VI.; but already men had had a first taste of the fruits of the commencing schism, which was to extend throughout the whole of western Christendom, and to continue for the next thirty years.

In earlier centuries the schisms created in the Church by the election of rival Popes, had produced in the minds of men the most profound impressions. The world's faith in the unity and immutability of the Church, its confidence in the sanctity of the Pontiff in Rome, had been shaken to pieces. When men beheld the vicegerents of Christ contending with envy and hate for power and honour and dominion, they began to have suspicions that in all the life and efforts of the rest of the clergy, there was in like manner nothing else to be found but a striving after higher offices and earthly advantages.[5]

It may be readily understood that the effects of a schism like that which had now broken out, were more powerfully felt than those of all previous schisms of the same kind, in proportion to its passionate character and its all-embracing extent. How deeply must a man of Wiclif's zeal for the honour of God and the well-being of His Church, and who was so acute an observer of all ecclesiastical facts, have been affected by the immense event of this Papal schism! High and joyful as the hope had been which he felt justified in entertaining by the accounts which came to hand of the first measures of Urban VI., his disappointment was equally severe when in the end Urban, not less than his rival Clement VII., injured and destroyed the unity of the Church by unbridled passion and by acts of war. I find that Wiclif by this schism was carried forward step by step in his views of the Papacy at large. The event became

a most momentous turning-point in the internal development of Wiclif, and in his position as a Reformer. His judgments concerning the Popes, the Papacy, and the right of the Papal primacy, from the commencement of the schism became always more keen, more charged with principle, more radical. In the time immediately succeeding the outbreak, Wiclif continued to recognise Urban as the rightful Pope, not only because his election had been regular, and had been carried through with honest intentions, but also because Urban himself was a man of truly upright character.[6] This latter ground, it is true, was of such a kind that, under certain pre-suppositions, it might lead to the most opposite results. And this was expressed without disguise by Wiclif himself (possibly towards the end of 1378) when he remarked: "If ever Urban departs from the right way, then is his election a mistaken one; and in this case it would be not a little for the good of the Church to want both Popes alike."

The sentiment which was here put only contingently, was one which Wiclif by-and-bye accepted definitively as just and true, under the impression made upon him by the realised results of the schism. When he was compelled to see with his own eyes that both Popes, in order to maintain their position against each other, had no scruple in using all kinds of weapons and appliances in the strife; that each put under the bann of excommunication not only his rival himself, but all his supporters; and that both parties alike, whenever possible, levied war upon each other,[7] he arrived at last at the conviction that it was not only allowable, but a plain duty, to separate himself from both Popes alike. This was something very different from the neutrality which at the beginning of the schism was observed by many lands and incorporate bodies in western Christen-

dom. When the kingdom of Castile adhered to its neutrality till May 19, 1381; when the University of Paris still remained neutral in the early months of 1379,[8] the intention of the parties was only to guard against over-haste, with the purpose in the end of recognising the Pope who should prove to have been lawfully elected. It was still felt that a Pope was indispensable. People were on their way to submit themselves to one of the two rival Popes; only, under the circumstances, they restrained themselves so far as to reserve their judgment as to who was the true Pontiff. Wiclif, on the other hand, was on his way to the issue of cutting himself loose from the Papacy itself, both on moral and religious grounds, so strongly was he repelled by the proceedings of both the rivals alike. Each of them declared his opponent publicly, most solemnly, and in God's name, "a false, pretended Pope," damned him as a schismatic, and, as much as in him lay, cut him off from the Church. And manifestly Wiclif's judgment of them was this,—They are both in the right (in their judgment of one another), *i.e.*, they are both without right (in their claims); they are both in point of fact false Popes: they have nothing to do with the Church; they are both, on the contrary, as is manifest from their doings and their lives, apostates and limbs of the devil, instead of members of the body of Christ.[9] Not only in scientific works like the *Trialogus*, or in lectures intended for the learned, but even in sermons, he spoke out without reserve against the violence of both parties against each other. It was nothing less than unchristian, and a thing before unheard of, that, by demanding the death of the rival Pope and his supporters, it was declared to be allowable that every Christian in the west of Europe might put his fellow-Christian to death; for every man held with one or

other of the two Rivals.[10] When Urban VI. issued a Bull in 1383, on the strength of which Bishop Spencer, of Norwich, undertook a crusade to Flanders, the effect of the schism in stirring up wars was brought home to Englishmen in common with other nations; and Wiclif raised a loud protest against such proceedings in a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his "Outcry touching the Crusade," and in other pieces.[11] But still worse, in his view, was the fact that even civil war was actually kindled, or at least threatened, by the opposing Popes and their fanatical adherents. Hence the reference in one of his sermons to the fact that the begging monks of England were in communication with Clement VII. (the French Pope), and were favourers of his party.[12] One circumstance alone in these melancholy circumstances appeared to him to be a judgment of God and an instance of his Providential working and that was that the two antichristian chiefs were striving to no other effect than to injure each other. He thought the best and wisest course was to stand by, and look quietly on, and let the two halves of Antichrist destroy each other.[13]

We see how neutrality between the two Popes was converted into a renunciation in principle of the Popedom itself, and ended in the conviction that the Papacy is the Antichrist, and its whole institution from the wicked one.[15] From the year 1381 we find this judgment repeatedly expressed by Wiclif. The thought and the expression gradually became quite habitual with him. From the day when this immense change took place in his convictions Wiclif's theological position and his ecclesiastical action became ever more and more decided and energetic. The work of Bible translation, which he had already taken in hand, with the help of some friends, was now pushed forward with increased

zeal and emphasis, so that the English translation of the entire Bible was completed in all probability in 1382.[16] It was probably, too, in the years between 1378 and 1382, that the training and sending forth of Wiclif's evangelical itinerant preachers began.[17] At the end of May 1382, the Archbishop of Canterbury mentions, in a Mandate to the Bishop of London, the operations of "uncalled" travelling preachers, who were alleged to be spreading erroneous doctrines. And a letter to the Archbishop by members of the University of Oxford who were opponents of Wiclif—also of the year 1382—mentions the great number of his adherents in the province of Canterbury in a way to suggest that it must have been by the preaching of his Itinerants that his reformational views were so largely spread abroad.[18] If we are not mistaken in this view, a remark made incidentally in the same document becomes all the more interesting, that the effects of which the writers of the letter complain had been accomplished "within a few years"—a hint which, in fact, may be taken as a confirmation of our suggestion, that the sending out of Itinerants had been commenced by Wiclif, in the main, since the year 1378. At all events, the Itinerancy was in full and effective operation in 1380 and following years, when, in the spring of 1382, the Supreme Church Judicatories of England found it necessary to take official action against them.

NOTES TO SECTION I.

1. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 3929, fol. 7, col. 2.

2. The literal rendering of the letter in Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, I., 382 f.

3. Comp. Walsingham, I., 385 f.

4. *Ib.*, I., 380 f.

5. Comp. on the schism which took place about the year 1044, Voigt's *Hildebrand, as Pope Gregory VII., and his Age*, 2 ed., 1846.

6. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. X., MS. 3928, fol. 19, col. 1. This is the standpoint which we find also in the *Trialogus*. In two places there, Book IV., c. 36, 37, pp. 373, 377, he speaks of Clement VII. (*Robertus Gilbonensis*), but on both occasions in such a way as to characterise both him and his party as heretical and unchristian. Whereas Urban VI., although his name does not expressly occur, is assumed to be the rightful, and a really good Pope.

7. Of the two Popes, Urban VI. was the first who threatened to overrun his enemy with a crusade, which he did in a Bull of 29th November 1378.

8. Comp. Schwab, *Joannes Gerson*, Würzburg, 1858, p. 113 f.

9. This is the standpoint taken by Wiclif in one of the latest of his known writings, viz., in the Supplement to the *Trialogus;* while in the *Trialogus* itself his position is this, that he looks upon Clement VII. as an illegitimate and inherently unworthy Pseudo-Pope, while quietly, and by implication, recognising Urban VI. In the supplement, on the contrary, he condemns both Popes as Antichrists, as monsters (*monstra*, c. 4), as incarnate devils (p. 425 f.); he praises the Lord Christ, who is the Head of the Church, that He has split the usurped head, the Pope, into two, and he laments only the stupidity of the Church that she does not withdraw herself from both these pretended and antichristian heads, but rather regards it as her duty to the faith to adhere to one of the two. The fourth chapter of the *Trialogus*, p. 423 f., treats for the most part of this subject alone. Clement VII., in Wiclif's opinion, may, comparatively speaking, be the worse Pope of the two; but it may be taken as a probable truth that neither the one nor the other is a real member of the Church, for their walk and work are opposed to Christ and the apostles; it would be better for the Church if she had no Pope at all, and held singly and alone to the Bishop of our souls in the triumphant Church above. In the 9th chap., p. 448 f., he pronounces both to be "manifest Antichrists," and warns the believers (in allusion to the Word of Christ in Matt. xxiv. 23 and 26) in these terms: "Believe it not that one or either of them is a Pope, and go not a crusading to slay the sons of the Church," etc., and in the tract on the crusade, entitled *Cruciata*, c. 8, he expresses himself in quite a similar way (see the passage from it quoted above, culminating in the assertion, quod nihil illis (Urban VI. and Clement VII.) et ecclesae Dei—neither the one nor the other has anything to do with the holy Church of God.

10. *XXIV. Miscel. Sermons*, No. 11, MS. 3928, fol. 156, col. 4.

11. *Litera Missa Archiepiscopo Cant.*, MS. 1387, fol. 105, col. 2; *Cruciata*, in 10 chap., MS. 3929, fol. 233–239.

12. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. XIV., MS. 3928, fol. 162, col. 4. The dependence of Pope Clement VII. upon the support of the French Crown converted, in fact, the Papal schism into a national question for England.

13. *De Quatuor Sectis Novellis*, MS. 3929, fol. 225, col. 3: Benedictus Deus, qui . . . divisit caput serpentis, movens unam partem ad aliam conterendam. . . . . Consilium ergo sanum videtur permittere has duas partes Antichristi semet ipsas destruere.

14. Comp. above, cap. 8.

15. Comp. above, cap. 7.

16. Comp. above, cap. 6.

17. The passage runs thus: Doctor quidam novellus dictus Joh. Wycliff, non electus sed infectus agricola vitis Christi, jam intra paucos annos pulcherrimum agrum vestrae Cantuariensis provinciae tot variis seminavit zizaniis, totque pestiferis plantavit erroribus, tot denique suae sectae procreavit haeredes, quod, sicut probabiliter credimus, absque mordacibus sarculis et censuris asperrimis explantari vix poterunt aut evelli. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, 1737, Vol. III., fol. 171.

SECTION II.—*Wiclif's Attack upon the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.*

SUCH action of the hierarchy seemed to be all the more necessary because Wiclif had recently begun to attack even the doctrines of the Church. This was the effect, on the one hand, of the Scripture principle which he had arrived at long before, by the power of which his criticism gained the requisite internal freedom; but, on the other hand, we shall scarcely err if we recognise in it, at the same time, the effect of the great Papal schism, inasmuch as this allowed him the necessary freedom of external action. Wiclif for a long time devoted his ardent attention to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; and at length, in the year 1379 or 1380 at the earliest, he arrived at the result that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is unscriptural, groundless, and erroneous. As soon as he had formed this conviction he gave expression to it without reserve, as well in the pulpit, in the hearing of the people, as in the chair, before the learned world. In the summer of 1381 he published twelve short theses upon the

Lord's Supper and against Transubstantiation, which he undertook to defend against the world.

These theses were the following:—[19]

1. The consecrated Host which we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but the efficacious sign of Him.

2. No pilgrim upon earth is able to see Christ in the consecrated Host with the bodily eye, but by faith.

3. Formerly the faith of the Roman Church was expressed in the Confession of Berengarius—viz., that the bread and wine which continue after the benediction are the consecrated Host.

4. The Lord's Supper, in virtue of the sacramental words, contains both the body and the blood of Christ, truly and really, at every point.

5. Transubstantiation, Identification, and Impanation—terms made use of by those who have given names to the signs employed in the Lord's Supper—cannot be shown to have any foundation in the Word of God.

6. It is contrary to the opinions of the saints to assert that in the true Host there is an accident without a subject.

7. The sacrament of the Eucharist is in its own nature bread and wine, having, by virtue of the sacramental words, the true body and blood of Christ at every point of it.

8. The sacrament of the Eucharist is in a figure the body and blood of Christ into which the bread and wine are transubstantiated, of which latter the nature remains the same after consecration, although in the contemplation of believers it is thrown into the background.

9. That an "accident" can exist without a subject is what cannot be proved to be well grounded; but if this is so, God is annihilated, and every article of the Christian faith perishes.

10. Every person or sect is heretical in the extreme which

obstinately maintains that the sacrament of the altar is bread of a kind *per se*—of an infinitely lower and more imperfect kind even than horses' bread.

11. Whosoever shall obstinately maintain that the said sacrament is "an accident," a quality, a quantity, or an aggregate of these things, falls into the before-said heresy.

12. Wheaten bread, in which alone it is lawful to consecrate, is in its nature infinitely more perfect than bread of bean flour or of bran, and both of these are in their nature more perfect than "an accident."

These theses, containing a bold attack upon a doctrine of such immense importance in the Roman system as transubstantiation, made a prodigious sensation in Oxford. In conservative and hierarchical circles in the university, the language made use of was that the orthodox faith of the Church was assailed; that devout feeling among the people was impaired; and that the honour of the university would suffer if such new doctrines were allowed to be held forth in it.[20] The Chancellor of the University at the time—William of Berton—took side with those who disapproved of Wiclif's proceeding. He called together a number of doctors of theology and laws, with the view of obtaining from them a judgment concerning the theses which Wiclif had published, and also touching the procedure which should be taken by the University in case of need. Two of these trusted counsellors were doctors of laws; among the ten doctors of theology there were only two who did not belong to the monastic orders; the rest were for the most part members of the mendicant orders, viz., three Dominicans, of the Franciscan, Augustinian, and Carmelite orders one each, and of the endowed orders one Benedictine and one

Cistercian. It is a fact full of significance for the social relations of the University at that time, that the majority of these doctors were monks, and that exactly the half of these monks were mendicant friars. The result of their deliberations was an unanimous advice that a decree should be issued pronouncing the substance of the theses to be erroneous and heretical, and prohibiting them from being publicly taught. The Chancellor accordingly drew up a mandate, in which, without expressly naming Wiclif, he declared two theses set down in the mandate (containing pretty nearly the substance of the twelve theses given above)[21] to be plainly contradictory to the orthodox doctrine of the Church, and further prohibited the said two theses to be publicly set forth and defended in the university, on pain of suspension from every function of teaching, of the greater excommunication, and of imprisonment; prohibiting also, on pain of the greater excommunication, all members of the university from being present at the public delivery of those theses in the university.[22]

This order was immediately published. The beautiful Augustinian Monastery in Oxford contained several apartments which were used as lecture-rooms.[23] When the officers of the university entered one of these to read the mandate of the Chancellor, Wiclif himself was seated in the chair and speaking on this very subject of the Lord's Supper. The official condemnation of his doctrine came upon him as a sudden surprise; and yet it is related of him that he immediately uttered the declaration, that neither the Chancellor nor any of his colleagues had the power to alter his convictions.[24] Later on, Wiclif, according to the same informant, appealed from the Chancellor and his advisers, but not, as might be supposed, to the Bishop of Lincoln, in

whose name the Chancellor exercised a certain ecclesiastical authority over the university; still less to the Pope; but to the King, Richard II. He was under the necessity, however, of abstaining from all oral disquisitions upon the Lord's Supper in the University, from that time forward. But as he was still left at liberty to defend his convictions in a literary form, he published a large *Confession* on the subject in Latin,[25] and also a popular tract in English entitled *The Wicket.* Not only in these, but in other writings, great and small, learned and popular, he continued to prosecute the treatment of this subject, collaterally at least with other themes; for after the year 1382 scarcely a single work of Wiclif appeared in which he did not recur, and sometimes in more places than one, to this weighty point of doctrine.

NOTES TO SECTION II.

19. *Vide* the original text under the title *Conclusiones J. Wiclefi de Sacramento altaris,* printed from a MS. in the Bodleian, in Lewis, *History,* etc., ed. 1820, p. 318 f.; in Vaughan (from Lewis), *Life and Opinions,* 2 ed., II. 425; *John de Wycliffe,* p. 560 f.; *Fasc. Zizan.,* Shirley, p. 105 f.

Conclusiones Wycclyff de Sacramento Altaris.

(1.) Hostia consecrata quam videmus in altari nec est Christus nec aliqua sui pars, sed efficax ejus signum.

(2.) Nullus viator sufficit oculo corporali sed fide, Christum videre in hostia consecrata.

(3.) Olim fuit fides ecclesiae Romanae in professione Berengarii, quod panis et vinum quae remanent post benedictionem, sunt hostia consecrata.

(4.) Eucharistia habet, virtute verborum sacramentalium, tam corpus quam sanguinem Christi, vere et realiter, ad quemlibet ejus punctum.

(5.) Transubstantiatio, identificatio, et impanatio quibus utuntur baptistae signorum in materia de Eucharistia, non sunt fundabiles in Scriptura.

(6.) Repugnat sanctorum sententiis asserere quod sit accidens sine subjecto in hostia veritatis.

(7.) Sacramentum Eucharistiae est in natura sua panis et vinum, habens, virtute verborum sacramentalium, verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, ad quemlibet ejus punctum.

(8.) Sacramentum Eucharistiae est in figura corpus Christi et sanguis, in quae transubstantiatur panis et vinum, cujus remanet post consecrationem aliquitas, licet quoad considerationem fidelium sit sopita.

(9.) Quod accidens sit sine subjecto non est fundabile ; sed si sic, Deus annihilatur et perit quilibet articulus fidei Christianae.

(10.) Quaecunque persona vel secta est nimis haeretica quae pertinaciter defenderit quod sacramentum altaris est panis per se existens in natura infinitum abjectior ac imperfectior pane equino.

(11.) Quicunque pertinaciter defenderit quod dictum sacramentum sit accidens, qualitas, quantitas, aut earum aggregatio, incidit in haeresin supradictam.

(12.) Panis triticius, in quo solum licet conficere est in natura infinitum perfectior pane fabino vel ratonis, quorum uterque in natura est perfectior accidente.

That only a single MS. of the *Conclusiones* is known to exist is the more to be regretted, that in more than one place there is strong reason to suspect that the readings are erroneous, *e.g.*, it can scarcely be believed that Thesis 8 is correctly given, for as in Thesis 5 the idea of *transubstantiatio* is rejected as unbiblical, it is impossible to see how this idea can again be made use of in Thesis 8—Corpus Christi et sanguis, in quae transubstantiatur panis aut vinum. In Thesis 12 also, the phrase *infinitum perfectior*, may have arisen from the *infinitum abjectior* of Thesis 10, for in the connection where it stands, it is unsuitable and out of place.

20. *Fasc. Zizan.*, Shirley, p. 109 f.

21. Primo, in sacramento altaris substantiam panis materialis et vini, quae prius fuerunt ante consecrationem, post consecrationem realiter remanere. Secundo, ... in illo venerabili sacramento non esse corpus Christi et sanguinem essentialiter nec substantialiter nec etiam corporaliter, sed figurative seu tropice ; sic quod Christus non sit ibi veraciter in sua propria persona corporali.

22. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Brit.*, Vol. III., 170 f. Lewis, Appendix, No. 20, p. 319 f. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., Appendix, No. III., p. 425 f. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed Shirley, 1858, p. 110 f.

23. Dugdale, *Monasticum Anglicanum*, London 1830, Vol. VIII., fol. 1596.

24. This statement from an enemy's pen is found at the end of the document which contains the mandate itself. But when Vaughan (*Monograph*, p. 247) represents the matter as though the Chancellor had been present in person, and Wiclif had appealed from him face to face, this representation does not agree with the original account.

25. *Confessio Magistri Johannis Wycclyff*, in Lewis, No. 21, p. 323-332 ; in Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., p. 428-433. *Monograph*, p. 564-570. *Fasciculi Zizan.*, ed. Shirley, p. 115-132.

Section III.—*The Peasants' Revolt in* 1381.

The measures taken by the Chancellor of Oxford to prevent the sanction of the University from being given to Wiclif's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, were followed in the next year by official action on the part of the heads of the Church. This procedure was, however, partly due to a political event which

took place in the year 1381, namely, the great insurrection of the peasantry in England. The adversaries of Wiclif brought this peasants' war into connection with his person, doctrine, and party, and charged him with being the intellectual author and proper ringleader of the revolt. In so doing they rested chiefly upon a confession which John Ball, one of the leaders of the peasants, was alleged to have made before his execution, and from which it appeared to come out that Wiclif was the chief author of the insurrection.[26] It is worth the pains to go into this subject with some care, in order to inquire whether the event can with any truth and right be set down to Wiclif's account.

The fact is beyond doubt that the insurrection of 1381 was occasioned by the growing pressure of taxation, by the new poll-tax in particular, and by the provoking severity which was used in the collection of these taxes. To this was added the strong desire and determination of the peasants, who were still in a state of serfdom, to obtain a like emancipation to what the inhabitants of the cities had already for a long time enjoyed. Acts of resistance to insolent and vexatious tax-collectors fell like so many sparks upon the heaped-up combustibles, and kindled the flames of a social revolution of a mixed democratic and socialistic character. The outbreak seems to have taken place almost simultaneously both south and north of the Thames, in the counties of Kent and Essex. A baker at Fobbing, in Essex, was bold enough to resist the collector, and in Dartford a tile-burner murdered the insolent tax-officer with one of his tools. The first weak efforts of the authorities to put a stop to such deeds of violence were not sufficient to strike terror, but only excited the rioters to still more outrageous measures. On 30th May, when one of the King's judges and a jury were assembled to try some of

the Essex insurgents, a mob rushed upon the jurymen, cut off their heads, and marched with these through the county. At the same moment the revolters in Kent collected in a mob under Wat Tyler (Walter, the tyle-maker), and broke open the Archbishop's prison to release John Ball, the priest, who thereupon became, along with another priest, who called himself Jack Straw, the leader, agitator, and mob-orator of the movement.

The rebel mobs of Essex and Kent united their masses and marched upon London in the beginning of June with a strength, it is alleged, of 100,000 men. The neighbouring counties were infected by the movement, and everywhere mobs of rebels wasted the houses and lands of the nobles, burnt all deeds and documents, and put to death all judges, lawyers, and jurymen, upon whom they could lay hands. Every man was compelled to join himself to the peasants to assist in obtaining freedom, as they understood it. The existing laws should be upturned, a new set of laws must be introduced; they would hear of no other taxes in future save the *fifteenths,* which had been paid by their fathers and forefathers. The worst outbreaks took place in London itself and its suburbs on Corpus Christi, 13th June, and the following days. The mobs of peasantry, strengthened by the city populace, reduced to ashes the magnificent palace of the Duke of Lancaster in the Savoy, and destroyed all the valuables which it contained. On Friday, 14th June, they seized the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury, who was also chancellor of the kingdom, along with several other high officers of state, all of whom they condemned as alleged traitors to lose their heads on the block; and while these and other scenes of blood were enacted in London, the neighbouring counties were overrun, and numerous houses

of the nobles and many rich religious foundations, including St. Alban's, destroyed.

The young King, Richard II., only fifteen years old, with his ministers and the whole council, could command neither courage nor strength enough to make a stand against the storm until on Saturday, 15th June, the undaunted Mayor of London, John Walworth of Smithfield, boldly laid hold upon Wat Tyler at the moment when he was approaching the King with an insolent air, and sent him off to prison; whereupon some knights of the king's train set upon him and put him to death. From this moment both soldiers and citizens regained their courage, and in a short time the nobles and armed burghers were able to crush the disorderly masses of the insurgents, to put down the revolt, and to re-establish quiet and good order in the land. The liberties which had been wrung from the King by the rebels were recalled on 30th June and 2nd July, and not only the leaders themselves, but hundreds also of their misguided followers were apprehended, and after trial and sentence, punished with death.[27]

We can readily understand how Wiclif's adversaries pointed to these events with a certain malicious satisfaction, and gave out that these were the fruits of his destructive opposition to the doctrines and institutions of the Church, and especially of the itinerant preachers, his adherents, who went about everywhere stirring up the people. But this was an accusation which was utterly groundless. We lay no special stress upon the fact that Wiclif himself, in one of his writings still remaining in manuscript, expresses the most deep felt disapprobation of the peasant war, with its rough deeds of violence and its cruel excesses.[28] For it might be replied that this proves nothing. Wiclif's opposition to the

Church might have had its influence upon the peasantry, and yet it might be reasonably expected that he would utterly disapprove of the cruelties of the rebels.

His adversaries appealed, at least at a later time, to certain confessions which John Ball was said to have laid before his judges. How does the case stand with this confession? In the absence of the official records of the trial themselves, we are pointed chiefly to a document which was drawn up at least forty years later;[29] and this document bears that after the suppression of the revolt, when John Ball was condemned at St. Albans, by the chief judge, Robert Tresilian, to be hanged and quartered, he sent for William Courtnay, Bishop of London, Sir Walter Lee, knight, and the notary, John Profet, and in presence of these gentlemen made the confession that he was for two years a hearer of Wiclif, and had learned from him the false doctrines which he had preached, especially on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The itinerant preachers of Wiclif's school, he said, had bound themselves to go over all England with the preaching of his doctrines till they filled the land. He had also given the name of Wiclif as the chief mover in all this affair, and in the second line the names of Nicolas Hereford, John Aston, and Lawrence Bedeman.

But these allegations are in part destitute of the importance which is attributed to them, and in part they are suspicious on other grounds. For example, the statement of Ball that he was for two years a hearer of Wiclif may be perfectly true, but what follows from that? What a multitude of hearers and disciples may Wiclif have had in the crowded University of Oxford since the time he began as a doctor of theology to deliver lectures; and certainly all these did not become his followers

in the sense of having formed his school, and so that their opinions and actions could with reason and justice be put to his account as the head of the school. Add to this, that in view of the notorious hostility of Bishop Courtnay against Wiclif, the supposition lies all too close at hand, and can hardly be called a groundless suspicion, that the prisoner, who was already under sentence of death, was here induced to say something which he knew that high dignitary of the Church would be glad to hear. There is an appearance, in particular, as if the mention of Wiclif's doctrine of the Lord's Supper had been made not without a leading question of the Bishop. But such an allusion to the Lord's Supper was utterly out of place here—for it was not till the early part of 1381 that Wiclif, as we know, began to attack the doctrine of transubstantiation; and at that date John Ball was already in the prison of the Archbishop, from which the rebel peasants released him. It is therefore unthinkable that the latter should have learned the heresy touching the sacrament of the altar from Wiclif, and had openly preached it.

The chronicler Walsingham mentions that John Ball had preached for twenty years and more in different places, in a style which showed that his aim was to gain popular favour; for he was wont to rail against the lords both spiritual and temporal. Nobody, he preached, need pay tithes to the parish priest, unless the payer was better off than the priest; and every man is at liberty to withhold tithes and gifts from the Popish priests when the parishioner lives a better moral life than the priest himself, etc.[30] This statement of the annalist of St. Albans is confirmed by an official document. As early as the year 1366 Simon Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, issued a mandate against

the "pretended priest," John Ball, who was "preaching many errors and scandals." The clergy should forbid the members of their flocks from attending his preachings, and Ball himself would have to answer for his proceedings before the Archbishop.[31] Now, before the year 1366, Wiclif had not yet in any way become the object of public attention. It is besides to be noticed that when in this same year the Archbishop had occasion, from the rumours which reached his ears, to take proceedings against Ball, the latter had been carrying on his practices for a considerable time previously; and thus we are carried back to the year 1360 or thereabouts, and therefore to the same period to which Walsingham refers. But the further back we go with the date at which that exciting mob-preacher first began to attract notice, the less does his mode of thought admit of being referred to the influence of Wiclif.[32] All the more worthy of attention is the view taken by another contemporary and historian, that John Ball, instead of being Wiclif's scholar, was rather his precursor.[33] From all which it follows that the personality of this man, and his statements before his execution, are by no means of avail to prove that Wiclif was the proper author and instigator of the English peasant war of 1381.

On the contrary, several facts go to disprove the existence of any such connection. There is first of all the declared hostility of the insurgent peasants and their leaders to Duke John of Lancaster—a fact which is quite irreconcileable with the supposition that Wiclif, whose high patron this prince was acknowledged to be, stood in any connection even of a mediate and remote kind with that movement. The insurgents took an oath from every one who joined them to recognise no one as king who bore the name of John—

which could refer to nobody else but Duke John of Lancaster.[34] They suspected him of ambitious designs, and believed him capable of nothing less than high treason. It was for that reason that on 14th June 1381 they gave to the flames the Duke's palace in the Savoy, destroyed all the valuables they found there, and put the prince to death in effigy, by placing a valuable doublet of his upon a lance, and shooting at it with arrows.[35] But not content with this, they had designs against his person and the whole of his possessions. Before the outbreak of the insurrection he happened to be engaged in negotiations on the Scottish Border, and he remained in Scotland after the treaty of peace was concluded, as long as the storm lasted.[36] In the meanwhile two strong leaders of insurgent peasants marched to the north, destroyed the castles belonging to the Duke at Leicester and Tutbury, with everything they found in them, and lay in wait for some time, though to no purpose, for his return to the kingdom. All these incidents prove so deep an embitterment against the man who for years had been the declared protector of Wiclif, that the leaders of the movement could not possibly have belonged to Wiclif's party.

A second fact must not be overlooked, that the movement of the serf-peasants and their leaders was directed against the privileged classes of the kingdom and all landed proprietors, as well as against all laws, rights, and legal documents favourable to these classes of the population. It was for this reason that they searched everywhere for papers, bonds, and deeds, in order to destroy them, and to create a new law of property upon the footing and basis of absolute freedom and equality. The storm broke forth upon the clergy and the rich church foundations and cloisters, not because they were spiritual and ecclesiastical bodies, but solely and

entirely because they belonged to the land-holding and privileged classes. This is another feature of the English peasant revolt which bears direct testimony against its having anything to do with Wiclif and his tendencies. For his contention from the first was against the Papacy and the hierarchy; and upon this ground that these latter allowed themselves in encroachments upon the rights of the State and the country, and were guilty of violations of their religious and ecclesiastical duties; whereas the rights of the State, and also the position and dignity of the temporal lords, were at all times warmly supported by him, and defended to the utmost of his power. He would have been fully entitled to say to the sowers of sedition, and the democratic clamourer for equality, "You are men of a different spirit from us."

A third fact is the partiality of the insurgent peasantry for the Begging Friars. Ill as things went with the great abbeys and richly-endowed foundations, the excited mobs dealt quite as indulgently with the cloisters of the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the rest of the Mendicant Orders. They evidently looked upon the monks of these Orders as people like themselves, with whom they had a certain community of interests, because they, too, were of poor and humble condition. This sympathy with the begging Orders was openly expressed in the confession of one of the most prominent leaders of the movement, Jack Straw, who, next to Wat Tyler, was the greatest man among them.[37] When he lay in prison under sentence of death, on being required by his judge, the Lord Mayor of London, to make a sincere confession respecting the designs which his party had contemplated, he made the following among other statements:—"We would have ended by taking the life of the King, and

by exterminating out of the earth all land-holders, bishops, landed monks, endowed canons, and parish priests. Only the Begging Friars would have remained in the land, and these would have been sufficient to keep up divine service throughout the whole country."[38] This preference of the peasantry for the Mendicant Orders is another thing which speaks decidedly against the view that Wiclif may have been the intellectual author of the insurrection. It is now ascertained, indeed, that Wiclif was not, from the first, an adversary of the Begging monks, as has hitherto been supposed; but that it was only after the controversy arose on the doctrine of transubstantiation that an antagonism rapidly developed itself between him and these Orders. But notwithstanding this fact, the high appreciation of the pastoral office which Wiclif always preserved, and his long-continued efforts to raise the tone of the preacher's function, make it impossible to suppose that a revolutionary movement, which menaced the pastor's office and would have substituted the Begging Orders in its room, was in any way originated or occasioned by Wiclif.[39] The preference for these Orders, which marked the movement, had by no means a religious ground, but rested on a purely social and secular basis—the poverty which was common to both parties. The remark of an able theologian receives confirmation, upon a closer examination of the English peasant-war, viz.—that the peasant-wars before the Reformation were essentially different in character from those which came after it. In the former, the feeling which lay at the bottom was the purely human feeling of hatred against unjust oppression. In the latter, there was present at the same time a powerful religious sentiment—the faith that men were fighting in the interest of pure Christianity.[40]

NOTES TO SECTION III.

26. *Thomae Walsingham Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, Vol. III., p. 32. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, p. 273 f.

27. Vaughan, *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph*, p. 252 f. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, V., p. 522 f. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, Vol. I., 453 f.

28. *De Blasphemia*, without doubt written in 1382, c. 13, MS. 3933, fol. 158, col. 4 : Patet nobis Anglicis de isto lamentabili conflictu, quo archiepiscopus prior (Simon Sudbury) et multi alii crudeliter sunt occisi. . . . . Temporales possunt aufferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente, quod foret tolerabilius, quam quod rurales aufferant vitam carnalem a capitali praeposito ecclesiae delinquente . . . . et haec videtur nimis crudelis punitio. In the popular tract *Of Servantis and Lordis how eche shall kepe his degree*, the poor priests and the itinerants are defended against a charge of disseminating a spirit of anarchy and disobedience. *Vide* Lewis, *History*, etc., p. 224 f.

29. *Fasc. Zizan.*, Shirley, p. 273 f. It was plainly the author's design to incorporate with his work, word for word, the protocol of the answers of Ball as it lay before him, but the protocol itself is unfortunately no longer extant.

30. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, II., p. 32.

31. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, III., 64 f. Unfortunately this mandate does not contain the slightest indication of the nature of the doctrines which Ball set forth.

32. This was rightly apprehended by Lewis, who remarked (*History of John Wiclif*, p. 223, note *a*) that in all probability Ball was an older man than Wiclif, at least not young enough to have been a scholar of his.

33. Henricus de Knighton, *Chronica de Eventibus Angliae*, in *Historiae Ang. Scriptores*, ed. Twysden, fol. 2644 : Hic habuit praecursorem Jo. Balle, etc., fol. 2656 : Hic magister J. Wiclyf in suo adventu habuit Johannem Balle suae pestiferae inventionis praemeditatorem, etc.

34. Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana*, ed. Riley, Vol. I., 454 f.

35. *Ib.*, 457.

36. *Ib.*, Vol. II., 41 f.

37. Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, ed. Riley, II., 9 : qui fuit, post Walterum Tylere, maximus inter illos.

38. *Ib.*, p. 10 : Postremo regem occidissemus, et cunctos possessionatos, episcopos, monachos (the landed monks of the older orders), canonicos, rectores insuper ecclesiarum de terra delevissemus. Soli Mendicantes vixissent super terram, qui suffecissent pro sacris celebrandis aut conferendis universae terrae.

39. Comp. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, IV., p. 547. *Westminster Review* 1854, VI., p. 170 : "If there was any underhand agency at work, it seems more probable that the heads of the Mendicants were the movers." Of very great interest in connection with this subject is a document printed in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 292. It is a letter addressed to Duke John of Lancaster by the heads of all the Mendicant

monasteries of Oxford, in which they pray the Duke to vindicate and protect them against injurious suspicions. The blame of the Peasants' Revolt is charged upon them and their Order, first, because they are alleged to suck out the substance of the land by their mendicancy, and this impoverishment of the people is one cause of the insurrection; secondly, because the begging of the monks has set a bad example, and the serfs and peasants have been moved by it to desert their work and indulge in idleness, issuing at last in rebellion; and thirdly, because the well-known influence of the Begging Friars upon the larger part of the nobles as well as the people, has led to the present state of excitement and irritation. The man who, more than any other, has spread such odious charges against these Orders is the doctor of theology, Nicolaus of Hereford. The letter is dated 18th February 1381, but this must mean 1382, for the revolt itself did not take place till May of 1381.

40. Häusser's *Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation*, Berlin 1868, p. 107.

SECTION IV.—*Preparations for Persecution on the part both of the Church and the State.*

ALTHOUGH it could not without injustice be maintained that Wiclif had had anything to do, even in an indirect way, with the outbreak of the peasants' revolt, his enemies, notwithstanding, eagerly seized this opportunity of blackening his character and of representing his opposition to certain doctrines and institutions of the Church of his time as the source of the social revolution which had filled everybody with terror.[41] It was an evil omen for Wiclif that just at that time the man who, perhaps more than any other, had a leaning to this view, rose to the highest dignity in the English Church.

On that dreadful Corpus Christi day, 13th June 1381, when the insurgent hordes of the peasantry perpetrated in London the worst misdeeds, they beheaded in the Tower the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury. He was a man of sense and mild character. In the following October William Courtnay, Bishop of London, was elected his successor. He was the fourth son of the Earl of Devonshire, and was related in blood to several of the highest

families in the realm. On the mother's side he was descended of the blood-royal—a great-grandson of Edward I.[42] In spirit he was a genuine hierarch — a zealot for the Papacy, and an energetic domineering churchman, and had already, in the year 1377, as we have seen — when Bishop of London—set on foot an inquiry against Wiclif. This "pillar of the Church," as his admirers called him, was now Primate of all England. As Wiclif, in the meantime, had proceeded further and further in his ecclesiastical opposition, and not only in preaching, writing, and academic action, but also by means of the Itinerant Preachers' Institute, had prosecuted his Reformational efforts far and wide throughout the country, the new Archbishop deemed it to be his imperative duty, without delay, and in the use of all available means, to adopt measures with the view of breaking down the increased power of the opposition party, and putting an effectual stop to their attempts.

His plan of operations was evidently the fruit of cool and mature deliberation, so as to make his victory and success all the more infallible. The order of procedure was to be this: that, in the first instance, the *doctrines* and *principles* of Wiclif and his adherents should be condemned by ecclesiastical authority; and then, in the second instance, the persons who professed these doctrines should be attacked and compelled to recant, or else, in the event of obstinacy, should be persecuted and struck down without mercy. First deal with the *subject* and then with the persons. That was the idea; and so men made sure to gain their end. The Archbishop *designate* was able to think over his future proceedings all the more deliberately that, after his appointment, he abstained, on principle, from all official action as Primate till he received the pallium from Rome;

and this was not the case till 6th May 1382—a full half year after his nomination by the Crown.

But now all the more rapidly he proceeded to action. The first measure was aimed, as before arranged, against the doctrines, and here no hindrance could stand in the way, for in the sphere of doctrine the ecclesiastical power could act with a free hand. The Archbishop summoned an assembly of ecclesiastical notables for 17th May 1382 in London. This assembly consisted of ten bishops, sixteen doctors of laws, thirty doctors of theology, and four bachelors of laws.[43] The Archbishop had selected at his own pleasure the men whom he could trust, to examine and decide the questions which he intended to lay before them—all men, of course, of acknowledged Roman orthodoxy and papistical views.[44] The sessions took place in the hall of the Dominican Monastery in Blackfriars.[45] During the sittings of the assembly, it happened that a terrific earthquake shook the city, and filled every one with consternation. The event made so deep an impression upon some members of the assembly that they looked upon it as an evil omen, and advised that the design of the meeting should be given up. But Archbishop Courtnay was not the man to be so easily shaken in his purpose. He declared that the earthquake was rather to be regarded as a good and encouraging omen, and he knew how to calm again the minds of the assembly.[46] He represented to the Churchmen that the earthquake was an emblem of the purification of the kingdom from erroneous doctrines. As in the interior of the earth, there are enclosed foul airs and winds which break out in earthquakes, so that the earth is purged of them, though not without great violence, even so there have been many heresies hitherto shut up in the hearts of the unbelieving, but by

the condemnation thereof, the kingdom has been purged—though not without trouble and great agitation.[47] Wiclif himself speaks of the earthquake as a judgment of God upon the proceedings of the assembly, which he was in the habit of calling the "Earthquake Council;" or at other times, as a gigantic outcry of the earth against the ungodly doings of men—like the earthquake at the passion of the Son of God.[48]

Of the transactions of the assembly we have no records. We only know the conclusions which it arrived at, and these only from the Mandates of the Archbishop, in which he published them for the information and use of the Church. These Mandates contain in an appendix twenty-four Articles, which had been in part publicly set forth in the University of Oxford, and in part spread abroad by itinerant preachers in the country. The judgment passed upon these Articles, after deliberation with the Council, was to the effect that they were in part heretical, and in part erroneous. The first ten which were pronounced heretical, were the following:—

1. That the substance of material bread and wine doth remain in the sacrament of the altar after consecration.

2. That the "accidents" do not remain without the "subject" in the same sacrament after consecration.

3. That Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar identically, truly and really in His proper corporeal person.

4. That if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin, he doth not ordain, consecrate, nor baptize.

5. That if a man be duly contrite, all exterior confession is to him superfluous and invalid.

6. That God ought to obey the devil.

7. That it hath no foundation in the Gospel that Christ did ordain the Mass.

8. That if the Pope be a reprobate and an evil man, and consequently a member of the devil, he hath no power over the faithful of Christ given to him by any, unless peradventure it be given him by the Emperor.

9. That after Urban VI. none other is to be received for Pope, but that Christendom ought to live after the manner of the Greeks, under its own laws.

10. That it is against the sacred Scripture that ecclesiastical persons should have any temporal possessions.

The following fourteen articles were condemned as erroneous :—

11. That no prelate ought to excommunicate any man except he first know him to be excommunicated of God.

12. That he who doth so excommunicate is thereby himself either a heretic or excommunicated.

13. That a prelate or bishop excommunicating a cleric who hath appealed to the king or the council of the realm, in so doing is a traitor to the king and the realm.

14. That they who leave off to preach or hear the Word of God or the Gospel preached, for fear of such excommunication, are already excommunicate, and in the day of judgment shall be counted traitors to God.

15. That it is lawful for any deacon or presbyter to preach the Word of God without the authority or licence of the Apostolic See, or of a Catholic bishop, or of any other recognised authority.

16. That a man is no civil lord, nor bishop, nor prelate, as long as he is in mortal sin.

17. Also, that temporal lords may at will take away their temporal goods from churches habitually delinquent.

18. That tithes are pure alms, and that parishoners, may, for the offences of their curates, detain them and bestow them on others at pleasure; and that tenants (*populares*) may correct delinquent landlords (*dominos*) at will.

19. Also, that special prayers, applied to any one person by prelates or religious men, do no more profit the same person than general prayers would, *caeteris paribus*, profit him.

20. That whosoever doth give any alms unto friars, or to any friar that preacheth, is excommunicate; as also is he that taketh.

21. Moreover, in that any man doth enter into any private religion whatsoever, he is thereby made more unapt and unable to observe the commandments of God.

22. That holy men who have instituted any private religions whatsoever (as well of seculars having possessions as of begging friars who have none), in so instituting, did err.

23. That religious men living in private religions are not of the Christian religion.

24. That friars are bound to get their living by the labour of their hands, and not by begging.

It will be observed that the first ten articles—condemned as *heretical*—began with three Theses relating to the Lord's Supper.

It is manifest that Wiclif's criticism of the doctrine of transubstantiation had excited the greatest attention. The doctrine of the Sacraments in general, however, forms the point of union in which all the theses of the first class

meet, for the 5th thesis relates to confession, and the 4th, with 8–10, to the sacrament of Holy Orders. The 7th thesis—*Deus debet obedire Diabolo*—did not perhaps proceed from a dishonest use of logical inference on the part of opponents, or from a fanatical misapprehension of Wiclif's meaning; it was rather a thesis of his own, set forth indeed in a paradoxical form, but bearing the sense that God has permitted evil to exist in the world, and must therefore have regard to its existence in his government of the world, or must shape his action accordingly, for even Christ submitted Himself to temptation by the devil.[50]

The theses of the second class, which are only censured as erroneous, have all their places in the sphere of the external order of the Church. For to that heading belong the questions touching excommunication (11–14), the office of teaching, and the right to preach (14, 15), tithes and Church property (17, 18), monastic orders and cloister-life (20–24), as well as touching prayers offered by prelates and monks for particular persons (19). The 16th thesis is related to the 4th and 8th in the first class. The 17th thesis, in manifest allusion to the event of the preceding year, viz., the revolt of the serf-peasants, contains a hint, which could scarcely be misunderstood, that the frightful violences and cruelties of the rebels had a connection with the inflammatory doctrines of the itinerant preachers.[51]

In the mandates issued by the Archbishop on the basis of the conclusions of the Council, neither Wiclif nor any other of his friends and adherents were mentioned by name—neither in the mandate to Peter Stokes, the Carmelite doctor of Theology in Oxford, the Primate's commissary there, nor in that sent to the Bishop of London, to be by him communicated to all the suffragan bishops of the Pro-

vince of Canterbury. The mandates bore that "men without authority, children of perdition, have usurped the office of preachers, and have preached, sometimes in churches and sometimes in other places, doctrines heretical and unchurchly —yea, and undermining the peace of the kingdom. To stem the evil and to hinder its spread, the Archbishop had called into his counsels, with the consent and advice of several bishops, men of experience and ripe ecclesiastical learning, by whom the theses laid before them were maturely weighed and examined, and who had concluded that they were in part heretical, and in part, at least, erroneous and unecclesiastical. So far the two mandates are identical. But at this point they separate; and first the Archbishop's commissary in Oxford is directed to publish the prohibition that, from that day forth, no man shall be permitted to set forth in lectures, or to preach or defend in the University, the errors now censured, and no man suffered to listen to, or in any way to favour the setting forth of the same; but every man, the contrary, must flee from and avoid every upholder of these doctrines, under pain of the greater excommunication. This mandate was dated May 28, 1382, from Oxford. Two days later was dated the mandate of the Primate to the Bishop of London.[52] It enjoins the Bishop, upon his obedience, to communicate to all his brother bishops in the Province the Archbishop's injunction that every bishop shall publish three times over in his own cathedral and the other churches of his diocese, an intimation and prohibition to the effect that, on pain of the greater excommunication, which every bishop has to pronounce in case of need, no one in future shall preach, or teach, or hold the condemned theses, or listen or show favour to any man who preaches them.[53]

In order to give greater publicity to the conclusions

arrived at, and to engage the sympathy of the people upon their side, an extraordinary Act was appointed. On Friday of Whitsunday week—30th May, a solemn procession passed through the streets of London, including clergy and laity, all arranged according to their several orders and conditions, and all barefoot, for it was meant to be an Act of penitence. It concluded with a sermon against the condemned doctrines, preached by the Carmelite, John Cunningham, a doctor of theology; who finished by reading in the pulpit the mandate of the primate whereby the twenty-four theses were condemned, and all men were threatened with the bann who should in future adhere to these tenets, or listen to them when set forth or preached by others.[54]

The first step was thus taken, and now it remained to carry it out to practical effect. But the second step was not so easy to take as the first. What had to be done was, to bow under the yoke of the judgment which had been pronounced on the new doctrines the persons who were attached to these doctrines—that is to say, to bring them to a recantation—to crush those who should prove refractory, and to annihilate the existence of the party. But these were aims which could not be carried through with the use of purely Church resources. The help of the State was required. The new Archbishop attempted to draw the latter into the business, and to make sure of its support for the end he had in view.

In the Parliament which met in May 1382, the Archbishop moved to obtain its consent that orders should issue from the Chancellor of the kingdom to the sheriffs and other royal officers to put in prison such preachers, as also their patrons and followers, as a bishop or prelate should indicate to them by name in this behalf. He represented to the

House of Lords that it was a well-known fact that different ill-disposed persons were going through the realm, from county to county and from town to town, in a well-known dress; and under the aspect of great holiness, were preaching from day to day, without authority from the proper ordinary or credentials from any other quarter, not only in churches and churchyards, but also in market-places and other public thoroughfares, where much people are wont to resort. Their sermons were full of heresies and manifest errors, to the great injury of the faith and the Church, and to the great spiritual peril of the people and of the whole realm. These men preach also things of a calumnious kind in order to sow strife and division between different classes, both spiritual and secular, and they influence the minds of the people to the great danger of the whole kingdom. If these preachers are summoned by the bishops for examination, they pay no regard to their commands, do not trouble themselves in the least about their admonitions and the censures of the holy Church, but rather testify their undisguised contempt for them. They know, besides, how to draw the people by their fine words to listen to their sermons, and they hold them fast in their errors with a strong hand, and by means of imposing crowds. It is, therefore, he urged, indispensably necessary that the State should lend the assistance of its arm to bring to punishment these itinerant preachers as a common danger to the country.[55]

The Lords in Parliament gave their consent to the statute proposed. But the consent of the Commons was still lacking. Whether it was that the concurrence of the latter was not asked for, or that the Commons, when asked, decidedly refused it, cannot be ascertained from the extant Parliamentary records. If the proposed statute had become law,

it would have become the duty of every king's officer in the counties, upon the application of a bishop to that effect, to send instantly to prison any man who was accused by the hierarchy as suspected of heresy, and to keep him there under strict durance until such time as he had cleared himself of the charge in the face of the Church. The meaning of which was nothing else but this, that the power of the State, so far as it was at the command of the county officials, should at all times and everywhere be at the disposal of the bishops—to make the State the obedient servant of the Church, and the officers of the King the policemen of the bishops.

In point of fact, the young King, Richard II., was induced to admit among the Statutes of the kingdom an ordinance of 26th May, wherein, with the pretended consent of Parliament, it was ordered that upon certification from the bishops the King's commands should issue from the Chancellery of the kingdom to the sheriffs and other State officers of counties for the imprisonment of itinerant preachers, as well as their favourers and adherents.[56] The ordinance sounded like a law which had been made by the joint consent of the Crown and the states of the realm.[57] And yet it was nothing of the kind. It was a mere royal ordinance, given out for a statute of the realm. And this fact did not remain without notice, for in the next sitting of Parliament—October 1382—the Commons presented a petition to the King, in which they roundly and clearly declared that that "statute" had never received the consent or approval of the Commons, and moved for the annulling of the same. They were by no means disposed, either for themselves or their posterity, to consent to a greater dependence upon the prelates than their forefathers had known in past times.

The consequence was that the offensive "statute," so called, but wrongfully, was withdrawn by the King.[58]

But apart from that pretended law of the land, the King, by desire of the Archbishop, issued also a patent, dated 26th June 1382, wherein, "out of zeal for the Catholic faith, whose defender he is and purposes always to remain," he conveys to the Archbishop and his suffragans, special plenary power to imprison the preachers and defenders of those condemned theses, and to detain them either in their own or other prisons, at their pleasure, aye and until they give proofs of repentance and make recantation, or until the King and his Privy Council should have taken some other action in the matter. At the same time the patent obliges all vassals, servants, and subjects of the King, upon their allegiance, and on pain of forfeiting all their estates, not to give any favour or support to those preachers or their patrons; but, on the contrary, to assist the Archbishop and his suffragans and their officers in the exercise of these plenary powers.[59]

This patent differs in form from the statute, in so far as the former is only a royal ordinance, which was issued as an act of administration, whereas the statute claimed to be a legislative Act. It differed also in substance from the statute, in as much as it only empowered the bishops to put and keep accused persons in prison by the hands of their own officers and servants, so that the officials of the State had nothing directly to do in the matter; whereas the statute made it incumbent upon the organs of the State to carry out directly the judgments of the ecclesiastical boards. How it came to pass that the patent was issued after that statute, it is not easy to see, especially as the former, as an addition to the latter, might almost be dispensed with, or at all

events must seem to be the weaker measure of the two. As the Lower House, some months later, publicly took objection to the constitutional validity of the statute, the conjecture is an obvious one, that immediately after the publication of the statute, public opinion had declared itself against it—that even some of the county authorities, to whom the imprisonment of itinerant preachers had been proposed agreeably to the provision of the statute, may possibly have declined to carry out the proposal, because they contested its force in law. If this was the case, a necessity would then arise for having recourse to some other expedient; and hence, perhaps, a renewed application of the Archbishop to the King, and as the fruit of this the patent of 26th June. At all events, with these plenary powers in hand, a persecution quite adequate to what was desired could now be set in operation against the persons whom it was desired to reach.

NOTES TO SECTION IV.

41. This appears plainly enough from the confession of John Ball, which may be conjectured to have been drawn from him by the Bishop of London.

42. Lewis, *History*, etc., p. 58, note *d*.

43. These numbers are taken from the document printed in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 291.

44. The Archbishop says of them, in a document printed in Wilkins' *Concilia*, III., 157, quos famosiores et peritiores credidimus, et sanctius in fide catholica sentientes.

45. *Apud Praedicatores, Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 272; *apud Dominicanos.* Foxe, *Rerum in Ecclesia Gestarum. Commentarii* 1559, p. 19. The English edition, 1563, p. 13, rendered this erroneously by "grey friars" (Franciscans) which has passed into many later accounts—*e.g.*, Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 79; *John de Wycliffe*, p. 269; Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, IV., p. 548.

46. This earthquake is mentioned not only in chronicles, but also in poems of the time, which have come down to us, and in several places by Wiclif himself. The day of its occurrence is given variously. Lewis and Vaughan name 17th May, the day of the first meeting of that ecclesiastical assembly. But documents like the *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 272, and historians like John Foxe (*Acts and Monuments*, ed.

Townsend, III., 19) mention the day after St. Dunstan's Day, which must have been 19th May. Walsingham (*Hist. Anglic.*, ed. Riley) gives a day still later, duodecimus calendas Junii, or 21st May. But no doubt the date is the most reliable which makes mention of the Saint's Day, and hence we may assume that the earthquake took place on the afternoon of Wednesday, 19th May 1382.

47. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 272 f. The construction of the words *fuit depuratum* proves that the earthquake cannot have taken place at the beginning of the sittings, but not till towards the close. Vaughan (*Monograph*, p. 265) finds himself obliged, by the view he takes of the date of the first meeting of the assembly, to give a different construction to the Archbishop's phrase.

48. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 27, p. 339 ; c. 36, pp. 374 and 376 : Multi fideles pie reputant, quod in ista damnatione, ad ostendendum defectum attestationis humanae, fuit insolite motus terrae. Quando enim membra Christi deficiunt ad reclamandum contra tales haereticos, terra clamat. Even in his sermons Wiclif contended against the earthquake council, *e.g.*, in the 14th of the *XXIV. Miscel. Serm.*, MS. 3928, fol. 157, col. 1 : Fratres—dampnarunt ut haeresin in suo concilio terrae motus, quod solum praedestinati sint partes s. matris ecclesiae. Comp. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 283. Comp. *Wiclif's English Confession on the Lord's Supper*, which is preserved by Knighton in Twysden, III., 2747. Both Lewis, p. 103, and Vaughan *Monograph*, p. 571, reproduce the whole piece simply as it appears in the printed chronicle, in which the words now in question are without meaning. But Arnold has recently published the piece in Vol. III., *Select English Works*, in a critically amended form, upon the authority of a MS. in the Bodleian Library, containing *Wiclif's Confession*, and after collation with two MSS. of Knighton's *Chronicle*. According to this corrected form, the passage in question reads as follows :—"And herefore devoute men supposen, that this council of frereis at London was with erthe dyn. For thei putt an heresye upon Christ and seyntis in heven ; wherfore the erthe trembled, faylande man's voice answerande for God, as hit did in tyme of his passioun, when he was dampned to bodily deth." This earthquake is mentioned by Wiclif in yet another of his English tracts, *The Seven Werkys of Mercy Bodyly*, cap. 6. Ther cownsel of trembulynge of the erthe. *Select English Works*, III., p. 175.

49. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, Vol. III., 157 f. Lewis, *History*, p. 357 f. Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, II., 58 f. Foxe, *Acts and Monum.*, III., 21 f. Lewis, *History*, p. 357 f. : *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, p. 277-282.

49*a*. Conclusiones heretice et contra determinationem ecclesiae de quibus supra fit mentio in haec verba sequuntur. Lewis, Appendix, 357-359. *Fascic. Zizan.*, Shirley, 277-282.

(1.) Quod substantia panis materialis et vini maneat post consecrationem in sacramento altaris.

(2.) Item quod accidentia non maneant sine subjecto post consecrationem in eodem sacramento.

(3.) Item quod Christus non sit in sacramento altaris identice, vere, et realiter in propria praesentia corporali.

(4.) Item quod si episcopus vel sacerdos existat in peccato mortali, non ordinat, conficit nec baptiz

(5.) Item quod si homo fuerit debite contritus, omnis confessio exterior est sibi superfluus vel inutilis.

(6.) Item pertinaciter asserere non esse fundatum in evangelio quod Christus Missam ordinavit.

(7.) Item quod Deus debet obedire diabolo.

(8.) Item quod si Papa sit praescitus et malus homo, ac per consequens membrum diaboli, non habet potestatem supra fideles Christi ab aliquo sibi datum nisi forte a Caesare.

(9.) Item quod post Urbanum sextum non est alius recipiendus in Papam, sed vivendum est more Graecorum, sub legibus propriis.

(10.) Item asserere quod est contra sanctam Scripturam quod viri ecclesiastici habeant possessiones temporales.

Conclusiones erroneae et contra determinationem ecclesiae, de quibus superius memoratur in haec verba sequuntur.

(11.) Quod nullus praelatus debet aliquem excommunicare, nisi prius sciat ipsum excommunicatum a Deo.

(12.) Item quod sic excommunicans, ex hoc sit haereticus vel excommunicatus.

(13.) Item quod praelatus excommunicans clericum qui appellavit ad regem et consilium regni, eo ipso traditor est Dei, regis, et regni.

(14.) Item quod illi qui dimittunt praedicare seu audire verbum Dei, vel evangelium praedicatum, propter excommunicationem hominum, sunt excommunicati, et in die judicii traditores Dei habebuntur.

(15.) Item asserere quod liceat alicui etiam diacono vel presbytero praedicare verbum Dei absque auctoritate sedis apostolicae, vel episcopi catholici, seu alia de qua sufficienter constet.

(16.) Item asserere quod nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est episcopus, nullus est praelatus, dum est in peccato mortali.

(17.) Item quod domini temporales possint ad arbitrium eorum, auferre bona temporalia ab ecclesiasticis habitualiter delinquentibus, vel quod populares possint, ad eorum arbitrium, dominos delinquentes corrigere.

(18.) Item quod decimae sunt purae eleemosynae, et quod parochiani possunt, propter peccata suorum curatorum eas detinere, et ad libitum aliis conferre.

(19.) Item quod speciales orationes applicatae uni personae per praelatos, vel religiosos, non plus prosunt eidem personae, quam generales orationes, ceteris paribus eidem.

(20.) Item quod eo ipso quod aliquis ingreditur religionem privatam quamcunque redditur ineptior et inhabilior ad observantiam mandatorum Dei.

(21.) Item quod sancti instituentes religiones privatas quascunque, tam possessionatorum quum Mendicantium, in sic instituendo peccaverunt.

(22.) Item quod religiosi viventes in religionibus privatis non sint de religione Christiani.

(23.) Item quod fratres teneantur per laborem manuum, et non per mendicationem victum suum acquirere.

(24.) Item quod conferens eleemosynam fratribus, vel fratri praedicanti est excommunicatus ; et recipiens.

50. In the Introduction to *Fasc. Zizan.*, lxiv. f., Shirley has given from a MS. in

Trinity College, Cambridge, the passage of a Latin sermon in which Wiclif mentions the condemnation of the Article, and vindicates the truth contained in it. And in the English tract, *De Apostasia Cleri, Select Works*, III., 437, Wiclif remarks that Christ himself submitted himself to Judas Iscariot : Crist obeshed and served to Scarioth. Comp. Arnold's note on these words.

51. It is for this reason that Wiclif in the *Trialogus* emphatically defends himself against the judgment of the Council, and explains the real meaning of his Article IV., c. 37, p. 377, while he justifies the 19th Art. in the 38th cap., p. 389.

52. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 157. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 275 ; comp. p. 282. Lewis Append, No. 31, p. 356 f.

53. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 158 f. : Knighton *De Eventibus Angliae*, Book V. of his Chronicle in Twysden's *Histor. Anglec. Scriptures* X., fol. 2651 f., gives the text of the archiepiscopal mandate to the Bishop of London, as incorporated in the mandate of the Bishop of Lincoln, 12th July 1382, to the archdeacons of his diocese. Knighton had the copy before him which had been sent to the Archdeacon of Leicester, and it was to this archdeaconry that the parish of Lutterworth belonged. Wiclif himself, as parish priest, must have received a copy of this mandate from the Archdeacon of Leicester through the Dean of Goodlaxton. The text of the Archbishop's mandate is given by Foxe (*Acts and Monuments, III.*, 23 f.) in English.

54. John Foxe, *Acts, etc.* III., 37.

55. *Ib.*

56. *Ib.* It is ordained and asserted in this present Parliament, etc.

57. The French Original of the petition, in Cotton, *Abridgement of the Parliamentary Rolls*, Vol. III., p. 141 ; translated in Foxe's *Acts and Mon.* III., 38.

58. The patent is printed in full in Foxe's *Acts, etc.* III., 39, and has here, as in the *Collection of Patents*, Vol. I., 35, the date 26th June, of the 6th year of Richard II. In Wilkin's *Concilia* the same patent is given in Latin, but bears date 12th July. As the latter text is taken from the Episcopal Archives of Ely, the difference of the date may be explained by supposing that in the latter archive the day was noted when the patent arrived in Ely.

59. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 292 f.

SECTION V.—*The Wiclif Party intimidated by the measures of the Archbishop.*

THE preliminary arrangements with the State had now been made as far as practicable. Action could now be taken either to bend or to break the leaders and adherents of the ecclesiastical opposition. The Archbishop thought that no time should be lost.

He had already made use of the Church Council of May 1382 and its condemnation of the Articles submitted to its judgment, for the purpose of intimidating Wiclif and his party. Occasion had been given him to do so by the state of parties in the University of Oxford.

Since the beginning of 1381 party feeling there had been more than ordinarily violent. Wiclif's attacks upon the Papacy, as well as his preaching itinerancy, which had now for some years been in operation, and of which Oxford was head-quarters, had materially increased the hostility of the opposing parties in the University. The peasants' rebellion, too, had had an indirect influence, at least, upon the position of the two factions. The Petition of the Mendicant Monasteries in Oxford to the Duke of Lancaster, mentioned in a former chapter, is an incontrovertible proof of this influence.[60] In particular, that document reveals the fact that Dr. Nicolas Hereford, a well-known friend and colleague of Wiclif, was the most energetic spokesman of the party in the University which was opposed on principle to the Mendicant Orders. To these ecclesiastico-political antagonisms were added collisions in the domain of doctrine itself. When Wiclif stood forward with his criticism of the doctrine of transubstantiation, it was theologians of the Mendicant Orders who first controverted his teaching. In the Church Council of May 1382, as we have seen, those doctors of theology who did not belong to the Orders of the Augustinians or Dominicans, the Carmelites or Franciscans, were an almost invisible minority. Naturally enough with Wiclif and his party the opinion gradually grew into an axiom that "Begging Monk" and "thorough-going defender of Papistical doctrine and modern errors" were one and the same

thing. As men's minds were now pitted against each other, and the two parties engaged in attacks, not only in the schools and lecture-halls, especially at disputations and other academic acts, but also in pulpits and in the intercourse of daily life, the excitement became every day more intense. It even occurred that several members of the University were found with arms concealed under their clothes in halls, and even in the church. All the more urgent appeared the necessity of interposing, even in the interest of peace and order, to say nothing of the need of doing something to uphold the doctrine and life of the Roman Catholic Church.[61]

On Ascension-day, 15th May, Nicolas Hereford had preached one of his bold sermons in the cemetery of St. Frideswide, in which he quite openly espoused the party of Wiclif, and if we may believe the report of an opponent, gave utterance to many things of an offensive and even inflammatory character. It was probably here that he expressed among other things the opinion that Archbishop Sudbury had been put to death, and justly so, because he was understood to have resolved upon taking proceedings against Wiclif.[62] He had also, some months earlier, taken every opportunity to declaim against the Begging Friars in connection with the peasants' revolt of the previous year. He asserted that their begging was to blame for the impoverishment of the country, for by it the population was drained dry more than by taxes and other public burdens — and further, that the bad example which the Mendicants gave by their laziness was the occasion of the serfs and peasants leaving their accustomed labours and rising in revolt against their masters, etc. These representations seem to have found willing ears in

Oxford, and a dangerous agitation against the Mendicant Orders began to spread. Hence the necessity under which the latter had found themselves to address the Duke of Lancaster, and to cast themselves upon the protection of that powerful prince.[63]

These inflammatory harangues of the resolute but too excitable Hereford gave particular offence to the Mendicants, and were the cause of his being singled out for attack before all the other friends of Wiclif. To make suitable preparations for this it was requisite for his opponents to obtain the necessary basis of facts. But this had its difficulties. For Nicolas Hereford, with all his boldness of attitude, seems to have acted with prudence and foresight. At least, he had not allowed a single writing of his own to leave his hand — neither book nor pamphlet. His enemies were aware of this, and called it wretched cowardice, heresy-hiding, etc.[64] To reach him, no other course remained open at last but to take down from his mouth any doubtful expressions which dropped from him, and to have them attested notarially. This was done at the suggestion of Dr. Stokes,[65] the Archbishop's commissary.

It seemed to the enemy to be high time to take measures for silencing the Wiclif party when it became known that Robert Rigg, the Chancellor, had appointed Philip Repington to preach before the University on Corpus Christi Day, 5 June 1382. Philip Repington was a member of the stately Augustinian Priory of St. Maria de Pratis in Leicester, and a Bachelor of Theology in Oxford. Hitherto he had modestly kept himself out of public view, and was even regarded with favour by the Popish party. But he had recently preached a sermon in the hospital

of Brackley, in Northamptonshire, in which he discovered himself to be an adherent of Wiclif's doctrine of the Lord's Supper; and after his promotion to be Doctor of Theology in the beginning of summer, he commenced his first lectureship in the University in that capacity by extolling the merits of Wiclif. In particular, he undertook to defend Wiclif's ethical doctrines at all points. After such antecedents it was intelligible that the adherents of the Scholastic Church-doctrine should look forward with some uneasiness to Repington's preaching before the University on such an occasion as Corpus Christi. There was reason to fear that he would use the opportunity to strike a keynote in favour of Wiclif, and openly to attack the doctrine of the change of substance in the Sacrament, for the very reason that it was the Feast of Corpus Christi. They therefore addressed themselves to the Archbishop, with an earnest request that without delay, and before the festival arrived, he would order the condemnation of Wiclif's Articles to be published in Oxford.[66]

This request was complied with without delay. On the 28th May, as already mentioned above, a mandate of the Archbishop, issued to Dr. Stokes with instructions to publish in the University the judgment which had been pronounced on the twenty-four Articles, and to prohibit the defence of them.[67] Two days thereafter the Primate addressed a letter to the Chancellor, Robert Rigge, in which he censured him in an ungracious tone, and with the bearing of an inquisitor, for having shown favour to Nicolas Hereford, who was under strong suspicion of heretical opinions, and for having appointed him to preach an exceptionally important sermon. He gives him, at the same time, emphatic advice to abstain in future from giving any

countenance to such men, otherwise he must himself be regarded as belonging to the party. On the contrary, let him give his assistance to Dr. Stokes in the publication of the Archbishop's mandate against the Articles, and let him cause the mandate to be read by the bedell of the Theological Faculty in the theological lecture rooms at the lectures next ensuing.[68]

But the Chancellor did not allow himself to be intimidated. He said aloud that Dr. Stokes, by making himself so busy with the Archbishop, was trenching upon the liberties and privileges of the University; that no bishop nor archbishop had any jurisdiction over the University, not even in a case where heresy was in question. The autonomy of the learned corporation asserts itself, we see, against the threatening attempt of the hierarchy to encroach upon the freedom of teaching in the University. But the Chancellor did not venture to give expression to these principles in public. On the contrary, after consultation with the proctors and some other members of the University, he publicly announced that he would give his assistance to Dr. Stokes. But in point of fact he put as many difficulties in the commissary's way as he could (at least so says an opponent), and found means to induce the mayor of the city to hold in readiness a hundred armed men, plainly with the view of putting a stop to any disturbances which might ensue; although there were some who imputed to him the design of making away with Dr. Stokes, or at least of compelling him to desist, in case he was resolved to execute his commission.[69]

Meanwhile the festival of Corpus Christi was approaching. On Wednesday, 4th June, the day before the Feast, Dr. Stokes handed to the Chancellor a copy of the mandate which the Archbishop had sent to him, along with the letter

which was directed to the Chancellor himself. The Chancellor took them both into his hands, but gave expression to some doubts upon the matter; he had as yet, he said, no letter and seal to show that it was his business to assist Dr. Stokes in the execution of the Archbishop's commission. It was only when the Carmelite, on the very day of the festival, showed him, in full assembly, the Archbishop's letter patent with his private seal attached, that the Chancellor declared himself ready to assist in the publication of the mandate; yet under reservation of first advising with the University thereupon, and obtaining its consent thereto.[70]

On Corpus Christi Day, the University, with the Chancellor and proctors at their head, and accompanied by the Mayor of Oxford, proceeded to the Cemetery of St. Frideswide for solemn divine service, which was celebrated in the open air. Dr. Repington preached the festival sermon. He seems to have made no direct attack on the doctrine of the change of substance; and he had good reasons for taking this course on that occasion. But he spoke out without disguise his conviction that Wiclif was a thoroughly sound and orthodox teacher, and had at all times set forth the doctrine of the universal church touching the Sacrament of the Altar. Among other things, he said that in sermons princes and lords should have honourable mention before the Pope and Bishops, otherwise preachers acted contrary to Scripture; he also referred to Wiclif's itinerant preachers, and called them "holy priests." Of the Duke of Lancaster the preacher declared that he was resolved to take all evangelically-minded men under his protection. There were people who characterised this sermon as seditious.

After sermon the assembly passed into the Church of St.

Frideswide, and opponents asserted that nearly twenty men, with concealed weapons, entered with the rest. Stokes, the Carmelite, harboured the suspicion that it was his own life which was aimed at, and did not venture to leave the Church again. The Chancellor waited for the preacher in the porch, congratulated Repington upon his sermon, and accompanied him from the church. The whole Wiclif party was overjoyed at the discourse.[71] But Dr. Stokes was in such fear of his life that he had not the courage to publish the Archbishop's mandate.[72] In the meanwhile the controversy publicly went on in lectures and disputations.[73] From those days date, in my judgment, those disputations in Oxford extending over several days, of which we read, between the champions of the hierarchy on the one side, and Hereford and Repington on the other. It was significant of the time that the latter were obliged to take up a defensive position, however ably and triumphantly they represented their cause. How much these learned discussions, aided as they were by being open to the public, enchained the attention of the general community, we see from a poem which was composed, at all events, in 1382—not earlier than July and not later than October—and which has come down to our times.[74]

The Chancellor of the University himself was now summoned before the Archbishop, to purge himself of the suspicion of heresy. On 12th June, the octave of the Feast of Corpus Christi, along with two others summoned at the same time—Dr. Thomas Brightwell and John Balton, Bachelor of Theology—Dr. Rigge appeared before an assembly of ecclesiastics in the Dominican Monastery of London, presided over by the Archbishop. Here the Chancellor was examined touching several facts which seemed to bear out the suspicion that he was a favourer of Wiclif's party, especially of the Doctors

Hereford and Repington, and participated in their opinions.[74] It was difficult for him to contest these facts. It was found that he and the proctors for the year—Walter Dash and John Huntman—had, in point of fact, favoured Wiclif's docrines. Hereupon the twenty-four Articles were laid before them, upon which the censure of the assembly of 21st May had been pronounced. Dr. Rigge at once assented to this judgment, while Dr. Brightwell and John Balton only expressed their concurrence in it after some hesitation and mental conflict.[75] It was further laid to the Chancellor's charge that he had disregarded the respect and deference which were due to the Archbishop, in having taken no notice of the Primate's letter directed to him in person; for which he begged upon his knees the Archbishop's pardon, and received the same upon the intercession of the Bishop of Winchester, William of Wykeham;[76] and now it was required of him to publish in person that ecclesiastical censure of the twenty-four articles which he had been unwilling, a few days before, so much as to assist Dr. Stokes in publishing. He even received a written injunction touching John Wiclif himself, Nicolas Hereford, Philip Repington, John Aston, and Lawrence Bedeman, no longer to suffer them to preach before the University, and to suspend them from every academic function, until they should have purged themselves from all suspicion of heresy.[77]

The Churchmen now thought themselves quite secure of the University. One unwelcome incident, however, occurred to cool somewhat their satisfaction. When Dr. Stokes was called to account on the same day for not having, up to that time, carried out the Archbishop's instructions touching the mandate, he frankly acknowledged that he durst not publish the document for fear of his life; upon which Courtnay

replied, "Then is the University a patron of heresies, if she will not allow orthodox truths to be published."[78]

On Saturday, 14th June, Chancellor Rigge returned to Oxford, and did not fail, in accordance with the obligation he had come under, to make known to Hereford and Repington that he had no choice but to suspend them from all university functions. But he was still of the same mind, notwithstanding, as an incident which occurred soon after showed. A monkish zealot, Henry Cromp, of the Cistercian Monastery of Bawynglas, in the county of Meath,[79] had been promoted doctor of theology in Oxford, and was delivering lectures in the University at that time. This man indulged in violent attacks upon the Wiclif party, and applied to them the heretic-name of Lollards, which had recently come into use, but until that time had never been publicly employed; upon which the Chancellor energetically interfered. He summoned the doctor to appear before him, and when the latter failed to present himself, he declared him guilty, pronounced judgment upon him as a disturber of the peace, and suspended him from all university functions—a sentence which was solemnly published in the University Church.

But the Cistercian did not take all this quietly; he hastened immediately to London, and put in a complaint against the sentence not only to the Archbishop, but also to the Chancellor of the kingdom and the Privy Council.[80] The consequence was that the Chancellor and proctors were summoned to appear before the Privy Council; and some weeks later Cromp's suspension was annulled by royal ordinance, and his complete rehabilitation enjoined. But the Archbishop did not omit to turn this opportunity to good account. He exerted himself to obtain from the

Government an instruction to the heads of the University similar to that which he had addressed to them himself—viz., that they should not fail to take measures against the Wiclif party. Meanwhile, the Archbishop, as Grand Inquisitor (*inquisitor hæreticae pravitatis per totam suam provinciam*), had summoned to his tribunal the Doctors Hereford and Repington, and also the Bachelor of Theology, John Aston. The same appeared (18th June), in a chamber of the Dominican Monastery in London, before the Archbishop and many doctors of theology and laws, in order to be examined on the often-mentioned "Articles." The two doctors craved time for reflection; Aston asked for none, but gave his declaration at once, to the effect that he would in future keep silence touching the articles laid before him. Hereupon he was prohibited from preaching in future in the province of Canterbury. He did not deny that he was aware that the Archbishop, by a special mandate, had inhibited every man from preaching who had not been properly called to that function. But as he maintained that he had not incurred the bann by his itinerant preaching, which had been continued in the face of the mandate, he too was summoned to appear a second time on 20th June; Hereford and Repington being also summoned to appear on the same day.[81]

On Friday, 20th June, the adjourned examination took place in the same monastery.[82] Hereford and Repington handed in a written declaration touching the condemned Articles, in which they expressed their views on every one of them in succession. This declaration was so worded as to guard their Church orthodoxy, while at the same time, by a guarded interpretation of the Articles, they sought to establish Wiclif's soundness in the faith.[83] No wonder that

to the Archbishop this written declaration seemed to be wanting in straightforwardness. There ensued, therefore, a further examination upon eight of the Articles. But here, too, no understanding was arrived at, because the accused—in reference, *e.g.*, to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper—refused to give any more definite or distinct answer than they had given already in their written answer. Hereupon the assessors of the Inquisitorial Court agreed to an unanimous judgment, that the answers of the two theologians were more evasive and reserved than sincere and satisfactory. The Archbishop accordingly required them once more, in a solemn tone, to make a declaration without reserve; and when this proved ineffectual, dismissed them from the bar with the intimation that they were to appear once more after eight days, to receive judgment.[84]

John Aston was then called forward. He had shortly before drawn up a brief confession of his faith in English, and spread it in London in many copies as a fly-leaf. The object of his confession was to gain over public opinion, and to convince his readers that he was a good, believing Christian.[85] But now the Archbishop required him to give a frank declaration touching the condemned Articles. Aston, a practised itinerant preacher, then began to make answer in the English tongue, which was very displeasing to the Archbishop because of the laity who were present. Courtnay required him to speak in Latin. Aston went on, notwithstanding, to use the mother tongue, and delivered a bold, exciting, and (to the thinking of the spiritual judges) insulting speech, without going at all, however, into the scholastic questions laid before him on the subject of the Lord's Supper. In the end, therefore, he was convicted of

harbouring the condemned opinions, and declared to be a teacher of heresy.[86]

On 27th June Hereford and Repington appeared before the Archbishop at Otford. They were, however, dismissed again without anything being done, and cited once more to appear at Canterbury on 1st July, on the alleged ground that the Archbishop at that time had none of his theological and legal assessors about him. If the Archbishop on this occasion had put them to useless trouble, they allowed him to wait to no purpose for them on 1st July. The Archbishop appeared at nine o'clock in the chapter-house of his cathedral with nine doctors and bachelors of theology, and ordered the accused to be called. When they failed to appear, he adjourned the proceedings to two o'clock in the afternoon; and when they remained absent also at that hour, he passed sentence upon them of contempt of court, and laid them under the bann of excommunication.[87]

Both of them now appealed to the Pope, but the Archbishop declared this appeal to be *insolent*, without justification, and invalid, and appointed public proclamation of the bann pronounced upon Hereford and Repington, to be made with all solemnity on 13th July, at sermons at St. Paul's Cross in London. A cross was erected, candles were lighted, extinguished, and thrown on the ground, etc.[88] The Chancellor in Oxford received commands to cause the bann to be published with like ceremonies in St. Mary's Church, and in a simpler form in all the lecture-rooms of the University, along with a summons to both to appear before the Archbishop's tribunal.[88] And even all this was not enough—the like publication of the bann and the summons must be afterwards made in all the churches of towns and larger villages throughout the church-province of Canterbury.[89]

But Archbishop Courtnay was not content with ecclesiastical measures. He used his influence with the King and Government to engage the power of the State in the affair, and to put down the heresy also with the temporal sword. On the same day on which the mandates of the Archbishop issued to the Chancellor of Oxford and the preachers at St. Paul's Cross, a royal patent was drawn up, addressed to the Chancellor and Proctors of Oxford, by which the duty was imposed upon them of making an inquisition at large (*inquisito generalis*) of all graduates of theology and law in the University, in order to discover such as might be attached to the condemned Articles; and further, within eight days they were to drive forth and banish from the University and the city, "every member who receives, bears favour to, or has any intercourse with Dr. John Wiclif, Nicolas Hereford, Philip Repington, John Aston, or any one else of the same party." Nay, more: search must be made without delay in all the halls and colleges of the University, for books and tracts of Wiclif and Hereford—and all such writings must be interdicted and sent in without correction to the Archbishop. All which must be faithfully carried out, under pain of the loss of all the University's liberties and rights. The Viscount of Oxfordshire and the Mayor of the city, with all other King's officers, are also enjoined to lend a helping hand in carrying out this royal order.[90]

A day later, on 14th July, issued a second royal letter to the Chancellor and Proctors of the University of Oxford, whereby, as already stated, the academic suspension of the Cistercian Henry Cromp was annulled, and his restoration to his former position was commanded. This brief at the same time prohibited the University from taking any

action against Cromp or the Carmelites, Peter Stokes and Stephen Patrington and others, on account of their polemic against the condemned Articles, and the teaching of Wiclif, Hereford and Repington.[91]

The Crown had thus done its utmost in the use of its administrative power to crush the party of free-thought, the Wiclif opposition.

In the meantime the persecution of the itinerant preachers was proceeding, and of all the principal friends and admirers of Wiclif. The Bishops of London and Lincoln in particular—Robert Braybrook and John Buckingham—distinguished themselves by their zeal in this work. In the extensive and populous diocese of Lincoln were Oxford, Lutterworth, and Leicester, the three chief centres of Wiclifite effort; and in the capital of the kingdom and the surrounding country, there were also to be found many "evangelical men." But the chief instruments of persecution in both dioceses were the begging monks. Wiclif himself mentions this fact, with bitter complaints against the diabolical malice of these monks, who were unceasingly at work in London and Lincoln to extirpate the true and poor preachers, principally for the reason that the latter had discovered and exposed their cunning practices to the people. The Bishop of Lincoln received from the Archbishop a letter of commendation and thanks for his indefatigable zeal against "the Antichrist" and his adherents.[93] One of the itinerants who were summoned in the diocese of Lincoln, examined, and at last condemned to recant, was the priest, William of Swinderby. This man appealed at first, when he was summoned by the bishop, to the King, and had the wish in particular to be examined by the Duke of Lancaster. But this helped him little. The case even came before Par-

liament, but the Parliament did not take up the subject, but left it to the Ordinary himself for decision. And the Ordinary obliged Swinderby to promise upon oath, that he would never more in future preach and teach the Articles which were laid before him. He was, at the same time, required to make a public recantation, in a form which was drawn up for him, and this in the Cathedral of London, in the Collegiate Church of Leicester, and in four parish churches of the diocese of Lincoln.[94]

In the meantime, by command of the Archbishop, search was made in Oxford and in the country for Hereford and Repington, Bedeman and Aston.[95] During the summer months they remained in concealment, and were able to baffle the pursuit of their enemies; but in the course of October the three last-named were apprehended, one after the other, and ended by making their submission and agreeing to recant. The first to set this example was Laurence Stephen, or Bedeman;[96] next, Repington, on 23rd October, presented himself before the Archbishop and several bishops and doctors in the Dominican Monastery of London. He endeavoured to clear himself of the charges laid against him, and declared his assent to the synodal judgment of the 25th May, whereby the twenty-four Wiclif Articles were condemned; whereupon he was absolved by the Primate from the bann, and restored to his former position, especially to his university rights.[97] His recantation was sealed at a provincial synod, held in Oxford in November, by a confession of his faith which he signed with his own hand on the 24th of that month.[98] Last of all, John Aston, too, made up his mind to a recantation, which he solemnly made before the same synod in Oxford, probably on 24th November, and was therefore also absolved and reponed.[99]

The only one of Wiclif's friends who now remained firm and unbowed was Nicolas Hereford. If we are to follow, indeed, the account of Knighton in his Chronicle, Hereford must have recanted about the same time. But upon accurate examination this assumption is found to be erroneous; it is in fact confuted by a piece of information which we owe to the same narrator.[100] He informs us, namely, that Hereford went to Rome, and submitted the twenty-four Articles to Pope Urban VI. for his definitive decision. After mature examination by several cardinals and other theologians, the Pope simply confirmed the judgment which had been pronounced in England. But Urban, mindful of the thanks he owed to the English Church for its adherence to his obedience, instead of sentencing Hereford to death at the stake, was pleased to commute the sentence to imprisonment for life. But in the summer of 1385 he was unexpectedly released from prison and returned to England, upon occasion of the Pope's being besieged in Nocera by King Charles of Sicily, when the Romans, discontented at the long absence of the Pope, raised a tumult in the city, and among other doings broke open the Papal prison and set free the prisoners.

In this whole narrative there is nothing of inherent improbability. It is on the contrary confirmed by the fact that from 27th June 1382 Hereford was not seen in England for several years, as well as by the curious fact formerly mentioned that his Translation of the Old Testament was abruptly broken off, and so remained unfinished. On 15th January 1383 the Archbishop applied to the King for the assistance of Government against Hereford, because he was still setting the bann pronounced upon him at defiance.[101]

In 1387, several years after Wiclif's death, Hereford is again mentioned as the leading Itinerant Preacher of the Lollards.[102] It is scarcely credible, if he had remained all these years in the kingdom, that he could have escaped for so long a time the search of his persecutors.

Thus had Archbishop Courtnay, at the date of October 1382, *i.e.*, within five mouths of his entry upon the actual discharge of his high office, succeeded to such an extent in his designs that the opposition party in the University of Oxford was fairly intimidated and reduced to silence. The most important members of the party were either driven out of the country, or had bowed themselves in submission and made formal recantation. A very considerable success, certainly, to be obtained in so comparatively short a time.

NOTES TO SECTION V.

60. In quo die (10 Juni 1382) visi sunt duodecim homines armati sub indumentis in scholis, *Fasciculi Zizan.*, ed. Shirley, 302. Post sermonem intravit (Philippus Repyngdon) ecclesiam S. Fredeswidae cum viginti hominibus subtus pannos armatis, p. 300.

61. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 296.

62. *Ib.*, p. 292.

63. Sed ille Nicolaus velut miser fugiens, numquam voluit librum vel quaternum communicare alteri doctori, sed modo haereticorum et multoties meretricio processit. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 296.

64. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 296 : Haereses et errores et alia nefanda redacta sunt in certam formam per notarios, ad instantiam cujusdam doctoris in theologia, fratris, Petri Stokys Carmelitae.

65. *Ib.*, p. 296 f.

66. *Ib.*, p. 275-282.

67. *Ib.*, p. 298 f.

68. *Ib.*, p. 299.

69. Litera fratris Petri Stokys, etc., in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 300, f.

70. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 299 f. ; comp. 307.

71. Letter from Dr. Stokes to the Archbishop, 6 Juni, *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 300 f.

72. *Ib.*, p. 302.

73. We give the poem complete in Appendix No. 7. The dates given above may be gathered from the facts that the appeal of Hereford and Repington to the Pope is mentioned at the end of the poem ; and this appeal was made at the beginning of July, from which it follows that the piece could not have been written earlier than that date. But, as Repington recanted on 23d October, the poem cannot have been written later than in October. The poem has already been twice printed from a MS. in the British Museum, but the Vienna MS. which we have used gives the text in a form which is in part better than the former. The poem, which is distinguished by a remarkable refrain, is in its contents in part a complaint, and in part an honourable commemoration of the Reformation efforts of Wiclif and his friends. The complaint describes the melancholy condition of England, menaced without, rotten within, and sinking deeper and deeper in its moral and religious life. For this state of things the writer blames all ranks, but especially the Begging Friars and the Benedictines also as well. To lift up the Church again, God has raised up Wiclif and his disciples, who tell both the landed and the Mendicant orders the truth. But the latter have opposed themselves to the witnesses of the truth, and coming forward one after another, have attacked them in disputations. But Hereford and Repington defended themselves so victoriously that nothing remained for the friars at last but to take refuge in the Archbishop, who thereupon took steps against Wiclif's friends until they appealed to the Pope.

74. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 304-308.

75. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, Vol. III. p. 159. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 288, fol. 308.

76. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 308.

77. *Ib.*, p. 309-311.

78. *Ib.*, p. 311.

79. *Ib.*, p. 350, in a Document of the Bishop of Meath.

80. *Ib.*, p. 311, f. ; comp. 315.

81. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III. 160 f. ; *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 289. The date of the latter document has to be corrected by substituting xiv. cal. Julii for xiv. cal. Junii. Shirley's conjecture, note 2, on p. 289, is erroneous.

82. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 319.

83. The "Explanation" in full form in Latin, is to be seen in Wilkins, III., p. 161 f. ; *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 319-325. In Old English, Knighton's *Chronicle*, fol. 2655, f. John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, III., 32 f.

84. Wilkins, III., 163 ; *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 326-329.

85. Confessio Magistri Johannis Astone, in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 329 f. Knighton gives this Confession in Old English, though in part incorrectly in his *Chronicle*, Book V., fol. 2656 f.

86. Wilkins, *Conc. M. Brit.*, III., 163 f. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 290-331.

87. *Ib.*, III., 164 f. Foxe, *Acts and Mon.*, III., 40.

88. *Ib.*, The archiepiscopal Document of 12 Juli vid., Wilkins, III., 165.

89. *Ib.*, *Concilia M. Brit.* III., 165 f. The Mandate of the Archbishop to the Preacher at St. Paul's on Sunday of that date.

90. Mandate of same date to the Chancellor, in Wilkin's ; *Concilia*, III., 166.

91. *Ib.*, Mandate of 30th July to the Bishop of London, III., 167 f.

92. Breve regium, in Rymer, *Federa*, VII., 363 Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 166 f. ; *Fasc. Zizan.*, 312 f.

93. Breve regimum, in Rymer, *Federa*, VII., 363 ; *Fasc. Zizan.*, 314 f. ; Lewis, p. 365 ; Foxe, III., 43.

94. *Trialogus*, IV., c. 37, p. 379 : Tam Londoniis quam Lincolniae laborant assidue ad sacerdotes fideles et pauperes extinguendum, et specialiter propter hoc. quod eorum versutias caritative in populo detexerunt.

95. Wilkins, *Concilia M. Brit.*, III., 168 f.

96. Processus domini Joh. Lincolniensis episcopi contra Willelmum Swynderby Wycclevistam, in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 334-346. This is a full transcript, dated 11th July 1382, and sent by the Bishop of Lincoln to those clergy of his Diocese in whose churches Swinderby was condemned to make the recantation required of him.

97. Information of the Chancellor Robert Rigge sent to the Archbishop, dated 25th July 1382, in Wilkins, III., 168.

98. Under date 18th October 1382, the Archbishop issued a Mandate restoring him to his rights in the University, which pre-supposes his recantation to have been previously made.

99. See the relevant document of 23d October 1382, in Wilkins, III., 169.

100. Wilkins, III., 172.

101. *Ib.*, III., 172. Comp. in same vol., fol. 169, the Archbishop's attestation of absolution and rehabilitation, dated Oxford, 27th November 1382.

102. Knighton, fol. 2655 f. A recantation of Hereford in English, which, however, cannot belong to the year 1382, but must date from a later period, because it names the year of grace 1382 as the date of a former declaration of its author. Still, we have no ground for suspecting it to be spurious, as Vaughan does, *Life and Opinions*, II., 89.

SECTION VI.—*The Cautious Proceedings of the Hierarchy against Wiclif himself.*

ONLY one man still stood firm and erect upon the field. And that was no less a personality than Wiclif himself, the bold, manful, and indefatigable leader of the party. How comes it that precisely the recognised head of the party should have remained unassailed? Judgment, it was true, had been pronounced against his "Articles." They had been branded by the Church authority partly as errors, partly as

heresies; and it might be said the name was nothing compared with the thing—the principles were the chief matter, and these had been condemned without reserve and without mercy. True, also, measures had not hitherto been wanting which had been taken against Wiclif himself. The Archbishop had, 12th July 1382, sent an order to the Chancellor of Oxford that no one in the University should be permitted to attend the preaching of Wiclif or his adherents, or in any way to favour them;[103] and in a second order it was commanded that public intimation should be given that the Archbishop had suspended John Wiclif, with Hereford, Repington, Aston, and Bedeman from all scholastic functions, until they should be purged by himself from all suspicion of erroneous doctrine.[104] But this did not touch directly the person of Wiclif, especially as at that time he no longer had his principal residence in Oxford, but in his parish of Lutterworth; and of course it was only his honour, not his personal condition, that was affected when, in addition, a royal order to the Chancellor and Proctors of Oxford (13th July 1382) prohibited all manner of favour being shown to John Wiclif and the other leaders, and appointed search to be made for the writings of Wiclif and Hereford.[105]

The question therefore again presents itself, how it is to be explained that, at a time when persecution was so systematically carried out against the friends of Wiclif, he should have remained personally unmolested himself? The question is attended with all the greater difficulty, the more clearly his enemies were aware of his personal importance and influence as the leader of his party; and plainly they were not lacking in this respect; they spoke of him as the Antichrist who was doing his utmost to undermine the faith.[106]

It has been sometimes thought that the difficulty may be removed by the observation that the measures adopted against the party applied principally to Oxford, while Wiclif had already for some time left the University and confined himself to Lutterworth.[107] But this goes but a very little way to clear up the matter; for on the one hand, Wiclif appears even now to have still possessed the right of delivering lectures, conducting disputations, and preaching before the University; otherwise the suspension from all academical acts which the Archbishop pronounced upon him would have had no meaning;[108] and on the other hand, the measures referred to were meant to apply to the whole province of Canterbury, howsoever and wheresoever the alleged errors might come into view. It may well, however, be supposed (and this is perhaps the true solution of the difficulty) that it was part of the well-weighed plan of operations adopted by the Archbishop, that after condemnation had been pronounced upon the doctrines and principles of the party, the personal persecution should only be directed at first against Wiclif's adherents and friends, in order that after these had been intimidated and reduced to submission, Wiclif himself might be all the more easily overpowered when deserted by all, and left standing alone.

In the end, however, he was summoned to appear in person before the Provincial Synod which assembled in Oxford, 18th November 1382, and was again adjourned to the 24th of the same month. The fact is not placed beyond all doubt, but has still a balance of probability in its favour, that Wiclif presented himself before this assembly in the church of St. Frideswide, and in the trial to which he was submitted, gave expression to and defended his convictions with freedom, and faithfulness, and unshrinking courage.

Another fact, however, connected with the trial is of undoubted historical certainty, viz., that no sentence was pronounced upon him as its issue, either condemning him to make a recantation of his doctrine, or inflicting upon him any other ecclesiastical censure. The silence of his adversaries as to any such issue is itself, in such a case as this, a convincing proof of the fact; for assuredly they would not have failed to trumpet forth the event in high triumph, if they had obtained so unexpected a success, and had bowed down the renowned and admired head of the opposition to undergo the humiliation of a public recantation. Add to this another fact, that when it was afterwards pretended that he had made such a recantation, they found themselves obliged to put forward as a proof of this a piece of writing —viz., his English Confession—which, properly understood, sets forth Wiclif's doctrine of the Eucharist in language so clear and unmistakeable, and in a tone of such fearless decision, that it is marvellous that it should ever have been appealed to for such a purpose; which, however, would never have been done if any document had ever come from Wiclif's hand of such a kind as to show that he had bowed down his shoulder under the caudine yoke of the hierarchical inquisition.

What was it that influenced the Hierarchy to abstain from demanding from him such a recantatation, to connive at his offence, and to allow the bold, free-spoken man to go back to his Lutterworth flock untouched, and in full possession of all his ecclesiastical promotions? Are we to suppose that what weighed with them was a dread of the Duke of Lancaster, who had always been his powerful patron? Archbishop Courtnay, it is true, could scarcely have forgotten the scene in his own Cathedral of St. Paul's which had touched his

honour so deeply; when the Duke took upon him the defence of the Oxford doctor in so high-handed a style, and with insulting threats directed against his own episcopal person.[110] But in the interval the Duke had been so sensibly affected by the events of the preceding year, when his life was threatened at the hands of the revolted peasantry, that his haughty bearing and power had been much broken down. He had, besides, for some time back—no doubt under the influence of the same circumstances—kept himself out of sight in Church affairs, and had warned Wiclif to be on his guard[111]—a fact which could not have remained unknown to the Archbishop. It can hardly, then, be supposed that it was from any reference to the Duke that Courtnay should have resolved to proceed cautiously with Wiclif. It must rather have been the thought of Parliament and of the state of public opinion that weighed with him, in adopting this prudential course.

It was on Tuesday, 18th November, that the Convocation had met in Oxford, and on the following day the Parliament assembled in Westminster. To this Parliament Wiclif addressed himself in a Memorial which, it may be presumed, would not fail to attract some measure of public attention. At least Wiclif himself expressed the hope that it would lead to a discussion. In its whole substance the "Complaint" was drawn up in such a way as to keep steadily before men's minds the legislative point of view. Four points were examined in it: 1, Monastic vows; 2, The exemption of the clergy and Church property; 3, What view was to be taken of tithes and offerings; 4, That the pure doctrine of Christ and his apostles touching the Lord's Supper should be allowed to be publicly taught in the Churches.[112] The last point is handled in the briefest manner; and it was good

tact in Wiclif not to go any deeper into doctrine, for King and Parliament were not the proper authorities from which could come the decision of dogmatic questions. But all the more fully does the author examine the first point, devoting almost one half of the Memorial to the proof of the proposition that monastic vows are nothing but inventions of sinful men, and are destitute of all obligatory force. A two-fold ground-thought runs through the whole document: first, the conception of the pure religion of Christ, without any additions of men; and next, the conception of Christian liberty. When the author claims the right of publicly setting forth the Scripture doctrine of the Sacrament, and when, in opposition to the fetters of monastic vows, he desires for himself and others the liberty of following the pure and simple rule of the Redeemer; when he contests the right of compulsory tithing, and on the other hand approves of tithes and offerings only as voluntary gifts, it is always a love of Christian liberty by which the writer is inspired. There can be no doubt that this Memorial, as a summary exhibition and defence of Wiclif's ideas, was well-fitted to find acceptance among the representatives of the country.[113]

To this must be added the well-warranted mistrust, and the only too intelligible irritation of the House of Commons, occasioned by the unconstitutional and arbitrary measure of the preceding session, when a bill for the imprisonment of the Wiclif Itinerants by the officials of counties, which had been passed only by the Lords, and had never even been brought before the Lower House, had been admitted into the collection of the Statutes of the realm. What must this lead to, men demanded, if the Crown and the Peers of the realm, quite over the heads of the Commons, lend their hands to the bishops in encroaching upon the liberty of the

people, and bowing them down in a style never before heard of, under the yoke of the prelates? If we allow such an irresponsible proceeding to pass unnoticed, what will become at last of the legislative power of the Commons? The Commons, therefore, addressed a strong representation to the Government against the pretended "statute" which had never obtained their consent, and pressed for its annulment;—a demand which was also, in point of fact, conceded. It may readily be supposed that this question must have been warmly discussed among Members of Parliament and in patriotic circles before the opening of the parliamentary session; and as it was the prelates who were chiefly aimed at in this popular agitation, it is easy to understand how the Archbishop, calling to mind the fate which had been prepared for his predecessor Sudbury, may have found it advisable to proceed cautiously with a man so highly regarded in the country, and of such immense influence, as Wiclif; and especially on the very eve of the opening of Parliament, rather to wink at his offences, than to add intensity to the ill-feeling which already existed by adopting a course in which all considerations of policy and prudence were set aside.

NOTES TO SECTION VI.

103. The order is given by Foxe, *Acts, etc.*, III., 47 f.

104. In a mandate to the Bishop of Worcester of 13th August 1387, Wilkins, III., 202 f.

105. Wilkins, III., 160.

106. *Ib.*, fol. 160.

107. *Ib.*, fol. 166.

108. Illum Antichristum, de quo scribitis pro posse fidei subversorem, in a letter of Archbishop Courtnay to the Bishop of Lincoln, Wilkins, III., 168. It can scarcely be doubted that the above expressions which the Archbishop borrows from the letter of his suffragan refer to Wiclif.

109. Vaughan, *A Monograph*, p. 286 f.

110. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 389 f.

111. Lewis, p. 117, says, "I cannot find that Wiclif appeared before this council." Herein he manifestly relies upon the circumstance that the protocol of the sessions (Wilkins, III., 172) does not say a single word about Wiclif. But Vaughan justly remarks (*Monograph, Appendix*, p. 572), that the protocol throughout contains very meagre minutes of the proceedings. These proceedings relate to the sworn recantations of Repington and Aston, as well as to the examination of the Carmelite Stokes and the Cistercian Henry Cromp. But if Wiclif made his answers before the council with intrepidity, and the bishops, notwithstanding, could not see their way to decide upon a final condemnation of his person, it is not difficult to explain why such an issue as this, which there was not the slightest reason to be proud of, should rather have been passed over in silence in a half-official minute. While nothing is to be gathered from this document, either for or against the fact in question, we have two other authorities who expressly attest that Wiclif, when summoned, appeared before the council and made answer for himself. These are the chronicler Knighton, and Anthony Wood. It is true, indeed, that when we carefully compare the two, the information of the latter appears to rest exclusively upon that of the former, which is, indeed, of much older date, for the account given by the churchmen who were present in the council coincides with Knighton's narrative, as also Wood's narrative does, save only that Wood, as a historian of the University, names the chancellor and doctors, as may be easily understood, immediately after the bishops, while the Canon of Leicester puts them in the second line. And there is another circumstance which speaks for Wood's dependence upon the chronicler, that the former as well as the latter, and with quite as little justification too, looks upon the confession of Wiclif as a recantation. The circumstance, on the other hand, that Wood makes mention of six men who wrote polemically against that confession, of whom Knighton says nothing, is by no means a proof, as Vaughan thinks (p. 766), that Wood had other authorities besides Knighton, in favour of the chief point of Wiclif having presented himself before the council, for it proves no more than this, that Wood found that particular literary notice in some other source than the Leicester *Chronicle*. All this being so, we have, in fact, only one original authority for the appearance of Wiclif before the council. But still this authority declares clearly, and with precision, that Wiclif was summoned by the Archbishop to Oxford, that he appeared before him and six bishops, as well as before the chancellor and numerous doctors, and before clergy and people, to answer to the charge of heresy which was laid against him (*De Eventibus Angliae*, fol. 2649). He asserts, it is true, that Wiclif made a complete recantation (*eis conclusionibus sive opinionibus omnino renuncians, nec eas tenuisse nec tenere se velle protestans*). But this judgment is contradicted by the English Confession on the Lord's Supper, which Knighton has inserted in his *Chronicle*, word for word, in this very place. The document does not contain a single trace of retractation, or of even the correction only of what he had before said on the subject, but only a clear exhibition and emphatic assertion of the same doctrine of the Lord's Supper which he declares to be the pure doctrine of Scripture, and at the same time the primitive doctrine of the Church, whereas the

doctrine of the Sacrament, as a mere accident without substance, is a modern error. The *Chronicle* of Leicester has found, notwithstanding, men of easy faith and full of prejudice who have maintained, on this mistaken authority, even in the present century, that Wiclif at that provincial council sought and obtained rest from further persecution by a cowardly disguising of his real convictions, *i.e.*, Lingard, *History of England*, IV., 260. Hefele, on the other hand, in his *Conciliengeschichte*, VI. 828, has, with justice, acknowledged that Wiclif, in the confession in question, remained true to his convictions, and even warmly attacked the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Supper. There is only one excuse for this misinterpretation of the piece; if the bishops had reasons for letting Wiclif's declaration pass as though they were satisfied with it, and saw in it a sort of recantation, it is all the more easy to understand that the chronicler, in case he did not go to the bottom of the matter, might unwarily consider the document in question as a recantation. Nor may it remain unmentioned that Knighton, in addition to this, fell into another error of a chronological kind. He is plainly under the erroneous impression that it was this council at Oxford which first pronounced that judgment upon the much agitated Articles of Wiclif, which, in fact, had already been pronounced upon them in May 1382. Comp. also the observations of Arnold in *Select English Works*, III., 501.

112. Comp. chap. 5, above. Vaughan, *Monograph*, p. 287, is disposed to think that this was the consideration which chiefly weighed with the Archbishop.

113. This memorial to Richard II. and Parliament, beginning with the words—"Plese it to our noble and most worthi King Richard," of which two manuscripts are still extant, the one perfect, in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the othe imperfect, in Trinity College, Dublin (comp. Shirley's *Catalogue*, p. 45) was published by Dr. Thomas James in 1608, along with a tract of considerable length against the Mendicant orders. It is published in Arnold's *Select English Writings*, III. 507-23, upon the basis of the Cambridge MS.

SECTION VII.—*The last two Years of Wiclif, and his Death.*

WICLIF was left at liberty to return in peace to his quiet cure in Lutterworth; and during the two full years which intervened between that date and his death, he experienced no further personal disturbance at the hands of the English hierarchy. The brief term of life still allotted to him he filled up with tranquil but many-sided and indefatigable labour. Before everything else he devoted himself with conscientious faithfulness to his pastoral work. A large part of the English sermons preached by him which have come down to us belongs, without doubt, to these last years of his life.[114] He found himself, however, necessitated by age and declining health and

strength to avail himself of an assistant pastor—a chaplain. The person who was associated with him for two years in this capacity was John Horn. In addition, John Purvey was Wiclif's constant attendant and confidential messmate—a helper of kindred spirit to his own, and a fellow-labourer in all his widely-extended work.[115] To him, without doubt, we are indebted for the writing out and collection and preservation of so many of Wiclif's sermons. In the great work of the English translation of the Bible, next to Nicolas Hereford, John Purvey was the most active and meritorious of Wiclif's co-workers. When this work was completed in its first form, and Wiclif became sensible of the need of submitting it to further revision and improvement, it was undoubtedly Purvey upon whom the largest share of this labour fell, and he carried forward the work after Wiclif's death, till it was at last happily completed in the year 1388.[116]

It may also be assumed, with some degree of probability, that during these years the preaching itinerancy, although menaced by the measures of the bishops, was still carried on, though in diminished proportions and with some degree of caution; and so long as Wiclif lived, Lutterworth continued to be the centre of this evangelical mission. But the narrower the limits became within which this itinerancy could be worked, the more zealously did Wiclif apply himself to the task of instructing the people by means of short and simple tracts in the English tongue, as a compensatory mode of reaching them. The largest number of the English tracts of Wiclif which have come down to us belong to these latest years of his life,[117] and of these there are at least half a hundred. Setting aside translations of portions of the text of Scripture, these tracts may be divided into two chief groups. The one consists of shorter or longer explanations of single heads of

the Catechism; the other of discussions of the doctrines of the Church. The latter, for the most part, have a polemical character, while the former are in a more positive form, didactic and edifying. To indicate more closely their contents in a few cases, several tracts of the first group treat of the Ten Commandments, of works of mercy, of the seven mortal sins; several discuss the duties belonging to the different stations and relations of life, while others treat of prayer, and explain the *Pater Noster* and the *Ave Maria*. There are also tracts on the Lord's Supper and on Confession and Absolution. To the second group—all treating of the Church, with its offices and members, institutions and functions—belong all those tracts which we have before mentioned, as defences of the itinerant preachers, and attacks upon their opponents. Others treat of the pastoral office itself, chiefly of the function of preaching, but also of the execution of the pastoral work at large, and of the life and conversation of the priests;[118] and of one tract of this set it is the special design to show that it is the duty of earthly rulers and lords to hold the clergy to their duty in all these respects.[119]

Ever interesting himself with vivid feeling in all that stirred his countrymen and fatherland, Wiclif could not remain unmoved when a crusade set forth from England which had no other object in view but to fight for the cause of Urban VI. against the supporters of the rival pope in Avignon, Clement VII., and, if possible, to overthrow the latter.[121] At the head of this crusade placed himself, not a nobleman skilled in war, but a prelate of the Church. During the peasant's revolt of 1381, Henry le Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, was the first man who had the courage to oppose himself to the movement, not only when it began, but as long as the flood continued

to rise, and when no one else had the spirit to resist it. He happened to be at his manor-house of Burlee when he heard that the people had risen in Norfolk. In a moment he set off to convince himself whether the fact was really so. Putting on his armour, and at the head of a small following of eight lances and a few bowmen, he attacked a crowd of rebels, among whom were two of the ringleaders, which latter he ordered to be beheaded upon the spot, and their heads to be set up in Newmarket. As he marched through the county his force increased at every step, for his resolution inspired new courage into the terrified knights and nobles. At North Walsh he came upon a fortified and barricaded camp of the rebels. This he immediately carried by storm under a blast of trumpets, himself leading the attack on horseback; and lance in hand, he dispersed the whole body, cut off their retreat, and after a great number had been slain, took their leaders prisoners. Those who fled to the churches for safety, trusting to the right of asylum, were slain even at the altar with swords and lances. Among the leaders was John Lister, a dyer of Norwich, who had allowed himself to be styled King of Norfolk. The Bishop in person sat in judgment on the ringleaders at Norwich — they ended on the gallows. A chronicler applauds him for this—"that his eye spared no one, and that his hand was stretched out for vengeance with joy."[122] From that day the Bishop of Norwich was highly considered as a man of heroic fearlessness and energetic action; he was even accredited with the talent of military command. No wonder that he was trusted to take the lead of a martial expedition which was designed to be a crusade.

Perhaps it is not too bold a conjecture that Henry le Spencer had himself taken the initiative of the movement, and at his own instance had obtained a commission from Urban VI. to lead a crusade against the "Clementines," the adherents of the rival pope. The Pope sent forth more than one bull in which he empowered the Bishop of Norwich to collect and take the command of an army which should wage a holy war against Clement VII. and his abettors on the continent, especially in France. Extensive powers were conferred upon the Bishop for this end, against Clement VII. and all his supporters, both clergy and laity. He was free to adopt all manner of measures against them — to banish, suspend, depose and imprison, and also to seize their estates. Whosoever should personally take part in the crusade for a year, and whosoever should provide a crusader at his own cost, or whosoever should even assist the undertaking with his purse and property, should receive a plenary absolution and the same rights and privileges as a crusader to the Holy Land.[123]

These bulls the Bishop communicated to the Members of Parliament in the session which met in November 1382, and published by the dispersion of copies in all parts of the kingdom, which he caused to be posted up upon the church doors and the monastery gates, that they might be patent to the knowledge of all.[124] The Bishop also, in virtue of "apostolic power" conferred to that effect, drew up and issued Letters of Indulgence.[125] And now commenced an agitation throughout the realm with the view of gaining the largest possible number to take a personal share in the crusade, and of inducing others to aid it, at least, with money and money's worth. For some time the fruit of these efforts does not

appear to have everywhere come up to the Bishop's wishes and needs. In a circular to the parish priests and chaplains of the diocese of York, he complains of the all too slender result, and presses upon them the duty of calling the attention of their parishioners to an opportunity so favourable for their soul's salvation; and of moving those who were remiss, whether rich or poor, by judicious handling in the confessional, to do what was in their power for the enterprise; all opposers of the undertaking it would be their duty to call before them, and to give intimation thereof to the Bishop or his commissaries, as well as to send in accurate returns of all the contributions obtained.[126] Circulars to the same effect were no doubt sent at the same time to the clergy of other dioceses. But in addition, by a special commission from the Bishop of Norwich, the Mendicants of different Orders put forth the most strenuous exertions in the pulpit and the confessional to awaken enthusiasm for the approaching crusade, and to call forth rich offerings in its behalf. They had in their hands one mighty key to the hearts of men—the promised absolution from all guilt and penalty; an absolution, however, which was only to be obtained at the price of contributions to the holy war.

The undertaking was meant to be made the common affair of the whole English Church and nation. Archbishop Courtnay worked for it at the instance, no doubt, of the Pope himself, by various mandates which he issued simultaneously on 10th April 1383 to the bishops of his province, and to the whole parish clergy of the kingdom, to the effect that in all churches prayers should be put up at mass and in sermons for the crusaders and the success of their enterprise; that every Wednesday and Friday solemn processions should be made for the behoof of the crusade; and all the parishioners

should be exhorted to join in the prayers.[127] A second mandate enjoined collections for the same object;[128] and the third contains the credentials and recommendation of three agents and receivers of the Bishop of Norwich, appointed in behoof of the collection.[129] No wonder that, when such extensive measures were adopted to secure success, an extremely large sum was in the end collected for the war-chest of the crusade. The sums obtained, not only in gold and silver, but also in money's-worth, in jewels, ornaments, and rings, in silver spoons and dishes, contributed alike by men and women, and especially by ladies of rank and wealth, were incredibly great. One lady of rank is said to have contributed one hundred pounds of silver, and many persons gave far beyond their means, insomuch that even a clerical chronicler is of opinion that the national wealth, in so far as it lay in private hands, was endamaged.[130]

But the grace-treasures which were offered in return for contributions were also worth something: for the pardons which were offered by Papal authority, were of virtue both for the living and the dead. It passed from mouth to mouth that one of the Bishop's commissaries had said that at their command angels descended from heaven to release souls in purgatory from their pain, and to translate them instantly to heaven.[131] In another key, but with the same object of making the crusade popular, the Archbishop applauds it, when, in his mandate of 10th April 1383, he seeks to stir up national feeling and English patriotism in support of the undertaking, by reminding the country that it is directed against France, the hereditary enemy of England; for France was the chief patron of the rival Pope; and by reminding it further, that the well-being of the State is inseparably connected with the interest of the Church;

while, in order to do away with the offence which could not fail to be taken by every unprejudiced mind against the conduct of the war being put into the hands of a prelate, the Archbishop gives the assurance that the only object of the war is to secure peace.[132]

Upon such proceedings as these, Wiclif could neither look with favour, nor preserve silence respecting them. More than once he not only threw gleams of side light upon the crusade, but also discussed it in proper form. In the summer of 1383 he published a small tract in Latin, bearing the title, "*Cruciata;* or, Against the War of the Clergy."[133] In this pamphlet he illustrates the subject on different sides, and condemns the crusade and everything connected with it in the severest manner; first, because it is a war at all, then because a war to which the Pope is the summoner is, under all circumstances, contrary to the mind of Christ; and further, because the whole quarrel between the contending popes has to do at bottom only with worldly power and mastery, which is a thing entirely unbefitting the Pope and wholly contrary to the example of Christ. But when it is even given out that every one who does anything to aid this crusade shall obtain remission from all guilt and punishment, this is a lie and "an abomination of desolation in the holy place." The Mendicant monks who promote this affair in their sermons, and take upon themselves the labour of collecting for it, are nothing else but enemies to the Church; they and all the cardinals and Englishmen in the Papal Court who plunder the country in this manner must, before everything else, make restitution of this unrighteous lucre, if they would ever obtain forgiveness of their sins.

I know no writing of Wiclif in which, with a greater

absence of all reserve, and in more incisive language, he laid bare, and did battle against the anti-christianism which lay in the great Papal schism in general, and particularly in the stirring up of an actual war for the purpose of annihilating one of the rival popes by force of arms and the shedding of blood.[134] He characterises the erection of the cross by Urban VI. as a persecution of true Christians, and as an inversion of the faith. It is a proof of the ascendancy of the devil's party, that kings and other powers tolerate the Pope's command to banish and imprison every man who opposes this party or does not actively support it. There are now few men or none at all who have the courage to expose themselves to martyrdom in this cause; and yet never since the time of Christ has there been a better cause for which men could have suffered a martyr's death; and never was there a more glorious victory to be won by the man who has the courage to stand up on the Lord's side. It is not enough that so many thousands of men should lose their lives, and that England should be sucked dry by the fraudulent spoliations of hypocrites; the worst of all is that many of those who fall in the crusade die in unbelief while taking part in this anti-christian persecution, while the Antichrist pretends that they are absolved from all sin and penalty and have entrance into heaven.[135]

How is this miserable mischief to be remedied which threatens in the end to bring the whole Church into confusion? To this question Wiclif replies,—"The whole schism is a consequence of the moral apostacy from Christ and His walk of poverty and purity." If it is to be mended, the Church must be led back to the poor and humble life of Christ and to His pure Word. In conformity with this view, his thought in the first instance is of princes and rulers. He

thinks that emperors and kings have done foolishly in providing the Church with lands and lordships; this they must set right again to the utmost of their power, and so restore peace. Wiclif compares, in his rough manner, the schism of the two popes to the quarrels of two dogs about a bone, and thinks that princes should take away the bone itself—that is, the worldly power of the Papacy—for surely they do not bear the sword in vain.[136] But *all* Christ's knights should in this cause stand true at the side of Christ's faithful poor; all good soldiers of Christ should stand shoulder to shoulder; this would enable them to win a great victory and renown. Yes! the whole of Christendom should take upon itself toil and trouble in order to put down wickedness, and restore the Church to the condition of apostolic purity, and to put an end to the means by which Antichrist misleads the Church."[137]

This memorial, written in the summer of 1383, enables us to perceive, in the clearest manner, that Wiclif was not in the least intimidated by the inquisitorial proceedings which Archbishop Courtnay had taken against him and his friends in the preceding year. He still speaks out in the most fearless and emphatic way against both the Popes, and against the crusade commanded by Urban VI., favoured by the Archbishop, and undertaken by an English bishop. In a writing directly addressed to the primate himself, which must have been penned at the same date, Wiclif plainly told him that he could not learn from Scripture that that crusade in defence of the Pope's cause was a lawful measure, or that the Lord Jesus Christ and His approbation had anything to do with it; and this, he continued, is an evident conclusion from the truth that only those works of man have the Lord's approval which are done from love. But

neither the slaying of men nor the impoverishment of whole countries is the outcome of love to the Lord Jesus Christ; especially as it is not our belief that the Pope is either head or member of our holy mother, the Church militant. And thus it is plain that there exists no valid and defensible ground for the endurance of martyrdom for the impoverishment of the people, and for an undertaking so full of anxiety and mischief.[138]

Of the crusade itself let it only be briefly remarked here, that the Bishop of Norwich embarked in May 1383,[139] and, advancing from Calais, took several towns in Flanders. But after this rapid and successful beginning he lost time by laying siege to the city of Ypres, and thereafter he met with nothing but misfortune. His conquests were no sooner won than they were lost again, until at last he was fain to surrender Gravelines, which he had taken, in order to secure his unopposed return to England at the beginning of October. The crusade came to an ignominious end. Nor was that all. At the bar of Parliament, which met at the end of October, the bishop and the chief officers of his staff had to answer to various charges which were laid against them, and the King withheld from him his temporalities, which were not restored again till 1385.[140]

It was a melancholy satisfaction to Wiclif that the crusade against which he had warned the nation came to such a wretched conclusion. He saw a judgment of God in its utter failure; only one thing was not yet clear to him, whether the whole of God's judgment was yet exhausted, or whether further punishment was yet to follow.[141]

It must have been in this year 1383, or the year following, that Wiclif's citation to Rome befell—if such a citation were a historical fact. His biographers all

agree in narrating that Pope Urban VI. summoned him to appear before his tribunal, but that Wiclif excused himself in a letter addressed to the Pope himself, on the ground of his declining health, while giving, at the same time, a frank confession of his convictions.[142] But it is passing strange that not one of them points to any contemporary account attesting the fact of such a citation. Of those "chroniclers" to whom we are indebted for authentic data concerning Wiclif's person and life, there is not one who has so much as a single word respecting the Pope's summons. The assumption of such a fact appears rather to rest entirely upon inferences drawn from a production of Wiclif's own pen, which, however, cannot in any case be regarded as an indubitable testimony to the fact in question. This is the so-called letter of Wiclif to Pope Urban VI.[143] But this piece, when examined without prejudice, is neither a letter in form, nor in substance an excuse for non-compliance with a citation received. Not a single trace can be discovered in it of the form of a real letter—neither an address at the beginning, nor any other epistolary feature from beginning to end. Nor among the alleged letters of Wiclif is this by any means the only one which has been erroneously included in this category;[144] while of all the letters which are indisputably such, there is not one which is without the characteristic address at least.[145] Indeed, the way in which the piece mentions the Pope is positive proof against the supposition that it was a letter addressed to the Pope himself. Not less than nine times is the Pope mentioned in this short composition, but, without exception, he is always spoken of in the third person; he is never addressed himself. More than once Wiclif refers to him as "*our* Pope,"[146] which is an indication that the writer had his

countrymen in his eye; and when we add to this the circumstance that the discourse, which from the beginning to beyond the middle proceeds in the first person singular, and sounds like an entirely personal confession, passes over, towards the close, into the first person plural, and in two instances assumes a hortatory plural form,[147] the conjecture may not seem too bold, that we have before us either the fragment of a sermon, or of a declaration addressed to English readers.

If we look about for any particular occasion which may have given rise to the document, it may be conjectured, with most probability, that Wiclif put forth this declaration at the time when his friend Nicolas Hereford set out for Rome to make his answer before the Pope. Perhaps, also, what the writing really contains of the nature of excuse stands connected with the occasion which we have surmised, and is explained by it. Possibly Hereford himself may have wished and proposed that Wiclif should undertake the journey to Rome along with him; or possibly Wiclif's undertaking it might be a step approved of by many of his friends as a proof of faith and courage, insomuch that it was hoped that if Wiclif himself should appear in Rome, there would be all the more reason to anticipate a favourable issue for the common cause. On either supposition Wiclif might see occasion to express his mind upon the subject; and certainly his words referring to the point sound more like a justification of himself to like-minded friends, than an excuse addressed to ecclesiastical superiors who had cited him to their bar; but least of all do they sound like a reply to a summons which had issued to him direct from the Pope and the Curia.

These thoughts respecting the possible occasion of this remarkable writing claim to be nothing more than conjec-

tures. But that the piece is not a letter to Pope Urban VI. is a point of which I have no manner of doubt.[148] On the presumption of this negative fact all the judgments which have been hitherto pronounced upon the piece itself come to nothing, whether of admiration for its bold, incisive, and ironical tone, according to some,[149] or of censure for its dissembling and disrespectful spirit, according to others.[150] If the writing, as we are convinced upon the evidence of its own contents, was really an address to men of the same convictions as himself, then neither did its author need any special degree of courage to make use of such sharp language, nor can he with fairness be charged with a disrespectful tone or a want of tact in his proceeding.

Although this alleged citation to Rome must be relegated to the category of groundless traditions, still Wiclif's life, in his latest years, was always in danger. He was also well aware of this, and stood prepared to endure still further persecution for the cause of Christ—and even to end his life as a martyr. In the *Trialogus* he speaks more than once on the subject—*e.g.*, where he says: "We have no need to go among the heathen in order to die a martyr's death; we have only to preach persistently the law of Christ in the hearing of Cæsar's prelates, and instantly we shall have a flourishing martyrdom, if we hold out in faith and patience."[151]

It was for some time received in certain circles as a fact, that Wiclif had either been banished from the country by the sentence of a tribunal, or betook himself into voluntary exile, from which, however, after some time, he must have returned. Foxe thinks that it may be gathered from Netter of Walden, that Wiclif was banished, or at least that he kept himself somewhere in hiding.[152] In an expanded

form the legend bears that Wiclif went into spontaneous exile, and made a journey into Bohemia. The Bohemians were already infected with heresy, but Wiclif in person, it was alleged, was the first man who established them in the opinion that little reverence was due to the priesthood, and no consideration at all to the Pope. But I do not find in the chroniclers and other writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a single trace of this legend; it seems to have come into existence first in the sixteenth century. If I am not mistaken, it was the Italian Polydore Vergil who was the first to bring forward this fable. He had come to England in 1509, as a Papal emissary, where, by the favour of Henry VIII., he obtained high preferment in the Church; but afterwards returned in advanced age to his native country, where he died in 1555, in Urbino, the place of his birth. In his English history, he told the above story with an air of confidence,[153] although it appears to have been nothing better than a conjecture of his own brain, devised to furnish an explanation of the connection between Wiclif and Hussitism, by means of a story which resembles very much the fantastic inventions of the middle age.

This utterly baseless statement of the Italian was rejected, as it deserved, by Leland, his contemporary, and characterised by him as "a vanity of vanities" and a dream. But the most important of Leland's writings, including his work on the British writers, were not printed till a hundred and eighty years later; and so his rejection of Vergilius's bold invention remained unknown to most writers, which accounts for the story having still found credit here and there—as with Bishop Bale, from whom it passed over to Flacius and others.[154]

But it is a fact to which there attaches not the slightest doubt, that Wiclif spent the last years of his life, without a break, in his own country, and in the town of Lutterworth where he was parish priest. There is no probability even in the allegation that he was fain to keep very quiet, in order not to draw upon himself the attention of his adversaries. On the contrary, it is proved by the writings which he published during the last three years of his life, including the *Trialogus* and numerous Latin and English tracts, in which, for the most part, he wields a sharp pen and adopts a resolute tone, that his energy was by no means diminished, nor his courage abashed.

The gracious protection of God was over him. His enemies must needs leave him undisturbed. This course, indeed, may also have been recommended to them by the circumstance (which cannot have remained unknown to them) that Wiclif had suffered a paralytic stroke towards the close of 1382,[155] and was totally disabled thereby from appearing again upon the public stage, although his mental power and force of character remained unimpaired. But even the personal credit of Wiclif as a believing Christian remained unassailed up to his death. It is true indeed that a number of Articles which were imputed to him were condemned as errors, and in part, as heresies; and in several Mandates of the heads of the Church he was designated by name as under suspicion of erroneous teaching. But no judgment had ever been pronounced upon his *person* on the side of his ecclesiastical superiors; Wiclif was never in his lifetime judicially declared to be a teacher of error or a heretic; he was never even formally threatened with the bann of excommunication. He continued not only in possession of his office and dignity as rector of Lutterworth, but also in high estima-

tion as a Christian and priest with his parishioners and his countrymen, till his second paralytic seizure, in two days after which he was permitted to breathe his last in peace.

The year and the day of the Reformer's death admit of being determined with precision—the opposite case of the year and day of his birth. Differences, indeed, are not wanting in the accounts which have come down to us. Walsingham gives 1385 as his death-year,[156] and Oudin, the literary historian, determines for 1387.[157] But two testimonies are extant—the one of an official and the other of a private character, which are quite decisive upon the point. The first is an entry in the Episcopal register of Lincoln, made in the time of Bishop Bockingham—in the days of Wiclif's immediate successor in the rectory, and indeed as early as the year 1385. It is probable that a question had arisen respecting the right of collation to the benefice, occasioned by the fact that Wiclif had been nominated to the living by King Edward III. An inquiry, therefore, had been made by commissaries upon the subject; an entry was engrossed in the register recording the result of their investigation; and this record establishes the fact that the nomination of Wiclif to the parish had been made by the King on account of the then minority of the patron. It is on this occasion that the death of Wiclif on 31st December 1384 is officially confirmed,[158] and we can hardly imagine any proof more documentary, older, or more trustworthy.

But the other testimony referred to, though only that of a private individual, has all the force of a declaration upon oath from the mouth of a contemporary, of even an eye-witness. Thomas Gascoigne, Doctor of Theology, and Chancellor of the University of Oxford from 1443 to 1445, who died in 1457, received and wrote down a communication respecting

the death of Wiclif in the year 1441 from the mouth of the priest, John Horn, then eighty years of age, under solemn asseveration of the truth of what he communicated. The declaration was to this effect, that Wiclif, after having suffered for two years from the effects of a paralytic stroke, on Innocents' Day of the year 1384, while hearing mass in his parish church at Lutterworth, sustained a violent stroke, at the moment of the elevation of the host, and sank down on the spot. His tongue in particular was affected by the seizure, so that from that moment he never spoke a single word more, and remained speechless till his death, which took place on Saturday evening—Sylvester's Day, and the eve of the Feast of Christ's Circumcision.[159] This declaration the aged priest, John Horn, who must have been a young man of three and twenty in the year of Wiclif's death, confirmed with an oath to Dr. Gascoigne;[160] and it is also entirely credible in every respect. In reference to the death-day itself the two testimonies corroborate each other perfectly; only Horn as an eye-witness supplies information, in addition, as to the day on which, and in what circumstances, Wiclif suffered the second stroke which ended in the fatal issue. It was *in die sanctorum innocentium—i.e.*, on 28th December—during the mass in Lutterworth church. A correction is thus supplied for the malicious remarks of several hostile chroniclers, to the effect that Wiclif had the stroke on St. Thomas à Becket's Day, when he had the intention to preach and to allow himself in a blasphemous attack upon the saint.[161] The Feast of St. Thomas à Becket was kept in the English Mediæval Church on the 29th December; whereas Wiclif, according to the testimony of John Horn was struck with paralysis on the 28th. The design is manifest of this displacement of the day of Wiclif's

last seizure, and when, in another place, Walsingham says still more plainly that Wiclif was righteously smitten down on St. Thomas's Day, whom he had often blasphemed, and that his death as righteously befell on the day of St. Sylvester, whom he had often exasperated by his attacks.[162] But this whole pragmatic interpretation, so far as it refers to Becket, is exploded by the fact that Wiclif was paralysed on the 28th day of December instead of the 29th, while the representation given of Wiclif's violent attacks upon Becket and Sylvester rests upon what can be shown to be an entire misunderstanding.[163]

Nor is the representation historically exact which is given by Vaughan, both in his earlier and later works on Wiclif, when he says that the Reformer was struck with palsy while "employed in administering the bread of the eucharist," or "while engaged in the service of the church at Lutterworth."[164] This is not merely such an addition to the picture from his own fancy as may be allowed to an historian, but a contradiction to the only trustworthy account which we possess of Wiclif's last illness, according to which he was not reading but hearing mass at the moment of his last seizure.[165] It is an additional inaccuracy to represent that Wiclif was deprived of consciousness by the stroke.[166] Horn says nothing of unconsciousness, but only of a violent shock under which he fell to the ground; he mentions in particular only the paralysis of his tongue. But speechlessness and unconsciousness are two different things; and it is at least conceivable that the sufferer may have come to himself again sufficiently to be sensible of the sympathetic love and care which were devoted to him in his last days by his friends, John Horn and John Purvey and others, and to express his gratitude, without words, by his

looks and gestures. Indeed, Gascoigne's description of his condition rather conveys the impression that it was not one of unconsciousness, for he makes repeated and careful mention of his speechlessness as if it had been a circumstance calling for remark, which it would not have been if he had been reduced to a condition of entire unconsciousness.[166] On St. Sylvester's Day—31st December—1384, John of Wiclif was delivered out of this condition of paralysis by death.

Adversaries of his work pursued him with fanatical outpourings of contumely even beyond his grave. Here are the words of a chronicler who has been frequently named before—"On the feast of the passion of St. Thomas of Canterbury, John Wiclif—that organ of the devil, that enemy of the Church, that author of confusion to the common people, that idol of heretics, that image of hypocrites, that restorer of schism, that storehouse of lies, that sink of flattery—being struck by the horrible judgment of God, was struck with palsy, and continued to live in that condition until St. Sylvester's Day, on which he breathed out his malicious spirit into the abodes of darkness."[167] There is no need at the present day to make any reply to words so full of venom as these; but at the point where such and so great a man withdraws from the stage of history, we feel it to be a duty to gather up again the various features of intellect and heart which have come before our eyes in the course of his life, and once more to present them in the form of a complete portrait.

NOTES TO SECTION VII.

114. Comp. chap. V. above.

115. *Ib.*

116. That Purvey (Purney) was Wiclif's assistant is pretty evident from Knighton's *Chronicle*, col. 2660 : Magistri sui dum adhuc viveret commensalis extiterat . . . . atque usque ad mortis metas comes individuus ipsum cum doctrinis et opinionibus suis concomitabatur indefesse laborans.

117. Comp. chap. VII.

118. Comp. Shirley's *Catalogue*, p. 40-49, and *vide* Appendix II.

119. *E.g.*, De Apostasia Cleri, Shirley's *Catalogue*, No. 46, p. 46, published by Todd, 1851. *Select English Works*, III., 430.

120. No. 35 Shirley's *Catalogue*, p. 44. *Select English Works*, III., 213 f.

121. Theodore Lindner, in *Theologistic Studien und Kritiken*, 1873, 151 f., has given it as his opinion that the anonymous author of a series of writings designed to put an end to this Papal Schism, which were re-published by Ulrich von Hutten, in 1520, must have been one of Wiclif's followers, and conjectures that the whole series was written in 1381. But no trace is to be discovered in these writings of the specifically Wiclifitic spirit, and its party-peculiarities. We have even reason to doubt whether England at all was the birth-place of this series of pieces so full of puzzles. To say the least, most of the particulars which occur in them and which are mentioned in a tone of personal feeling, are of such a character that they must be referred to French personalities and events.

122. Knighton, col. 2638. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, II., 6 f.

123. Walsingham II., 71, particularly p. 76.

124. *Ib.*, 72.

125. *Ib.*, 79. Gives one such indulgence, word for word.

126. *Ib.*, 78. The circular is dated 9th Feb. 1382, but this should have been 1383, for at the beginning of 1382 the business could not have been so far advanced ; besides the 13th year of his episcopal consecration agrees only with 1383.

127. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 176 f.

128. *Ib.*, 177.

129. *Ib.*, 177 f.

130. Knighton, Lib. V., col. 2671: Et sic secretus thesaurus regni, qui in manibus erat mulierum, periclitatus est. Comp. Walsingham, II., 85.

131. Knighton, as above, 2671. The blasphemous extravagance of the language reminds one of Tetzel.

132. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 177 : Praecipue contra Francigenas, ipsorum schismaticorum principales fautores, et domini nostri regis et regni Angliae capitales inimicos pro pace ecclesiae acquirenda et defensione regni . . . . quod neque pax ecclesiae sine regno neque regno salus poterit nisi per ecclesiam provenire, etc.

133. *Cruciata seu Contra Bellum Clericorum :* Such is the title of a tract in 10 chapters, hitherto unprinted, of which MSS. are only now extant in Vienna, where

no fewer than six copies are to be found. Shirley's *Catalogue*, No. 75. In MS. 3929, which I have used, the name of the author is given at the end. Explicit cruciata venerabilis et evangelici Doctoris Magistri Joannis Wyklef.

134. *Cruciata*, c. 2, MS. 3929, fol. 234, col 1: "As Satan," says Wiclif, "poisoned the human race by one sin, the sin of pride, so he has a second time poisoned the clergy by endowing them with landed property, contrary to the law of Christ, and by the publication of a lie concerning the forgiveness of sins and indulgences, he has thrown the whole Western Church into a state of disorder, as now, with two rival Popes, our whole Western Christendom must take side with either the one or the other, and yet both of them are manifestly Antichrists (et uterque ipsorum sit patule Antichristus). But the strongest thing in the piece is the view which pervades it throughout, that at bottom there are only two parties existing at present in the Church—the party of the Lord Christ, and the devil's party (pars Domini pars ista diaboli)," c. 3, fol. 234, col 4, fol. 235, col 1.

135. *Cruciata*, c. 3, fol. 234, col. 4; fol. 235, col. 1: Pauci vel nulli sunt, qui audent se exponere martyrio in hac causa; et tamen scimus, quod a tempore Christi non fuit melior causa martyrii, nec gloriosior triumphus illi, qui in causa domini audet stare. Non enim quietatur persecucio in multis millibus corporum occisorum, nec solum in fraudulentis spoliationibus hypocritarum, ut specialiter patet in Anglia, sed, quod est gravius, in subversione fidei et perfida exaltatione partis diaboli, sic quod multi occisorum, quos Antichristus dicit sine pöna ad cölum ascendere, moriuntur infideliter in hac persecutione perfida jam regnante.

136. *Ib.*, 2. fol. 233, col. 3: Videtur quod eorum interest prudenter auffere hoc dissensionis seminarium, sicut canibus pro osse rixantibus . . . . os ipsum celeriter semovere.

137. *Ib.*, c. 2. fol. 234.

138. *Litera missa Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi*, Vienna MS., No. 1387, fol. 105, col. 1 f.: Dixit tertio idem sacerdos et tenuit, quod nescit ex scriptura, quod ista crucis erectio pro defensione causae papae sit licita, vel quod approbative processit a domino Jesu Christo. Istud autem ex hoc evidet, quod solum opera hominis ex caritate facta a domino approbantur. Sed probabile est, quod nec ista plebis occisio nec terrarum depauperatio processit ex caritate domini Jesu Christi, specialiter cum non sit fides nostra, quod iste papa est caput vel membrum saactae matris ecclesiae militantis. Et sic videtur, quod ista non sit stabilis causa martyrii, depauperationis (MS.: depauperatio) populi et laboris tam anxii et damnosi.

139. Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana*, ed. Riley II., 88.

140. *Ib.*, II., 104, 109, 141. Comp. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, IV., 544 f.

141. In the piece, *De Quatuor Sectis Novellis*, Vienna MS., 3929, fol. 225 f., Wiclif, c. 10. fol. 231, col. 4, comes to speak of this Crusade, and says: Nec scimus, si iste ultimus transitus nostratum in Flandriam, quem fratres multi istarum sectarum quatuor regularunt, sit a Deo punitus ad regulam, vel adhuc ejus punitio sit futura. Under these four sects, Wiclif understands the endowed priests, monks, canons, and Mendicant orders.

142. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1844, III., 49; Lewis, *History*, 122 f.; Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 121 f.; *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph*, 320 f.

143. The piece in Latin is extant in five Vienna MSS., and in English in two Oxford MSS., and in a transcript besides of the 17th century. Comp. Shirley's *Catalogue*, p. 21, f. 47, No. 55. The English text, as Arnold rightly judges, is a version from the Latin, which, in any case, is the original. The English form of the text is printed in Lewis, p. 333; in Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 435; *Monograph*, 576; *Select English Works*, III., 504 f. The Latin text in *Fasc. Zizan.* 341 f.; *vide* Appendix, No. 9.

144. Shirley, in *Catalogue*, p. 21 f. enumerates eight letters, but in my view only the half of these deserve that name; *vide* Appendix II. For a long time I have had no doubt of the fact that the alleged *Epistola ad Simplices Sacerdotes* is no letter; *vide* above, Chap. VI.

145. The Letter to the Archbishop has the address, Venerabilis in Christo pater et domine; and the letter itself begins thus: Vester sacerdos pauper et humilis sub spe paterni auxilii, pandit vestrae reverentiae ostia cordis suae, etc. Vienna MS., 1387, fol. 105, col. 1.

146. Thrice it speaks of *Romanus pontifex*, thrice of *papa aut cardinales*, twice of *papa noster*, once of *papa noster Urbanus sextus*.

147. Rogare debemus; . . . igitur rogemus Dominum cujuslibet creaturae; et rogemus spiritualiter. . . . .

148. To this assertion, it is true, is opposed the external testimony of the MSS., which, since the second decade of the 15th century, can be shown to have intituled the piece either *Epistola Missa Papae Urbano Sexto* (so the Vienna MS., 1387), or in some other similar way. But still there was an interval of thirty years between the time when Wiclif wrote it and the execution of these transcripts; and in this interval many of the shorter writings of Wiclif had a similar history—*e.g.*, the alleged *Epistola Missa ad Simplices Sacerdotes*.

149. Vaughan, *Monograph*, 320; Jäger, *John Wycliffe*, p. 59.

150. Kerker, Article Wicliffe in the *Roman Catholic Church Lexicon*, XI., p. 935. "Wicliffe excused himself in a hypocritical epistle, in which he read the Pope a lecture in courtly phrase upon his manner of life," etc.

151. *Trialogus*, III., 15, p. 181, f.: Sed praedicemus constanter, legem Christi, etiam praelatis Caesariis, et statim aderit florens martirium, si in fide et patientia perduremus.

152. *Acts and Monuments*, III., 49, 53.

153. Polydori Vergilii Urbinatis *Anglicae Historiae* libri *XXVI.*, Basileae, 1533 At the end of Book XIX., p. 394 f., the author speaks of Wiclif, of whom he says, at the end of the passage: Ad extremum homo nimium confidens, cum rationibus veris cogeretur ad bonam redire frugem, tantum abfuit ut pareret, ut etiam maluerit voluntarium petere exilium quam mutare sententiam: qui ad Boëmos nonnulla haeresi ante inquinatos profectus, a rudi gente magno in honore habetur, quam pro accepto beneficio confirmavit, summeque hortatus est in ea remanere sententia, ut ordini sacerdotali parum honoris, et ad Romanum Pontificem nullum respectum haberet.

154. The Father of English Antiquaries, John Leland, † 1552, says in his *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. Ant. Hall, Oxford, 1709, II. 379 f. : Quid hic respondebo vanissimis Polydori Vergilii vanitatibus, qui . . . . disertis et accuratis verbis asserit Vicoclivum, ut alia somnia praetercam, voluntarium exilium petiisse, ac magno postea apud Boëmos in pretio fuisse ? etc. The modern Vergilius was generally considered a liar in England, as is shown by the biting expression of the celebrated epigrammatist, Owen († 1622) : Virgilii duo sunt, alter Maro, tu Polydore alter. Tu mendax, ille poëta fuit.

155. This fact is attested by Dr Thomas Gascoigne : Et iste Wycleff fuit paralyticus per duos annos ante mortem suam, s. Lewis, *History of Wyclif*, ed. 1820, 336.

156. *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, II., 119 ; *Hypodigma Neustriae in Anglica, Normanica*, etc., ed. Camden, Frankfort, 1602, fol. 537. He is followed by Capgrave († 1464), *Chronicle of England*, London, 1858, 240.

157. *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiquis*, Lips., 1722, Vol. III., 1048.

158. The words bearing upon this point run thus : Inquisitores dicunt, quod dicta Ecclesia (de Lutterworth) incepit vacare ultimo die Decem. (Decembri) ultimo praeteriti (1384) per mortem Joannis Wycliff ultimi rectoris ejusdem. The whole passage (see above, chap. 5) was first published by Lewis from the *Registrum Bokyngham*, and afterwards by Vaughan, *Monograph*, 180.

159. For this valuable communication we are also indebted to Lewis, who printed in full Gascoigne's *Deposition*, written with his own hand, from a MS. in the British Museum, *History*, Appendix, No. 25, p. 336. Vaughan has also printed it again, *Monograph*, p. 577.

160. Et mihi juravit sic dicendo. Sicut respondebo coram Deo, novi ista fuisse vera, et quia vidi, testimonium perhibui. We may therefore receive all that is contained in the testimony as fully certified, and we have no reason to hesitate between this account and another given by some annalists, as if the day of the last paralytic seizure were not quite certain. Compare Vaughan, *Monograph*, p. 468, "On the 28th, or, as some say, on the 29th of December," etc.

161. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, II., 119 f.: Die Sancti Thomae, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi et Martyris . . . Johannes de Wiclif, dum in Sanctum Thomam, ut dicitur, eodem die in sua praedicatione quam dicere praeparaverat, orationes et blasphemias vellet evomere, repente judicio Dei percussus, sensit paralysim omnia membra sua generaliter invasisse, etc. He is followed here, word for word, by Capgrave, *Chronicle of England*, London, 1858, 240 f.

162. Walsingham, *Hypodigma Neustriae*, in Camden, *Anglica, Normannica*, etc. Frankfort, 1602 f. : Et quidem satis juste die S. Thomae percussus est, quem multotiens lingua blasphemaverat venenata, et die Silvestri temporali morte damnatus est, quem crebris invectionibus exasperaverat in dictis suis.

163. I find Thomas Becket not unfrequently mentioned in the MS. books and sermon's of Wiclif, *e.g.*, *De Civili Dominio*, I., 34, 39 ; II., 2, Vienna MS. 1341, fol. 79, col. 2 ; fol. 94, col. 2 ; fol. 157, col. 1 ; *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. V., MS. 3928, fol. 8, col. 1; fol. 9, col. 2. *De Ecclesia*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 172, col. 3

Compare Wiclif's English sermons on the Gospels, *Select English Works*, I., 330 f. And Wiclif always speaks of Becket, if not indeed with unlimited veneration, yet with sincere respect. He rejects the view which prevailed among some of his contemporaries that Becket had died in a contest about church property, and he maintains by documentary proofs that the contest which Becket carried on was for the jurisdiction of the church, its autonomy in opposition to the State. The case was very different with Pope Silvester in Wiclif's eyes, for it was Silvester, according to the historical view which Wiclif shared with large numbers of minds in the Middle Age, who, by accepting the alleged Donation of Constantine the Great, laid the foundation for the territorial patrimony of the Pope, the wealth of the clergy, and the secularisation of the churuh. Wiclif, notwithstanding, was at all times far from condemning Silvester, as if in that act he had been guilty of an unpardonable sin. He judged the act itself, indeed, of accepting the patrimony to be a sin, but he was also willing to presume that Silvester had acted in the matter with a good intention, and that this sin was forgiven him by God, at least in his last hour. Comp. *Trialogus*, III., c. 20; IV., c. 17. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 1, 2, pp. 196, 303, 407. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. VI. (on Silvester's Day), MS. 3928, fol. 10, col. 2; fol. 12, col. 1. Nowhere do I find him casting unmeasured blame upon Silvester. The malicious observation of the Popish chronicler mentioned in the text is, therefore, entirely destitute of truth.

164. *Life and Opinions*, II., 224: He is said to have been employed in administering the bread of the eucharist, when assailed by his last sickness. And in *John de Wyeliffe, a Monograph*, 468, it is said: While engaged in the service of the church at Lutterworth, he was seized with palsy.

165. Audiens missam in ecclesia sua de Lyttyrworth circa elevationem sacramenti altaris decidit percussus magna paralysi, says Gascoigne, from the mouth of John Horn, in Lewis 336.

166. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 224: The paralysis deprived him at once of consciousness. He expressed himself more cautiously at a later date, *John de Wyeliffe*, 468: He does not speak nor even seems to be conscious.

167. Gascoignes' words are: Percussus magna paralysi, et specialiter in lingua, ita quod nec tunc nec postea loqui potuit usque ad mortem suam; in introitu autem sui in ecclesiam suam loquebatur, sed sic ut percussus paralysi in eadem die loqui non potuit, nec unquam postea loquebatur.

168. Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana*, ed. Riley, II., 119 f. Comp. Capgrave, *Chronicle*, 1858, p. 240.

169. Walsingham, *Hypodigma Neustriae*, etc., ed. Camden, Frankfort, 1602, fol. 537.

SECTION VIII.—*Character of Wiclif and his important place in History.*

THE importance of Wiclif, as seen from an age five hundred years later than his own time, is in no respect less imposing than it seemed to his contemporaries, in so far as they were not pre-occupied by party prejudice against him. But the judgment of the present time must needs differ from that of his own period, as to where the chief importance of his personality and work lay. To the men of his own age his greatness and his chief distinction lay in his intellectual pre-eminence. Not only his adherents, but even his opponents, looked upon him as having no living equal in learning and scientific ability — to all eyes he shone as a star of the first magnitude.[170] But the reference in these judgments was entirely to *scholastic* learning in philosophy and theology; and along with scholasticism itself, Wiclif's mastery as a scholastic lost immensely in value in the eyes of later generations. But we frankly confess, notwithstanding, that to our thinking this depreciation has been carried too far, and that Wiclif's scientific importance is wont, for the most part, to be undervalued unduly.[171] This fact admits of explanation from various circumstances. First of all, the very unsatisfactory condition in which the text of the *Trialogus* existed till recently was answerable for much of the disfavour into which Wiclif fell as a writer. Much also in his writings which appears faulty in our eyes is to be put to the account, not of the man himself, but of his age, and of the usages, not always the best, of the scholastic style. The utterly unclassical Latinity, the lumbering heaviness of the style, the syllogistic forms and methods in which inquiries are conducted—these and other

features are all characteristics which are common to scholastic literature in general. Even the practice observable in Wiclif of often repeating himself to an extraordinary degree, not only in different works upon the same subject, but even in the conrse of one and the same work, was a common fault of the period which he shared with many other scholastic writers. A reader who keeps all this in view will be on his guard against censuring too severely faults and imperfections which Wiclif had in common with the age in which he lived.

On the other hand, this very mastery of Wiclif as a scholastic deserves a more just recognition in the present age than it usually receives. The high intellectual position which was accorded to him was all needed to protect him from the malignant attacks which threatened him as a "Biblicist," and a severe critic of Roman doctrine. This, to be sure, was only a collateral benefit of his scientific eminence; but undoubtedly the extraordinary acuteness of his dialectic, the intellectual force of his criticism, and the concentrated unity of the principles which form the immutable basis of his thinking, are worthy of a more unreserved recognition than is now usually accorded to him.

The many-sidedness of his mind also deserves to be considered. He has an eye for the most different things—a lively interest for the most manifold questions. Upon occasion of an inquiry on the subject of slavery, he comes to speak of the laws of optics;[172] at another time the thought of mental intuition and the idea of the operations of grace lead him to refer to the laws of corporeal vision.[173] On one occasion he illustrates the moral effect of sin by which the soul is separated from the fellowship of the blessed, by pointing to chemical analysis, by which the most different elements of a compound body are detached from one

another and separated in space.[174] How love waxes cold (Matt. xxiv. 12) he illustrates in a sermon by a reference to physical laws, and to the colder atmosphere of the mountain summits.[175] To describe moral watchfulness, he calls in the explanations of naturalists respecting the physiological genesis of sleep.[176] Geometrical and arithmetical relations he frequently introduces in connection with the investigation of certain ideas; and he has a special partiality for the treatment of subjects relating to national economics. The fact that in his references to the natural sciences his notions are now and then fantastical and far from clear, cannot with justice lay him open to any suspicion of ignorance on such subjects; for who would demand of him—a man who had no pretensions to be a professed physicist—that he should have been four or five centuries in advance of his own time? But it is certainly well worth remarking how mathematical, physical, naturalistic, and social ideas all pour in a full stream into his many-sided and richly furnished mind.

Another characteristic feature of Wiclif is the critical spirit which inspires him. It cannot be denied, indeed, that he, too, innocently repeats several sagas and legends which passed for sterling coin in the Middle Age, *e.g.*, that the Apostle John changed forest leaves into gold, and pebbles on the sea shore into precious stones.[177] In this respect, as in others, Wiclif pays tribute to his own time. For the Middle Age has a certain fantastical legendary spirit of its own, in virtue of which things shape themselves to it in grotesque forms, like the mirage which conjures up distant objects as if they were near at hand, but in reversed position. Historical events and relations contracted thereby a romantic colouring. The age lacked the true historical sense

—it was wanting most of all in the critical endowment. To this legend-world of the Middle Age belongs in particular the Saga of the Donation of Constantine.[178] The endowment of the Papal see with territory and people, the landed possessions of the Church, and her entire secularisation—all these evils which Wiclif fights against had their source, according to the view which he shares with the centuries before him, in the supposed donation of the Emperor.

It cannot be denied, notwithstanding, that Wiclif was endowed with a remarkable gift of criticism. It does not amount to much indeed, in this direction, that when the authority of one of the Fathers is brought into the field against him—as, *e.g.*, of Augustine himself—he does not at once acknowledge himself to be defeated, but first of all brings out, by a thorough examination, whether the meaning of Augustine, in the quoted place or elsewhere, is really that which is founded upon as decisive against himself.[179] Of higher importance is the circumstance that Wiclif mentions Church legends occasionally with undisguised doubts of their truth—*e.g.*, the legend that the child whom the Redeemer on one occasion called to Him and placed in the midst of His disciples (Matt. xviii.) was St. Martial, whom Peter at a later period sent into Gaul.[180] But the most decisive fact here is this, that Wiclif, instead of accepting at once and without more ado the whole condition of the Church as to doctrine, ordinances, and usages, just as it stood and was recognised in his time, turned upon it all a scrutinising glance, and subjected the whole to a rigid examination. However undeniably Wiclif shares in the weak points of the scholastic habit, he is still free enough from prepossession, and has still enough of the critical vein to see how much useless straw the common scholasticism was

still addicted to threshing. It is nothing unusual with him to express his contempt of the many subtleties (*argutiæ fictitiæ*) in which men still deal so much, and the multitude of baseless possibilities with which they still occupy their heads. He earnestly calls upon men to renounce all such utterly superfluous labour of the brain, and to occupy themselves instead with solid and useful truths (*veritates solidæ et utiles*)[181]—all of them thoughts tending towards an emancipation from scholasticism—to a reformation of science.

Still further, it is frequent with him to distinguish between what has come down from antiquity and that which is of later date, which the men of the last centuries, the moderns, had introduced. But "old Christian," with him, means what belonged to the original, the Primitive Church — *ecclesia primitiva;* and precisely for this reason the ultimate Standard for him is the Bible—"the law of Christ," as he calls it. From this purely Protestant spirit of criticism, sprang his free and manly contention against various usurpations of the Papacy and abuses of the hierarchy, against many particulars of the Roman Catholic worship, and even against several articles of Roman doctrine, *e.g.*, the doctrine of transubstantiation. For such a criticism nothing less was indispensable than a holy zeal for the truth and honour of God, moral resolution, and manly courage. In a word, the critical genius of Wiclif was not merely an efflux of scientific power and independence, but also a fruit of moral sentiment and of Christian character.

It is not, however, in his intellect that the centre of gravity of Wiclif's personality lies, but in his will and character. With him, so far as I see, all thinking, every intellectual achievement, was always a way to an end—a means of moral action and work,—it never terminated in

itself. And this serves to explain, apart from the fact that Wiclif shared in many of the faults of his time, many of the weak sides of his performances as an author. There are, speaking generally, two kinds of natures, one putting itself forth in the presentations of art, the other in practical action. Natures of the former class seek their satisfaction in the works which they complete—the painter in his pictures, the sculptor in the plastic forms which he produces, the musician in his harmonic creations, the poet in his poetry, and the prose writer in his prose. That every part of the work should make the wished-for impression; that the whole should make an unity complete in itself; that the form, in harmony with the substance, should so shape itself as to give full satisfaction to the mind, at once loveable and fair, elevating and attractive: to these ends is directed all the effort of the artist. And that is the reason why one sketch after another is made and thrown away—that attempt follows upon attempt; the thinking mind never rests, nor the critical eye, the improving hand, the smoothing file, till a perfect art-work stands before the artist.[182] To these artistic natures, certainly, Wiclif does not belong, but as certainly to the men of practical action and work. It is not beauty of form, not its harmony, not its full expression, in a word, not the work itself as a completed performance and presentation which floats before the eye of such personalities; it is in action and work themselves that they seek their satisfaction—in the service of the truth, in the furthering of the good, in work for man's weal and God's glory. To this class of natures belonged Wiclif. At no time was it his aim to give to his addresses, sermons, scientific works, popular writings, etc., an artistic shape, to polish them, to bring them to a certain perfection of form; but to join his hand with others in the

fellowship of labour, to communicate to others what he knew, to serve his native country, to promote the glory of God, the kingdom of Christ, and the salvation of souls. That was what he wanted to do, and therein to serve God was his joy and satisfaction. If only what he said was understood; if his spoken word was only kindling to men's souls, whether in the chair or in the pulpit; if his written word was only effective, and his action was only followed by any good fruit, then it troubled him little that his style of presentation was thought to be without finish or without beauty, or perhaps even wearisome; in the end he came to have no distinct consciousness himself how it stood with his productions in these latter respects.

It is true that the repetitions in which Wiclif allowed himself as a writer go far beyond the permissible limit. And even this is not all. His treatment of a subject generally moves in a very free and easy manner; a strict logical disposition of his matter is missing often enough. He often allows himself in digressions from his proper subject, and is obliged to remind himself at last that he has lost sight for a time of his main topic.[183] The structure of his sentences is extremely loose—a circumstance which adds much to the difficulty of arriving at the true and certain sense; and the diction has rarely anything sitting close to the thought, well-weighed, or carefully chosen. In one word, the style and presentation are lacking in precisely those qualities which we account classical, in well proportioned and harmonious form, artistic inspiration, æsthetic perfection.

But in compensation for these defects, Wiclif always communicates *himself* as he is, his whole personality, undissembled, true, and full. As a preacher, as well as a

writer, he is always the whole man. Scarcely any one has stamped his own personality upon his writings in a higher degree, or has carried more of morality into his action than Wiclif. Wherein, then, consists the peculiarity of his personality?

Wiclif was not a man of feeling, but a man of intellect. Luther was a genial soul. On one occasion he begs his readers to take his words, however mocking and biting they may be, "as spoken from a heart which could not do otherwise than break with its great sorrow."[184] Wiclif never said that of himself. He is a man in whom the understanding predominates — an understanding pure, clear, sharp, penetrating. It is in Wiclif, as if one felt the sharp, fresh, cool breath of the morning air before sunrise; while in Luther we feel something of the kindly warmth of the morning sun himself. It was only possible to a predominantly intellectual nature to lay so great stress as Wiclif did upon the demonstration of the Christian verities. Even in the Fathers of the Church, he puts a specially high value upon the philosophical proofs which they allege in support of the doctrines of the Christian faith. Manifestly it is not merely a result of education and of the scholastic tone of his age, but in no small degree the outcome of his own individuality, that the path in which he moves with so strong a preference is that of speculation, and even of dialectical demonstration.

But in Wiclif, along with the intellectual element thus decidedly expressed, there is harmoniously combined a powerful will, equally potent in action and energetic in opposition —a firm and tenacious, a manly, yea, a heroic will. It is impossible to read Wiclif's writings with an unprejudiced and susceptible mind, without being laid hold of by the

strong manhood of mind which everywhere reveals itself. There is a force and fulness of character in his feeling and language which makes an over-mastering impression, and keeps the mind enchained. Wiclif sets forth his convictions, it is true, in a learned manner, with dialectical illumination and scholastic argumentativeness. And yet one finds out that it is by no means a one-sided intellectual interest which moves him. His conviction has unmistakeably a moral source. He confesses openly himself that the conviction of the truth is reached much more in a moral way than in the way of pure intellect and science.[185]

It is certain that in his own person he arrived at his convictions more in a moral than a merely intellectual way; and hence his utterances have equally the stamp of decisive thinking, and of energetic moral earnestness. We recognise everywhere the moral pathos, the holy earnestness which wells up from the conscience and the depths of the soul. And hence the concentrated moral force which he always throws into the scale. Whether he is compelled to defend himself against the imputation of petty by-ends and low-minded feeling,[186] or whether he is speaking to the consciences of those who give their whole study to human traditions instead of God's Word,[187] or whether he is upon occasion addressing moral warnings to young men,[188] he invariably comes forward with a fulness of moral earnestness, with arresting force, with marrowy pith and power. From the intensity with which he throws his whole soul into his subject springs also the warmth of feeling with which Wiclif at one time repudiates that which he is opposing, and at other times rejoices in some conquest which he has won. Not rarely he manifests a moral indignation and horror in the very midst of a learned investigation, where one is not

at all prepared for such an outburst of flaming feeling.[189] At other times, in the very middle of a disputation with opponents, he breaks out into joyful thanksgiving and praise to God that he has been set free from the sophistries by which they are still held fast.[190] The contrast between trains of scholastic reasoning and such sudden outpourings of feeling has something in it surprising and arresting in a high degree; and this inner fire of inspiration and heart-fervour, long hidden beneath the surface, and only now and then darting forth its tongues of flame, is one well fitted to explain psychologically and to excuse many literary faults. For from whence come these frequent outbursts? and whither do they tend? In very many cases Wiclif enters into regions of thought into which he is drawn by his heart and the innermost feeling of his soul. Often in such episodical passages have I come upon the most elevating gushes of his moral pathos—the most precious utterances of a healthy piety. If we follow him in such places, we find no reason to regret it. The reader advances in the author's hand with growing veneration and love; and at the close he will not only be fain to forgive him for a digression, but in spirit he warmly presses his hand with elevated feeling and a thankful heart. What seemed a literary fault proves, upon an unprejudiced and deeper view, to be a moral gain.

The intense feeling and warmth of the man manifests itself ever and anon in the personal apostrophes which he addresses to an opponent,[191] as well as in the circumstance that he very often speaks of himself in quite a personal way. On all occasions, indeed, he comes forward with entire straightforwardness and unreserved sincerity; never in any way concealing the changes of view through which

he has, it may be, passed; openly confessing the fact, when he has previously done homage to an error; declaring frankly what are his aims, and praying that by the help and in the fear of God he may be steadfast to the end.[192] As a preacher, in particular, Wiclif at all times proves himself a man of perfect integrity, and at every stage of his inner development, reflects it faithfully as in a mirror without reserve. At all times, whatever was highest and best in the convictions which he had arrived at, he took into the pulpit and truthfully published; and from this perfect integrity and honour it comes to pass that his sermons furnish a standard for the state of his knowledge and manner of thinking at every stage of his career.

The personality of Wiclif includes also a rich vein of wit and humour. To these he often allows a diverting play of cheerful banter, as when, in speaking of the practice of taking money in the confessional, as though penitence could prove itself to be genuine in that way, he indulges in the word-play—*revera non jurisdictio sed falsa jurisfictio;*[193] or when, in his investigations on church property, he mentions, on the faith of an old legend, that when the Apostle Paul was on his way to Jerusalem with the money which he had collected for the church there, his road was beset with robbers, whereas at all other times, he added, the apostle travelled in perfect safety, because

Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator.[194]

Even in the midst of serious discussions and in polemical pieces, he loves now and then to strike a more cheerful note. On one occasion he says: — "Fortune has no such kind intentions for me as that I should be in a position to bring forward any proof on matters

of Church property which could have any weight in the eyes of the doctor (a learned opponent with whom Wiclif was at the time engaged). To every proof which I have produced, his reply has commonly been, that it is defective both in substance and form. But verily that is not the way to untie knots, for so might a magpie contradict all and every proof. I proposed the question whether the King of England is entitled to deprive the clergy who are his subjects of the temporalities, when they transgress. In reply, he sillily leaves the question in this form unanswered, and introduces quite a different subject—like the woman, who, when asked 'How far is it to Lincoln?' gave for answer—'A bag full of plums.' Much like is his answer. 'The King cannot take away from his clergy any of their temporalities, *brevi manu;*' *i.e.*, he cannot strip them of their property by an exercise of arbitrary power."[195]

When certain theologians of his day by their scholastic sophistry almost made sport of the Bible, by first maintaining that, in many particulars, its language is impossible and offensive, *i.e.*, when taken according to the letter, or in the carnal verbal sense; and then professing the deepest reverence for the Scriptures, and pretending to redeem their honour by a different translation,—Wiclif's opinion of them was, that they come in sheep's clothing, but bite with fox's teeth, and thrust out, to boot, an otter's tail. It is just what the fox does when he makes peace with the poultry and gets into the hen-roost. He is no sooner in than he falls to work and makes good use of his teeth. When they pretend that the Scriptures cannot have that sense, but only the orthodox sense which they put forward, is it not, in fact, says Wiclif, an unworthy proceeding to bring a false accusation against a man, though it is acknowledged

immediately after that he has been lied against, or to break a man's head, though he has afterwards handed to him a healing plaster.[196]

In such cases, indeed, his wit and humour easily pass over into mockery and sarcasm; and hence an objection sometimes made by his opponents that he had recourse to satire as a polemical weapon. In one place I find him defending himself in the face of an opponent, on the point of having allowed himself in the use of irony against him. "If," says he—"He who sitteth in the heavens laughs at them (Psalm ii. 4), so also may all men who stand on God's side bring that school of theologians to shame with raillery, with reproaches, or with proofs, as God has given them severally the ability. Elias, too, poured out bitter mockery and scorn upon the priests of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 27), and Christ himself severely reproached the Pharisees in rough and disdainful words (Matt. xxii.). When any one, from a motive of love to his neighbour, breaks out into words of reproach and scorn, in order to defend God's honour and to preserve the Church from errors, such a man, if uninfluenced by revenge and ambition, does a work worthy of praise."[197]

The monks especially are a butt for his ridicule. In one place he has occasion to speak of the prayers of the monks, and he remarks that a principal motive which induces men to institute monastic foundations, is the delusive notion that the prayer of a monk is of more value than all temporal goods; and yet it does not at all look as if the prayer of those cloistered folks were so very powerful, unless, indeed, it be supposed that God listens to them more than to other men, on account of their red backs and their fat lips.[198] Wiclif has occasionally caricatures of the monks similar to this, and drawn in still greater detail. Of the begging

friars, he goes so far as to say that "they are like the tortoises, which quickly find their way, one close after the other, through the whole country. They are even on a footing of familiarity with noble lords and ladies, for they penetrate every house, into the most secret chambers, like the lap-dogs of women of rank."[199] A saying of his has been preserved by the learned Carmelite, Thomas Netter of Walden, which reveals to us the tart humour of the man. Netter tells us that Wiclif said of the Mendicant Orders, that when search is made among the sayings of Christ for any word to justify the founding of these Orders, no other is to be found save that one — "I know you not" (Matt. xxv. 12). Many examples of Wiclif's homely vernacular are already known from the *Trialogus*, as, *e.g.*, when he said of the Mendicants and their letters of brotherhood, that "they sell the cat in a bag."[200] Even in sermons he does not shun the use of such strong expressions; as when, in speaking of certain arguments which were used by the Mendicants to prove the pretended antiquity of their Orders (which was alleged, in the case of the Carmelites, to go back to the days of Elijah of Carmel, their founder), he characterises their argumentation "as worse than the sophistry of apes."

Although the personality of Wiclif comes out in his writings thus strongly marked, this by no means implies that he had any wish or design to put forward any claim for his own person. On the contrary, he desires to place in the foreground One far higher than himself, the Lord Christ. His wish is to prepare the way for Him—as once did John the Baptist—his design, to promote God's glory and Christ's cause. In face of a reproach which one of his opponents had cast at him, that he set forth unusual

views from a motive of ambition or of hostile feeling, he gives this solemn assurance in a passage already mentioned—"Let God be my witness, that before everything I have God's glory in my eye, and the good of the Church, which springs out of reverence of holy Scripture, and following the law of Christ."[201] He has the consciousness, in all humility and in joyful confidence, that it is the cause of God, and of the Cross and Gospel of Christ, for which he fights and labours.[202] And just because it is not with his own petty honour but with the honour of God that he has to do, he does not even make a difficulty of making some confessions from which otherwise a concern for his own personal credit would have held him back, *e.g.*, "I confess that in my own case I have often, from a motive of vain ambition, departed from the doctrine of Scripture both in my reasonings and my replies, while my aim was to attain the show of fame among the people, and at the same time to strip off the pretensions of ambitious sophists."[203] This consciousness that he was, in fact, contending not for himself but for God's honour and Christ's cause, was also the source of the joyful courage, and the confident hope of final victory which filled his breast even in the menacing prospect of persecution; and, perhaps, even of an approaching death-blow to himself and his fellow-combatants. He grew himself with the holy aims which he pursued; his personal character was exalted by the cause which he served; and the cause which he served was never the truth as mere knowledge, but the truth as a power unto godliness. He has always and everywhere in view the moral kernel, "the fruits;" not the leafage but the fruit is everything in his regard.[204] It was from glowing zeal for the cause of God, sincere love to the souls of men, upright conscientiousness before God, and heartfelt longing

for the reformation of the Church of Christ, that he put forth all his energetic and indefatigable labours, for the carrying back of the Church to her original purity and freedom, as she had flourished in the primitive Christian age.

And what was the character of these Reformation efforts of Wiclif? It does not admit of being defined in simple and few words, and for this reason, that his Reformation ideas passed through different transmutations and developments, precisely the same as those of his whole personality. Wiclif, indeed, from the time when, in mature age, he entered upon public life and drew attention upon himself, down to the end of his career, was always inspired by the Reformational spirit. That the Church as she then stood was suffering under evil conditions; that she stood in indispensable need of renovation and reform—this was and ever remained his firm conviction, and for this object he at all times continued to do what he could. But what the worst of these conditions were, and how they were to be remedied—on these points he thought differently at a later period from what he did in his earlier life. In middle life his Reformational views bore an entirely ecclesiastico-political complexion; in the last six years of his course, from 1378, the political points of view retreated more into the background, and the religious motives came to the front. In the first twelve years of his public activity, the worst mischief of the Church appeared to him to be the usurpations of the Papacy upon the sovereign rights of the English Crown, the financial spoliation of the country for the benefit of the Curia in Avignon, the general secularisation of the clergy, including the monasteries and foundations, simony and the corruption of morals—all these evils were ecclesiastico-political matters; and accordingly the means and ways of

remedying them which he recommended. and in part himself applied, were chiefly of an ecclesiastico - political character. State legislation and administrative measures were called for—it was the duty of Crown and Parliament, king and lords to stem these evils, while he himself laboured collaterally to remove these evil conditions by the lights of knowledge, in the way of instruction, conviction, and admonition.

There was truth in all this, and yet the end aimed at was not to be reached in this way, for the weed was not plucked up by the root; with the best intentions, a wrong road was taken. Of this stage of Wiclif's work, but only of this, is what Luther said true, that he attacked only the life of the Church, and not her doctrine. But in the last stage of his work Wiclif, undoubtedly, went farther and dug deeper. The Church's doctrine as well as her life now engaged his examination; and in more than one article was emphatically assailed. His first step was to set forth with the utmost clearness, and to assert with the greatest decision, the fundamental principle, that holy Scripture alone is infallibly true and an absolute standard of truth. No one, for centuries, had so clearly recognised this decisive ground-truth, and established and defended it with such emphasis as Wiclif. And not only did he learnedly and in a literary form maintain this Protestant principle, as we may well call it, but he also carried it into actual life, and practically applied it, by the institute of biblical itinerant preaching, by the English translation of the Bible, as well as by Scripture Commentaries and popular tracts. Wiclif, however, did not stop with laying the foundation. With the Bible, as a touchstone, in his hand, he also examined several chief articles of the dominant theology of his time, found them to be untenable, and from that moment

fought against them with all the fiery zeal of which he was capable: especially the doctrine of the sacraments, and in particular from the year 1381, the Romish-scholastic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and chiefly the article of transsubstantiation. That was an important piece of Reformational criticism. But it was neither the only nor the most important piece, though it was the criticism which most forcibly arrested the attention of the world. Still weightier was the doctrine of Wiclif touching Christ and the Church. That Christ alone is our Mediator, Saviour, and Leader, that He alone is the real and governing Head of His Church —this is what we may well call the *material principle* of the theology of Wiclif, just as the sole authority of holy Scripture may be called its *formal principle.* This fundamental principle of the sole mediation of Christ has an intimate connection with the evangelical ground-doctrine of justification by faith alone; and while it is true that the setting forth of the latter doctrine by Luther was an immense advance beyond Wiclif, a memorable deepening of insight, and a felicitous seizure of truth in the power of Divine light and guidance, it still remains, nevertheless, a prophetic thought of Wiclif, a thought of large Reformational reach and bearing, that he proclaimed the principle that Christ alone is our Mediator and Saviour. With this harmonises his idea of the Church as the whole body of the elect. Indeed, this latter idea stands in the most profound connection with Wiclif's fundamental view of Christ Himself. For that Augustinian conception of the Church forms with Wiclif the conscious opposite to the clerical, hierarchical, and Popish idea of it; but it rests precisely upon the principle that the true Church is the Body of Christ. Proof enough all this, that Wiclif examined and

attacked not the life alone, but also the doctrine, of the Church of his time.

If we look back from Wiclif in order to compare him with his continental precursors, and to obtain a scale by which to measure his personal importance, the fact which first of all presents itself is, that Wiclif exhibits in a concentrated form, in his own person, that reform movement of the preceding centuries which traced the corruption of the Church to its secularisation by means of worldly property, honour, and power; and which aimed to renew and improve the Church by leading it back to a condition of apostolic poverty.

What after Gregory VII.'s time, Arnold of Brescia, and the communion of the Waldenses, Francis of Assisi and the Mendicant Orders had all in various ways aimed to effect; what St. Bernard of Clairvaux had so devoutly longed for —the return of the Church of Christ to an apostolic life and walk,—the same object filled the soul of Wiclif, in the first period of his public activity. In addition, the modern idea of the State as opposed to the hierarchial ideal, which began to dawn upon men's minds after the struggle between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair; which found in Marsiglio of Padua, John of Jandun, and William of Occam, its eloquent advocates and representatives; and which called forth so vivid a sympathy of accord among the English people in the middle of the 14th century,—this idea was not only taken up by Wiclif, but also utilised by him for the practical object of Church-reform. In establishing and defending as a first principle the authority of holy Scripture as the sole standard of Christian truth, and in practically labouring for Bible-reading and the spread of Biblical knowledge among the people, he was to some extent

following in the footsteps of the Waldenses. But he does not appear to have been aware of this fact. There is nothing to show that he was indebted to them for any of his reforming ideas and methods;—while it is certain that neither the Waldenses, nor any others before him, had asserted the authority of the Bible with a clearness, stringency, and emphasis equal to his.

In the collective history of the Church of Christ, Wiclif marks an epoch chiefly on the ground that he was the earliest *personal embodiment* of the evangelical reformer. Before him, it is true, many ideas of reform and many efforts in the direction of it crop up here and there, which even led to conflicts of opinion, and collisions of parties, and gathered themselves up in the formation of whole reformed societies. But Wiclif is the first important personality in history who devotes himself to the work of Church-Reform with the entire thought-power of a master mind, and with the full force of will and joyful self-sacrifice of a man in Christ. To that work he devoted the labours of a life, in obedience to the earnest pressure of conscience, and in confident trust that "his labour was not in vain in the Lord." He did not conceal from himself that the labours of "evangelical men" would in the first instance be opposed and persecuted and driven back. Nevertheless, he consoled himself with the assurance that the ultimate issue would be a Renovation of the Church upon the Apostolic model. It was only after Wiclif that other living embodiments of the spirit of Church-Reform, a Huss, a Savonarola, and others, appeared upon the field—a succession which issued at length in the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

NOTES TO SECTION VIII.

170. When opponents give expression to such a judgment, it has, of course, the greatest weight. Now Knighton, the Leicester Chronicler, is a man who manifests his dislike to Wiclif and his party upon every occasion; and yet he cannot avoid bearing this testimony to him: Doctor in Theologia eminentissimus in diebus illis. In Philosophia nulli reputabatur secundus, in scholasticis disciplinis incomparabilis. Hic maxime nitebatur aliorum ingenia subtilitate scientiae et profunditate ingenii sui transscendere. *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores*, Vol. III., col. 2644. And the Carmelite John Cunningham, an opponent, who more than once stood forward against him in his lifetime, is reported by his disciple, Thomas Netter, of Walden, to have been an admirer of Wiclif's distinguished learning (admiratur in Wiclefo Doctrinae Excellentiam, Lewis, Appendix, XXIII.). On the side of his followers, it may suffice to point to the testimonial (so much discussed) of the University of Oxford, which celebrates his *sententiarum profunditas*, and pronounces of him, that in logicalibus, philosophicis ac theologicis ac moralibus et speculativis inter omnes nostrae universitatis (ut credimus) scripserat sine pari. Wilkins, *Conc. Magnae Britanniae*, III., 302.

171. We are not able to agree with Vaughan when, with all his esteem for Wiclif, he says (*Life and Opinions*, I., 319) that his scholastic treatises possess, at the present day, only a very limited value, even for the students of history.

172. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 33, Vienna MS. 1341, fol. 78, col. 1.

173. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. LII., MS. 3928, fol. 106, col. 3.

174. *De Ecclesia*, c. 5, MS. 1294, fol. 142, col. 3 and 4.

175. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXX., MS. 3928, fol. 58, col. 4, to fol. 59, col. 1.

176. *Ib.*, No. XLIX., fol. 99, col. 1. Comp. *Miscell. Sermons*, No. I., MS. 3928. fol. 194, col. 1.

177. *De Ecclesia*, c. 9, MS. 1294, fol. 155, col. 1.

178. Comp. the interesting investigation of Dollinger in his *Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters*, ed. 2, München, 1863, 61 f.

179. *De Ecclesia*, c. 8, MS. 1294, fol. 151.

180. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XXVI., MS. 3928, fol. 50, col. 3: Iste autem parvulus somniatur fuisse Martialis . . . . Sed dimisso isto ipsis, qui credere illud volunt, tenendum est, etc. Comp. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. X., fol. 155, col. 1; *De Ecclesia*, c. 22, MS. 1294, fol. 201, col. 1-3.

181. Comp., *e.g.*, *Trialogus*, III., c. 27, p. 225 f.

182. Comp. Schleiermacher's thoughtful remarks in the second of the *Monologues*, 4 ed., Berlin, 1829, p. 29.

183. Even as a preacher he makes little account of flowery, fine speech, but both in his theory of preaching and his own pulpit practice he gives the decided preference to a plain and simple, but suitable and apt mode of expression; *vide* above chap. 6.

184. *Of the Papacy in Rome* (1520), in Preface to the Jena Edition of Luther's Works, 1690, I., 264.

185. *De Dominio Divinio*, I., c. 11, MS. 1294, fol. 225, col. 2: Credo, quod sancta conversatio, miraculorum operatio, et constans ac humilis injuriarum perpessio foret argumentum efficacius infideli, quam disputationes scolasticae, quibus insistimus, etc.

186. The strongest passage of this kind which I know is one in *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 12, Vienna MS. 1294, fol. 34, col. 4, where he refers to the fact that he was accused of seeking by-ends of his own, and that imputations were cast upon him of falsehood and equivocation, and repels these calumnies in a high tone of earnestness and piety.

187. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 20, fol. 65, col. 2. Here he presses the consciences of those who study the doctrines of men more than the Bible with one interrogation after another, in a style which makes one feel that he speaks with the authority of a theological censor, and with the spirit and power of a prophet.

188. *Trialogus*, III., c. 22, p. 206 f., where he deals with the sin of Onanism with impressive earnestness.

189. *E.g.*, *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 34, col. 3 and 4: Illam novitatem detestor, etc. *De Ecclesia*, c. 8, in the same MS., fol. 151, col. 1 and 2: Deum contestor et numina, quod inter omnes doctrinas et consilia, quae audivi non occurrit mihi aliquod difficilius aut detestabilius. . .... . Ego quidem horrerem introducere scolam istam tanquam doctor mendacii, etc.

190. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 32: Benedictus sit Deus, qui nos liberavit ab istis argutiis!

191. *De Ecclesia*, c. 3, MS. 1294, fol. 135, col. 2.

192. Characteristic is the confession in *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 32, MS. 1294, fol. 117, col 1, that he is equally on his guard against a presumptuous arrogance in the treatment of doubtful questions, as against timidity and a hypocritical faint-heartedness in defence of Scripture truth; this last, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, he is resolved boldly to maintain.

193. *Liber Mandatorum* or *Decalogus*, c. 26, MS. 1339, fol. 206, col. 1: Revera non jurisdictio sed falsa jurisfictio istud cogit, etc.

194. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 20, MS. 1341, fol. 45, col. 2.

195. *De Ecclesia*, c. 21, MS. 1294, fol. 196, col. 2.

196. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 31, col. 3.

197. *Ib.*, c. 22, MS. 1294, fol. 199, col. 4; fol. 200, col. 1.

198. *Dialogus* or *Speculum Ecclesiae Militantis*, c. 23, MS. 1387, fol. 155, col. 2.

199. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. IV., MS. 3928, fol. 138, col. 3.

200. *Trialogus*, III., c. 30, p. 352: Videtur utique, quod fratres seminant deceptionem frivolam utrobique, et faciunt in facto magis fraudulentam commutationem, quam si venderent catum in sacco.

201. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. VIII., MS. 3928, fol. 5, col. 2: Pejori quam simiali argutia arguunt quidam fratres, etc.

202. *Ib.*, *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 34, col. 4: Testis sit mihi Deus, ego principaliter intendo honorem Dei et utilitatem ecclesae, etc.

203. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 3, col. 1; comp. c. 5, fol. 11, col. 4; *vide* above, c. 8.

204. Comp. *De Ecclesia*, c. 21, MS. 1294, fol. 199, col. 2: Ista irregularitas, qua magis attendimus ad folia quam ad fructus, creditur facere in oculis Dei sacramenta nostra vilescere.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER IX., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THERE are several points in the history of Wiclif and the first Wiclifites on which it was natural to expect that some additional light might be obtained from the Papal archives in Rome. One of these was Wiclif's alleged citation to appear in person before the tribunal of Urban IV., to which it has long been supposed that he sent a declinature on the score of age and infirmity, a supposition for which, as the reader has seen, Professor Lechler sees no adequate ground. A second point was the part which Wiclif took, in 1374, in the negotiations at Bruges with the Papal Legates, with respect to which our author had expressed his expectation that some original papers hitherto unknown might possibly be preserved in the archives of the Vatican. To which historical points may with equal reason be added the curious incidents in Nicolas Hereford's life recorded by Knighton, and resting exclusively on his authority, viz., his appeal to Pope Urban VI. against the sentence of Archbishop Courtnay, his condemnation and imprisonment in Rome, and his unexpected release from prison and return to England.

Having become aware in 1876 that our Public Records Office had an agent in Rome employed in searches among the archives of the Vatican on matters connected with the history of Great Britain, I brought under the notice of Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy the first of the historical questions above referred to, and more recently I have called his attention to the other two. In both instances Sir Thomas accepted my suggestion that search should be made by his agents in Rome with the greatest readiness, and he lost no time in communicating first with Mr. Stevenson and afterwards with Mr. Bliss; and from both these gentlemen the instructions sent by him received immediate and painstaking attention; but I regret to add, without any satisfactory result. The Bulls of Gregory XI., in the matters negotiated at Bruges, are of course to be seen in their places in the *Bullarium* of that Pope; but not a single notice has yet been discovered in the records of the Vatican to add anything to our previous knowledge either of Wiclif or Hereford.

Of course my only reason for recording here this purely negative result is to make others aware, that an opportunity which looked so promising of obtaining further light on a subject of so much historical interest has not been overlooked, in the preparation of the present English edition of Professor Lechler's work, and to save time and trouble to future inquirers in the same field of research.

APPENDIX.

I.

"THE LAST AGE OF THE CHURCH."

THE first article in the Appendix of Dr. Lechler's work is on the authorship of the treatise which was long unanimously ascribed to Wiclif, intituled *The Last Age of the Church.* The author agrees with Dr. Vaughan and Professor Shirley in rejecting the Wiclif authorship, and in ascribing the work to some unknown English member of the Franciscan Order, who was a cotemporary of the Reformer; and he enters at full length into all the considerations, external and internal, which have weighed with him in coming to this conclusion. But as the same field has already been traversed by two of our own writers, and as it is scarcely supposable that any doubt upon the point can remain in the mind of any one who has looked into what they had written upon it a good many years before the appearance of Dr. Lechler's work, it does not appear to be necessary to reproduce here more than a few sentences of his copious article, in which he indicates clearly enough the circle of Church society to which the anonymous and unknown author of the work probably belonged. Vaughan, who was the first to reject the long-prevalent notion that the work was Wiclif's, and his very earliest publication dating, as it certainly does, from 1356, offered no opinion on the subject of its real authorship; but Shirley had come to see that "the frequent quotations" which it contains "from the prophecies, real or spurious, of the Abbot Joachim, and the fact that the abuses referred to in the tract are exclusively those of the endowed clergy, seem to point to a Franciscan monk as the probable author." Dr. Lechler following up this suggestion, has satisfied himself fully, not only that the author of the tract was a Franciscan, but that he could not have been other than one of a special circle of the Franciscan brotherhood, who were marked by certain characteristics which he brings fully out in the following interesting paragraph, the closing one of his article:—"If we seek to define the circle to which the anonymous author may have belonged, the intellectual atmosphere

in which he lives and breathes in the work before us points to no other quarter than to those Franciscans who, with a zealous adhesion to the strictest peculiarity of their order, had been brought into a position of antagonism to the existing Church, and were attached to certain enthusiastic apocalyptical views. To mention a few names, such men were Petrus Johannes Olivi, † 1297 ; his scholar, Ubertinus de Casali ; and Jacoponus of Todi, the famous poet of the sequence, *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*, were all men of this peculiar spirit. And it is well known from other sources that it was precisely this party among the Franciscans who had a high value for the writings of the Abbot Joachim, and made use of them, too, with a respect approaching to reverence. Several circumstances concur to make it probable that the author of *The Last Age of the Church* was one of the Franciscans belonging to this class. 1. The author censures exclusively the faults of the endowed clergy, which leads to the conclusion that he may have belonged to one or other of the Mendicant orders. 2. The author is fond of apocalyptic views, and is attached in the first line to the authority of Joachim of Floris. This points to the Franciscan order, and therein to the fraction of it indicated above. We are not, indeed, to impute to this whole party the feeble and narrow-minded characteristics of this tract: these are to be put to the account of the author himself, whose name and position it may neither be possible nor of any importance now to ascertain.

II.

WICLIF'S WRITINGS.

THREE catalogues of these writings are extant, which date from the fifteenth century, and in all probability were drawn up not much later than about thirty years after Wiclif's death. They are preserved in two MSS. of the Imperial Library of Vienna, but were only lately published. They thus remained virtually unknown to the learned world, which for centuries was obliged to have recourse to catalogues of a much later date.[1]

The first man who attempted to draw up a comprehensive list of the writings of Wiclif was John Bale, Bishop of Ossory († 1563), in his *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium in Quasdam Centurias Divisum*, which first appeared in 1548. At that time it included only five centuries of writers. During his exile in Germany, he enlarged the work by four additional centuries,

[1] Shirley printed in the appendix to his *Catalogue* the first two of these old lists; the third was unknown to him. *Vide* Catalogue of the MSS. of the Imperial Library of Vienna, v. 5.

and carried it down to A.D. 1557, in which year the enlarged edition appeared at Basel. It reckons in this form no fewer than 900 writers. In this collection, p. 451 f., Bale gives 242 of Wiclif's writings, with their titles, and in 149 cases he adds their commencing words; but he does not aim at any systematic arrangement, and it is no part of his plan to indicate where the MSS. enumerated are to be found. But Bale's principal fault was the hasty way in which he picked up titles of writings of Wiclif wherever he came upon them, and gathered them together without a trace of criticism. Hence his catalogue is entitled to very little confidence.

More than 150 years passed away before Bale had a successor in the same field. Wiclif's first biographer, John Lewis, in his *Life of Dr. John Wiclif*, 1720 (new edit., Oxford, 1820) gave a catalogue extending to 284 numbers, which, while resting upon Bale's, is in some respects an improvement upon it. Lewis's catalogue is not only richer than Bale's, but it notes also, whenever possible, the libraries where the MSS. are to be found, adding also the commencing words of the books and tracts, and sometimes also mentioning, after the title, the contents, or the occasion of each piece. But we miss in this catalogue, as much as in Bale's, any suitable classification, and even any critical sifting. Larger works and short tracts, Latin and English pieces, are all mixed miscellaneously together; many pieces enumerated by Lewis are not Wiclif's at all, and others are entered in his list twice over.

The catalogue which was prefixed by H. H. Baber to his Reprint of Wiclif's, or rather Purvey's Translation of the New Testament, in 1810, was drawn up on the basis of Bale's and Lewis's, but is not so complete as the latter. The only advance made by Baber was the thankworthy one that he was the first to give a more exact account of the Wiclif MSS. in the British Museum, as well as of the MSS. preserved in Vienna, in regard to the latter of which he made use of the catalogue of Dénis.

Eighteen years later, in the first edition of his *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe*, Dr. Vaughan gave a catalogue, which was the fruit of personal investigation, carried out especially in Cambridge and Dublin, and which, besides a classification of the writings, contained a fuller account of the libraries where they are preserved, and some criticism on the genuineness of the several pieces. And in his last work on Wiclif—*John de Wycliffe, a Monograph*, 1853—he has drawn up a new list which is in many respects more accurate and minute than his earlier one, although we cannot help thinking it inferior in point of comprehensiveness. In point of accuracy, too, it still leaves much to be desiderated, *e.g.*, more than one writing is twice introduced under different titles, *e.g.*, B. 544, No. 103, *De Dotatione Ecclesiae*, and 125, *Supplementum Trialogi*, which is one and the same work. Another instance is in the observations which he repeatedly makes, pp. 537 and 542, on the subject of Wiclif's *Summa Theologica*,

which are very inexact, and even confusing; for, according to these, we should have to suppose that the *Summa* is a single work, consisting of twelve chapters, whereas it is rather a comprehensive *Collection* or *Corpus*, embracing no fewer than twelve treatises, many of which would fill a goodly printed volume.

The most important advance in this field was made by the late Dr. Walter Waddington Shirley, Professor of Church History in Oxford. As a preparatory work to a projected edition of *Select Works of Wiclif*, which he did not live to take part in, he published, in 1865, *A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. This work, though very modest in bulk, was the fruit of considerable labour, and of correspondence and laborious collections reaching through ten or twelve years. The peculiar recommendations of this catalogue are numerons. Shirley divides the Latin and the English writings entirely from each other; he distributes the Latin works into certain classes according to their contents; he adds testimonies and notices to aid, as far as possible, in determining the genuineness of the several writings; he endeavours to fix their several dates, at least approximately; and lastly, he indicates accurately the MSS. which contain the several works. To the catalogue of the genuine and still extant works of Wiclif, the author adds a list both of his lost writings, and of writings which have been incorrectly attributed to him. He prints in an appendix two of the old catalogues of Wiclif's works, mentioned above as dating from the commencement of the fifteenth century, which are found in the Vienna MSS. The little work ends with an alphabetical register of all the extant works, arranged according to their commencing words, and separated off from each other as Latin or English.

Last of all, Thomas Arnold, in the third volume of the *Select English Works of John Wiclif*, Oxford, 1871, has given a catalogue of the English writings exclusively which are ascribed to Wiclif, in which he places first the writings which are probably genuine, forty-one in number, and next those which are doubtful, twenty-eight in number, adding at the close a short list of others, which, in his judgment, are certainly spurious. Arnold has added to Shirley's list one English piece which he was the first to discover (*Select Works*, Vol. III., pp. 130-233). It bears the title of *Lincolniensis* (Grosstête), but is nothing else than an appeal for sympathy in behalf of the persons and work of the itinerant preachers, after several of them had been tried and thrown into prison. For the rest, Arnold has directed his chief attention to the critical question of the genuineness of the several pieces, though aiming also as much as possible at the determination of their respective dates. The result reached was that he contested the genuineness of a considerable number of pieces. Of the sixty-five English works brought forward by Shirley, he pronounces decidedly against the Wiclif authorship of eight or thereabouts, while, with respect to from fifteen to twenty others, he is unable to go further than a *non-liquet*. He has not, however, pro-

ceeded upon his own individual judgment as decisive, but has printed in his third volume, among the "Miscellaneous Works," several of the pieces whose genuineness he does not allow.

To come more closely to the Works themselves, we have first of all to offer some remarks upon their difference in respect of language. Dr. Vaughan says of the English writings of Wiclif that they are by far the most numerous. This is an error. Even looking to numbers only, Shirley's catalogue contains not fewer than ninety-six Latin works, while the English works number only sixty-five. But when we compare the two classes of pieces in respect to bulk, the Latin pieces have still more the advantage; and hence, in Arnold's judgment, the Latin works of Wiclif "are by far the most numerous and most copious." In fact, the English pieces are for the most part nothing more than mere tracts of a couple of pages, and the largest of them fill at most three or four sheets; while the series of Latin works includes from ten to twelve equal to the *Trialogus* in bulk, every one of which would fill a respectable octavo volume. But the importance of their contents, too, in the case of many of the Latin works, is far superior to that of the English. Scientifically considered, it is only the Latin writings which are of value. Wiclif's philosophical and theological position can only be learned from them with certainty and thoroughness; while his English writings are chiefly valuable in part for the history of the English language and literature, and in part for our knowledge of the influence of Wiclif upon the English people.

And here we must not omit to mention that the genuineness of the most important of the Latin works is sufficiently attested and indeed placed beyond all doubt, partly because Wiclif himself is accustomed to quote his own earlier works in the later, and partly because his several opponents cite different works of Wiclif in their controversial writings. In this way a pretty copious list of his works can be gathered from the writings of William Woodford, from a mandate of Archbishop Sbynjek of Prag against Hus, from the anti-Hussite works of Friar Stephan, of Dolan, but most of all from the great work of Thomas Netter, of Walden. But friends and admirers too, like Hus, mention several of his writings, and give exact quotations from them. In the Vienna MSS. his name occurs by no means unfrequently attached to his several pieces. But the case is entirely otherwise with the English writings: not one of them is mentioned in any other writing, either of Wiclif or of his literary opponents. His popular tract on the Lord's Supper, *The Wicket*, stands alone in being expressly mentioned as his in several of the Acts of Process brought against particular Lollards, but not earlier than the beginning of the sixteenth century; and in the MSS. containing these English tracts it is marvellous that his name should so rarely occur. In other words, there are almost no external testimonies in existence for the genuineness of the English writings of Wiclif; we are thus thrown entirely upon internal grounds either for or against their Wiclif authorship, and,

as may be easily understood, the work of deciding becomes, in these circumstances, precarious and difficult.

Further, it is a very remarkable fact that of the Latin writings of Wiclif comparatively few old MSS. are extant in England itself and in Ireland, while the whole of his English writings are to be found in English and Irish libraries. Of the ninety-six Latin works enumerated by Shirley, there are only twenty-seven of which MSS. dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are in the possession of English or Irish Libraries—*i.e.*, not fully a *third*. And among those which are wanting in England itself are not a few works of the greatest importance—*e.g.*, the *Trialogus*, *De Juramento Arnoldi*, one of the earliest memorials of Wiclif which is of high interest, etc., etc. On the other hand, the libraries of the Continent, and chiefly the Imperial Library of Vienna, the University and Archiepiscopal Libraries of Prague, and even the National Library of Paris, and the Royal Library of Stockholm, are in possession of MSS. of Wiclif's Latin works. And, indeed, the state of matters is this, that of the ninety-six Latin works, including tracts, there are only six of which MSS. are extant exclusively in England or Ireland, while of the English writings not a single MS. is to be found in the Continental libraries. The latter fact finds an easy explanation in the ignorance of the English language which prevailed on the Continent, even in Bohemia, during the Hussite movement. But less easy of explanation is the fact that so few in proportion of Wiclif's Latin writings should have been preserved in England. To impute this to the destructive inquisition of the English bishops, is forbidden by the circumstance that only two of the purely philosophical tractates enumerated by Shirley are extant in MS. in England; and in the case of essays on logic and metaphysics such as these, it is impossible to see why the inquisition should have troubled itself about their detection and destruction.

In now proceeding to an orderly enumeration of the several writings of Wiclif, the object which we aim at is to present a picture of his activity as an author. With this end in view, it did not appear to me so advisable as it did to Shirley, whose object was different, to make the difference of the two languages employed in the writings the chief principle of distribution in arranging the latter. It seemed better here to subordinate the linguistic point of view, and to aim, in the first instance, at a *material* classification according to *subject* and *content*. Shirley himself has always made a *material* division within the two chief classes of works set out by him—1, Latin works, and 2, English works. But in carrying through this material classification, we shall follow a way of our own, while rejoicing in the coincidence of his judgment with our own, as often as it occurs. In our indication of MSS. and the libraries containing them, we allow ourselves to refer simply to Shirley's meritorious work.

We divide the works into four chief classes—1. Works of scientific

content. 2. Sermons. 3. Practical catechetical pieces. 4. Judgments, personal explanations, pamphlets, etc. Several letters form a species of appendix.

A. Works of Scientific Content.

1. Philosophical Works.

1. *Logica.*
2. *Logicae Continuatio.*
3. *Quaestiones Logicae et Philosophicae.*
4. *De Ente sive Summa Intellectualium* (includes two books, each with six tractates). *Vide* Shirley, No. 8.
5. *De Universalibus*, Shirley, 10.
6. *Replicatio de Universalibus*, Shirley, 9.
7. *De Ente Particulari*, Shirley, 4.
8. *De Materia et Forma*, Shirley, 6.[1]
9. *De Materia*, Shirley, 7.
10. *De Compositione Hominis*, Shirley, 5.
11. *De Anima.*

2. Theological Works.

A. Systematic.

Here deserves to be put in the foremost place, both on account of its great extent and its inherent value, the great work of Wiclif to which his admirers give the title of *Summa Theologiae* or *Summa in Theologia*, a name not unusual in the scholastic theology, though this name for it does not occur anywhere in his own writings, so far as I have observed. For from the thirteenth century it had been customary to give this title to works of a more than ordinary comprehensive character, in which the doctrinal system of a doctor of the schools was set forth in an independent way of his own, and not in the way of commentary on the sentences of Peter the Lombard, and at the same time in a close degree of connection and interdependence; and this even when the author had given to his work a different title. So, *e.g.*, I find that to the great work of Bradwardin, which he had entitled *De Causa Dei*, the title is given in some MSS. of *Summa de Causa Dei.* The voluminous work, too, of Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh, *Adversus Errores Armenorum*, is constantly called *Summa.*

[1] As a supplement to what Shirley (*Catalogue*, p. 2 f.) has communicated, it is proper to remember here that the Royal Library of Stockholm, according to Dudik's "Forschungen in Schweden für Mähren's Geschichte 1852, p. 198 f., possesses a paper MS. in 4to, probably written by Huss himself in 1398, which contains the following philosophical tracts of Wiclif:—1. *De individuatione temporis et instantis*, in 12 chapters, pp. 1-33. 2. *De Ydeis*, pp. 34-52. 3. *De Materia et Forma*, pp. 53-76. 4. *Replicatio de Universalibus*, pp. 73-86. 5. *De veris universalibus*, pp. 87-134. This MS. was part of the booty carried off by General Königsmark, at the taking of the Hradschin in Prague, on 26th July 1648, from the "Schatzkammer" and Library of the royal castle.

The *Summa* of Wiclif (so entitled in three catalogues of the Hussite period) comprises no fewer than fifteen books, some of which—*e.g.*, the 6th book, *Of the Truth of Holy Scripture*—would fill in print a volume of at least 30 sheets. To the main work, which is purely theological, is prefixed a more general work of mixed philosophico-theological content, which treats *De Dominio*. The *Summa* consists of the following series of treatises :—

1. *De Dominio.* This appears, from the preface in several MSS., to have been the general title, with which agrees the old catalogue contained in Vienna MS. 4514.
   (a) *De Dominio*, Lib. I. (fragment in 19 chapters).
   (b) *De Dominio Divino*, Lib. II. (fragment in 6 chapters).
   (c) *De Dominio Divino*, Lib. III. (fragment in 6 chapters).
2. *Summa Theologiae*, in 12 Books.
   (1) *De Mandatis Divinis.*
   (2) *De Statu Innocentiae.*
   (3) *De Dominio Civili*, Lib. I.
   (4) *De Dominio Civili*, Lib. II.
   (5) *De Dominio Civili*, Lib. III.
   (6) *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae.*
   (7) *De Ecclesia.*
   (8) *De Officio Regis,*
   (9) *De Potestate Papae.*
   (10) *De Simonia.*
   (11) *De Apostasia.*
   (12) *De Blasphemia.*
3. *Trialogus.*
4. *Supplementum Trialogi sive de Dotatione Ecclesiae ;* both edited by Lechler, Oxford, 1869.
5. *De Incarnatione Verbi* (Shirley, No. 12.)
6. *De Ecclesia et Membris.* This appears to be the correct title, and not as Shirley, following the catalogues in two Vienna MSS., gave it under No. 13, *De Fide Catholica.* This book, moreover, is not the same with the book *De Ecclesia*, which forms the seventh part of the *Summa.*
7. *De Officio Pastorali*, edited by Lechler, Leipzig, 1863, Shirley, p. 48, No. 61.
8. *De Eucharistia Tractatus Major.*
9. *De Eucharistia et Pœnitentia, sive de Confessione*, Shirley, No. 23.

B. Polemical Works.

1. *Contra Kilingham Carmelitam determinationes, vide* Shirley, 20, No. 53.
2. *Contra Magistrum Outredum de Ornesima* (?) *Monachum Determinatio,* Shirley, No. 54.
3. *Contra Wilhelmum Vynham Monachum de S. Albano Determinatione*, Shirley, No. 55.
4. *De Dominio Determinatio Contra unum Monachum,* Shirley, No. 56.
5. *Responsiones ad Radulfum Strode*, Shirley, No. 57.
6. *Responsiones ad Argumenta Cujusdam aemuli veritatis,* Shirley, No. 58.

7. *Responsiones ad XLIV. Quaestiones sive ad argutias monachales*, Shirley, No. 59.
8. *Responsum ad Decem Quaestiones*, Shirley, No. 60.

B. Sermons and Practical Expositions of Scripture.

1. Collections of Sermons.

A. In Latin.

1. Sermon on the Gospels, for Sundays—*Super Evangelia Dominicalia*, Shirley, No. 33.
2. Sermons on the Gospels for Saints' Days—*Super Evangelia de Sanctis.*
3. Sermons on the Epistles, for Sundays—*Super Epistolas.*
4. Miscellaneous Sermons—64 in number. The kernel of this collection consists of 40 sermons which occur in Vienna MS. 3928, as a special collection, and which are of outstanding importance as containing the earliest sermons of Wiclif, and reflecting his earlier views. As these collections of sermons could scarcely have been made by Wiclif himself, their variations in number and contents can the more easily be accounted for. Thus Shirley places under No. 37, a collection of twenty-four miscellaneous sermons, the most of which again occur under No. 4, as a distinct collection.

As an Appendix to the Collections of Sermons, are to be mentioned single sermons which were transcribed from the collections, *e.g.*, *Sermo Pulcher* on Ruth ii. 4, which is identical with the 24th sermon in the *Miscellaneous XXIV. Sermons; vide* Shirley, No. 39. Another such is *Mulierem fortem quis inveniet?* on Proverbs xxxi. 10, identical with the 5th of the twenty-four sermons in Shirley, No. 41. The *Exhortatio novi Doctoris*, Shirley, No. 38, is also a sermon, delivered at a doctoral promotion. Last of all, the tractate, *De Sex Jugis* (*vide* Appendix, No. 7), is a combination of several sermons; comp. Shirley, No. 40.

B. In English.

1. Sermons on the Gospels for Sundays—from first Sunday in Trinity to the close of the Church year—*Evangelia dominicalia.*
2. Sermons on the Gospels for Sundays—from first Sunday in Advent to Trinity Sunday.
3. Sermons for Saints' Days, on Texts from the Gospels—on the *Commune Sanctorum.*
4. Sermons for Saints' Days—on the *Proprium Sanctorum*; *vide* Shirley, No. 2 (1-4). These four parts are published in vol. I. of the *Select English Works of John Wiclif*, by Arnold.
5. Week-day Sermons on Texts from the Gospels, besides several occasional sermons—*Evangelia Ferialia.* The whole number of these sermons on the Gospels 1-5, amounts to 239.

6. Sermons on the Epistles—*Epistolae Dominicales*—fifty-five in number. The collections under 5 and 6, are printed vol II. of Arnold's *Select Works of Wiclif.*

The Tract on the Holy Supper, intituled *Wyckett*, appears as a single sermon.

2. Practical Expositions of Scripture.

A. In Latin.

1. Exposition of Sermon on the Mount—*Opus Evangelicum sive de Sermone Domini in Monte*, in four parts; the two last parts also bear the title *De Antichristo; vide* Shirley, No. 42.

2. Exposition of the 23d Chapter of Matthew's Gospel—*Expositio S. Matth. c. xxiii. sive de Vae Octuplici.*

3. Exposition of the 24th Chapter of Matthew—*Expositio S. Matt. cap. xxiv. sive de Antichristo.*

4. Exposition of the New Testament Books, with the exception of the Apocalypse.

B. In English.

1. *Vae Octuplex*—Exposition of 23d chapter of Matthew, printed in *Select Works*, VI., 379-389.

2. *Of Mynystris in the Chirche*—Exposition of 24th chapter of Matthew, printed as above, 393-423. These two tracts stand in all complete collections of the English Sermons of Wiclif.

The English explanations of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, as well as the explanation of the Revelation of John, which Shirley describes, p. 35, under Nos. 6-9, were not, in all probability, written by Wiclif; comp. Arnold in the Introduction to Vol. I. of the *Select Works*, p. iv.

Probably, on the other hand, Wiclif was the author of

3. The twelve pieces which occur in a collected form in several MSS., under the title *Super Cantica Sacra*, and are published by Arnold in *Select Works*, v. III., 5-81. The order in which they occur in the MSS. and in print is not regulated either by their dates or subjects. We enumerate them in a different order.

I.—Old Testament *Cantica.*

1. Song of Moses, Exod. xv.
2. Hymn of Moses, Deut. xxxii.
3. Hanna's Song, 1 Sam. ii.
4. Israel's Song of Thanksgiving, Isaiah xii.
5. Hezekiah's Hymn of Praise, Isaiah xxxviii. 10-20.
6. Habakkuk's Prayer, iii. 2-19.

II.—Apocrypha of the Old Testament.

7. Song of the Three Men in the Furnace, Daniel iii. 51, after the LXX.

III.—New Testament *Cantica.*

8. The Magnificat, Luke i. 46-55.
9. Benedictus—Prayer of Zacharias, Luke i. 68-79.
10. Simeon's Hymn, Luke ii. 29-32.

IV.—*Cantica* of the Ancient Church.

11. The Te Deum.
12. The Creed *Quicunque*, considered as a Psalm, Shirley, p. 36.

These Pieces are all laid out in one way, viz., that the verses one after another are first given in Latin after the Vulgate, and then in an English translation, to which a short explanation is added.

C.—Practical Explanations of Catechetical Pieces.

We here use the liberty of carrying back the modern name Catechism to the Middle Ages, although, as is well known, it was not then used in the sense of the present day. We also include among pieces designed for popular use a great many more sorts than have been ranged under the name of Catechism since Luther's day. These works being designed for the benefit of the people at large, are for the most part written in English. Only a few tracts belonging to this category are written in Latin.

I. In Latin.

1. *De septem donis Spiritus sancti*, Shirley, *Catal.* No.27.
2. *De Oratione Dominica*, Shirley, No. 47.
3. *De Salutatione angelica*, Shirley, No. 48.
4. *De Triplici vinculo amoris*, Shirley, No. 49.
6. *Differentia inter peccatum mortale et veniale*, Shirley, No. 28.

II. In English.

1. *Of the Ten Commandments*, Shirley, No. 40. Printed in *Select Works*, Vol. III., 82-92.
2. *Of the seven works of mercy bodyly ;* and
3. *The seven werkys of mercy ghostly*, or *Opera caritatis*, Shirley, Nos. 42, 43. The two pieces evidently form one whole, printed in *Select Works*, Vol. III., 168.
4. *On the seven deadly sins*, Shirley, No. 44, in *Select Works*, Vol. III., pp. 119-167.
5. *The Mirror of Christian Life*, Shirley, No. 11. It is to be remarked, however, that according to the investigations of Arnold and Professor Stubbs of Oxford, the pieces marked 1 and 7 in this collection (No. 11) certainly did not belong to Wielif, but to a Manual of Religious Instruction drawn up by Archbishop Thoresby of York, in 1357, and circulated among clergy and laity in his diocese ; *vide* Arnold, *Select Works*, Vol. III., Introd. vi. The remaining five pieces of this collection are printed by Arnold in Vol. III., namely :—

(2.) *On the Lord's Prayer.*
(3.) *On the Ave Maria.*
(4.) *Explanations of the Apostles' Creed.*
(5.) *On the Five Bodily Sins.*
(6.) *On the Five Spiritual Sins.*

Besides the tract on the Lord's Prayer, just named, two other explanations of the Prayer by Wiclif are found, which are to be carefully distinguished from this one, namely—

6. Shirley, No. 27.

7. Shirley, No. 64. The latter piece, which is the larger of the two, is printed in *Select Works*, Vol. III., p. 98-110.

8. *On the Ave Maria*, Shirley, No. 28, to be distinguished from the tract on the Angels' Salutation, which has been already mentioned under 5, (3).

9. *Of Faith, Hope, and Charity*, Shirley, No. 41. Arnold's judgment on this tract is somewhat unfavourable, *Select Works*, Vol. III., Introd. vi.

Last of all, we think we should add here some tracts which, to speak with Luther, form a sort of House-Table, namely:—

10. *Of Wedded Men and Wifis, and of their Children also*, Shirley, No. 36; *Select Works*, Vol. III., 188-20.

11. *Of Servants and Masters;* how each should keep his degree, Shirley, 31.

12. *A Short Rule of Life.* Shirley, No. 24; *Select Works*, III., 204-208.

D. Judgments, Personal Explanations, and the Like.

A. Judgments.

All in Latin.

1. *Ad Quaesita Regis et Concilii; Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 258-271. Shirley's *Catal.*, No. 65.

De Captivo Hispanensi. Shirley, No. 66.

3. *De Juramento Arnoldi.* Shirley, No. 71. Printed for the first time below, in Appendix, No. IV.

B. Petitions, Personal Explanations and Defences addressed to Public Bodies.

I. In Latin.

1. *Ad Parliamentum Regis.* Shirley, No. 50. Published first by Lewis, p. 382, and then by Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum.*

2. *Declarationes Johannis Wickliff*, Shirley, No. 51. Printed in Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*, ed. Riley, Vol. I., 357-363.

3. *De Condemnatione XIX. Conclusionium*, Shirley, No. 52. Printed in Appendix to *Fasc. Zizan.*, No. III., p. 481-492.

4. *De Eucharistia Confessio*, Shirley, No. 19. Printed in Lewis. p. 323-332; in Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, Vol. II., 428 f., and *Monograph*, 564 f., following Lewis word for word; lastly, in an independent and critical manner in Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 115-132.

5. *De Eucharistia Confessio*, shorter than the preceding, Shirley, No. 20.

II. In English.

1. Wiclif's Petition to King and Parliament, intituled, *Four Articles*, Shirley, No. 39. Published by Dr. James, Oxford, 1608, in *Two Short Treatises*, etc.; and in a more correct form by Arnold, *Select Works*, III., 507-523, under the title: *A Petition to the King and Parliament.*

2. *Two Confessions on the Sacrament of the Altar*—1. I knowleche that the Sacrament, etc., Shirley, No. 65, printed in *Select Works*, III., 499 f. 2. I beleve as Crist, etc., Shirley, No. 54. *Select Works*, III., 501.

E. Polemical Writings and Pamphlets.

I. In Latin.

These writings all relate to the Church—its worship, especially the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; its members and ranks; its duties and rights; its needs and mischiefs; its improvement and reform. These numerous tracts are, in fact, no more than fly-leaves; and in attempting to reduce them to several chief classes, the following order may perhaps be adopted, admitting, however, in advance, that it is all the more easy to fall into errors here, that only a very small proportion of these fugitive pieces have been printed.

A. Worship.

1. *De Eucharistia Conclusiones XV.*

2. *Quaestio ad Fratres de Sacramento Altaris;* both these are named in Shirley, No. 21, 22.

3. *De Imaginibus*, Shirley, No. 26.

B. Organization of the Church.

1. *De Ordine Christiano*, Shirley, No. 77.

2. *De Gradibus Cleri Ecclesiae sive de Ordinibus Ecclesiae*, Shirley, No. 95.

3. *De Graduationibus scholasticis*, Shirley, No. 94.

4. *De Praelatis contentionum*, Shirley, No. 92.

5. *De Clavibus Ecclesiae*, Shirley, No. 70.

6. *Errare in materia fidei quod potuit Ecclesia militans*, Shirley, No. 32.

7. *De Officio Regis Conclusio*, Shirley, No. 69.

8. *Speculum secularium dominorum*, Shirley, No. 67.

9. *De Servitute civili et Dominio seculari*, Shirley, No. 68.

C. Monachism, especially the Mendicant Orders.

1. *De Religione Privata*, I.
2. *De Religione Privata*, II., Shirley. No 81 and 82.
3. *De Religionibus vanis Monachorum*. Shirley, No. 80.
4. *De Perfectione statuum*, Shirley, No. 78.
5. *De nova praevaricantia mandatorum*, Shirley, No. 79. A short Fragment of this piece is *De Purgatorio*, Shirley, No. 31.
6. *De concordantia fratrum cum secta simplici Christi, sive De Sectis Monachorum*, Shirley, No. 84.
7. *De paupertate Christi, sive XXXIII. Conclusiones*, Shirley, No. 64.
8. *De novis ordinibus*, Shirley, No. 87.
9. *Descriptio Fratris*, Shirley, No. 89.
10. *De mendaciis Fratrum*, Shirley, No. 88.
11. *De Fratribus ad Scholares*, Shirley, No. 90.
12. *De Minoribus Fratribus se extollentibus*, against the boasting of the Franciscans, in the Vienna MS., 3930. (Dénis CDIV.), pp. 178-187. The tractate, which Shirley seems to have overlooked, begins with the words *Cum viantes et fratres.*

D. Decay of the Church, and Church Reform.

1. *De contrarietate duorum dominorum, suarum partium ac etiam regularum*, Shirley, No. 83.
2. *De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo*, Shirley, No. 76.
3. *De Diabolo et membris ejus*, Shirley, No. 29.
4. *De Daemonio meridiano*, Shirley, No. 73.
5. *De solutione Satanae*, Shirley, No. 30.
6. *De detectione perfidiarum Antichristi*, Shirley, No. 86.
7. *De citationibus frivolis et aliis versutiis Antichristi*, Shirley, No. 72.
8. *De dissensione Paparum sive de Schismate*, Shirley, No. 74.
9. *Contra Cruciatam Papae*, Shirley, No. 75.
10. *De quatuor Sectis novellis.* This tract does not refer, as Shirley gives us to understand by the place which he assigns to it, No. 85, under the heading of Monastic Orders, exclusively to the Monastic system, and to the four Mendicant orders in particular, which Wiclif, it is true, often puts together; but according to the author's own explanation at the outset, in Vienna MS. 3929, fol. 225, col. 2, and the whole course of the piece itself, he means by the four modern sects, (1), the priests endowed with lands and lordships—*sacerdotes caesarei*; (2), the landed Monastic orders; (3), the canons; (4), the begging monks.
11. *De fundatione Sectarum*, Shirley, No. 91.
12. *De quatuor Imprecationibus* (some MSS. read *interpretationibus*), Shirley, No. 93. This tract seems to be only a fragment of Matt. xxiv.; *vide* p. 330 above, under 2. *Practical Expositions of Scripture in Latin.*

13. *De duobus generibus Haereticorum, i.e., Simoniaci et Apostatici*, Shirley, No. 96.

14. *De Prophetia*, Shirley, No. 24.

15. *De Oratione et Ecclesiae purgatione*, Shirley, No. 25.

16. *Dialogus sive speculum ecclesiae militantis*, Shirley, No. 62.

It is a fact worthy of remark that of this book more MSS. have come down to us than of any other work of Wiclif, with the exception of some very short fly-leaves—namely, ten such. The reason of this, no doubt, was the nature of its contents, which all relate to the Reformation of the Church, and discuss this subject on more than one side. The date of the *Dialogue* may be determined with tolerable exactitude. It must be placed later than 1378, because the Papal schism is mentioned in cap. 12. Further, as Wiclif is already attacking the doctrine of transubstantiation, cap. 18, and opposing with warmth the Mendicant orders, cap. 32, the book cannot have been written before the year 1381.[1] On the other hand, the *Dialogus* was, without doubt, written earlier than the *Trialogus*; for, first of all, the *Dialogue* is a simpler form of colloquy than the *Trialogue*, and, secondly, the speakers introduced in the *Dialogus* are more than in the *Trialogus* abstract ideas, namely Truth (meaning Christ, as in John xiv. 6, to which there is an express reference in the Introduction), and Falsehood; whereas the speakers in the *Trialogus*, viz., Alithia, the philosopher; Pseustis, the sophistical unbeliever; and Phronesis, the ripe and deep divine, while also somewhat too abstract, still bear a much nearer likeness to living personality than Veritas or Mendacium. Last of all, the conversational form itself is kept up much more persistently in the *Trialogus* than in the *Dialogus*, whose first seven and last five chapters (1-7, 8-30) are rather monologues than dialogues; for in these Truth alone speaks, and it is only in the intervening chapters that the form of dialogue is introduced. These three differences of literary form taken together may suffice to support our conviction that the *Dialogus* is to be looked upon as Wiclif's first attempt in this literary style, and is to be placed earlier than the *Trialogus*. But as the latter was written either in 1383 or 1384, the date of the *Dialogus* may be set down as 1382.

We have still to remark in this place that the tract *De Triplici Ecclesia*, which Shirley brings forward under No. 63, as an independent writing is, in fact, nothing more than a fragment of the *Dialogus*, which, dropping the preface, begins with the first chapter and goes on to the seventh.

17. *Speculum Secularium Dominorum*, Shirley, No. 67.

II. In English.

A. Doctrine of the Church.

1. *Octo in quibus seducuntur simplices Christiani*, Shirley, No. 23. Printed in *Select Works*, III., 447-453.

[1] Herewith I recall and correct what I have put forth on the date of the *Dialogus* in the Prolegomena to my edition of the *Trialogus*.

2. *On the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture* (a fly-leaf), Shirley, No. 60. *Select Works*, III., 18*b*.

B. Worship.

1. *De Confessione et Poenitentia*—against auricular confession, Shirley, No. 51. Here would fall to be added the tract marked No. p. 46, in Shirley's Catalogue, *Of Antechristis Song in Chirche*, and also the tract *Of Prayer*, marked No. 50, which, however, are both only extracts from No. 63 of that catalogue, in case they belonged to Wiclif. But Arnold, while indeed including in Vol. III. the last-named piece, entitled *On the XXV. Articles*, has, at the same time, made it appear probable (p. 454) that this writing was a reply to accusations which were brought against the Lollards by the clergy in 1388, and was therefore written, at the earliest, four years after Wiclif's death.

C. Constitution of the Church.

1. *How the office of Curatis is ordeyned of God, or De XXXIII. erroribus Curatorum.* Shirley No. 19.

2. *For the ordre of presthod.* Shirley, No. 20.

3. *Of Clerkis Possessioners.* Shirley, No. 18.

4. *De Precationibus sacris*, an exhortation to priests to pious prayer, a good life, and pure preaching of the Gospel. Shirley, No. 22; *Select Works*, III., 218-229.

5. *De Stipendiis Ministrorum, or How men schullen fynde prestis.* Shirley, No. 21; *Select Works*, III., 202 f.

6. *Of Prelates.* Shirley, No. 16.

7. *De Obedientia Praelatorum, or Hou men owen obesche* (obey) *to Prelates, drede curs, and kepe lawe.* Shirley, No. 12.

8. *The grete sentence of curs expounded.* Shirley, No 38. First published fully in *Select Works*, III., 267-337.

9. *De Papa.* Shirley, No. 62. No. 6-9 treat of the Hierarchy up to the Pope, of the authority of the higher clergy, and the power of the Keys. The tracts which follow occupy themselves with the monastic system, especially with the Mendicant orders.

10. *How men of privat religion shulden love more the Gospel, Goddis heste* (commandment), *and his Ordynance then ony new lawis, neue rulis, and ordynances of synful men.* Shirley, No. 30.

11. *Rule of St. Francis*, and
12. *Testament of St. Francis*, } Shirley, No. 13, 14.

13. *Tractatus de Pseudo-freris.* Shirley, 47.

14. *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars.* Shirley, No. 15. Only that Shirley, as Lewis before him, gives to the book the less distinctive title of *Objections of Freres*, which has only the marginal note of a MS. to support it. Arnold gives the writing in *Select Works*, III., 366-401; It contains fifty chapters, and forms a comprehensive attack upon the Mendicant orders.

15. *De Blasphemia contra Fratres* (Shirley, 47, No. 52), to be carefully distinguished from the book *De Blasphemia* in Latin, which forms the last part of Wiclif's *Summa*. The English controversial piece is published in *Select Works*, III., 402-429.

D. Decline and Reform of the Church.

Among all these eighteen English writings last enumerated (*A*, *B*, *C*), there is not one which had not in view the disorder and corruption of the Church, and did not work for its purification and reform. But in the writings now to be named the reformation spirit and standpoint are incomparably more prominent and prevailing. I place in the front a work which equally inquires into both subjects, the Church's decline and reform.

1. *The Church and her Members.* Shirley, No. 45. First published by Dr. Todd in Dublin, 1851, in *Three Treatises by John Wycliffe*, p. iii.—lxxx.), but now printed in *Select Works*, by Arnold, in a more satisfactory form, after a much better MS. in the Bodleian Library, III., 338-365. The next following tracts occupy themselves chiefly with proving the fallen condition of the Church and opposing its corruptions.

2. *De Apostasia Cleri.* Shirley, No. 46. Printed in Todd's *Three Treatises*, and in Arnold's *Select Works*, III., 430-40. Let us not omit to mention here that the piece entitled *Of Antecrist and his Meynee* (Shirley, No. 48), which Todd also published in the *Three Treatises*, was pronounced ungenuine by Vaughan in his *Monograph*, p. 539, and has also been referred by Arnold in *Select Works*, I., Introduction vii., to a later date.

3. *Antecrist and his Clerkis traveilen to destroie Holy Writt.* Shirley, No. 33.

4. *How Sathanas and his Prestis casten to destroie alle good lyvynge.* Shirley, No. 34.

5. *Speculum de Antichristo, or How Antecrist and his clerkis feren true Prestis fro prechyng of Cristis Gospel bi four disceits.* Shirley, No. 17.

6, *Of feyned contemplative lif, of songe, and worldly bisynesse of Prestis*, etc. Shirley, No. 26.

7. *How Sathanas and his Children turnen werkes of mercy ypsodown and decevyn men thereinne*, etc., Shirley, No. 29.

8. *De duobus generibus hereticorum* (Simony and Apostasy), Shirley No. 56. *Select Works*, III., 211 f.

9. *De Dominio Divino:* more correctly, *Of Church lands and lordships of the Clergy.* Shirley, No. 58. *Select Works*, III., Introd. vii.

10. *Thre thingis distroien this world*, false confessoures, false men of law, and false merchauntis. Shirley, No. 25.

11. *De Pontificum Romanorum Schismate*, Shirley, No. 59. *Select Works*, III., 242-266.

The following pamphlets occupy themselves chiefly with Church Reform itself, with the ways and means to be adopted to bring it about, with the defence of the persons labouring to that end, especially the itinerant preachers, and with exhortations to others to come to the help of this work.

12. *Of good prechyng prestis.* Shirley, No. 37.

13. *Why pore prestis have non benefices.* Shirley, No. 32.

14. *Lincolniensis,* a pamphlet hitherto unknown, which Arnold was the first to discover in a MS. of the Bodleian Library, which is of great importance for the English tracts of Wiclif, and has been largely used by him. Published in *Select Works,* VIII., 230-232. The short but interesting tract begins with Grossetête's description of a monk outside his cloister (hence the title *Lincolniensis*), but it treats chiefly of the attacks of the Begging Orders upon "poor priests," and calls upon knights and lords to take the persecuted men under their protection, and to join the battle for Christ's cause and the reformation of His Church.

15. *For the skilles* (reasons) *Lordis schulden constreyne Clerkis to lyve in mekenesse, wilful povert,* etc. Shirley, No. 35. *Select Works,* III., 213-218.

16. *De Vita Sacerdotum.* Shirley, No. 53. *Select Works,* III., 233-241. The subject is the necessity of secularising the property of the Church, and reducing the priests to apostolic poverty.

F. Letters.

1. In Latin (Original), *vide* Shirley, p. 21, No. 61.

1. *Litera missa Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi.* The letter first establishes Wiclif's principle that the clergy should possess no secular lordships, in connection with which it opposes the crusade in the cause of Pope Urban VI. The second chief subject of the letter is the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the writer desires to see brought to a decision by the Primate, agreeably to the standard of Holy Scripture. The earliest date to which the letter can be assigned is the year 1382, but possibly it might fall in the year following.

2. *Litera missa Episcopo Lincolniensi—i.e.,* manifestly to Bishop John Bokyngham—is shorter than the preceding, and treats exclusively of the Lord's Supper and the doctrine of change of substance; written either at the end of 1381, or at the beginning of 1382.

3. *Litera parva ad quendam socium* (so in the Vienna MS. 1387, fol. 107), a short letter of commendation to some one who shared his views and his struggles.

4. *De Octo Quaestionibus propositis discipulo.* The letter noticed by Shirley in his *Catalogue,* p. 22, No. 6, under the title *De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum,* appears to have been nothing more than an integral part of this letter, *De Octo Quaestionibus,* viz., the answer to the first question.

The letter *De Amore*, numbered 5 in Shirley, is a Latin translation of an English original (see below, under 2.). On the other hand, the pieces numbered 1 and 4 in Shirley, viz., *Ad Urbanum Papam* and *Ad Simplices Sacerdotes*, are both only letters by *supposition*, but not in reality. As to the latter of the two, we refer the reader to what is said upon this point cap. IX. above, as well in the text as in a note. The alleged letter to Pope Urban VI., published by Shirley in the Latin original, in *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 341 f., was early translated into English in the form of a free paraphrase. This English version of it was first printed by Lewis in the appendix to his *Life and Opinions*, II., 122. In the *Select Works*, III., 504-6, Arnold has published the fragment with critical exactness upon the basis of the two original MSS. of it which are extant in England. As to its contents and form I refer to the remarks which have been already made, cap. IX.

2. English (in the Original).

1. *Ad Quinque Quaestiones.* Shirley, No. 57. Here Wiclif answers five questions of a friend and sympathiser on the subject of the love of God. There is no doubt that the English text is the original, and the Latin a translation (*vide* Shirley, No. 61-5), for more than once the writer speaks in such a way of the Latin and the English that we must suppose that the letter was originally written in English. And as Wiclif remarks that it is difficult to give a right answer to these questions in the English tongue, I think I may infer from this that the letter may have been written at a comparatively early date; for in his latest years Wiclif wrote so much English that in these years an expression of that kind could no longer be expected to come from him. This letter was first published by Arnold in the original, *Select Works*, III., 183-185.

Note on the Vienna MSS. of Works of Wiclif.

It may not be without interest to many readers to obtain more exact information concerning the contents of the Wiclif MSS. preserved in the Imperial Library of Vienna, which are so frequently referred to in the above catalogue of the Reformer's works. And the interest felt would be still greater if we were able to give in all cases a history of the transcripts themselves, and of all the changes of hands through which they have passed. But it is only in rare instances that we find any notices of this kind in the MSS. themselves. The following notes have been drawn up, with the help of the Catalogue of the Latin MSS. of the Imperial Library, which was published in 1864 by the Imperial Academy of Sciences. It seemed requisite, however, to add, in all cases, where possible, the numbers attached to the several volumes in the excellent catalogue of the learned Dénis.

The following list of volumes is confined to those which are of chief importance, to the exclusion of others which contain only duplicate or triplicate transcripts of the same works, and also of several volumes which contain only a small proportion of Wiclif material, mixed up with the productions of other writers.

The numbers, which stand first in *Arabic* numerals, are those of the Catalogue,

presently in use in the Imperial Library. The numbers in Roman numerals are those of the Dénis Catalogue.

1. No. 1294 (Dénis I. CDV.), 4to, 251, written in very small hand, in two columns, is of particular value, because the vol. contains a complete copy of Book vi. of Wiclif's *Summa*—viz., the Treatise *De Veritate Sacrae Scripturæ*, pp. 1-127. At the end occurs this notice, *Correctus quariter, anno Domini* 1407, *in Vigilia purificationis S. Mariæ, Oxonii per Nicolaum Faulfish et Georgium de Knychnitz.* This volume also contains the seventh book of the *Summa De Ecclesia*, and the work which forms the Introduction to the *Summa, De Dominio Divino.*

2. No. 1337 (Dénis I. CCCLXVIII.) 4to, 258, pp., contains for the most part only small tracts, all by Wiclif, many of them extending only to a single chapter. The longest of them is the Treatise *De Trinitate*, pp. 182-243. At the end of the tract stand the initials M. F. W.

3. No. 1339 (Dénis, CCCLXXX.), 4to, pp. 248, contains the first portions of the *Summa*—viz., the first three books, *De Dominio Divino*, which form the Introduction to the work, but all three only in a fragmentary form, followed by the first two books of the *Summa* itself—viz., the *Liber Mandatorum*, otherwise intitled *De Mandatis Divinis*, and *De Statu Innocentiæ.*

4. No. 1341 (Dénis CCCLXXXII.), 4to, pp. 254, forms the continuation to No. 1339, containing the third and fourth books of the *Summa* proper—viz., the first and second books *De Civili Dominio.*

These MSS. volumes, 1337, 1339, 1341, and two others of less importance (one of them a duplicate of 1339), were originally the property, as appears from several notices found in them, of some one in the small town of Nimburg, which lies about ten German miles north-east of Prague. In No. 1339 occurs the No. MCCCLXXXIII., which, however, it is certain, does not indicate the date of the execution of the MS. Possibly enough this date stood in the original copy transcribed in England, from which this was a transcript, made in Bohemia. Dénis found in the volume a business letter in the Czech language, addressed by a bootmaker to the Dean of Nimburg, from which he inferred, not without reason, that the volume was at one time in possession of this priest; and it is a conjecture of my own that the Dean may have obtained it from Hussite hands, or may have confiscated it.

5. No. 1343 (Dénis CCCXCII.), 4to, pp. 230, contains the three last books of Wiclif's *Summa;* the tenth, *De Simonia;* the eleventh, *De Apostasia;* and the twelfth, *De Blasphemia.* At the end of the eleventh book stand the words—*Explicit tractatus de Apostasia per reverendum doctorem J. W. Cujus anima per misericordiam altissimi requiescat in pace. Amen.*

6. No. 1387 (Dénis CCCLXXXIV.), fol. 215, a miscellaneous volume, containing fourteen different pieces by Wiclif, some of them of larger size, such as the *Trialogus*, pp. 163-215, and the treatise *De Eucharistia*, pp. 1-43; others of small bulk, *e.g.*, letters, some controversial pieces, and several commentaries on Scripture passages.

7. No. 3928 (Dénis CD), fol. pp. 253, contains several collections of Wiclif's sermons—1. Sixty sermons for saints' days; 2. Twenty-four Miscellaneous sermons; 3. Tractate on the Six Yokes; 4. A small tractate by a disciple of Wiclif on the power of a prince over his clergy when sunk in mortal sin; 5. Thirty-eight sermons of Wiclif—originally forty.

8. No. 3930, fol. pp. 359, a very miscellaneous collection, comprising several works of Wiclif—the *Dialogus*, the *Trialogus*, etc.—mixed with pieces by Huss and several of the leading Hussites, *e.g.* Jacob von Mies and Johann von Rokyzana.

9. No. 3932 (Dénis CCCLXXXVIII.) fol. pp. 211, bears the exact date of its transcription, 1418, while the name of the transcriber, originally inserted, has been erased. The volume begins with the *Trialogus*, which is followed by the *Dialogus*, and next by sermons and tracts.

10. No. 3933 (Dénis CCCXCI.), fol. pp. 196. This volume was once the property of a certain *Paul von Slawikowich.* It contains eleven writings of Wiclif, all of them smaller pieces, except one entitled *De Officio Regis*, which formed the eighth book of the *Summa.* The volume closes with a *Catalogue of Wiclif's Latin*

Writings, which was printed by Shirley in his *Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif*, 1865.

11. No. 3934 (Dénis CCCXCVIII.), fol. pp. 151. The only writings of Wiclif found in this volume are a collection of his Latin Sermons, pp. 1-132, extending through a whole year.

12. No. 3935, (Dénis CCCCX.), fol. pp. 343. Of this MS. only two-thirds contain writings of Wiclif—viz., *De Dominio Divino*, the 11th and 12th books of the *Summa*, *De Apostasia*, and *De Blasphemia*, followed by the third book *De Statu Innocentiae*, and *De Trinitate*. The remaining third part of the MS. gives the articles of Archbishop Fitzralph against the Begging Friars along with a sermon of his, and in addition, several pieces relating to the disputation between Peter Payne, the zealous Wiclifite, and Johann von Przibram, which took place in Prague in 1426-1429.

13. No. 4302. (Dénis DCCCII.), 4to, pp. 274. A miscellaneous collection, written partly in the thirteenth and partly in the fifteenth centuries, It comprises three genuine works of Wiclif—pp. 25-50, *Speculum Militantis Ecclesiae*; p. 53-74, *Pastorale*, or *De Officio Pastorali*; and p. 75-96, the tract *De Compositione Hominis*.

14. No. 4307, (Dénis, CCCCVI.), 4to, pp. 242, contains six of Wiclif's writings, almost all on philosophical subjects—p. 38, *De Compositione Hominis*; p. 62, *De Universalibus*; p. 115, *De Incarnatione*; p. 158, *De Ente in Communi*; p. 167, *De Ente Primo*; p. 190, *De Ente Particulari*. The MS. bears the name of the copyist, Peter von Czaslaw, and also the date and place of transcription, *finibus Glatorie* (Klettau), *sub anno domini*, 1433, *et eodem anno fuit Synodus Generalis Concilii cum Dominis Bohemis Basilie*.

15. No. 4343, Dénis DLXV., 8vo, pp. 303. A miscellaneous collection, including several small pieces of Wiclif, *e.g.*, the *Speculum Dominorum*; also a tract by Bishop Grosstete, *De Oculo Morali*, and a defence of Wiclif by Peter Payne.

16. No. 4483, (Dénis CCCLXII.), 4to, pp. 327, contains a sermon by Wiclif, *De Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis Christi*, in addition to pieces by Huss, Stanislaus, Von Znaim, and others.

17. No. 4505, (Dénis CCCCIII.), 4to, pp. 227. This MS. contains only Wiclif pieces, especially the following:—(1) The *Decalogus*, (2) the *Trialogus*, (3) the Supplement to the *Trialogus*. Comp. Lechler's edition of the *Trialogus*, Oxford, 1869; *Prolegomena*, p. 23.

18. 4514, (Dénis, CCCXCIII.), 4to, pp. 184, contains (1) an alleged commentary of Wiclif on the Song of Songs; (2) the book *De Blasphemia*; (3) an alphabetical catalogue of the writings of Wiclif (published by Shirley, *Catalogue*, etc., 1865); (4) *De Officio Pastorali*.

19. No. 4515 (Dénis CCCCII.), 4to, pp. 236, contains several pieces of Wiclif, *e.g.*, the *Dialogus*, the *De Simonia*, the *De Septem Donis Spiritus*, in addition to several writings by Huss, and against him.

20. No. 4523 (Dénis CCCXC.), 4to, pp. 156. This MS. contains only writings of Wiclif, and these exclusively on philosophical subjects, viz., the *Logica*, the *Continuatio Logicae*, the *De Universalibus*, and the *De Ideis*.

21. No. 4527 (Dénis CCCLXXXIX.), 4to, pp. 229, a volume including, among the forty-one short pieces which it brings together, letters, tracts, and controversial pieces of Wiclif.

22. No. 4529 (Dénis CCCXCIX.), 4to, pp. 188. The largest part of this MS., pp. 1-156, contains Wiclif's Sermons on the Gospels.

23. No. 4937, 4to, pp. 296. Among a miscellaneous collection of pieces referring for the most part to the Hussite controversies, occur, Nos. 13-15, several small pieces of Wiclif, *e.g.*, *De Daemonio Meridiano*.

24. No. 5204, 4to, pp. 100. This MS. contains, the *De Universalibus*, and the *De Propositionibus Insolubilibus* of Wiclif.

III.

WICLIF, DE ECCLESIA, C. 16.

(*From MS.* 1294 *of the Imperial Library of Vienna; Dénis, CCCCV., f.* 180, *col.* 2.)

Quinto arguitur per deducens ad *familiare inconveniens*, scilicet: Sibeatus Silvester peccavit in recipiendo dotacionem ecclesie in perpetuum, sequitur a pari, quod *collegia nostre universitatis* verisimiliter peccarent in recipiendo temporalia pro sustentacione perpetua pauperum clericorum; et ita sequitur, quod tam clerici Domini Wyntoniensis, quam alii collegiati, tenentur non perpetuari, et per consequens movere patronos ad dissolvendum privilegia perpetua, ut est de privilegiis perpetuis concessis universitati nostre a rege, et sic de cantariis et aliis elemosinis perpetuis. Revocetur, inquit, ista heresis, cum extingueret devocionem populi, elemosinas perpetuas clericorum, et per consequens cederet ad detrimentum maximum pauperibus in futurum.

Hic dico *primo*, quod consequencia non procedit; cum homo potest facere nedum bonum de genere, sed bonum[1] moraliter, et tamen cum hoc et in hoc peccare venialiter, ut ista pars habet dicere, "*in familiariori*[2] *exemplo:*" Nam Dominus Simon Hyslep, archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, fundavit unum collegium in Oxonia,[3] plus pia intencione, ut evidencius creditur, quam de fundacione cuiuscunque abbathie in Anglia; et ordinavit, quod in ea[4] sub forma laudabili studeant ad utilitatem ecclesie *pure clerici seculares*, quod et factum est; et tamen[5] pso mortuo, symoniace cum commentis mendacii eversum est tam pii patroni propositum, et illis expulsis pauci alii non egentes sed diviciis affluentes, irregulariter introducti, contra decretum captum ex dictis beati Jeronymi positum 12, qu. 2:[6] "Gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere; ignominia sacerdotis est, propriis studere diviciis." Et cum pretextu[7] illius fuci[8] episcopus et suum capitulum sunt una persona, a qua non licet alienare bona illius ecclesie, ista persona vendicat bona illius collegii proprietarie possidere. Unde consulendum videtur domino Wyntoniensi, ut caveat hanc cautelam. Credo autem quod dictus Symon peccavit fundando dictum collegium, sed non tantum, quantum Antisymon, qui ipsum dissolverat. Sed, ut credo, nunquam fuit ecclesia appropriata in Anglia, vel possessio in perpetuam elemosinam mortificata, quin appropriatio sapuit peccatum altrinsecus.

[1] *bonum*, bene, Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, 526.

[2] *familiariori*, familiari, Shirley.

[3] *in Oxonia*, MS.: in Oxonii.

[4] *in ea*, MS., as if not *collegium* but *aula* had preceded.

[5] *tamen*, tum, Shirley.

[6] Corpus jur. can.: Decreti secunda pars, causa 12, quaestio 2, cap. 71.

[7] *pretextu*. Shirley reads *pretextum*, conjectures, however, rightly, *pretextu;* but the MS. itself has in fact *pretextu*.

[8] *fuci*, facti, Shirley.

Ulterius *pro materia argumenti*, affectarem, si Deus decreverit, quod non foret in regno nostro talis ecclesiarum appropriatio vel redditiuum temporalium mortificatio, scilicet quod totus clerus vivendo pure exproprietarie, de decimis, oblationibus et privatis elemosinis sit contentus.

IV.

FORMA JURAMENTI ARNALDI PAPE THEZAURARII.

(*MS.* 3929 *of the Imperial Library of Vienna* (*Dénis, CCCLXXXV.*), *f.* 246, *col.* 1; *f.* 247, *col.* 2.)

Hec est forma iuramenti Arnaldi de Granario,[1] collectoris domini Pape Gregorii XI. in ecclesia Anglicana. Et dividitur sacramentum in X articulos: primo promittit et iurat ad sancta Dei evangelia, quod erit fidelis et legalis regi et corone sue etc.

Formidantissime (*sic*) domine mi rex! Ego Arnaldus de Granario, receptor iurium s. patris nostri domini pape intra vestrum regnum Anglie promitto et iur ad sancta Dei evangelia, quod ero fidelis et legalis vobis et vestre corone.

Nec faciam nec curabo nec paciar fieri nec procurari aliquid quod possit esse preiudiciale et dampnosum vobis vel regno ac legibus vestris vel iuribus et alicui de vestris subiectis.

Bonum et fidele consilium vobis dabo super quanto ex vestra parte fuero requisitus.

Consilium vestrum ac regni vestri, dum potero esse quomodolibet informatus, vel quodcunque feceritis me scire per literas vel alio modo, celabo et secretum tenebo sine revelacione vel deteccione alicui persone vive, unde dampnum, preiudicium vel dedecus possit sequi vobis vel regno vestro.

Nullam execucionem literarum seu mandatorum papalium per me vel per alium faciam vel fieri permittam, quod possit esse displicens et preiudiciale vestre regali maiestati nec vestris regalibus legibus ac iuribus nec alicui de subiectis vestris.

Nullas literas papales et alias recipiam, si non illas portem tradam et deliberem, quam cito potero, consilio vestro, antequam fuerint publicate vel tradite alicui alteri persone vive.

Nullum thezaurum vestrum vel regni vestri pape vel cardinalibus aut alteri persone cuicunque in moneta vel massa auri vel argenti, per literas Cambii aut aliter transmittam, nec aliqualiter[2] literas quascunque mandabo extra predictum regnum vestrum, antequam super hoc habuero specialem licenciam de vobis aut vestro concilio.

[1] MS.: Granario.

[2] *aliqualiter*. This reading is conjectural, as the MS. has only the contraction *aliqe*, and the French text, in which this clause is wanting, is of no assistance here.

Honorem vestrum et statum, leges vestras, regalias et iura custodiam et defendam inviolabiliter pro posse meo ;

Et quod non transibo extra regnum Anglie sine speciali licencia regis per literas sui magni sigilli,

sicut Deus me adiuvet et sua sancta evangelia, secundum scire meum !

Hec facta sunt in pallacio Regis in Westmonasterio XIIIo die Februarii Anno domini MCCCLXXII,

praesentibus domino Roberto Thorp cancellario,
domino Ricardo de Scrop, thezaurario Anglie.
domino J. Nevyle, Senescall,
Nicol. Caren, custode sacrati sigilli,
domino Joh. Knyvet, iusticiario Regis,
domino Henrico Wakfeld, thezaurario domus Regis,
domino Henrico Snayth, cancellario stactarii (?)
domino Ricardo de Rauenesher, clerico de Haneper,
J. de Burncester
et Wilhelmo Tyrygtan, notario Regis.

Wiclif's Judgment on the above Oath.

De istis 10 articulis provideat prudenti examine discretum regis consilium, utrum dominus collector incurrebat magnum periurium. Nam in *secundo* iurat, quod nec faciet aliquid nec procurabit nec permittet fieri aut procurari, quod possit esse preiudiciabile aut dampnosum regi, regno, legibus vel subditis regis nostri. Numquid credimus, quod exhaustus tanti thezauri ad curiam sine recompensa corporalis aut spiritualis suffragii sit tam preiudiciabile aut dampnosum? Videtur, quod sic; cum regnum nostrum iam sensibiliter percipiens illud gravamen de ipso conqueritur. Quantum ad retribucionem *corporalis* suffragii, dicunt experti, quod non nostri sed inimici nostri cum thezauro per ipsum extracto de Anglia relevantur. Et quantum ad *spirituale* suffragium, non videtur dacio tante pecunie esse nobis elemosinaria aut meritoria, dum a nobis inuitis, nec ad pios usus nec egenis aut pauperibus, sit extorta, sed pocius videtur prepositis nostris dampnabilis et per consequens dampnosissima quoad Deum, cum secundum theologos, qui potest emendare delictum et negligit, constituit se delicti participem quoad Deum.

Si dicatur, quod non potest esse preiudiciabile quod summus pontifex arbitratur, quia, quod illi principi placuerit, legis habet vigorem ; imo supposito, quod dictus collector incurrat periurium, habet presbitero sibi assistenti commissam potestatem ad absoluendum eum, quotiescunque in ipsum incurrerit, ita plene, sicut absoluerit dominus noster papa.

Quoad *primum*, videtur quod sapit[1] calumpniam, cum dominus papa sit satis peccabilis, imo per idem, si voluerit, conquireretur sibi regi-

[1] *sapit*, MS., capit.

men Anglie, vel transferre in alios foret iustum. Et quoad *secundum*, videtur, tam sophistica et subdola illusio consilii regis nostri foret tam preiudicialis quam dampnosa regi nostro[1] et omnibus incolis regni sui. Ideo cum secundum sapientem "qui sophistice loquitur, est Deo odibilis,"[2] non debet supponi tam vulpina calliditas in patre nostro sanctissimo vel in eius venerabili collectore; nec per idem supponi debet dolosa quorundam opinio, qui dicunt, quod in omni iuramento subintelligenda est condicio: "si pape placuerit," vel: "nisi ipse decreverit aliter faciendum" quia tunc foret esse superfluum, regnum nostrum de ministris papalibus recipere aliquod iuramentum. Et idem est iudicium supposito, quod post iuramentum iurans protestatus fuit coram notariis, quod sic fecerat metu mortis. Quomodo, rogo, suppositis cautelis huiusmodi "finis controversie et pacis signaculum fuerit iuracio"?[3]

Item, inquit, foret tam preiudiciale quam dampnosum, regnum Anglie tantum depauperari pecunia, quod assistente invasione hostibus,[4] rex non haberet unde dispertiretur exercitui suo stipendium, qui hostes invaderet et regnum regis ac pape ecclesiam a destruccione defenderet. Utrum autem talis paucitas pecunie possit regno nostro contingere ex substraccione thezauri regni nostri ad curiam romanam, relinquendum est superiorum iudicio, qui noverant statum regni.

Imo cum dictus collector sit iuratus in *tertio articulo*, quod bonum et fidele consilium dabit regi et regno, super quocunque, super quod sciverit (*sic*) fuerit requisitus: videtur, quod *parliamentum* debet onerare eum virtute iuramenti prestiti, quod vere dicat sibi, quantum de pecunia vel aequivalenti pro uno anno transmisit ad curiam vel promisit aut sciverit transmitti, vel quantum de omnibus bonis *ecclesie Anglicane*, que papae vendicat, superest transmittendum. Si enim super hoc oneratus negat vel dissimulat dicere veritatem, non videtur quod sit fidelis vel legalis corone, sicut dicit *primus articulus* iuramenti. Hoc autem cognito potest *parliamentum* discernere, si transmissio talis, que iam est copiosior, pensata proporcione ad residuum thezaurum regis, eidem regno preiudicialis fuerit vel dampnosa. Item cum regni prosperitas stat in complecione pie elemosine, secundum formam qua rex et domini regni nostri dotarunt singulariter ecclesiam, quomodo non foret prejudiciale et dampnosum extrahere elemosinas predictas ad curiam, ex quarum defectu foret complecio tam pie elemosine dissoluta? Cum enim dei suffragium sit prestancius quam humanum, et torpere in defensione iuris divini sit gravius, quam omittendo defendere ius humanum, videtur, quod talis thezauri regni extraccio eclipsat a regno divinum subsidium, et implicat patronos, heredes fundatorum, in periculosa voragine peccatorum; permittens

[1] *nostro*, MS., nostri.

[2] Proverbs xii. 22. Vulg.: Abominatio est Domino labia mendacia.

[3] Comp. Heb. vi. 16.

[4] So the MS., I conjecture: *insistente invasione hostium;* or *insistente invasione hostibus.* In the one case a defensive war would be referred to, in the other an offensive war.

autem et procurans hec fieri non potest evadere quin permittit aut procurat preiudicialia et dampnosa regi, regno, legibus et subditis regis nostri, quod manifeste obviat iuramento; nam leges Anglie, que currerent super indigenis sustentatis ex dictis elemosinis, deficiente robore populi nostri, et multiplicata gente extera[1] nobis contraria, sunt frustratae.[2]

Item cum omnes sacerdotes vel clerici de regno Anglie, qui solvunt curie *primos fructus*, coacti sunt per dictum collectorem sub pena gravis excommunicacionis deferre sibi Londonias valentem illorum fructum, non in decimis vel rebus sacris, sed in moneta regis nostri, que est res purissime temporalis, quomodo sic exsequens tales censuras non facit preiudicium tam regni nostri legibus quam personis? *Legibus* quidem, quia per censuras cogit, ut sacre decime in bonum mere temporale mutentur, etsi sine remedio regis Anglie, eciam supposita iniuria, deferantur; *persone* autem, quia sunt legii homines regis nostri, non defenduntur in pristina *libertate*, cum ex uno latere necessitati sunt ultra solitum[3] facere expensas non modicas et labores; ex alio autem latere, cum oportet eos vivere, sustentacionem extorquent a subditis pauperibus, et debitum Dei ministerium pretermittunt. Et isti[4] licet parvipendantur a superioribus, qui ipsa non senciunt, decrescit regni prosperitas, quia secundum sapientem "qui contempnit modica, paulatim decidit."[5]

Item iuxta *quintum* articulum iuramenti dictus collector non debet exequi literas vel mandata papalia per se vel per alium, que possent esse[6] displicencia aut preiudicalia regiae maiestati, regni legibus vel subditis. Sed constat ex facto eius notorie, quod sic facit. Ideo, ut a multis creditur, est periurus. Si enim prestaret hodie idem iuramentum quod prius, sicut videtur multis quod foret adhuc, creditur, quod execucio sui officii regi nostro, licet in etate iuvenili florenti, et omnino[7] suo consilio racionabiliter displiceret, et, si non fallor, displiceret maiori parti populi Anglicani. Ex istis videtur, quod literas quascunque de curia romana recepit vel transmisit in ista materia, facit preiudicium regno nostro contra *quartam*, *sextam*, et *octavam* partem iuramenti; et per consequens nec honorem regni nec eius statum prosperum custodit vel defendit, sed omnino oppositum, contra *nonum* articulum iuramenti.

Et sic si decem iuramenti particulae distincte et particulariter sint discussae, forte dictus collector inveniretur periurus in Deum et homines, et per consequens prevaricator decalogi mandatorum. Lex itaque correpcionis fraternae urget regnum nostrum, prevaricatori tam intoxicabili resistere et radicem tanti[8] deo et regi odibilem cum

[1] *extera*, MS., exteri.
[2] *frustratae*, MS., frustrata.
[3] *solitum*, MS., solicitum.
[4] *isti*, so MS. It may be questioned whether the reading *ista* might not perhaps be preferable.
[5] Sirach. xix. 1.
[6] *esse*, MS., ex se.
[7] *omnino*, conjectural for omni.
[8] Here we must either read *tante*, an adverb which occurs not unfrequently with Wiclif, or, if *tanti* is correct, some word like *mali*, *peccati*, or the like, must have fallen out.

suis complicibus extirpare, specialiter pensata natura legis caritatis et pacienciae Christi vicarii et natura legis elemosinae bonorum. Si enim layci non extorquent a papa suffragium spirituale plus debitum, multo magis interest papae, qui in humilitate et paciencia excederet laycos, elemosinam praeter evangelium mendicatam excommunicacionibus vel tradicionibus aliis[1] extorquere. Sic enim posset papa christianismum paupertate et paciencia martirum conquisitum dirimere a domino quantum.[2] Et idem videtur beatum Bernardum innuere libro tertio ad Eugenium sic asserentem, quod papa solum in spiritualibus ut humilitate, caritate et paciencia superat seculares; alioquin, inquit, quo pacto te reputes superiorem his, a quibus beneficium mendicas?[3] Nec videtur, quin liceret in principio excommunicare pro elemosina, sicut post eius subtraccionem, postquam fuit gratis[4] repetita, etc.

V.

SERMON ON LUKE VIII. 4-15.

XL. Sermones. MS. 3928 *of the Imperial Library of Vienna* (*Dénis, CCCC.*), *fol.* 207, *col.* 2; *fol.* 210, *col.* 2.

Unfortunately that portion of this volume which contains the *Miscellaneous Sermons* was written by a copyist who was somewhat ignorant, and, what was still worse, executed his task very carelessly.

Constat ex serie evangelii, quod Salvator noster Dominus Jesus Christus crebro locutus est suo auditorio in *parabolis*, nunc ut sententia latens et salubris in patente parabola fortius memoranter imprimatur, sic enim docemur artificialiter per domos et imagines memorari, nunc ut audientes ob pönam sui demeriti minus intelligant, et ut proprietas naturalis tam exempli quam exemplati philosophice doceatur. Sic enim secundum beatum Augustinum scriptura sacra continet omnem veritatem philosophicam. Et propter primam causam et tertiam totus populus Palaestinorum et multorum, inter quos Salvator noster conversatus est, intentus fuit parabolis. Et ideo condignum valde fuit, quod evangelium Christi, medium inter Vetus Testamentum et epistolas apostolorum, participaret conditionibus utriusque.

Sed inter omnes parabolas Salvatoris nullam significantius et apertius legitur docuisse quam parabolam seminantis. Ipsam enim dig-

[1] If I do not quite err, *non* must have fallen out before the infinitive.

[2] *relit, libet,* or some similar word, has been omitted by the transcriber.

[3] Bernhard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione.*

[4] *gratis,* MS., gracius.

natus est suis discipulis seorsim exponere, ultra quam sufficit humana fragilitas comprehendere. Unde ante expositionem factam de terra quadruplici seminata declamat in haec verba: "Qui habet aures audiendi audiat!"

Semen itaque secundum expositionem Salvatoris est verbum Dei. Ex quibus verbis elicio michi tria fraternitati vestrae per ordinem declaranda: primum est de dispositione spiritualis *seminis*, secundum est de dispositione *seminantis*, et tertium de congruentia sive convenientia *temporis* seminandi.

1. Pro quo advertendum, quod "semen" accipitur tripliciter in scriptura, *primo* pro *materia* decisa a vivo habente in se virtutem inclinativam ad animatum consimile in forma et in specie producendum, sive sit terrae nascentium et natatilium,[1] quorum semen est constans, cum non habet appropriatum receptaculum, sive formale et liquidum ut semen gressibilium vel volantium,[2] unde Genesis i.: "Protulit terra herbam viventem et facientem semen juxta genus suum." *Secundo* accipitur pro *individuo seminantis* ex tali semine producto, ut Genesis iii.: "Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius." *Tertio* accipitur pro quocunque *opere* viatoris digno merito vel demerito, unde Gal. vi.: "Quae enim seminaverit homo, haec et metet."

Semini ergo primo modo dicto similatur verbum Dei, quia deciditur non a quocunque vivo, sed ab angelo ecclesiae,[3] sacerdote videlicet Domini, misso ad gignendum et nutriendum populum verbo vitae. Habetque verbum debite praedicantis vocem formatam pro suo materiali, et vim mentis, quae secundum praecipuos philosophos multiplicatur[4] cum voce, pro suo formali. Hinc enim secundum magicos naturales habent verba sapientis incantationem suam efficaciam, quantumlibet distantia transmutando, sine hoc quod taliter transmutent medium. Verbum itaque praedicantis est materiale quoddam decisum a vivo, habetque in se quandam virtutem seminalem *datam desuper* ad producendum novam creaturam; quia non dubium quin praeter vocem et vim animae oportet esse interius verum doctorem, qui mentem illuminet et veritatem ostendat. Cum igitur ille magister utitur voce tanquam organo, non mirum si in illam redundet virtus inclinativa ad spiritualem hominem producendum. Et illum sensum praetendit apostolus, 1 Corinth. 4: "In Christo Jesu per evangelium ego vos genui." Ecce praemittit Christum Jesum tanquam opificem principalem. Quia Jacobi i., scribitur: "Voluntarie genuit nos verbo virtutis, ut simus initium aliquod creaturae ejus." Et hinc concipientes in animo verbum divinitus seminatum et foventes calore caritatis, donec formetur in eis Christus, *matres* ejus sunt. Unde Matthaei xii., Salvator dicit: "Quicunque fecerit voluntatem patris mei qui in cölis est, ipse meus

[1] Plants and fishes.
[2] Quadrupeds or fowls.
[3] Comp. Apocal. ii. 1, 8, 12, etc.
[4] *multiplicatur*, MS., multipliciter.

frater et soror et mater est." "*Frater*" quidem propter ydemptitatem patris cölestis, secundum interiorem hominem renovatum; et "*soror*" secundum naturam corpoream, quae quamvis est difformis sexus, tamen fragilior; et "*mater*" propter ministrationem gignitionem et nutritionem Christi in anima contriti,[1] cui per se debetur opera fervida caritatis; oportet enim merentem ad actum suum meritorium active concurrere, sed oportet matrem coagere[2] ad formationem suae prolis. Et illam affinitatem secundum narratum ordinem oportet quemlibet natum denuo habere ad Christum secundum humanitatem, et per consequens esse filium ejus secundum divinitatem, ut dicitur Jacobi i., et 1 Joh. i.

O stupenda virtus divini seminis, quae fortem armatum superat,[3] corda quasi lapides indurata emollit, et homines per peccata conversos in bestias et infinitum a Deo distantes[4] renovat et transmutans in homines facit deiformes! Non dubium, quin tam summum mirabile non posset verbum sacerdotis perficere, nisi principaliter coëfficiat calor spiritus vitae et verbum aeternum; unde Matthaei x., scribitur: "Non enim vos estis qui loquimini, sed spiritus patris vestri, qui loquitur in vobis."

Sed proh dolor! his diebus est verbum sacerdotis quasi semen decisum a mortuo! Et cum influentia cölestis semper agit secundum dispositionem materiae, non mirum, si verbum exhortationis tantae efficaciae non sit sicut olim. Unde manifestum est, quod praecipua causa mortificationis spiritualis in populo, et per consequens totius nequitiae regnantis in seculo, est defectus vel mortificatio seminis verbi. Sed unde quaeso tam perniciosa radix peccati? Revera "inimicus homo" surrepens in animas sacerdotum, superseminavit zizania![5] Nunc enim si quis loquitur, non quasi sermones Dei,[6] sed gratia extraneandi praedicabit gesta, poëmata vel fabulas extra corpus scripturae, vel praedicando scripturam dividet ipsam ultra minuta naturalia, et allegabit moralizando per colores rithmicos, quousque non appareat textus scripturae sed sermo praedicantis[7] tanquam auctoris et inventoris primarii. Et ex illa affectione dyabolica, qua quilibet appetit a se ipso, et non ab alio, habere talia, insurgit tota vitiosa novitas hujus mundi. Propter hoc autem fiunt divisiones sermonum divisiones ornamentorum et aliorum, artificialium ultra solitum. Et non dubium quin istae divisiones vel causant vel pronosticant divisiones in moribus. Et ex hinc "refrigescit caritas multorum,"[8] quae est junctiva virtus, non quaerens ambitiose quae sua sunt sed quae domini Jesu Christi.[9]

[1] *contriti*, MS., conti.

[2] *i.e.*, cooperari.

[3] *superat*. Conjectural. The MS. has the contraction, erat. Allusion to Luke xi. 21 f.

[4] *distantes*. Conjectural. The MS. has plainly, disputantes.

[5] Comp Matth. xiii. 25, 28.

[6] Comp. 1. Petri iv. 11.

[7] *praedicantis*. Conjectural. In the MS. stands, sermo primus dicantis.

[8] Comp. Matth. xxiv. 12.

[9] Comp. Philip. ii. 21.

Sermo ergo perversa intentione sic infectus in radice, et fuco[1] alligatus in germine est verbum mortuum et dyabolicum, et non verbum domini nostri Jesu Christi, quia juxta confessionem beati Petri "verba vitae habet,"[2] et secundum alium apostolum "verbum domini non est alligatum."[3]

Sed ut praedictum peccatum jactantiae magis appareat et cautius caveatur, quod tam latenter et nequiter perdit oves Christi fame refectionis spiritualis, recitabo *tres evidentias* inventas a sic superbientibus ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis.

1. Dicunt enim, quod nisi addiderint aliquas novitates ultra modum praedicandi solitum ab antiquo, non foret differentia inter theologum quantumlibet subtilem in seminando verbum Dei, et sacerdotem . . . .[4] quantumlibet exiliter literatum.

Sed quid praetendit ista sententia nisi cupiditatem inanis gloriae, qua affectamus "nos ipsos" praedicare et non dominum Jesum Christum?[5] Cum tamen apostolus Galatas v., monet, et specialiter nos ecclesiasticos, quod non simus inanis gloriae cupidi, invicem provocantes, invicem invidentes.[6] Inanis gloriae cupidus est qui inititur divisionibus et texturis verborum, ut reputetur subtilis ab auditorio. Illi autem "invicem provocant et invicem invident," qui nedum divisiones[7] thematis sed cujuslibet auctoritatis occurrentis ingeminant, ut aliis subtiliores appareant.

Non sic, carissimi, sed imitatores simus nostri domini Jesu Christi, qui cum in forma Dei esset,[8] humiliter confessus est Joh. vii.: "Doctrina mea non est mea sed ejus, qui misit me, patris; quia a semet ipso loquitur, propriam gloriam quaerit."[9] Et revera haec est inanis gloria et fallax: *inanis* quidem, quia gloria in confusione eorum qui terrena sapiunt; inanissima ergo est gloria laudis, cui quanto quis ardentius innititur, tanto abjectius et confusibilius dejicitur. Est etiam summe *fallax*, quia tales "dicentes, se este sapientes, stulti facti sunt eo, quod mutarunt gloriam incorruptibilis Dei in similitudinem imaginis corruptibilis hominis."[10] Et indubie haec est sapientia terrena et per consequens dyabolica.[11] Quae quaeso magis dyabolica sapientia, quam honorem proprium honori divino praeponere, et dare occasionem extraneando et se ipsum exaltando per grandia verba et commenta, ne simplices audeant praedicare? Non dubium quin ista sapientia sit expresse caritati contraria et per consequens mere dyabolica.

2. *Secundo*[12] movet praedictos inaniter gloriantes, quod de lege naturae *forma* semper proportionanda est ejus *materiae;* cum igitur

[1] *fuco*, MS., fugo.
[2] Comp. Joh. vi. 68.
[3] Comp. 2 Tim. i. 9.
[4] Here a word in the MS. is so contracted as to be illegible, but nothing of the sense is lost from this circumstance.
[5] 2 Corinth. iv. 5.
[6] Comp. Galat. v. 26.
[7] *divisiones*, MS., divisionis.
[8] Comp. Phil. ii. 6, ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ.
[9] John vii. 16-18.
[10] Comp. Rom. i. 22, 23.
[11] Comp. James iii. 15.
[12] *secundo*, MS., secunda.

materia theologica sit perfectissima, consequens est, quod forma nobilissima et pulcerrima sit sibi tribuenda; sed hujusmodi[1] est color rhetoricus et colligantia rithmica. Sic enim secundum auctores eloquentia perficit sapientiam.

Sed sic arguentes graviter peccant tam in materia quam in forma: in materia quidem, quia assumunt, quod forma sapientiae sit lepor verborum, et sic in re dicunt "bonum malum et malum bonum, et lucem tenebras."[2] Sed quod pejus est, dum declamatorie sic loquuntur sapientiam quae ex solo Deo est, formam metricam induunt sibimet usurpando, ad quam quidem induitionem est labor in curiose componendo, labor in pueriliter repetendo, et labor in composite proferendo; et in omnibus istis propter carentiam fructus et aggravationem scelerum est vanitas vanitatum et afflictio spiritus. Respiciamus igitur ad forman, qua sapientia theologica a nostris[3] auctoribus est inducta, et instar *illius* coaptemus formam verborum cum ipsis exhortationibus. 2 Corinth. ii., scribit apostolus: "Non enim sumus sicut plurimi adulterantes verbum Dei, sed in sinceritate, sicut ex Deo, coram Deo in Christo loquimur." Quid rogo est praedicatorie "*adulterare* verbum Dei"? Scilicet involvendo ipsum in peplis et in aliis ornamentis meretriciis, extraneis a scriptura, abuti ipso ad ejus voluptuosam ostentationem, et sic a sponso excludere florem ejus et fructum, qui est honor Dei et conversio proximi. Et quid est "in sinceritate loqui," nisa clara intentione, nude et apte loqui veritatem quae aedificat? Tunc enim praedicator loquitur "*ex Deo*" et non de extraneo sibi[4] vel extraneis impertinentibus ad salutem animae. Et cum "hominem Dei"[5] habet principaliter prae oculis, ad gignendum Christum in anima sponsae suae, non dubium quin "coram Deo in Christo loquitur,[6] *coram Deo* quidem, et non latenter more adulteri in angulis falsitatis; *in Christo* etiam loquitur, qui est lux mundi, tanquam sibi nihil conscius, et non in tenebris peccatorum. Nec caret[7] scriptura nostra eloquentia sibi debita, sicut egregie declarat beatus Augustinus De doctrina Christiana c. 6:[8] "Quaereret forsitan aliquis, utrum auctores nostri, quorum scripta divinitus inspirata canonem[9] nobis saluberrima auctoritate fecerunt, sapientes tantummodo aut eloquentes[10] nuncupandi sunt?[11] Quae quidem quaestio aput me ipsum et aput eos, qui mecum quod dico[12] sentiunt, facillime solvitur. Nam ubi eos intelligo, sicut eis nichil sapientius ita etiam nichil eloquentius mihi videri potest. Et audeo dicere, omnes qui

[1] *hujusmodi*. Conjectural; MS., hujus.
[2] Isa. v. 20.
[3] *a nostris*, MS., amrs. Under *nostri auctores* Wiclif, like Augustin, understands in the passage immediately following, the biblical writers.
[4] scil. Deo.
[5] Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 17.
[6] Comp. 2 Corinth. ii. 17.
[7] *caret*, MS., carent.
[8] *De doctrina christiana* Lib. IV., c. 6.
[9] *scripta divinitus inspirata canonem*, MS., scriptura Dei intus inspirata canone.
[10] *aut eloquentes*, in the original text of Augustin, an eloquentes etiam.
[11] *sunt*, Augustin, sint.
[12] *quod dico*, MS., quodammodo

recte intelligunt quae ipsi loquuntur, simul intelligere, eos non aliter loqui debuisse. Sicut enim est eloquentia, quae magis aetatem juvenilem decet, est quae senilem, nec jam[1] dicenda est eloquentia, si *personae* non congruat eloquentis; ita est quaedam quae viros summa auctoritate dignissimos planeque divinos decet. Hac ipsi locuti sunt, nec ipsos decet alia nec alios ipsa; quanto enim videtur humilior, tanto altius, non ventuositate sed soliditate, ascendit." Haec Augustinus. Utinam ecclesiastici *nostri* moderni sic saperent de scriptura! Tunc enim forent longe plures pugiles pugnantes in campo spiritualis militiae cum gladio spiritus, quam sunt modo.

3. *Tertio* movet praedictos hypocritas, quod quidam libri hymnici[2] et prophetici Veteris Testamenti contexi sunt metrice, sicut patet de libro beati Job pro parte, et de aliquibus libris Salomonis; professor igitur hujus textus debet se conformare suae auctoritati specialiter, cum metrum juvat animos paucis comprehendere multa.

Sed constat, quod illud dictum facit ad opposita. Nam aliud est canticum laudis vel prophetiam canere, et aliud verba exhortationis disserere; quoad *primum* juvat sermo metricus, sicut patet ex laudabili usu canticorum ecclesiae; sed quoad sensum, non dubium quin colores moderni confundunt intelligentiam sententiae, tamen quia communiter obscurius profertur sententia praetextu vocalis concordiae, tamen etiam, quia auditus assistentium sentiens pruriginem in verbis metricis, plus attendit ad signa sensibilia quam signata; et cum sensationes impertinentes mutuo se confundunt, patet quod colores moderni abstrahunt a conceptu sententiae, etsi quandoque juvent memoriam eloquentis, unde more attendentium ad melodias musicas pro magna parte animo obversatur[3] ex modernis sermonibus nisi pro tempore[4] auditoris[5] titillans delectatio et fortè praedicatoris de sua subtilitate ventuosa laudatio.

De tali igitur dyscrasia morali populi christiani potest[6] verificari illud apostoli Timoth. iv.: "Erit enim tempus, cum salvam doctrinam non sustinebunt sed ad sua desideria coacervabunt sibi magistros, prurientes auribus a veritate quidem auditum avertent, ad fabulas autem convertentur."[7] Revera completio hujus prophetiae instat hodie, cum major pars potentatum ecclesiae sit *tantum* dedita temporalibus, quod seminantes doctrinam salutiferam reputant jure stolidos, et hinc juxta sua desideria coacervant sibi ecclesiasticos, qui omnes dicunt se "magistri" (*sic*) populi. Et signanter dicit apostolus, quod "coacervant" et non quod "ordinant," cum ecclesiastici dicunt esse

[1] *jam*, MS., illa.

[2] *hymnici*, MS., ympnidici.

[3] *obversatur*, resting upon conjecture, as the place is hopelessly obscure and written with contractions; the word in the MS. rather looks to be *repetatur*, where, however, the subjunctive form does not suit the connection.

[4] *pro tempore*, a conjectural reading, for the contraction in this place suggests rather *quam tempore*.

[5] *auditoris*, also conjectural as antithesis to *praedicatoris*, for there stands here a contraction which I am unable to make out.

[6] *potest*, MS., possunt.

[7] 2 Tim. iv. 3.

infirmis[1] firmum defensorium contra hostes, tanquam turris stans appropinquata cum propugnaculis. Sed modo sunt impolliti et inordinate positi propter defectum convenientis scientiae et caritatis, et sec coacervati quasi materiae depulsae a gradu spiritualitatis ad gradum summum mundanae vanitatis, in tantum quod religiosi quidam propter ambitionem temporalium egressi claustris commixti sunt inter gentes et didicerunt opera eorum.[2] Et revera haec est horrenda monstruositas sponsae Christi, et verisimiliter praesumitur, quod sit occasio perturbationis totius christianismi, cum secundum Lincolniensem[3] "claustralis, propter ambitionem temporalium sic egressus, sit sicut cadaver mortuum, pannis funeralibus involutum, de sepulcro egressum, a dyabolo inter homines agitatum." Quid mirum igitur, si perturbatio sit consequens tale monstrum?

Tales igitur magistri sic spissim coacervati ingerunt pruritum auribus mundialium, dum alii in monachantibus vel machinantibus lucro[4] temporalium solum intendunt, alii lautis refectionibus, largis muneribus et fictis adulationibus populum pascunt. Et alii palliantes verba doctrinae, dimissa annuntiatione sceleris, populi vanos applausus auditorio rhetorice referunt. Et cum in rebus insensibilibus et aeternis potissime sit veritas, et in istis transitoriis propter eorum mutabilitatem fabulosa fallacia, patet, quomodo moderni a veritate auditorium avertunt ad[5] fabulas convertentes. Nam si quis hodie veritatem theologicam annunciat, non auditur sed spernitur tanquam vaniloquus; sed tractanti negotia secularia statim intenditur, quod sine dubio est signum carnalitatis et extinctionis vite spiritualis, quia spiritualis homo appeteret refici cibo spirituali, quo viveret; et talis appetitus induratus in homine est evidens signum mortis.

Patet igitur cuilibet nutrito[6] in philosophicis, quod quaecunque media ordinata ad finem aliquem de tanto sunt aptius proportionata, de quanto compendiosius et copiosius ducunt ad finem illum. Cum igitur seminatio verbi Dei sit medium ordinatum ad honorem Dei et aedificationem proximi, patet, quod, quanto compendiosius et copiosius hoc facit, de tanto est aptior. Sed non dubium quin *plana* locutio de pertinentibus ad salutem sit hujusmodi, ideo ista est eligenda, declamatione heroica[7] postposita. Idem enim secundum Jeronimum[8] est loqui sic populo et miscere semina cum floribus ne radicent.[9] Et secundum Lincolniensem cum praedicatores sint ubera sponsae, sic loquentes[10] deludunt populum, ac si nutrix divaricativam porrigeret infantulo, ne lac sugat, et ac si dispensator mensuram furfuris non

[1] *infirmis.* If this word is rightly read, for which I cannot pledge myself, it is a *Dative commodi.*

[2] Comp. Hosea vii. 8; Jerem. x. 2.

[3] *i.e.*, Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln.

[4] *lucro.* Conjectural; the MS. has *lucrum.*

[5] *ad*, MS., et ad.

[6] *nutritio*, MS., utrumque nutrito.

[7] *heroica*, MS., eroica.

[8] Hieron.

[9] *ne radicent.* Conjectural; the MS. has *ne ut dicent.*

[10] *loquentes.* Conjectural; the MS. has *loqvendi.*

tritici daret familiae domini sui;[1] non enim rutilante cortice verborum sed adipe frumenti satiavit nos Dominus.[2]

Sic ergo consumto calore caritatis ad intra, et relucente nitore verborum ad extra, sunt praedicationes modernae tenebritatae[3] nocte ignorantiae sensibilia innominata ut squamae ad quercum putridam;[4] sed esus talium secundum philosophos est mortiferus, sterilisans edentem: ideo consulitur metrice, quod

lucens de nocte
non comedatur a te!

Non sic, sacerdos Domini, sed sicut in Veteri Testamento ordinati sunt sine defectu in naturalibus quoad corpus, sic in[5] Novo Testamento correspondenter ad figuram habundant in spiritualibus et specialiter in fideli dispensatione divini seminis. Sicut enim inter omnes actus hierarchicos[6] ecclesiae militantis est[7] fidelis seminis ministratio Deo maxime placita: sic fraus in illa seminatione est maxime perniciosa et per consequens Deo maxime odiosa.

Et tantum de dispositione divini seminis.

II. *Secundo* dixi, quod ostenderem caritati vestrae *dispositionem seminantis*, quae notari potest in illo verbo thematis. Debet enim quilibet[8] fidelis christianus, et specialiter praedicator, et constanter et mere substare divino beneplacito; et quamvis de se non habeat qualitatem, oportet tamen ipsum *quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus* spiritualiter indui. Et primo *prudentia*, attendendo ne justitiam suam faciat coram hominibus, ut videant opera ejus bona, ne forte sit de numero fatuarum virginum, de quibus Dominus dicit in evangelio: "Amen dico vobis, nescio vos!" Matth. xxv.[9] Quantum fatua ergo est intentio aptare labores bonos de genere, ut vel principialiter[10] vel mixtim captetur applausus populi! Idem enim est sic facere et commutare amicitiam Dei[11] pro ficta et adulatoria fama mundi, et per consequens bonum aeternum gaudii perdere pro gaudio hypocritae, quod est instar puncti breve, imo constituere unum talem vilem peccatorem Deum suum, et sic, quantum in se est, pervertendo ordinem universi, dum ejus laudem praefert laudi Dei. O caeca commutatio[12] et distorta ratio! Dicit Salvator Matthaei vi.: "Quod si oculus tuus, hoc est intentio operandi, fuerit simplex, tunc totum corpus operum simplex erit." Et credo, quod inter omnes cautelas dyaboli haec est una de subtilissimis, per quam surrepit in mentem *scolasticorum*, quia vix est aliquis, quin principaliter vel mixtim facit acta sua ut videatur ab hominibus. Et cum minimus error in principio sit causa maximi in fine, patet, quod isti cautelae dyaboli est prudentius resistendum.

[1] Comp. Luke xii. 42.
[2] Comp. Ps. cxlvii. 14.
[3] Here stands in the MS. the incorrect and unmeaning word, *tenebritatis*. Anyhow, the passage is much disfigured.
[4] The MS. has *et quercus putridam*.
[5] *in*, wanting in MS.
[6] *hierarchicos*, MS., yerarticos.
[7] *est*, MS., et.
[8] *quilibet*, MS., quibus.
[9] *Matth.* xxv., MS., Matth. x.
[10] *principaliter*. Conjectural; MS. has participaliter.
[11] *Dei*. Conjectural; the MS. has Deo.
[12] *commutatio*, MS., communicatio.

Secundo requiritur *temperantia* in cibariis et aliis corporis nutritivis, ne forte sacerdos propter petulantiam et ventris ingluviem cespitet in serendo. Unde exemplar dicit: "Castigo corpus meum et in servitutem redigo,[1] ne forte, cum aliis praedicaverim, ipse reprobus efficiar."[2]

Tertio requiritur *fortitudo* in tolerando adversa pro zelo veritatis et salute populi. Illud patet discurrendo per omnes pugiles laudabiles ecclesiae militantis. Unde vere dixit apostolus: "Omnes qui pie volunt vivere in Christo, persecutionem patiuntur."[3]

Et demum juatum est, quod mens sacerdotis *elevetur in Deum* per notitiam et amorem et alias latrias Deo debitas.

Unde Salvator noster, exemplificans praedicatoribus suis quoad omnia illa per ordinem, non legitur in evangelio publice praedicasse ante annum tricesimum. Sed paulo ante praedicationem suam petivit desertum[4] locum, ut sic doceret discipulos suos *prudentiam* ad evitandum adulatorios applausus populi; ubi etiam jejunavit[5] 40 diebus naturalibus, ut ipsos doceret *temperantiam*. Tertio pugnavit vincens temptatorem tripliciter, ut in hoc doceret nos *fortitudinem;* et quarto oravit praestans *obsequium* Deo et ostendendo se populo. Ipsum ergo magistrum sequamur in nostris operibus, non solum secundum ejus humanitatem, sed secundum ejus divinitatem, et per consequens totam beatem Trinitatem. Non enim est possibile, quod actus aliquis viatoris sit Deo placitus, nisi fuerit ad imitationem summae Trinitatis exemplatus.

Oportet ergo sacerdotem praecipue esse *potentem*, correspondenter ad *Deum patrem;* potentem quidem non in divitiis nec in potestate mundi vel corporis, sed in opere et sermone. Oportet secundo esse ipsum *sapientem*, correspondenter ad *filium*, non in sapientia hujus mundi, quae est stultitia aput Deum,[6] sed sapientia quae vincit malitiam populi acerbe fortiter increpando peccata, et suaviter disponendo ac nutriendo bona opera. Sed tertio oportet ipsum esse *bene volentem*, correspondenter ad *spiritum sanctum;* bene volentem dico, non injuste conferendo indignis, propter affectionem carnalitatis, bona temporalia, sed caritative procurando salutem animae proximis et bona spiritualia.

Et tantum de dispositione seminantis.

III. *Tertio* dixi, quod ostenderem fraternitati vestrae *convenientiam temporis seminandi*, quod notari potest in tertio verbo thematis, quod successionem implicat, et sic constat tempus quoddam ex tertia significatione seminis, quod, quamdiu sumus hic in via, superest tempus continue seminandi. Unde Exodi xiii. praecipitur, quod lex, quae obligat nos ad seminationem praedictam et instruit, continet

[1] The words *et in servitatem* before *redigo* are left out in the MS.
[2] 1 Cor. ix. 27.
[3] 2 Tim. iii. 12.
[4] *desertum*, MS., adsertum.
[5] *jejunavit*, MS., jejunat.
[6] 1 Cor. iii. 19.

semen nostrum, sit quasi "signum in manu nostra et quasi appensum ante oculos."[1] Sed secundum imaginationem apostoli seminantes sunt bifarii, ut quidam in carne quidam in spiritu;[2] et hi proportionabiliter duplici sapientiae[3] tanquam vasa sui seminis colla subjiciunt. Seminantes autem mundialiter habent sapientiam hujus mundi pro contentivo et ductivo sui seminis; sed ista sapientia secundum Jacobum est triplex,[4] *animalis*,[5] correspondenter ad concupiscentiam carnis, et *terrena*, correspondenter ad concupiscentiam oculorum; et est *dyabolica* correspondenter ad superbiam vitae. Et ita mundialiter seminantes tres auras insalubres sibi captant pro suis seminibus. Sunt enim nonnulli ecclesiastici, qui in *concupiscentia carnis*, secundum *animalem* sapientiam, sed in paludibus seminant semen suum; hi sunt qui de patrimonio Christi carnem suam gulose nutriunt, meretrices et hystriones vestiunt, et voluptatibus luxuriae se involvunt. Et non dubium, quin abscisa vena voluptatis (quod inevitabiliter erit in hora mortis) taliter seminantes in carne de carne metent corruptionem.[6] Sunt alii in *concupiscentia oculorum*, secundum *terrenam* sapientiam, in aura gelida seminantes; et hi sunt ecclesiastici, qui bona pauperum per traditiones suas avare congregant, vel ut totum mundum per coactivam potentiam sibi subjiciant, vel de praeda possessiones vel pinguia beneficia sibi perquirant, vel ut lites pro temporalibus protenter suscitent et foveant. Nec dubium quin tales, cum dormierint somnum suum, inveniant pro tali semine acerbas tristitias, anxietates corrosivas ut vermes, et colligantias horridas cum opacis terrestribus, quae tam inordinate construxerunt. Sunt autem tertii in *superbia vitae*, secundum sapientiam *dyabolicam*, in vento valido seminantes, et hi sunt inflati, qui propter pompam seculi acta sua faciunt, ut honorabiles ac dominati (*sic*) spectantibus appareant, apparatus splendidos et sumptuosos sibi adinveniunt. Et in isto vitio est major pars ecclesiasticorum hodie excaecata, cum vix ullum invenies, qui praelaciam vel officium in ecclesia suscipit, ut "semen" spiritualiter "fratri suo" seniori "suscitet," sed magis ut laute vivat et gloriosius appareat. Sed cum durum judicium his, qui praesunt, fiet, non dubium quin talis sicut ceteri finaliter obstinati pro tempore, quo reddet rationem villicationis suae,[7] ignominiose repulsus projicietur in tenebras exteriores, ligatis manibus et pedibus.[8]

Illi autem qui in spiritu seminant, seminant in benedictionibus;[9] et sunt isti, quorum omnia opera sunt ad imitationem summae Trinitatis, ut superius est expositum, exemplata et per consequens benedicta; quam quidem benedictionem in operibus precatur sibi Psalm-

[1] Exod. xiii. 9.
[2] Comp. Gal. vi. 8.
[3] Comp. James iii. 15.
[4] *triplex.* The MS. has erroneously *duplex.*
[5] *animalis.* Omitted in the MS.
[6] Comp. Gal. vi. 8.
[7] Comp. Luke xvi. 2.
[8] Matth. xxii. 13.
[9] Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 6.

ista sub triplici nomine trina Dei ita dicens: "Benedicat nos Deus, Deus noster, et benedicat nos Deus!"[1]

Sic ergo, fratres carissimi, seminemus in benedictionibus, dum tempus habemus,[2] quia non dubium quin tunc tempore suo et in benedictionibus metemus, quando veniemus cum exsultatione portantes fructum[3] divini seminis, qui quidem fructus est sempiterna fruitio beatae Trinitatis, quam nobis concedat Deus dominus noster! Amen.

VI.

EPISTOLA MISSA AD SIMPLICES SACERDOTES.

First printed by Shirley from the Vienna MS. 1337, *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, Introd. XLI. not. 1, from the Vienna MS. 1337 (Dénis CCCLXXVIII.) f. 52
MSS., A. – Vienna MS., 1387. Dénis CCCLXXXIV. f. 105, Col. 2.
„ B. – „ „ 3929. „ CCCLXXXV. f. 207, Col. 2.

Videtur meritorium mihi[4] bonos colligere sacerdotes, cum Christus exemplar cujuslibet boni operis sic fecit. Sed elemosynantes caverent de talibus sacerdotibus praecipue in his tribus. *Primo* quod sint amovibiles et non haeredati, cum jam non sint in merito[5] confirmati, sed sub conditione, quod vivant digne et juste, habeant de temporali eleemosyna in mensura. *Secundo*, quod sint in numero loco et[6] tempore competenti, quia abundantia et defectus in isto peccatum inferunt secundum sententiam sapientum. *Tertio* quod sint solliciti in officio congruo sacerdoti,[7] cum tam insolertia[8] quam ostiositas ipsos inhabilitat ad hoc opus, nec quaelibet occupatio pertinet sacerdoti, sicut tabernae exercitatio, ferarum venatio, ad[9] tabulas vel ad scaccos occupatio, sed attenta legis Dei informatio, clara verbi Dei praedicatio et devota oratio.

Praecipuum[10] autem istorum est evangelii[11] praedicatio, cum Christus Marci ultimo pro memoriali perpetuo sacerdotibus hanc injunxit.[12] Per hanc enim Christus regnum suum de manu diaboli conquisivit, et per hanc filios suos ad statum triumphalem reduxit. Qui autem non praedicat publice, hortetur private, sic quod si quis loquitur,[13] loquatur secundum Petri sententiam verbum[14] Dei.[15] Per

[1] Ps. lxvii. 7, 8.
[2] Comp. Gal. vi. 9, 10.
[3] Comp. Ps. cxxvi. 6.
[4] *mihi*, omitted in Shirley, and in MS. A.
[5] *in merito*, in Shirley immerito, which entirely destroys the sense.
[6] *et*, wanting in A.
[7] *sacerdoti*, sacerdotii, Shirley.
[8] *insolertia*, insolentia, A.
[9] *ad*, vel ad, B.—*scacci* = chess.
[10] *Praecipuum*, primum, Shirley.
[11] *evangelii*, Christi evangelii, Shirley.
[12] *injunxit*, injunxerit, A.
[13] *sic quod si quis loquitur*, wanting in Shirley.
[14] *verbum*. Shirley rightly conjectures this to be the true reading. The MS. used by him has *verbi*, but A and B both have verbum.
[15] Comp. 1 Peter iv. 11

hoc autem vigerent presbyteri et aedificarent ecclesiam tanquam apostoli.

Et quicunque sciverit sacerdotes melius reducere ad hunc statum, habet potestatem a domino et meritum caritative taliter operando.

VII.

DE SEX JUGIS.

I name first the Vienna MSS., which I have collated, and, for brevity, I distinguish by the following letters :—

A. Cod. lat. No. 1337 (Dénis CCCLXXVIII.), fol. 161, col. 1 to fol. 165, col. 2.

B. No. 3928 (Dénis CCC.), fol. 186, col. 2—fol. 189. col. 1. To be carefully distinguished from the other copy in the same volume, in which the five sermons which make up the tract occur separately.

C. No. 3928, fol. 53, col. 4, with breaks in fol. 66, col. 2.

D. No. 3932 (Dénis CCCLXXXVIII.), fol. 153, col. 1.—fol. 155, col. 3.

Ut simplices sacerdotes[1] zelo animarum succensi[2] habeant materiam praedicandi, notanda sunt *sex juga* secularis brachii, quae trahunt efficacius currum Christi : *Primum* est inter Christum et fideles simplices viatores, *secundum* est inter conjuges secundum legem Dei[3] conjugatos, *tertium* est inter parentes et filios naturales, *quartum* est inter patresfamilias et suos mercenarios et eis servientes, *quintum* est inter dominos seculares et suos servos vel tenentes,[4] et *sextum* generaliter inter proximos conviventes.[5] Omnibus enim istis debet[6] columba ecclesiae[7] canticum pacis et caritatis canere et optare. Cum autem[8] ista sex juga secundum istam levitatem et suavitatem[9] sunt fundabilia in scriptura, evangelisans sic animatus[10] a domino debet animose atque viriliter ista per ordinem praedicare. Illud autem jugum, quod debet esse *sacerdotum* ad Christum vel populum,[11] vel est[12] in lege domini plene instructum vel ex antichristi perfidia plene disparatum.[13]

Jugum autem *primum*, quod est[14] tocius ecclesiae ad Christum, stat in observantia mandatorum, nam quicunque christianus ipsa servaverit, erit salvus. Et hoc jugum est *suave* non exasperans hoc ferentem, et *leve* est non deprimens supportantem, ut dicitur Matth.

[1] *simplices sacerdotes*, ydiote et simplices sacerdotes, C.

[2] *zelo animarum succensi*, wanting in C.

[3] *Dei*, wanting in A, B, D.

[4] *suos servos et tenentes*, mercenarios eis servientes C. Tenentes = Vasallen.

[5] *conviventes*, convivantes, C.

[6] *debet*, wanting A, B.

[7] Comp. Song of Songs, ii. 12.

[8] *autem*, wanting C.

[9] Comp. Matth. xi. 30.

[10] *sic animatus*, sit animatus, C.

[11] *populum*, papam, C.

[12] *est*, esse, B.

[13] *disparatum*, desperatum A, B, D.

[14] *primum quod est*, wanting C.

xi.[1] Nam in lege veteri[2] observarunt decalogum cum oneribus extra Christum;[3] sed modo per eorum *exonerationem*, per Christi *confortationem* et *adjutorum* multiplicationem est levius quam tunc fuit.

Constat quidem, quod lex Dei fuit per cerimonias legis veteris multipliciter onerata, ut dicit Petrus Act. 15mo. Cum ergo totum hoc onus ex libertate christiana deponitur, patet primum.[5] Sed heu antichristus tantum difficultavit[6] legem graciae per suas traditiones caesareas, quod tolerabilior fuerat[7] lex antiqua. Sed prudens et simplex christianus debet traditiones illas[8] sapienter excutere, cum in earum regulari observantia sit venenum.

Quantum ad *confortationem* Christi, patet, quod superat omnem gravedinem,[9] cum fidelis constanter retinet, quod tenendo legem suam et contemnendo traditiones hominis[10] peccati magnifice praemiatur.

Et quoad *tertium*,[11] patet, quod licet sunt rari *adjutores* superstites, tamen omnino multiplicantur adjutores militantium in ecclesia triumphante, sic quod currus Dei hodie est magis multiplex, ideo sicut millia exultantium,[12] quia Deus[13] est in ecclesia militante. Et quantum ad omnes argutias vitulaminum spuriorum,[14] patet, quod omnia Christi consilia facilitant ad observantiam mandatorum. Et illi qui stulte et private sine[15] auctorisatione ad consilia ipsa se obligant, ab eis magis degenerant.

Nec oportet hortari Christum, ut recte faciat, qui est pars altera hujus jugi, cum ex fide firmiter capimus, quod ex parte *sui* non posset pactum deficere.

De observatione istorum mandatorum decalogi patet alibi.[16]

(c. 2.) Secundum.[17]

Quantum ad duo juga sequentia capite proximo introducta, notanda est vox turturis[18] sancti Pauli ad Colossenses 3io. Quamvis enim Christus sit turtur praecipue Matthaei 5o miscens luctum cum gaudio: "Beati, inquit, qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur," tamen[19] membra ejus turtures[20] possunt dici. Nam magnus turtur fuit Baptista Joh. iii. dum sic cecinit: "Amicus sponsi, qui stat et audit

[1] *Matth.* xi., Matth. xx. C.
[2] *veteri*, domini. A, B, D.
[3] *Christum*, ipsum, A, B, D.
[4] *adjutorum*, adjutoriorum, D.
[5] *primum*, namely *exoneratio.*
[6] *difficultavit*, difficultat, A, D.
[7] *fuerat*, foret, C.
[8] *illas*, istas, B, C, D.
[9] *gravedinem*, gravedinem antichristi, which appears to be a Gloss.
[10] *hominis*, homines, A.
[11] *tertium*, secundum, B, D.
[12] *millia exsultantium*, sunt multi exultantium C; comp. Ps. lxviii. 18.
[13] *Deus*, dominus, C.
[14] *spuriorum*, spiriorum C. Comp. *De officio pastorali*, I., c. 1 p. 7.
[15] *sine*, sua C.
[16] *alibi*, superius parte prima C., referring to the first collection of sermons.
[17] *Secundum.* Secundum jugum, A, C, D.
[18] Comp. Song of Songs, ii. 12.
[19] *tamen*, cum C.
[20] *turtures*, turturea C.

cum[1] gaudio, gaudet propter vocem sponsi."[2] Magnus etiam fuit turtur Paulus apostolus, dum cecinit: "Ipse spiritus postulat pro nobis gemitibus inenarrabilibus." Ex quibus colligitur, quod iste spiritus erat turtur.

Docet autem iste apostolus ad Colossenses ubi supra, quod omnia quaecunque fidelis fecerit, debet facere in nomine domini Jesu Christi: "Omne, inquit, quodcunque facitis verbo aut opere, omnia in nomine domini Jesu Christi facite."[3] Patet rationabilitas hujus principii ex hoc, quod omnis vita hominis viantis voluntaria vel naturalis debet esse meritoria, et per consequens esse in gracia domini nostri[4] Jesu Christi. Ipse enim est prima natura et gracia, in qua natura subducto peccato oportet fieri *creatum quodlibet* naturale. Tolle inquam[5] peccati vetantiam, et in virtute ejus ac gratia est quaelibet creatura; multo evidentius quidquid *homo* fecerit, qui Christi ministerio tam specialiter deputatur.

Isto itaque[6] principio ut fide supposito adjungit apostolus: "Mulieres, inquit, subditae estote viris vestris, sicut oportet, in domino. Viri diligite uxores vestras et nolite amari esse ad illas." Debent enim[7] mulieres de natura et ex mandato trinitatis esse subditae viris suis, in cujus signum ordinatae sunt esse in natura inferiores, unde philosophi vocant eas viros[8] in naturalibus defectivos. Genesis autem tertio[9] legitur, quomodo[10] prima femina ex costa primi viri, non ex pede vel capite est formata. Et ambo ista docent, quomodo quadam inferioritate mulier debet esse viro matrimonialiter copulata. Ideo cum hoc sit naturale, dicit apostolus mulieres oportere esse subditas[11] viris suis. Sed signanter modificat, quod sint subditae[12] "*in domino;*" debent enim uxores viris suis tanquam domino deservire, ut docet Petrus de Sara et Abraham.[13] Si autem viri ab uxoribus suis quidquam exigant quod a domino[14] est vetitum, tunc non debent[15] in completione hujus[16] esse subditae viris suis, quia tunc non forent illis subditae[17] *in domino.*

Et per locum a majori, si superior vel praelatus ecclesiae subjecto suo quidquam praeceperit[18] quod dissonat legi Christi, tunc debet ex obedientia debita Christo et illi praelato humiliter rebellare. Quum enim duo praelati quorum unus ese superior et alter,[19] inferior, mandant contraria, superiori in rationali[20] est parendum; cum ergo Christus sit superior quocunque praelato ab homine instituto,[21] nec potest nisi rationale et justum mandare cuiquam,[22] patet quod quid-

[1] *cum* eum C.
[2] *sponsi*, sponsus B.
[3] Rom. viii. 26.
[4] *nostri*, wanting in C.
[5] *inquam*, inquit A, C, D.
[6] *itaque*, namque A, B, D.
[7] *enim*, autem C,
[8] *viros*, wanting A, D.
[9] Gen. ii. 22.
[10] *quomodo*, quum C.
[11] *subditas*, subjectas C.
[12] *subditae*, subjectae B, C.
[13] 1 Petr. iii. 5 f.
[14] *domino*, Deo B, C.
[15] *debent*, A, B, D.
[16] *hujus*, hujusmodi C.
[17] *subditae*, subjecta B, C.
[18] *praeceperit*, praecepit C.
[19] *alter*, alius B, et alius C.
[20] *rationali*, rationabili B, C.
[21] *instituto*, substituto A, B.
[22] *cuiquam*, cuique A, cuicunque B.

quid voluntati[1] suae contrarium papa quicunque praelatus quantumcunque stricte mandaverit suo subdito, debet viriliter[2] contra illud rebellare, nam faciendo oppositum peccaret graviter. Ex quibus patet quod tam[3] praelatus quam subditus debent cognoscere beneplacitum domini[4] Jesu Christi; nam sine obedientia sui *privati* praepositi potest salvari, cum non juvat nisi de quanto promovet[5] ad obedientiam domino Jesu Christo; sed sine obedientia *Christi* non stat, quod alias sit salvatus.

Ideo ad discendum [*sic*] Christi regulam debent privati ordines primo tendere, et se fuerint ita stolidi, quod per se ipsos et Christi regulam non sufficiant regulari,[6] tunc consulant superiorem intuitu caritatis, ut eos misericorditer dirigat in agendis; si autem improvise[7] obligati fuerint maledicto vel ignaro[8] praeposito, dissolvant statim hunc nexum fatuum, et vel vivant prudenter secundum alium vel teneant religionem simplicem christianam pure secundum abbatem communem,[9] dominum Jesum Christum. Et licet in stultis maritis jacet periculum, tamen longe plus in stultis praelatis, quia in majori parte exigunt a subjectis, quod ignorant esse Dei beneplacitum, vel debent cognoscere esse mandato suo contrarium. Quandocunque quis[10] praelatus praecipit, subjectum facere quod non est expeditius vitae[11] suae et Deo placentius, peccat graviter. Sed quid scit[12] ipse hic[13] de subjecto, cujus statum et vitam ignorat, cum[14] crebro nesciat de se ipso? Ideo secundum regulam Christi, cui non licet contradicere, debet quilibet viator continue mereri et spiritu Christi duci, nam ductus ille non deficit, nisi peccator ponens obicem sit in causa. Ideo durum judicium fiet istis praelatis, qui sic caece[15] praecipitant se et suos.

In conjugatis autem, non sic temere obligatis istis consiliis, oportet virum praecipue mandata Dei cognoscere, et uxorem vel ab informatione conjugis[16] vel a Christo mandata Dei cognoscere. Ideo mandat Christus in suo apostolo viros in caritate uxores suas diligere, et non illas amarē tractare; ille autem amarē tractat uxorem, qui tractat eam crudeliter ut ancillam, nunc verberat, nunc conviciat et nunc ad peccatum inclinat.

Verumtamen cum toto isto tractatu non videtur mihi matrimonium debere dissolvi, cum saepe salvatur vir infidelis per mulierem fidelem: et mulier ex patientia injuriae, salve semper quod non consentiat ad peccatum, vivit meritorie in vero matrimonio, ut deberet. Istis ergo conjugibus tam generaliter quam specialiter debet praedicari vinculum

[1] *voluntati*, voluntatis B.
[2] *viriliter*, contra illud humiliter C.
[3] *tam*, wanting A.
[4] *domini*, domini nostri B.
[5] *promovet*, promovet in rationabilibus A, B.
[6] *regulari*, regulare C.
[7] *improvise*, improvide B.
[8] *ignaro*, ignavo A, B.
[9] *communem*, wanting C.
[10] *quis*, quidem A, B.
[11] *vitae*, viae B, C.
[12] *scit*, wanting A.
[13] *hic*, hoc C.
[14] *cum*, cum hoc A, B.
[15] *qui sic caece*, qui se in C.
[16] *conjugis*, conjugis *i.e.*, viri, A, B., which in any case is a Gloss.

caritatis. Et alii casus[1] privati exigunt speciales conditiones et consilia evangelica praeter leges privatis de sponsalibus introductas.

(c. 3.) Tertium.[2]

Quoad *tertium jugum*, scilicet inter parentes et prolem suam sive de sexu virili sive[3] femineo, est[4] notandum, quod parentes, plus tenentur providere de sua prole in spiritualibus secundum legem domini quam in carnalibus,[5] licet ipsa carnalia[6] propius et immediatius[7] a parentibus sint causata.[8] Probatur, quod[9] perfecta caritas hoc requirit, sed tenentur perfecta caritate prolem suam diligere, ergo conclusio.[10] Deus enim plus ponderat vitam spiritualem interioris hominis quam carnalem ;[11] cur ergo non parens, qui solum in Deo debet prolem suam diligere? Item profectus in moribus est proli utilior quam nutritio corporalis; quare ergo parentes ex sincera dilectione non debent illum profectum majorem proli suae appetere? Nam amando minus bonum in Esse genito foret ordo praeposterus,[12] non amor sed odium venenosum. Item illud debet homo plus appetere in Esse alteri, de cujus carentia plus doleret; sed quis non doleret plus de damnatione prolis, et de maculatione peccato, quam de sua corporali[13] esurie vel penuria mortali, quod raro vel nunquam eveniet?[14] Ergo debet ad illud[15] bonum spirituale melius magis niti.

Ex isto patet, quod sinistre et inordinate multi parentes diligunt prolem suam; multi namque delectabiliter ipsos[16] nutriunt in peccatis, et vel non curant ipsos corripere vel correptionem illam faciunt nimis remisse, quod est signum evidens, quod inordinate diligunt Deum atque prolem; debent enim secundum legem caritatis ordine converso[17] diligere proximum quantumcunque extraneum, ergo longe evidentius prolem suam.[18]

Sed mundiales graviter et indignanter ferunt istam sententiam dicentes, quod juxta illam permitterent[19] homines nedum proximos[20] sed proprios natos mori, quod cum contradicit legi naturae, manifestum est quod est contrarium legi Dei. Nemo enim scit, si ex tali educatione carnali[21] quis peccabit mortaliter vel erit deterior quoad

[1] *casus*, casti A.
[2] *Tertium*, wanting C.; Tertium jugum A.
[3] *sive*, vel A, B.
[4] *est*, wanting C.
[5] *carnalibus*, corporalibus C.
[6] *carnalia*, corporalia C.
[7] *propius et immediatius*, proprius et magis immediatius C.
[8] *causata*, curata B.
[9] *quod*, quia C.
[10] *conclusio*, conclusio vera A.
[11] *carnalem*, corporalem C.
[12] *praeposterus*, praeposteris C.
[13] *corporali*, carnali C.
[14] *eveniet*, evenit A, B.
[15] *illud*, id A.
[16] *ipsos*, eos C.
[17] *converso*, transverso A.
[18] *ordine converso . . . . prolem suam*, wanting in C.
[19] *permitterent*. A conjectural reading; all the MSS. have promitterent, which does not suit the connexion.
[20] *proximos*, homines C.; meaningless, but occasioned by *homines* preceding.
[21] *carnali*, corporali C.

mores. Hic dicit logicus, quod nedum oportet patres[1] dimittere sed debent[2] gratanter sufferre mortem proximi[3] sive nati ut patet II. Regum 12,[4] de David, quod hilariter sustulit[5] mortem nati. Verumtamen isti non repugnat sed consonat, quod parens potens debet proli de vitae necessariis providere, licet in malum[6] praeter intentum parentis, ex hinc quandocunque proli eveniat.[7] Oportet tamen parentes[8] prudenter et cum moderamine talia tribuere proli suae et non propter fortificandum pulcritudinem vel potestatem prolis carnalem, aut propter magnificentiam seculi in parentibus extollendum,[9] sed utrobique ad honorem Dei et profectum ecclesiae intendendum. Et si occasione mala[10] accepta sit proles ex facto parentis deterior, parens propterea non est increpandus, cum secundum rationem Augustini nemo tunc faceret quodvis opus. Oportet ergo intendere ad intentionem prudentem[11] in talibus.

E contra autem necesse est hortari *prolem*, ut excellenti gradu honorificet et obediat suis parentibus, ut patet in materia de primo mandato secundae tabulae; oportet tamen ut[12] catolicus istam obedientiam modificet ut priorem. Ideo dicit apostolus ubi[13] supra: "Filii obedite parentibus per omnia, hoc enim beneplacitum est domino. Patres nolite ad indignationem provocare filios, ut non pusillo animo fiant."[14] Debent autem filii obedire parentibus, non solum in opere manuali, sed praecipue in spirituali, quod sonat in salutem animae suae. Ideo cum spirituale et corporale sit[15] omnia, signanter dicit apostolus, quod filii debent obedire parentibus suis "*per omnia;*" non autem dicit, quod filii obediant in quibuscunque parentes mandaverint, quia stat ipsos mandare irrationabiliter; et per consequens tunc debent obedire rationi, qui[16] est pater superior, dominus Jesus Christus. Talis autem irrationabilis praeceptio non ponit in numerum cum mandatis.[17]

Patres autem non debent nimis aspere tractare filios, ne postmodum fiant invalidi ad debite patiendum. Sicut enim Christus *paulative* introduxit suam humanitatem a deitate[18] assumptam, ut patet de Baptista et sua conversatione usque ad annos triginta, sic debent parentes bonos mores in filiis suis inducere *paulative.*

(c. 4.) Quartum.[19]

Quantum ad *quartum jugum*, quod est inter *patremfamilias* et suos

[1] *patres*, patrem C.
[2] *debent*, debet C.
[3] *proximi*, Christi C.
[4] 2 Samuel xii. 20 f.
[5] *sustulit*, sustinuit C.
[6] *malum*, alium A.
[7] *eveniat*, conveniat A, B.
[8] *parentes*, parentem C.
[9] *extollendum*, extollendam C.
[10] *mala*, male A.
[11] *prudentem*, prudentis C.
[12] *ut*, quod C.
[13] *ubi*, vide A.
[14] Coloss. iii. 20, 21.
[15] *sit*, sunt C.
[16] *qui*, quae C.
[17] *non ponit . . . mandatis, i.e.*, does not count among the commandments, does not deserve to be regarded as a commandment.
[18] *a deitate*, ad deitatem C.
[19] *Quartum*, De quarto jugo A, C.

mercenarios et ei servientes,[1] oportet quod sint fides spes et caritas inter illos, et per consequens oportet quod inter conjuges conducentes et suos mercenarios sit fides, rationabiliter conducendo, debite tractando et fideliter mercedem debitam persolvendo. Sicut enim fraus in emptionibus et venditionibus est damnanda, sic in conductionibus et aliis duobus sequentibus in fideliter serviente.[2] Patet,[3] quia tanta est ratio utrobique. Unde quoad *tertium*[4] in lege antiqua Levitici 19mo dicitur:[5] "Non morabitur opus mercenarii tui apud te usque mane." Quamvis autem istud exponatur communiter, quod post completionem laboris opus mercenarii non debeat remanere[6] per tempus culpabile tenebrosum, tamen assistente indigentia mercenarii debet merces retribui *in completione laboris.* Deus enim exemplar humanae justitiae semper gratiose praevenit servitorem et tribuit copiosius quam suus mercenarius merebatur. Et quantum ad *medium*[7] novit mundus, quantum injuste multi mercenarii sunt tractati nunc labores indebitos ex diuturnitate temporis, ex qualitate operis et ex[8] aliis circumstantiis exigendo. Ideo debet esse regula aequitatis in talibus illud[9] Matthaei 7mo: "Omnia quaecunque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, et vos facite illis!" Ista[10] autem regula intellecta debite est principium communicationis moralis; quicunque enim juste voluerit aliqualiter sibi fieri, debet[11] similiter facere alii in casu simili;[12] et totum hoc intelligitur in hoc dicto: "ita et vos facite illis." Debent autem[13] homines proportionabiliter facere proximis, ut dicunt[14] velle illos facere sibi ipsis. Unde in isto principio fundatur quinta[15] petitio orationis dominicae, dum oratur: "Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris!"

Ex parte autem *mercenarii* contingit esse fraudem multiplicem, ut in ingressu locando operam servitoris, in progressu fraudando a plenitudine temporis,[16] et finaliter fraudando in operis bonitate.[17] Contra quos loquitur apostolus ad Colossenses tertio, mandans quod sint non ad oculum servientes quasi hominibus placentes, sed in simplicitate cordis timentes dominum; "Quodcunque,[18] inquit, facitis, ex animo operamini, sicut domino et non hominibus, scientes quod a domino accipietis retributionem haereditatis. Domino Christo servite. Qui enim injuriam fecit, recipiet id[19] quod inique gessit, et non est personarum acceptio aput Deum." In quibus verbis manifeste sequitur cum isto principio fidei, quod omnia quaecunque fidelis fecerit[20] debet

[1] *et ei servientes*, wanting in B, while A erroneously has *eis* instead of *ei*.
[2] *in fideliter serviente*, in fideliter (without *serviente*) A.
[3] *patet*, secundum mentum patet A.
[4] *tertium*, the payment of the wages.
[5] *dicitur*, wanting C.
[6] *remanere*, manere A.
[7] *medium*, das *debite tractare*.
[8] *ex*, wanting C.
[9] *illud*, juxta illud C.
[10] *Ista*, illa A, B.
[11] *voluerit . . . debet*, aliqualiter voluerit sibi, sicut debet C.
[12] *simili*, consimili C.
[13] *autem*, enim C.
[14] *dicunt*, debent A, B.
[15] *quinta*, secunda C.
[16] *temporis*, operis C.
[17] *operis bonitate*, bonitate operis C.
[18] *quodcunque*, quaecunque C.
[19] *id*, illud C.
[20] *fecerit*, facit A.

facere coram Deo, ac si serviret proprie ipsi Deo, quia non servirent[1] solum apparenter in praesentia conducentis et in ejus absentia fraudantes ab opere, quia tunc servirent[2] in cordis duplicitate, quod servitium non convenit Deo vero.

Secundo sequitur, quod servientes debent locantibus fideliter servire *continue*,[3] quia debent continue servire Deo, cujus praesentiam debent credere adesse continue, et totam qualitatem operis cum intentione cordis clarissme intueri. Si ergo mercenarius[4] propter praesentiam *hominis* serviret[5] fideliter, quantum magis propter praesentiam *Dei* infinitum majoris domini et totam qualitatem operis verius cognoscentis! Non enim subest[6] ratio, nisi infidelitas excusaret.

Tertio patet, quod ministri debent[7] pensare laborem secundum rationem qua Christo serviunt.[8] Ista enim est ratio potissima maxime attendenda, quia si serviunt Christo fideliter, quomodocunque sit de locante, non possunt a mercede Christi deficere. Et haec ratio, quare ministrando infidelibus vel quantumcunque discolis debent mercenarii fideliter ministrare, quia secundum rationem, qua Christo serviunt, mercedem[9] infallibiliter ab ipso capiunt.[10] Quanto magis nos sacerdotes, Christi servi, tam specialiter et comminatorie ab ipso conducti!

(c. 5.) Quintum.[11]

Circa[12] quintum jugum, quod est[13] inter *dominos seculares* et suos *servos* et *tenentes*,[14] hortanda est utraque pars ad observantiam caritatis. *Domini* enim debent tractare suos subditos[15] tanquam fratres in domino, et nichil facere servis suis nisi quod appeterent[16] *sibi* fieri in casu consimili;[17] omnia enim opera viantium debent fieri ex amore. Unde ad Colossenses quarto "Domini, quod justum est et aequum servis praestate, scientes quod et vos dominum habetis in cölo." Unde postponenda sunt jura civilia[18] momentanea et infundabilia in ista materia. Cum certum sit ex fide, quod domini non debent tractare servos[19] nisi in *caritate* et *defensione* quoad mundanas repugnantias ac *directione viae ad patriam*. Unde ad Ephesios 6to[20] "Vos domini eadem facite servis vestris remittentes injurias,[21] scientes quia[22] illorum et vester dominus est in colis, et personarum acceptio non est aput Deum." Cum enim Deus librat[23] et acceptat quem-

[1] *serrirent*, serviret B, C.
[2] *servirent*, serviret A.
[3] Corresponding to *plenitudo temporis*, above.
[4] *mercenarius*, mercenarii C.
[5] *serviret*, servirent C.
[6] *subest*, obest C.
[7] *debent*, debet C.
[8] *Christo serviunt*, Christus servivit A, B.
[9] *mercedem*, et mercedem B. C.
[10] *capiunt*, recipiunt C.
[11] *Quintum*, De quinto jugo A.
[12] *Circa*, Sed C.
[13] *est*, wanting B.
[14] *et suos servos et tenentes*, et servos suos tenentes C.
[15] *suos subditos*, subditos servos B.
[16] *appeterent*, deberent appetere C., deberet appetere A.
[17] *consimili*, simili A.
[18] *jura civilia*, miracula C.
[19] *servos*, servos suos C.
[20] Ephesios 6to, Ephesios dicitur C.
[21] *injurias*, misericordias B.
[22] *quia*, quod et C.
[23] *librat*, lfberat C. erster Hand.

cunque secundum ejus virtutem aut humilitatem,[1] et non secundum statum quem occupat[2] aput mundum: manifestum est quod servus humilior et virtuosior de tanto acceptior est aput Deum. Unde videtur multis, quod servorum subjectio sit catena[3] superbiae a veritate sive[4] virtute retardans et saepe impediens dominos seculares; debent enim providere servis suis de vitae necessariis secundum congruentiam sui status.

Secundo debent ipsos[5] *defendere* a[6] raptoribus tam ecclesiasticis quam secularibus irrationabiliter insultantibus. Et *tertio* debent eos[7] *in caritate tractare* tam verbis quam opere, ut patet ex praedicto morali principio.

Servi autem non debent remurmurare[8] contra eorum subjectionem, ut dicit apostolus (1 Corinth. vii.): "Servus vocatus es,[9] non sit tibi curae." Et ratio est, quia, ut patet ex utroque testamento, ordinatio Dei est, quod a subjectis in pönam peccati sui superioribus dominis serviatur. Et saepe est ille status aptior quam seculare dominium, ut servus Dei amplius mereatur. Unde quia status servitutis hujusmodi est consonus legi Dei, ideo scribit apostolus 1 Timoth. 6: "Quicunque sunt sub jugo servi, omni[10] honore dominos suos dignos arbitrentur ne nomen domini et doctrina blasphemetur." Christus enim ordinavit genus suum adjici[11] servituti per plurimos annos, ut patet Gen. et Exod. per processum. Sed quia duae sunt maneries dominorum, scilicet justae et injustae, declarat apostolus, quod sicut nec servitus sic nec dominium repugnat statui promerendi, et per consequens qualescunque sint[12] domini, servi debent voluntarie eis subdi. "Qui, inquit apostolus, fideles habent dominos, non contemnant, quia fratres sunt et[13] dilecti, qui beneficii[14] participes sunt."[15] Sententia ergo apostoli est, quod servi fideliter serviant dominis sive fidelibus, quia principaliter serviunt domino Jesu Christo. Et breviter quia omnia talia possunt fieri sine consensu ad facinus, debent mitigando malitiam servire fideliter utrobique.[16]

Et patet, quam leviter et quam sinistre[17] loquuntur qui hortantur servos vel famulos rebellare, eo quod domini tyrannice regunt eos. Nam secundum legem evangelii tam Christi quam sui apostoli servi et famuli debent humiliter servire tyrannis, non sub ratione quod[18] tales, sed sub ratione quod serviunt domino Jesu Christo. Et si discipuli diaboli objiciunt contra istem patientiam et colorant[19] rebellionem ac repugnantiam per hoc, quod aliter facinori consentirent;

[1] *humilitatem*, habilitatem A.
[2] *occupat*, acceptat C.
[3] *catena*, cathedra A, B.
[4] *a veritate sive*, wanting C.
[5] *ipsos*, eos C.
[6] *a*, de B, C.
[7] *eos*, ipsos C.
[8] *remurmurare*, renunciare A.
[9] *es*, est A.
[10] *omni*, cum omni C.
[11] *adjici*, adduci C.
[12] *sint*, sunt A.
[13] *et*, wanting C.
[14] *beneficii*, beneficiis A, B. *prima manu.*
[15] 1 Timoth. vi. 2.
[16] *utrobique*, utrique C.
[17] *sinistre*, sine tempore C.
[18] *quod*, qua C.
[19] *colorant*, colerent B., colarent C.

item: subditi tales habent ut sui domini potentiam invasivam, quare ergo non[1] resisterent injuriantibus[2] ut . . . .[3] et serpentes? Item Deus movet propter demeritum inhabitantium ad conquestus; quare ergo non moveret[4] subditos, ut contra deprimentes ipsos recalcitrarent? Hoc ergo ex instinctu naturali habet quilibet, ut, sicut appetit vivere, sic appetat libertatem.

Sed hic dicitur scolae[5] diaboli, quod omnis instructus in lege et gratia domini Jesu Christi debet in talibus injuriis non rebellare sed pati humiliter. Cujus ratio est, quia propositis duabus contrariis viis, quarum una est difficilis atque ambigua quoad mores, et alla facilis atque certa,[6] lex gratiae est quod prior dimitatur et altera eligatur. Lex ergo humiliter patiendi injurias est facilis atque certa; et lex invadendi atque[7] resistendi difficilis atqua ambigua. Ideo scola foret diaboli, priorem relinquere et istam ambiguam acceptare. Et hinc Christus eam[8] docuit tam opere quam sermone. Nam gratis passus est mortem durissimam,[9] et docuit apostolus istam scolam: "In patientia, inquit, vestra possidebitis animas vestras."[10] Qui ergo hortatur ad rebellionem hujusmodi, indicat se esse expertem sapientiae scripturarum. Sed hoc dicendum est[11] dominis secularibus et civilibus christianis,[12] quod non consentiant facinori sacerdotum rebellantium legi Christi, hoc est enim inseparabiliter malum sicut consensus ad istud. Ideo cum subtractio juvaminis non sit actio sed actionis dimissio,[13] ad ipsam sunt christiani singuli instruendi. Et haec ratio, quare sacerdotum eleemosinaria ministratio debet esse libera non coacta.

Ad *primam instantiam*[14] dicitur negando primam consequentiam, quia nullus ex invasione est certus ut resistat facinori, sed potius ex sibi dubio augebit[15] facinus tam ex[16] parte propria quam invasi.[17]

Quoad *secundum* dicitur, quod subditi, licet habuerint talem potentiam, mediante qua possent sic in christianos irruere, tamen quia illa potentia ex primo crimine est infecta, ideo dimissa inclinatione sua est, secundum legem gratiae, patientiae insistendum. Nec excuso seculares dominos in istis invasionibus vel conquestu, sed *Deo* approprio propter excellentiam sui capitalis dominii activam;[18] nec est michi evidentia capta de stimulo serpentino.

Quoad *tertium articulum* dicitur, quod habentes ad hoc revelationem possunt libere rebellare, sed debent temptare spiritus, se ex

[1] *quare ergo non*, non ergo A.
[2] *injuriantibus*, wanting.
[3] Here in all three MSS. are two words contracted which I have not been able hitherto to decipher.
[4] *moveret*, movet A, C.
[5] *scolae*, *i.e.*, scholae, discole B., scolari dyaboli C.
[6] *certa*, certa via A.
[7] *atque*, vel C.
[8] *eam*, ipsam B, C.
[9] *durissimam*, gravissimam C.
[10] Luke xxi. 19.
[11] *est*, wanting C.
[12] *civilibus christianis*, cuilibet christiano B, C.
[13] *dimissio*, divisio B.
[14] namely, *quod aliter facinori consentirent*, oben.
[15] *augebit*, augebat A.
[16] *ex*, in C.
[17] *invasi*, ex parte invasi A.
[18] *activam*, actionem A, B.

Deo sunt ;[1] imo conceditur, quod Deus dat peccantibus et rebellantibus naturalem potentiam et instinctum ad quodlibet criminis positum,[2] sed a rege superbiae habent complexionem[3] defectus in moribus. Conceditur ergo, quod omnis homo appetit naturaliter libertatem, sed specialiter a peccato. Sed quia ad illam libertatem est patientia via securior, et invasio abducit communiter, ideo debet illa dimitti et lex patientiae accipi propter appetitus vehementiam libertatis. Nec sequitur, quod corporales[4] domini super suos subditos tyrannisent, quod propter hoc eādem mensurā debeat[5] remitiri, quia scola Christi est,[6] propter malum bonum[7] retribuere.

(c. 6.) Sextum.[8]

Sextum jugum, quod est amor inter proximos, est[9] paululum pertractandum. Quamvis autem apostolus 1 Corinth. 13mo narrat conditiones sexdecim caritatis, ex quibus juxtopositis[10] conversationi nostrae caritas nostra extinguitur, hypocritice fingimus, quod observamus caritatem, quae sufficiat[11] ad salutem. Quis enim est sufficienter "*patiens*" injurias atque molestias? quis secundo "*benigne*" dolet[12] alienas injurias, ita ut vere dicere possit[13] cum apostolo :[14] "quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor"[15] quin potius gaudet[16] de molestiis proximorum? Quis tertio "*non invidet*" sectae[17] procurans et sectis sibi contrariis improperans ac de contentione[18] sectae Christi propter superbiam indubie dedignatur? falsum quidem est, quod caritas talium "non emuletur." Quis quarto non declinat a mandatis Christi atque consiliis, "agendo perperam?" Quis quinto ex bonorum fortunae copia vel bono naturali, aut dato vel ficto bono gratiae "*non inflatur*" tangere[19] montes ad habendum experientiam, et fumigabunt?[20] Sexto cujus viantis caritatis capacitas "non est ambitiosa?" judicet autem super isto propria conscientia, si quis honores mundanos, famam seculi vel temporalia non affectat, quod si deformatur in istis primae regulae, quis dubitat, quin tunc declinet ab observantia caritatis? Septimo caritas "non quaerit esse proprietaria;" sed ut obmittam[21] cupiditatem secularium. cujus *clerici* caritas non extinguitur hoc peccato? nam *possessionati* plus laborant pro proprietate quam beatitudine, *mendicantes* vel exproprietarii laborant pro multiplici proprietate damnabili, ut quod illorum[22] religio

[1] Comp. 1 John iv. 1.
[2] *positum*, all the MSS. Perhaps we should read *propositum*.
[3] *complexionem*, complecionem B, C.
[4] *corporales*, temporales B, C.
[5] *debeat*, debeant C.
[6] *est*, docet C.
[7] *bonum*, wanting C. Comp. Rom. xii. 19 f.
[8] *Sextum*, De sexto et ultimo jugo A.
[9] *est*, et A, B.
[10] *juxtapositis*, *i.e.*, put to one side.
[11] *sufficiat*, sufficit C.
[12] *dolet*, wanting A, B.
[13] *possit*, posset A.
[14] *apostolo*, Paulo C.
[15] Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 29.
[16] *gaudet*, congaudet C.
[17] *sectae*, sectas C.
[18] *contentione*, contentatione C.
[19] *tangere*, tange A, C.
[20] Comp. Ps. civ. 32.
[21] *obmittam*, amittam C, dimittam A.
[22] *illorum*, eorum A.

vel quod illis est proprium extollatur, quod suae proprietati temporalium copia adquiratur, et quod illis cederet ad honorem proprium,[1] licet honorem Dei suppeditet, in populo efferatur. Et idem est judicium de rectoribus, de vicariis et[2] de quocunque genere viatorum. Quis enim affectat, ut cuncta fiant communia, sicut in statu innocentiae et statu apostolico a Christo fuerat ordinatum? Quis octavo pro dicta sibi sententia veridica de[3] talibus vitiis "*non*" contra dicentem licet benevole "*irritatur*"? Tangat hortator in quantacunque caritate voluerit, et videbit quod[4] cunctum genus viatium, etiam fratres, succumbent in ista macula caritatis. Nono caritas "*non cogitat*," quomodo "*malum*" ponae vel culpae sit proximo irrationabiliter[5] inferendum. Sed quis, licet extinxerit[6] alias caritatis maculas, in isto senserit se immunem? Omnes enim cogitamus superflue, quomodo vindicta caperetur de hostibus Christi atque ecclesiae, et potius cogitamus imprecando[7] istam vindictam quam alia media misericordiae, quae sic injuriantibus cederent ad salutem. Decimo "caritas *non gaudet super iniquitate*," qualiter faciunt maligni more diaboli, qui delectantur de vindicta capienda de[8] proximo et[9] denigratione famae personae, cui invident; gaudenter audiunt peccata proximi et gaudentius publicant malum suum mendaciter dilatando. Undecimo caritate formatus "congaudet rectitudini justitiae" proximorum, ut quum audit zelare quemcunque pro justitia sine personarum acceptione, hoc approbat et de hoc gaudet. Sed suscitata ista conditione caritatis diffamatio[10] et detractio deliterent. Duodecimo "caritas *omnia*" genera tam bonorum quam malorum "suffert" cum gaudio moderato. Numquid credimus impetuosos[11] ista proprietate indui caritatis? Tredecimo caritas movet tam de bonis quam de malis, ut "credat"[12] omnes fidei veritates. Sed illi qui volunt credere eis placens et favorabile, atque discredere eis displicens, licet sit veritas ac Dei ordinatio, ex ista caritatis deficientia sunt culpandi. Quartodecimo caritas "*sperat*" tam de beatis gaudium quam damnatis; non enim cadit in istam haeresin, quod singuli sint salvandi, sed de unoquoque, sive praedestinato sive praescito sperat gaudium, cum non sit conscientia quod damnetur,[13] et certa sit, quod "timentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum."[14] Quintodecimo caritas "*omnia sustinet*" tam juste illata a domino quam injuste illata a proximo. Sed nunquam credimus illos, qui tantum zelant pro vindictis propriis, esse in isto capitulo; cujusmodi sunt qui contendunt pro suis supra limites rationis, qui pugnant cum regnis exteris pro justitia, quam somniant[15] non cognoscunt, vel qui

[1] *proprium*, propitium A.
[2] *et*, wanting C.
[3] *de*, pro B.
[4] *quod*, wanting A.
[5] *irrationabiliter*, nostro A.
[6] *extinxerit*, extraxerit vel extinxerit A.
[7] *imprecando*, in praedicando A.
[8] *de*, in B, C.
[9] *et*, de A, B.
[10] *diffamatio*, defamatio A, B.
[11] *impetuosos*, impetuosus B.
[12] *credat*, credantur B, C.
[13] *damnetur*, dampnet C.
[14] Comp. Rom. viii. 28.
[15] *somniant*, somniantes A.

rebellant contra suos dominos etiam propter injurias quas eis inferunt, et regulariter qui sic pugnant. Et ne videatur istam conditionem cum duodecima conditione incidere, notandum est, quod perfecti in caritate[1] sustinent omnia ista in opere et sermone, non solum quoad suas injurias sed omnia quae illata fuerint cuicunque, scientes quod justus[2] cuncta respiciens facit et patitur singula hujusmodi pro justitiae complemento; ideo caritativus manet in talibus inturbatus.[3] Sedecimo caritas "*nunquam excidit*,[4] quia si respectu cujusquam excideret, potissime hoc foret propter injuriam inimici, sed omnem talem injuriam sustinet patienter, ut patet ex conditione proxima.

Ex quibus convincitur, quomodo dicentes se servare caritatem generaliter mentiuntur. Et patet, quam vera est illa generalis sententia, quod caritas se non compatitur cum mortali.[5] Imo quantumcunque quis sciverit de se ipso, ignorat caritatem suam ex conditione hac ultima, nise forte fuerit sibi revelatum. Et ut breviter dicam, non video quomodo quicunque[6] in caritate persisteret, qui propter amorem ad quemcunque proximum martirio se non daret; omnis enim talis non plus diligit proximum carne sua, et per consequens pervertitur sinistre[7] regula caritatis. Et patet quod ex vita et operibus melius judicandum est de caritate proximi quam de verbis propriis, quantumcunque solemniter confitetur. Et patet tam de clericis quam de[8] laicis, quomodo eorum caritas hodie refrigescit.[9] Si enim habent talem habitum, tum inclinant[10] ad actus proprios caritatis. Istae autem regulae praedicandae sunt instanter populo, ut cognoscant, si ipsi vel clerici plene servaverint caritatem. Nec dubito quin[11] discrasia introducta per sectas novellas ab observantia legis Christi huic observationi sexdecuplae sit repugnans. Et cum omne sonans contra caritatem tanquam haereticum sit damnandum, patet cum quanta diligentia exequeretur ecclesia contra hujusmodi novitates.[12]

[1] *in caritate*, wanting C.

[2] *justus*, Deus justus all the MSS. But *Deus* evidently does not suit the connection; a distinction is taken between *justus* and *caritativus*, but in both cases the subject spoken of is only man.

[3] *inturbatus*, turbatus A.

[4] *excidit*, excidet C.

[5] *mortali*, scil, *peccato, i.e.*, Love is not consistent with mortal sin.

[6] *quomodo quicunque*, quomodocunque A.

[7] *pervertitur sinistre*, in ipso sinistre pervertitur B., pervertitur sinistre in ipsa A.

[8] *de*, wanting C.

[9] Comp. Matth. xxiv. 12.

[10] *inclinant*, inclinat C.

[11] *quin*, quando A.

[12] *novitates*, novitates. Amen. B. Whereupon follow in Czech, *Taksem chtyel*. Whereas in MS. A stands. Explicit tractatus de sex Jugis.

VIII.

A SECTION OF WICLIF'S BOOK "DE VERITATE SACRAE SCRIPTURAE," c. 14.

Vienna MS. No. 1294, fol. 40, col. 3—fol. 44, col. 2.

Sic enim [1] salutatus sum nuper a quodam *doctore*, quem credidi amicum meum specialem et defensorem praecipuum catholicae veritatis. Et licet patienter sufferam *personales injurias* secundum regulam scripturae, tamen necesse est mihi ob *honorem Dei* et *profectum ecclesiæ*, ut tollam ab ea scandalum, quod darem ex taciturnitate culpabili, respondere ad argumenta, quibus apparet multis doctorem docere *me* et *omnes fautores meos esse haereticos* et regni subdolos proditores. Hoc enim debeo facere secundum legem Christi humiliter patientis et diligentis, cum Christus et .sui apostoli sic fecerunt (John viii. 49), et Christus subditus erat dominis secularibus ut . . . . Caesari (Matth. xxii. 21.)

I. Imponitur autem mihi *primo*, quod tanquam periculosissimus inimicus ecclesiae sum Doctor fallaciarum, eo quod ex confessione mea propria frequenter aequivoco et instar Christi sum Doctor aequivocorum, aequivocatorum . . . . aequivocantium. . . . .

This he immediately proceeds to combat in the formally logical style.

II. *Secundo* fit *tripliciter* argumentum opprobriosum ad probandum, quod sum haereticus; cujus argumenti recitationem et solutionem, si non esset scolae seductio et famae insontium declaratio [*sic*] mallem sub silentio praeterire.

A. Reportatum est autem mihi a tribus personis gravibus auditori satis sagacis, scilicet magistris artium, religiosis possessionatis et similibus, quod doctor ille assumit, *me imiti sensui verbali* scripturae sacrae ratione cujus in errores plurimos sum prolapsus; ut inter mult exemplificat, quomodo ex illo textu apostoli 1 Cor. ii.: "spiritualis homo judicat omnia," reputando me sic spiritualem, nullius judicio nisi judicio divino et proprio me submittere; hoc autem est maximum signum haeretici; si enim haeriticus neminem in terris habeat, qui eum a suo errore compesceret, a quo de jure judicari possit, quid restat amplius, nisi ut libere et sine freno suas haereses dogmatizet, cujus libertatis acquisitionem omnis haereticus summe desiderat? Sic enim ille haereticus Occam [2] et sui sequaces suos errores asseruit, sed stare judicio summi pontificis vel ecclesiae romanae tanquam venenum effugerat, ne videlicet, eorum doctrina igne examinationis probata, veritas in gazophilacium Domini reponatur, et sententiam dampnationis reciperet doctrina erroris. Eodem modo per omnia iste Doctor [3] judicium summi pontificis et romanae ecclesiae subterfugit, ut

[1] Immediately before, he had been speaking of lying calumnies.

[2] *Occam*, Hocham, MS.

[3] *iste Doctor*, viz., Wiclif himself.

liberius suos errores, ymo ut verius dicam haereses, possit astruere. Vidi enim protestationem suam,[1] quam misit Domino summo pontifici, in qua fatetur se velle stare judicio Dei et ejus universalis ecclesiae, sibi tamen cavendo diligentius, ne judicio ecclesiae romanae vel judicio summi pontificis sit subjectus; quae protestatio videtur mihi valde suspecta eo quod, si ejus conclusiones catholicas et pro utilitate ecclesiae reputaret, subjiceret se summo domino pontifici, nec ecclesiae romanae eas tradere formidaret, ut ipsi examinarent, si dictae conclusiones teneri debeant vel damnari.

Istud longum argumentum includit venenum *sextuplex.*

Primo enim fundatur super mendacio. Concessi quidem, quod "spiritualis homo judicat omnia;" sed non est hucusque auditum, quod judicavi *me* esse de numero illorum spiritualium; tamen recognosco et recognovi saepius, me esse miserum accidum,[2] mole mundialium praegravatum.

Secundum mendacium est, quod nolo stare judicio alicujus nisi judicio Dei et proprio; quia, ut patet in *protestatione,* "submitto me judicio *sanctae matris ecclesiae;*[3] et iste modus loquendi est scripturae s. conformior, generalior et humilior, quam dicere, quod homo submittit se *romanae ecclesiae,* licet hoc implicet. Volo enim, sicut debeo ex fide scripturae, esse subjectus omni homini propter Christum.[4]

Tertio implicat, omnem *papam* haereticum fuisse summe haereticum, eo quod multi fuerunt papae dampnati haeretica pravitate, et, ut Doctor asserit, nemo debet in causa papae cognoscere nisi solum Deus et ipse, quae foret conditio summi haeretici.

Quarto assumit,[5] quod *Venerabilis Inceptor* Occam[6] fuit haereticus, quod nec scit probare nec[7] sibi consonat, cum in his, quibus maxime videretur a fide devius, Doctor iste[8] fuit et est excellens et praecipuus. Ubi enim Occam ponit, quod nihil est nisi substantia vel qualitas, iste Dr. ponit, quod nihil est nisi substantia, et illam vocat rem per se signabilem, sicut didicit ex Occam, ex Doctore de Aureolis,[9] et illis fratribus quos nunc odit.

Quinto committitur mendacium in hoc, quod imponendo mihi haereses dicit, quod subterfugi judicium summi pontificis et romanae ecclesiae, cujus judicio "humiliter me submitto,"[10] cum etiam quia ecclesia universalis mater nostra, cujus filiationem humiliter recog-

[1] *Protestatio,* in Lewis, *Life of John Wiclif,* Appendix No. 40, S. 382 f., with the commencing words: *Protestor publice, ut saepe alias* u. s. w.

[2] *accidum,* a conjectural reading. The MS. has *accivum,* or *attirum. Accidus,* derived from *accidia* (ἀκήδεια), means indolent, indifferent.

[3] s. Lewis, p. 382.

[4] Eph. v. 21.

[5] The words *assumit . . nisa substantia,* are given by Shirley, *Introd.* to *Fasc. Zizaniorum,* p. LIII., note, after a MS. in the Bodleian Library.

[6] *Occam,* Vienna MS., the Bodleian MS. has here *Hokham.*

[7] *nec scit probare nec,* nescit probare. *Nec,* Shirley.

[8] *Doctor iste,* the opponent to whom Wiclif is replying.

[9] *Doctor de Aureolis,* Petrus of Vereria, called Aureolus, † 1345. Comp., Prantl, *Gesch. der Logik in Abendlande* III., 319.

[10] *humiliter me submitto,* from the "*Protestatio*" s. Lewis, 382.

nosco, est romana ecclesia, sicut patet ex jure canonico et conformitate[1] ecclesiae, et patet respicienti protestationem meam, quod nimis sinistre conclusum est, quod soli judicio Dei et meo proprio me submitto, cum ex protestatione formaliter sequatur oppositum.

Sexto committitur[2] conditionalis impossibilis, cum sic concluditur: "si reputarem conclusiones meas esse catholicas et ecclesiae Dei utiles, non dubitarem dare eas summo pontifici nec tradere eas examinandas *romanae ecclesiae.* Nam posset esse, quod dominus papa foret ignarus legis scripturae, et quod *ecclesia anglicana* foret longe praestantior in judicio veritatis catholicae, quam tota ista romana ecclesia collecta de istis papa[3] et cardinalibus. Imo ex facto meo colligitur, quod non sum suspectus de formidine istarum conclusionum, cum transmisi illas per magnam partem Angliae et Christianismi, et sic[4] usque ad curiam romanam, salte mediate, examinandas. Imo cum dictus Doctor viderit protestationem, et illi[5] patebit per Dei gratiam, quod non timebo[6] respondere sibi et omnibus suis complicibus, vel in facie vel in scolis, quod posset manuducere etiam inimicos, quod nec[7] sum conscius mihi ipsi de conclusionibus praedictis, cum volo non solum illas examinari per romanum curiam sed per totam ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem, quae est "sancta mater ecclesia," cui "humiliter me submisi," a qua absit me excludere romanam ecclesiam, cum credo illam esse caput aliarum ecclesiarum militantium. Unde quia volui materiam communicatam, collegi et communicavi 33 conclusiones illius materiae *in lingua duplici.*

II. B. *Secundo* arguit Doctor forma consimili: De communi, inquit, consuetudine haereticorum semper fuit, spreto ecclesiae judicio ad *dominorum secularium praesidium* convolare ut errores suos, quos non valebant ratione defendere, saltem brachio seculari et manu valida supportarent, inferendo viris ecclesiasticis et verae obedientiae filiis molestias corporales atque diversas injurias, sicut patet[8] respicienti cronicas et gesta antiquorum haereticorum; invenietis enim, quod semper haeretici infestabant fideles. Unde et ille maledictus haereticus Occam, cujus in persecutione ecclesiae videor esse sequax, pro defensione sui erroris adhaesit imperatori Bavaro[9] qui ad tempus suas haereses supportavit. Sic, inquit, ego pro defensione conclusionum mearum non dubium haereticarum his diebus brachio seculari adhaereo, ut saltem gladio et illatis injuriis contra adversantes queam defendere; quales etiam injurias atque molestias per dominos seculares ego intulerim membris ecclesiae, ipse in persona sua in parte, ut asserit, est expertus. Sed licet, inquit, ad tempus regnet, ego tamen

[1] *conformitate*, conjectural. The MS. has *confre.*

[2] This paragraph, from *committitur* to *lingua duplici*, Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.* XXXIII., note 2, was printed from the Bodleian MS.

[3] *papa*, after Shirley. The Vienna MS. has *papis.*

[4] *et sic*, after Shirley.

[5] *et illi*, after Shirley; Vienna MS., et illas (scil. *conclusiones*) patebit, &c.

[6] *timebo*, Shirley, timeo.

[7] *nec*, non Shirley.

[8] *patet*, conjecture; potest, MS.

[9] *Bavaro*, Lewis of Bavaria.

non timeo, nisi de quibusdam conclusionibus voluerit emendari, finaliter judicabitur inimicus crucis Christi atque ecclesiae.

Sed ista ratio videtur mihi in multis deficere. *Primo* in fallacia consequentis: haeretici solent inniti dominis secularibus, ut patet de Arrianis; et ego sic facio; ergo ego et socii mei sumus haeretici.

Constat Doctori, quod non valet argutia, quia tunc *Christus* et sanctus *apostolus* ex defensione veritatis scripturae forent haeretici, Christus enim spretis sacerdotibus, scribis et pharisaeis adhaesit dominis secularibus, ex quorum[1] suffragiis voluit se et suos discipulos relevari. Sic enim voluit inopiam sui et parentum suorum in sua *nativitate* per tres magos orientales, quos scriptura vocat reges Tharsis et insulae,[2] relevari, ut patet Matthaei 2⁰. Sic in *media aetate* sua suscepit elemosinas de devotis mulieribus et aliis secularibus, comedendo cum publicanis et aliis secularibus, ut patet de Lazaro et Zachaeo. Et tertio in *morte* sua voluit impensis et ministerio secularium sepeliri, ut patet de Joseph ab Arimathia, qui fuit nobilis decurio. Quod autem comedit cum sacerdotibus vel suscepit ab eis elemosinas corporales et spirituales, ut patet de Nichodemo et centurione. Non ergo sequitur: adhaesit dominus secularibus, et movit eos ad spoliandum sacerdotes, ut patet de Vespasiano et Tyto principibus, quos quadragesimo secundo anno post ascensionem fecit ire Jerusalem ad destruendum illos sacerdotes; ergo fuit haereticus.

Conformiter dicitur de *apostolo*, qui spreta submissione summi pontificis appellavit Caesarem, non beatum Petrum papam, licet causa sua fuerit fidei, ut patet Actorum 25⁰; non tamen ex hinc sequitur, quod fuit tunc haereticus, sed perfectus Christianus. Et idem patet de *Jeremia*, qui fuit sinistre accusatus a sacerdotibus et prophetis reputantibus ex conditionali prophetae sententiam de inesse[3]; sed principes seculares, quibus *Jeremias* adhaeserat, eum liberarunt, ut patet *Jeremiae* 26⁰. 38⁰. 42⁰. *et* 43⁰. capitulo. Imo de *Nabuchodonosor* pagano habuerat *Jeremias* et *Daniel* plus amicabilitatis quam de perversis sacerdotibus sui generis, ut patet Jeremiae 40 et Daniel; a sacerdotibus autem et pseudoprophetis fuerant persecuti, ut patet *Jeremiae* 20, et ideo locuti sunt eis aspere instar Christi[4].

Cum ergo multi haeretici adhaeserunt brachio seculari, ut dicitur in libris apocrifis[5], multi autem catholici adhaeserunt brachio seculari, ut dicitur in scriptura sacra, quae non potest esse falsa, oporteret descendere specificando *modum* adhaerendi brachio seculari, ex quo cognoscitur hominem esse haereticum, et non turpiter arguere ex fallacia consequentis a communi[6] usque ad suum particulare: "Isti haeretici adhaeserunt brachio seculari pro defensione suae opinionis; et tu adhaeres brachio seculari pro defensione tuae opinionis; ergo tu es hae-

[1] *quorum*, conjecture; quibus, MS.

[2] Comp. Ps. lxxii. fol. 10, Isaiah lx. fol. 9.

[3] *de inesse*. The marks of contraction in this MS. are not clear to me.

[4] *instar Christi*, *i.e.*, as the priests spoke against Christ.

[5] *apocrifis*, MS., *apocrisis*.

[6] *a communi*, conjecture; MS., *ad communi*.

reticus." Unde ad discernendum ista est mihi pro regula: si quis adhaerat brachio seculari *pure pro defensione veritatis scripturae*, tunc ipse est catholicus; et si adhaeret brachio seculari vel sacerdotali *pro defensione falsitatis suae*, scripturae s. contrariae, tunc ipse est haereticus, quia adversarius legis.

Sed hucusque nec Doctor iste nec alii priores, qui multiplicarunt contra me[5] argumenta, potuerunt convincere, quod aliqua conclusionum, quas impugnant, sit scripturae sacrae contraria; sed ex inventione eorum patuit scolae et mundo, quod sententia eorum fuit scripturae magis consona. Et sic tam ratione quam scriptura scio conclusiones illas defendere gracia Dei, qui me preservans a mania accommodavit intelligentiam ad tollendum omnes suas versutias dictis meis et legi Dei contrarias.

Secundo quantum ad exprobrationem[1] *Inceptoris Occam*, quem dicit me sequi nec aliquid novitatis invenire nisi quod in libris suis inseritur, hic dico *tria: primo*, quod ego nescio ipsum probare fuisse haereticum, sicut forte nec Doctor, sicut pateret eis, qui volunt opiniones suas defendere vel ad Doctoris evidentias in ista materia respondere. *Secundo* dico, quod conclusiones meae nec ab ipso nec a me sumpserunt originem, cum sint in *scriptura* sacra infringibiliter stabilitae et per sanctos Doctores eas astruentes saepius repetitae, sicut collegi in quodam *compendio istius materiae*[2]. *Tertio* dico ut supra, quantum ad libros hujus *Venerabilis Inceptoris*, quos ego vidi, Doctor[3] est in *pluribus* sequax suus assiduus, quam sum ego; nec verecundor sed gaudeo, si in veritatibus convenimus. Quum autem dicitur, quod conclusiones meae indubie sunt haereticae, fuisset plus honorificum notasse illas, et vi argumentorum, non nudis scandalis, docuisse hanc scolam; quia aliter non crederet dictis suis.

Tertio quantum ad illud, quod dicit, ipsum in parte sensisse injurias ex instigatione mea illatas clero per dominos, videtur mihi periculosum dictum, salva sua reverentia, propter *multa:* videtur enim imponere regi, regni consilio, et suis legibus nedum errores sed haereses. Quantum ad *errores*, dicit consilium regis injuste egisse cum eo. Et cum egerunt cum eo secundum leges Angliae, innuitur, leges illas esse injustas, et sic scripturae sacrae contrarias et per consequens *haereticas*, et sic dominos sub legibus illis militantes. *Secundo* confirmatur ex hoc, quod inter alia sic loquitur: per malam, inquit, informationem meam et meorum sequacium domini seculares acceptant et temptarunt in parte, spretis censuris ecclesiasticis cognoscere de possessionibus religiosorum, et etiam auferre ab eis quasdam eorum possessiones, quas in puram et perpetuam elemosinam eorum progenitores ecclesiae contulerunt. Istud dictum indubie cum verbis implicat, ipsos esse haereticos, et potissime caperet veritatem de monachis *francis* translatis de *Anglia*, et de thezauro regis, propter necessitatem

[1] *exprobrationem*, MS., exprobationem.

[2] What was this nature of the writing has not hitherto been ascertained.

[3] The anonymous opponent himself.

suae detentionis detento a curia; quod factum haereticare foret nedum haereticare regis consilium, regnum nostrum et leges suas, sed etiam regnum *Franciae* ac alia, et leges civiles atque canonicas. *Tertio* confirmatur ex hoc, quod patenter asserit, dominos regni nostri defendere me in opinionibus meis haereticis. Sed tunc indubie cum verbis sequitur, ipsos esse haereticos, quia 24. quaestione ultima: "*qui aliorum*"[1] vere dicitur ab *Urbano* papa: "Qui aliorum errorem defendit, multo est dampnabilior illis qui errant, quia non solum ille errat, sed etiam aliis offendicula erroris praeparat et confirmat; unde, quia magister erroris est, non tantum haereticus sed haeresiarcha dicendus est." Periculosum itaque videtur, imponere dictis dominis haereses, nisi quis sciverit probare, quod fundamentum est falsum, scripturae sacrae contrarium; specialiter cum imponens alteri haeresim obligat se ad pœnam talionis, nisi sciverit hoc probare. Si ergo Lector nesciat *probare*, conclusiones meas esse falsas vel scripturae sacrae contrarias, securus sum, quod non probabit haereses ex illis in me, in meis sequacibus aut defensoribus, quin potius sequitur haeretica pravitas in secta opposita. Si autem sciret hoc facere, videtur mihi quod Christi caritas urgeret ipsum signare conclusionem haereticam, et docere scriptura vel ratione, quod sit haeretica, vel in scolis publice vel ad partem specialiter, cum sim paratus ad revocandum et emendandum me, si sim doctus, quod sit haeretica. Et iterum cum sententia mea sit catholica, rei publicae directiva, a fide scripturae secundum postillationes sanctorum concorditer elicita: videtur peccatum grande, retrahere dominos a tantae veritatis defensione, cum secundum *Crisostomum*, ut dictum est proximo capitulo,[2] omne genus hominum tenetur veritates tales modo suo defendere.

Quarto quantum ad pronosticationem vel prophetiam quam annectit, quod finaliter judicabor inimicus crucis Christi atque ecclesiae: videtur mihi, quod sententia mea est remota a contrarietate crucis Christi, quia secundum partem, quam plus impugnat Doctor, quod sacerdotes Christi debent vivere in paupertate et persecutione propter justitiam. Unde ad docendum, quod Doctor iste sit in inimicitia crucis Christi profundior, deliberatione magna cum suis complicibus ordinavit, ut unus frater minor, qui gravavit eos ex praedictione paupertatis et status primitivae ecclesiae, per modum revocationis, confiteretur publice in ecclesia beatae Virginis[3] sanctitatem conversationis praesentis ecclesiae sub hac forma:

"Non teneo, ecclesiam militantem propter suam *dotationem* imperfectionis gradum incurrere aliquem."

Et revera talis confessio non est scripturae consona nec sanctis Doctoribus aliquatenus vallata nec rationi de perfectione status consentanea, sed omnino oppositum. Ulterius de conclusione prophetica formido, non propter spiritum prophetiae, quem scio ipsum[4] habere,

[1] *Corpus juris canonici.*

[2] *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 13.

[3] *Virginis*, in St. Mary's Oxford. The whole incident is not without interest.

[4] *ipsum*, the opponent.

sed propter fragilitatem meam quam timeo, perseverare in constanti assertione veritatum evangelicarum, quas assero et defendo. Certus sum enim, si vixero in confessione earum usque ad mortem, quod relinquam mundum et temporalia per carnis et mundi crucifixionem, et per consequens fiam amicus sponsi ecclesiae[1] per aeternam domus suae cohabitationem, et sic ero amicus sanctae matris ecclesiae, quia sponsi, per consummatam incorporationem. Conclusiones itaque erroris et seculi oportet me destruere et sequi Christum in pauperie, si debeo coronari.

Tertio sic arguitur: Omnes haeretici antiqui de more habebant fidelibus insultare dicendo eis, quod erant opinionis contrariae, verba contumeliosa, et sic instar latronum fideles de latrocinio accusantium fideles vocant haereticos et multa falsa fingentes eis improperant. Sic enim invenimus, quod *Arrius* vocavit *Athanasium*[2] haereticum, et quia *Athanasius* docet trinitatem personarum esse *omosion*,[3] unius substantiae, *Arrius* cum suis complicibus vocavit *Athanasium* cum suis sequacibus *omosiones*, ut patet in quodam sermone. Sic *ego* cum meis sequacibus voco haereticos omnes a meis opinionibus discrepantes, et alia multa opprobriosa[4] ac contumeliosa ipsis inferimus, quum nobis deficiunt argumenta, et sic more meretricum ad litigia nos convertimus, ut omnino ultimum verbum improperatorium sit nobiscum. Ex istis, inquit, verisimiliter sequi videtur, quod *ego cum secta mea* tam in conclusionibus quam doctrina sapiam haereticam pravitatem. Verumtamen, inquit, hoc adhuc ex causa nostra assero; sed postmodum in facie resistet mihi, cum sit ad hoc ex causa multiplici animatus.

Quantum ad istud, videtur mihi, quod hoc argumentum ex fallacia consequentis non sit multum scolasticum; imo si debeat credi talibus suasionibus topicis, cum quibus ignari possent decipi, videtur argumentum illud in Doctorem meum et dominum retorqueri, cum scola cessante ipse manifestius habundat in verbis improperatoriis et calumniis defamatoriis et in subterfugiis frustratoriis, quam alias sectae nostrae. Ideo si per se ex tali conditione argueretur haereticus, ex *plurí* illius conditionis argueretur *major* haereticus, numquam enim memini me hucusque explicite imposuisse haeresim alicui, sed saepe dixi, quod adhuc repeto: si quis pertinaciter asserit sic vel sic, ut puta quod scriptura sacra sit falsa, aut quod sapientia Dei patris non sit passa, tunc ipse est haereticus; sed ille est sibi conscius, qui assumit super se consequens, et tum non audet simpliciter asserere antecedens.

Et eodem modo vidi in quadam epistola, quomodo si papa vel angelus de colo pertinaciter dampnaverit quatuor datas sententias, tunc ipse foret haereticus; quam veritatem connexionis obligo me ad

[1] *amicus sponsi ecclesiae*, after John iii. 29.

[2] *Athanasium*, the MS. has instead of this *Augustinum*, *Augustinus* three times over.

[3] *omosion*, ὁμοούσιον; *omosiones*, ὁμοουσιοι.

[4] *opprobriosa*, MS., impropriosa.

vicarie sustinendum. Sed simile est imponere scribae illius epistolae asserere, quod papa *est* haereticus, eo quod dicitur: "*si* sic dampnaverit, tunc est haereticus;" ac si quis argueret, quod nolo subjici romanae ecclesiae nec cuiquam nisi Deo, quia volo subjici sanctae matri ecclesiae. *Secundo* dico, quod oportet dimittere convicia latronum et meretricum, et *probare* ratione vel auctoritate, quod conclusio quam Doctor proponit haereticare, sit falsa, scripturae s. contraria; quia sum certus, si sit vera, non est haeretica vel dampnanda. Et sic videtur multis, quod improprians nobis de defectu argumentorum dissolveret gazophilacium margaritarum suarum et doceret per copiam rationum vivacium conclusionem quam asserit, et falsitatem sententiae quam diffamat. Verumtamen quia, dominante in mundo hypocrisi, homines possent alternando[1] sibi imponere haereticam pravitatem, ordinavit sponsus ecclesiae legem scripturae pro regula, ubi potuerit hoc discerni; quicunque enim non vere fundaverit vel vitam suam vel sententiam suam in scriptura s., sed adversatur sibi et suis professoribus, hic obliquat ut pugil diaboli atque haereticus. *Tertio* miror, quomodo Doctor concludit ex dictis, quod sapimus haereticam pravitatem, sed adhuc ex causa differt nobis ipsam imponere. *Primo* quia omnia argumenta sua facta per locum a simili vel assumunt mendacium quod non probat, vel e contra vel evidentius docerent, *ipsum* ac suos esse haereticos, cum ipsi sint copiosius conditionis, per quam nimis levis discernit haereticum. Miror insuper, quomodo dicit, se non adhuc nobis imponere haereticam pravitatem, cum saepe prius inculcat, verum esse quod sumus haeretici. Et revera, ut dixi superius, propinquius est contradictioni dicere, quod "verum est me esse haereticum, sed non dico hoc," quam foret dicere: "non malefaciam illi homini, et tam facto quam verbo depravo eum, quantum sufficio." Consideret itaque lector argumenta Doctoris per locum a simili, et apparebit, quomodo pertinentius concluderet, nos esse latrones et meretrices, quam haereticos, et ut credo ex signata similitudine tam omne genus perversorum quam etiam improbos viros. Si ergo Doctori liceret per locum a tali similitudine occupare scolam cum talibus nudis argutiis, tunc vel pauperi sophistae non deficerunt argumenta.

Quarto arguit Doctor conformiter: Apud antiquos, inquit, haereticos ista diabolica calliditas inolevit, ut in gestu et exteriori habitu simulent quandam sanctitatis imaginem, ut perversam doctrinam[2] eorum, quae de se non habet apparentiam veritatis, saltem suis simulatis fictitiis et falsae hypocrisis versutiis palliarent, et sic venenum sub velamine cibi sani Christi fidelibus periculosius propinarent. Sic, inquit, magnus ille haeresiarcha *Arrius* nimiam victus austeritatem et vestium abjectionem continue praeferebat ad *hoc* non dubium, ut suas haereses colaratius praedicaret et simplicium animos copiosius captivaret. Si, inquit, ad *folia* istorum, scilicet ad exteriorem hominem

[1] *alternando*, conjecture, as the MS. here has an unreadable contraction.

[2] *perversam doctrinam*, conjecture, the MS. has *perversa doctrina*.

attendatur, quis non eos sanctissimos reputaret? Sed si ad *fructum* profunde inspicitur, quis eos esse haereticos validissimos formidaret? Ideo signanter docet Christus: "*a fructibus cognoscetis eos!*" Sic, inquit, modernis temporibus ego cum meis sequacibus, licet veniamus in vestimentis ovium, in omni secus tamen sumus lupi rapaces, cum, ut confirmemus nostras doctrinas evidentia sanctitatis, nimiam *victus* austeritatem et *vestium* abjectionem aliarumque apparentiam virtutum objicimus conspectibus incautorum, ut vel sic nobis credatur callidius et nostri sequaces multiplicius cumulentur. Praeservamus quidem nos a *juramentis* extrinsecis, et intrinsecus laboramus invidia et rancore, et sic instar hypocritarum tempore Christi "colamus culicem sed deglutimus camelum.[1] Addimus insuper, nostram doctrinam continere infringibilem veritatem et testimonio catholico undique comprobatam, sed revera non sequitur, quod verum.

"Nolite, inquit, eis nimis caeco credere,[2] cum secundum doctrinam apostoli debemus temptare spiritus, si ex Deo sunt,[3] nempe quantamcunque sanctitatem quis in homine exteriori praetendat, difficile tamen est cognoscere, qualis veraciter intus existat; et ideo oportet ad fructum attendere, et tunc indubie scire potestis, qualis sit arbor, ex qua fructus hujusmodi processerunt. Si, inquam, ad fructus hujus sectae attenditis, videre potestis, quod a doctrina eorum oritur regni perturbatio et ecclesiae persecutio, cum velut ingrati filii maternum honorem ferre non valentes s. matrem ecclesiam jure et libertatibus suis privare satagunt toto nisu, sicut, inspicienti eorum doctrinam luce clarius elucescit. Insuper et ad divisionem ecclesiae per substractionem obedientiae ab ecclesia romana totus viribus elaborant, et sic ex consequenti corpus Christi misticum, praecidentes domini caput a corpore, amputare desiderant totam ecclesiam destructis[4] suis compagibus, quantum in eis est, dissolvere et ruere (*sic*) moliuntur. Unde digne haeretici sunt consendi, dicente *Decreto* distint. 22: "Omnis quisquis cuilibet ecclesiae privilegium ab ipso summo omnium ecclesiarum capite traditum auferre conatur, hic procul dubio in haeresim labitur, et cum *ille* notetur injustus, *hic* est dicendus haereticus." Hoc, inquit, me et meos complices fecisse, quantum in nobis est, sufficienter ostenditur ex praemissis. Unde credo, quod positus est hic in ruinam et non in resurrectionem sed in signum, cui per Dei graciam contradicetur.[5] Nullus, inquit, aestimet, quod dico ista malo animo; nolo enim teste conscientia malum dicere alicui. Unde diligo ipsum forte melius quam credit, cum omnia ista dico secundum regulam caritatis."

Videtur mihi salva reverentia Doctoris, quod hoc argumentum deficit plurimum secundum infamem binarium, tam in materia quam in forma. *In materia* quidem, quia falsum pro fundamento saepius as-

[1] *Matt.* xxiii. 24.

[2] This passage has the appearance of being taken from the lecture of the opponent.

[3] 1 John iv. 1.

[4] *destructis*, conjectural; *structuris*, MS.

[5] Luke ii. 34.

sumitur, ex quo non minus falsum informiter concluditur. Nam non docetur ex cronicis, quod *Arriani* nimiam pœnalitatem exterius inferebant, sed nimis modicam, cum indigni fuerant vivere super terram. Ideo debuerunt macerasse carnem suam, quousque fuissent noscentes veritatem scripturae, quam totis viribus depravarunt; et insuper fuissent impotentes ad sinistre seminandum suas haereses et ad palliandum ipsas mendaciis contra scripturam per catervas infidelium, quas illudunt. Unde nullus christianus reputaret eos sanctissimos, nisi ex ignorantia et inadvertentia scripturae fuerit maniacus et insanus.

Secundo dico, quantum ad applicationem similitudinis per locum a simili, quod argumentum deficit infami binario supradicto. Falsum quidem est,[1] quod ego cum meis sequacibus nimiam pönalitatem et abjectionem cum apparentia virtutum objicio conspectibus incautorum; nam inter alia peccata, de quibus timeo, hoc est unum praecipuum, quod consumendo in excessivo victu et vestitu bona pauperum, deficio dando exemplum aliis, ut lux et regula sanctitatis vitae, quam deberem habere, luceat sacerdotaliter conspectibus laicorum. Quod autem communem vitam vivendo frequenter avide et laute manduco, dolenter profiteor; cum, si illud hypocritice simulare voluero, testarentur contra me socii commensales. Et quantum ad *formam* argumenti, est similis cum priori, quo sic arguitur: haeretici communiter adhaerent infidelibus et tyrannis pro defensione sui perversi dogmatis; et ego adhaereo christianis principibus pro defensione catholicae veritatis; ergo sum haereticus.

Tertio videtur mihi mirabile, ex quo spiritu Doctor imponit mihi tantam victus et vestium parcitatem, specialiter cum hoc non didicit ex sensu vel testimonio, nec credo hoc sibi fuisse revelatum ex spiritu prophetiae. Ideo non occurrit mihi locus, quo illud crederet, si non per locum ab insufficienti similitudine: "Tu sic facis, eo quod *Arrius* haereticus, cum quo in aliquo convenis, ita fecit." Sed si locus a tali similitudine attendi debeat, evidentius sequeretur: "*Arrius* haereticus negavit scripturam asserendo, quod debet concedi catholice, Christum Deum simul et hominem, secundum formam quam evangelium exprimit posse pati; et tu sic facis, ergo tu es haereticus." Nam quantum ad pönalitatem et vitae austeritatem attinet, non dubium quin Baptista apostoli et multi sancti primitivae ecclesiae superaverant *Arrianos*, imo beatus *Jeronymus*, beatus *Martinus* et ceteri sancti, qui *Arrianis* in facie restiterunt; ideo si ex nuda similitudine pönalitatis cum *Arrianis* arguendus foret haereticus, isti sancti Doctores ex majori in ista similitudine arguendi forent haeretici plus quam ego.

Quarto videtur mihi non sanum judicium, quo dicit nos cavere *juramenta* extrinseca et laborare intrinsecus invidia et rancore. Nam licet nobis judicare de manifestis criminibus, de occultis autem nequaquam; sed de operibus bonis de genere, nisi docto in facie ecclesiae,

[1] *Falsum quidem est . . commensales* given by Shirley as above, p. XLVI., Note 1, from the Bodley MS. The number of the chapter, however, is 14, not 12, as there marked.

quod fiant *mala intentione*, non debemus ad deterius judicare ; hoc enim foret temerarium judicium a scriptura sacra prohibitum; Matthaei septimo dicit Christus : "Nolite, inquit, judicare, et non judicabimini." Multis enim videtur probabile, quod Doctor interpretans opera bona de genere ad malum, ut puta perniciosam pönitentiam et juramenti abstinentiam, ex hoc quod procedunt ab hypocrita ex invidia et rancore, incidit in judicium quod ostendit, quia nec servatur forma correctionis fraternae in forma judicii, nec dictum illud videtur consonum confessioni priori. Quum autem dedit ista signa incompleta sub quodam involucro verborum communium, per quae discernit haereticum, scripsi sibi, cum aliqua pars scolae supponit, quod *me* intelligit in verbis suis communibus; respondit, *quod non*, cum reputat me virum catholicum. *Nunc autem* effundendo virus collectum antiquitus multiplicat argumenta secundum numerum illorum signorum haeretici, et omnia illa ad *me* modo applicat, singulariter et expresse. Constat autem mundo, quod ex hinc non potest convincere, unde sim modo noviter super haeresim singulariter impetitus. Unde ne materia[1] istius contentionis sit nimis formalis,[2] statui mihi pro *tripla regula* ex scriptura, quod *primo* mundem me cavendo diligentius de culpa quae mihi imponitur ; scio enim[3] quod nimis crebro immisceo zelum sinistrum vindictae cum intentione dextra, si quam habuero. Ideo quoad[4] illud, quod imponit[5] mihi, sub praetensa sanctitate latere hypocrisim, invidiam et rancorem, timeo mihi, quod dolens refero, quod illud mihi evenit nimis crebro, ratione cujus mereor pati scandala longe plura, quam adhuc mihi illata sunt. Et hinc pulsando Deum meum orationibus nitar diligentius, de peccatis spiritualibus, quae est solius Dei cognoscere, de cetero praecavere. *Secundo* considerans, quod[6] diabolus tanquam leo rugiens circuit quaerens quem devoret,[7] quem non potest devorare seductum nequitia manifesta, famam ejus inquinare conatur, ut vel sic opprobriis hominum et malarum linguarum detractione[8] deficiat, non conscius mihi de crimine manifesto[9] imposito patienter sufferam maledictum, quia 1 Cor. 4[9] dicit apostolus ; "mihi autem pro minimo est, ut a vobis judicer aut ab humano die." *Tertio* excusans me a scandalo mihi imposito, rogabo pro scandalizantibus, ne livor et zelus vindictae dolorem mihi super priora vulnera superaddant. Et ista triplex regula mihi necessaria elicitur ex epistola Augustini ad cives Ypponenses. *Quarto* quoad *fructum* sectae nostrae, quo assumitur nos perturbare ecclesiam et niti separare membra a capite nitendo destruere privilegia romanae ecclesiae, non

[1] The section from *ne materia . . . . vulnera superaddant*, Shirley has printed from the Bodleian MS. Introduction to *Fasc. Zizan.* XL. f., note 1.

[2] *formalis*, sterilis, Shirley.

[3] *scio enim*, wanting in Shirley, but erroneously ; giving quite a different sense.

[4] *quoad*, *ergo ad*, Shirley,

[5] *imponit*, imponitur, Shirley.

[6] *quod*, quia, Shirley.

[7] 1 Peter v. 8.

[8] *detractione*, conjecture, Shirley ; *obtractione*, Vienna MS. ; *subtractione*.

sum mihi conscius quoad ista, cum intendo tam in universali quam in particulari, quod destruam peccatum scandali a Christi ecclesiae, quod est per se causa totius perturbationis in populo. Ex quo patet, quod non in praedicando veritatem evangelicam ad destructionem peccati, sed in fovendo peccata et impediendo, ne lex scripturae servetur, turbatur ecclesia, licet quantumlibet malum p nae sequatur ex primo, et quantumlibet apparens prosperitas ex secundo. Apparet ex III⁰ Regum 18³ dicto Heliae: "Tune es ille qui conturbas Israel?" et ille ait: "Non ego turbavi, sed tu et domus patris tui, qui dereliquisti mandata Domini!" Sic ergo debet omnis catholicus niti unire membrum capiti Christo, faciendo in casu divisionem hostium crucis Christi, quia hoc est ad veram pacem matris ecclesiae, licet p önalis corporalis perturbatio consequatur, dicente Christo Matth. x.: "Non veni pacem mittere in terram sed gladium; veni enim separare hominem adversus patrem suum, et filiam adversus matrem suam, etnu rum adversus socrum suam." Venit itaque Christus ad dissolvendum conföderationem fictam inter homines mundanos per *superbiam diaboli*; illa enim viros fortiores fallit, cum diabolus, rex super omnes filios superbiae, omnes peccatores illaqueat; carnales autem ex vitio *voluptatis carnalis* conjuncti sunt per Christi p önitentiam sejungendi; sed *mundo* nupti sunt per Christi pauperiem separandi. Qui ergo nititur quiete fovere populum in aliquo horum trium, nititur dissolvere veram pacem, quia pacem originalem hominis ad Deum, quae solum dissolvitur per peccatum. Unde generaliter omnes sancti utriusque Testamenti ad illum finem fecerunt seditionem in populo, cum aliter non forent milites Christi exercitus, nisi pacem diaboli sibi contrariam niterentur dissolvere. Unde et istam accusationem de commotione populi tulerunt sacerdotes et scribae adversus dominum Jesum Christum, accusantes eum tanquam haereticum occidendum, ut patet Lucae 23⁰: "Commovet, inquiunt, populum docens per universam Judaeam incipiens a Galilaea usque huc;" et sequitur: "Stabant autem principes sacerdotum et scribae constanter accusantes eum." Patet ergo, quod non sequitur: Iste christianus commovet populum ad pugnandum secundum fidem scripturae contra diabolum; ergo est haereticus; cum sit signum oppositi.

Ex istis perpendi potest fructus sententiae, quam per tempus solicite seminavi. *Primo* discerni potest, qui clerici conjugati cum seculo et per consequens cum Mammona ut socro fortius quam cum Deo; quia omnes, qui plus remurmurant contra praevaricationes temporalium quam virtutum. *Secundo* discerni potest quomodo mundo divites debent a talibus prudenter subtrahere elemosinas corporales, cum nemo debet "jugum ducere cum infidelibus"[1] confirmando matrimonium tam monstruosum, quin potius dissolvendo. *Tertio* si Deus voluerit, possunt de omni genere clericorum hi, quoram corda spiritus sanctus tetigit, animari ad mundi contemptum et induendum pauper-

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 14.

tatem evangelicam propter Christum. Nec credo tantum fructum procedere ex opinione dicente, quod scriptura sacra sit haeretica et blasphema.

Ulterius quantum ad destructionem privilegiorum *romanae ecclesiae* protestor publice, quod amando et venerando romanam ecclesiam matrem meam desidero et procuro defensionem omnium privilegiorum suorum atque insignium. Scio quidem ex fide scripturae tanquam infringibiliter verum, quod omne suum privilegium est ex Deo; et de quanto secuta fuerit Christum conformius, de tanto amplioribus privilegiis insignitur. Illi autem qui alliciunt, ut dicta ecclesia plus attendat ad homines ac prosperitates mundanas, quam ut persecutionem patiatur pro justitia,[1] ut plus appretietur dotationem ac aedificationem Caesaris quam capitis sui Christi, sunt ejus subdoli inimici, dicente Christo Matt. x. postquam docuit se daturum non pacem mundanam sponsae suae sed gladium, "inimici," inquit, "hominis domestici ejus." De hoc alibi.

Sexto cum Doctor determinatione multiplici docuit ex sanctis Doctoribus, per quae signa possunt haeretici cognosci, et jam ultimo eadem repetiit, applicando ad *me* singulariter quae prius dixerat in communi, restat colligere, ex quo signo infallibiliter cognosci possunt haeretici, quia certum est quod nullum signorum in forma qua mihi recitata sunt, probant vel topice quantumcunque haereticum: ideo dico, ut supra, quod omnis talis et solum talis est haereticus, qui scripturae sacrae verbo vel opere pertinaciter contradicit. Cum enim illa sit testimonium Dei, quod voluit remanere in terris, ut suam voluntatem cognoscerent, patet quod impossibile est, nisi per conformitatem ad illam, fidelium mentes bonae[2] effici voluntatis. Ideo signanter legitur Lucae 16°: "Habent Moysen et prophetas; audiant illos!" Lex, inquam, scripturae sufficit pro instructione ecclesiae, et sic omnis haereticus est adversarius legis et prophetarum, ut saepe exposui. Unde beatus *Gregorius* tertio Moralium super libro Job 2°: "condixerant enim sibi, ut pariter venientes visitarent eum; condicunt, inquit, sibi haeretici, quum prava quaedam contra ecclesiam concorditer sequuntur, et in quibus a veritate discrepant, sibi in falsitate concordant." Volvant et revolvant quicunque voluerint, et non invenient in sanctis Doctoribus vel ratione fundatum, quod quicunque sunt haeretici nisi ex eo, quod fundantur in falsitate scripturae sacrae contraria, quia veritas scripturae sacrae non potest esse ecclesiae sanctae contraria, et solum illud dogma est haereticum, quod est contra ecclesiam. Solum ergo illi, qui contra scripturam sacram, quae est *carta* sanctae matris ecclesiae, conspirant et sentiunt, sunt censendi haeretici, eo quod solum illi sunt contra ecclesiam. Ad convincendum ergo haereticos, quod vel false sentiant extra scripturam, vel quod de ipsa sinistre sentiunt, tales inquam non solum haeretici,

[1] Matt. v. 10.

[2] *bonae.* This reading is conjectural, with an allusion to Luke ii. 44, as the contraction used in the MS. here is hard to decipher.

h. e. a voluntate Dei divisi, sed proditores ac persecutores Dei merito possunt dici. Unde *Crisostomus* in Imperfecto, homelia 20 exponens illud Matt. xx. : "Assumpsit Jesus duodecim discipulos suos seorsum in itinere et ait illis : ecce ascendimus Jerosolymam, et filius hominis tradetur principibus sacerdotum et scribis, et condempnabunt eum morte, et tradent eum gentibus ad illudendum et flagellandum et crucifigendum," omnis, inquit, gloria Dei et omnis salus hominum in Christi morte posita est : nulla enim est res, quae ad salutem hominum magis pertineat, nec aliud propter quod magis Deo gracias agere debeamus; ideo cum plurima turba sequeretur Christum in via, 12 apostolos tulit (*sic*) secreto et *eis* tantum suae mortis nuntiavit misterium, quia semper pretiosiorem thezaurum in melioribus vasis includimus; plebs ergo propter incapacitatem et mulieres propter naturae suae mollitiem excluduntur. Sed post tradit iste sanctus[1] ex praedictis verbis evangelii sensum magis mellifluum :[2] Christus, inquit, verbum veritatis est secundum testimonia scripturarum : unde sicut tunc, sic et modo, Deus tradit eum sacerdotibus et scribis ad manifestandum fidem sanctorum et perfidiam iniquorum, cum tradit eis scripturam sacram, quae est verbum veritatis. Et sicut tunc fideles videntes eum pati secundum humanitatem non recedebant a fide deitatis, iniquorum autem perfidia, licet intellexerit, eum esse filium Dei secundum testimonia scripturarum, ausi sunt eum interficere, sicut et modo, quum, inquit, vides scripturas prophetarum, evangelii et apostolorum traditas esse in manus falsorum sacerdotum et scribarum, intellige, quia vivum verbum veritatis traditum est principibus iniquis et scribis" etc.

Ex testimonio autem istius sancti et aliorum sanctorum elicitur, quod sicut haeresis antichristiana in primitiva ecclesia coepit persequendo Verbum Dei in natura corporea, sic eadem haeresis continuatur depravando illud verbum quod est scriptura sacra, adversando sibi tam opere quam sermone. Hoc ergo est per se signum cognoscendi haereticum.

Ulterius quoad *prophetiam* de *ruina mea*, iuxta prophetiam Symonis de Christo Luc. 2, rogo Dominum, quod, si non sit a Deo sententia quam praedico, sed falsitas fidei scripturae opposita, quod ruam cum meis fautoribus, saltem ab ejus defensione temeraria ad lumen fidei resurgendo. Et sic videtur mihi, quod sive sim haereticus sive catholicus, quod "positus sum in resurrectionem;" si, inquam sim haereticus, sum certus, quod sententia mea ad resurrectionem multorum, quia ad declarationem fidei, destruetur; si autem in hoc sim catholicus, sum certus iterum, quod sententia, quam teneo, per *organa De* vel ante adventum antichristi vel postea defendetur, quia super omnia vincit veritas verbi Dei, ut dicitur Esdrae 3°. Et sic utrobique vel ad bonum meum vel malum dogma meum proderit sponsae Christi et erit cum paribus ad resurrectionem multorum a volutabro voluptatum.

[1] *sanctus*, scil. Chrysostomus.

[2] *mellifluum*, mellifusum MS.

Quantum ad *dilectionem* quam Doctor jurat se *erga me* gerere plus quam credo, si veritas ita se habeat, Deus sibi retribuat; si sophistice palliat, rogo Deum, ut de perjurio sibi parcat, quia multis videtur, quod mixtio mendacii sit malum in genere, et raro evenit, quod malum tale bene circumstantionetur [*sic*] moraliter, cum de difficultate simplex intentio adjaceat bono extrinseco. Constat quidem [1] ex testimonio *Crisostomi* omelia 17ma Imperfecti, quod licet christiano corripere christianum, sed oportet cavere, quod vere corripiat de reatu, subducto odio, pro peccato commisso in hominem, subducta, inquit [2], jactantia de propria justitia vel virtute, et tertio servata forma evangelica, quod non judicetur ex levi suspicione ambigua et occulta. Quae videntur multis in ista correptione deficere, cum notum sit mihi, quod cum duplicitate verborum ad partem [3] in publico falsum fingitur, et caritativa communicatio in scriptis patule denegatur. Ideo timens de malo, quod Doctor meus [4] posset ad verificandum pronosticationem suam disponere, licet fuerim citatus ad comparendum [5] nunc coram domino archiepiscopo in quocunque loco fuerit suae provinciae, timui illo ire; audivi enim, quod dixit in sententia, quod "Modicum, et non videbitis me, et iterum modicum, et videbitis me[6]." Si, inquam, vadit ad patrem papam vel archiepiscopum, posset faciliter parare mihi locum insidiarum et caedis corporis, cum multi sunt instructi, Deus scit a quibus et qualiter, quod foret elemosina, ut combustione [7], occisione vel morte alia sim extinctus in tantum, quod ista argumenta, quae Doctor jam fecerat, notantur communiter in ore multorum clericorum episcopalium, trahentium ignaros ad infidelitatem, quotquot possunt cum ipsis subvertere.

IX.

METRICA COMPILATIO DE REPLICATIONIBUS CONTRA MAGISTRUM JOHANNEM.

Article IX. in Dr Lechler's Appendix is a Latin poem of Wiclif's time, intituled *Metrica Compilatio de Replicationibus contra Magistrum Johannem*, or, as it is intituled in another MS., *Invectivum contra Monachos et alios religiosos tempor Richardi Secundi.* The piece is

[1] From *Constat quidem . . . . sim extinctus.* Shirley has presented this passage after the Bodleian MS., *Fasc. Zizan.*, XXXIV., note.

[2] *subducta, inquit, subductaque,* Shirley, arising from an erroneous reading of a contraction which occurs in the Vienna MS.

[3] *ad partem, partem,* without *ad,* Shirley, whereby the sense suffers.

[4] *meus, nimis,* Shirley, perhaps owing to a contraction which is also found here in the Vienna MS.

[5] *comparendum,* comparandum, Vienna MS.

[6] John xvi., 16.

[7] *combustione,* combustive, Shirley, who, however, conjectures *combustira.*

one of singular interest and curiosity, both for its literary form and for its historical value as a mirror of the time, which was one of extreme agitation and excitement both in religious and political affairs. It is not surprising that our author should have included it in his Appendix at full length, as it apparently had not previously been incorporated with any German work bearing upon the history of the period. It was no doubt intended mainly for the eyes of his learned countrymen, as he was well aware of its having been already twice printed in England—first in the *Monumenta Franciscana*, edited by Prof. Brewer, 1858, and in the following year in *Political Songs and Poems Relating to English History*, edited by Thomas Wright, 1859—both these works being included in the collection of *Rerum Britannicarum Medii aevi*, still in progress of publication at the expense of Government. As these volumes are readily accessible to all English lovers of historical research, it is not thought necessary to reprint the piece here, as it extends, with the elaborate mass of notes, in which the author gives the results of a very careful collation of the two extant MSS. of the poem—that of the Imperial Library of Vienna, chiefly followed by Lechler, and that of the British Museum, followed by Brewer and Wright. This collation is of much value for the settlement of the text; but it is sufficient that those to whom it is of interest should have access to it in the author's original work.

X.

LITERA MISSA PAPAE URBANO SEXTO.[1]

A. MS. of the Vienna Imperial Library, No. 1387, fol. 105.
B. MS. of the Bodleian Library. E. Mus. 86, printed in *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, ed. Shirley, p. 341.

Gaudeo plane detegere cuicunque fidem[2] quam teneo, et specialiter Romano pontifici; quia suppono, quod si sit orthodoxa, ipse fidem illam humiliter confirmabit, et si sit erronea, emendabit.

Suppono autem, quod evangelium Christi sit cor corporis[3] legis Dei; Christum autem, qui evangelium illud immediate dederat, credo esse verum Deum et verum hominem, et in hoc legem evangelii omnes partes scripturae alias[4] excedentem.

Suppono iterum, quod Romanus pontifex, cum sit[5] summus vica-

[1] A. The title in B is, *Copia cujusdam literae Magistri Johannis Wycclyff missae papae Urbano* VI. *ad excusationem de non veniendo sibi ad citationem suam*, a. d. MCCCLXXXIV.—Lewis, *Life of Wiclif*, ed. 1820, 194, No. 81: *Excusationes ad Urbanum*, gives the title.

[2] *fidem*, A; fidem meam, B.

[3] *cor corporis*, A; corporis, B.; corpus, Shirley, conjectural, but erroneously.

[4] *alias*, A; wanting in B. English edition, *all other laws*.

[5] *sit*, A; wanting in B.

rius Christi in terris, sit ad istam[1] legem evangelii inter viantes maxime obligatus; majoritas enim inter Christi discipulos non penes magnitudinem mundanam, sed penes Christi imitationem in moribus mensuratur.

Iterum ex isto corde[2] legis Domini patenter elicio, quod Christus fuit pro statu[3] hujus viationis homo pauperrimus, omnem dominationem mundanam abjiciens. Patet per fidem evangelii, Matth. viii. 20, et 2 Cor. viii. 9.

Ex istis communiter elicio, quod nec papam[4] nec aliquem[5] sanctorum debet fidelis aliquis imitari, nisi de quanto ipse imitatus fuerit Dominum Jesum Christum. Nam Petrus, Paulus et filii Zebedaei cupiendo dignitatem mundanam contra istam imitationem, deliquerant; ideo non sunt in istis erroribus imitandi. Ex istis elicio tanquam consilium,[6] quod papa dimittat seculari brachio temporale dominium,[7] et ad hoc clerum suum efficaciter exhortetur. Sic enim Christus fecit signanter per suos apostolos.

Si autem in istis erravero, volo humiliter, etiam per mortem, si oporteat, emendari. Et si in persona propria ad votum potero laborare, vellem praesentiam Romani pontificis humiliter visitare. Sed Deus necessitavit me ad contrarium, et consequenter[8] me docuit plus Deo quam hominibus obedire. Cum autem Deus dederit papae nostro instinctus justos evangelicos, rogare debemus, quod instinctus illi non per subdolum consilium extinguantur, nec quod papa aut cardinales aliquid agere contra legem Domini moveantur. Igitur rogemus Dominum[9] cujuslibet creaturae, quod sic excitet papam nostrum Urbanum sextum, sicut inceperat, ut imitetur cum clero suo in moribus[10] Dominum Jesum Christum, ut ipsi efficaciter doceant populum in hoc ipsos fideliter imitari, et rogemus spiritualiter papam nostrum a maligno concilio[11] praeservari; quod certum[12] cognoscimus, quod "*Inimici hominis domestici ejus*,"[13] et "*Deus non permittit nos tentari supra id quod possumus:*"[14] multo magis Deus[15] a nulla creatura requirit, quod faciat quod non potest; cum illa sit patens conditio Antichristi.

[1] *istam*, A; illam, B.
[2] *isto corde*, a proof that *cor* must not be omitted in reading preceding note 3.
[3] *statu*, A; tempore, B.
[4] *papam*, A; ipsum papam, B.
[5] *aliquem*, B; alium, A. English ed., *ne no saint.*
[6] *consilium*, A; concilium, B.
[7] *temporale dominium*, A; dominium temporale, B.
[8] *consequenter*, A; communiter, B.
[9] *Dominum*, A; Deum Dominum, B.
[10] *in moribus*, A; etiam in moribus, B
[11] *concilio*, A and B; consilio, Shirley, by conjecture, but without sufficient ground.
[12] *certum*, A; iterum, B.
[13] Comp. Matth. x. 36.
[14] Comp. 1 Cor. x. 13.
[15] *multo magis Deus*, A; multo plus (without Deus), B.

THE END.

ERRATUM.

Vol. I., p. 150—For *John Scotus Erigena*, read *John Duns Scotus*.

COLSTON AND SON, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

Date Due
