

JOHN WICLIF
AND HIS
ENGLISH PRECURSORS

BY
Prof. Dr. Lechler
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"

NEW EDITION IN ONE VOLUME

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE
1881

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved)

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

SCIENCE is an international good. It is not confined by territorial boundaries, nor restricted by the ties of nationality. Nowhere does it stand written that only an Englishman can suitably write the history of England or a portion of it. It may easily happen that a German may have access to sources of English history from which the Englishman may have less opportunity to draw. It is from such sources that I believe myself able to offer not a little which may serve to supplement and enrich, and even to correct, the knowledge which has hitherto been current respecting the history and the characteristic genius of Wiclif.

All the men whose Wiclif-researches have hitherto acquired importance and authority, have in every instance been able to bring to light, and make use of for the first time, fresh documentary materials. It was so with John Lewis in the last century, who wrote the first independent biography of Wiclif. The chief value of that book—a value still fully recognised at the present day—lies not in its style of execution, but purely in the mass of materials which it brought together and published. In the present century, Dr. Robert Vaughan, by his works upon the same subject, increased our historical knowledge of Wiclif to such a degree, that these works have been everywhere recognised as authorities, and used as a storehouse of information. The chief

distinction of these writings was the extensive use made in them, by quotation and otherwise, of Wiclif's manuscript Tracts and Sermons. More recently, at the suggestion of the late Professor Shirley, these English writings of the Reformer have been published by the Clarendon Press, which had already, in 1850, given to the world a model edition of the Wiclif Translation of the Bible. The *Select English Works of John Wiclif*, edited in excellent style by Thomas Arnold, M.A., of University College, Oxford, contains a complete collection of the Reformer's English sermons, and a selection of his English tracts, popular pieces, and fly-leaves—a service to literature and religious history which calls for the warmest acknowledgments.

It was as an integral part of the same projected collection of *Select Works of Wiclif*, that the author of the present work brought out in 1869 a critical edition of the *Dialogus*, upon the authority of a collation of four Vienna MSS. of the work, accompanied by the *Supplementum Dialogi*, which had never been in print. It was the treasures of the Imperial Library of Vienna which put him in a position to execute that critical task. When at the beginning of the 15th century the Wiclif spirit took so strong a hold of Bohemia and Moravia, Bohemian hands were busily employed through several decades of years in multiplying copies of the books, sermons, and tracts of the *Evangelical Doctor*. Hence there are still to be found at the present day, not only in Prague itself, but also in Vienna and Paris, and even in Stockholm, MSS. of Wiclif's works, of which little use has hitherto been made. In particular, the Imperial Library of Vienna, owing to the secularisation of the Bohemian monasteries under Joseph II., is in possession of nearly forty volumes, which consist either entirely or chiefly of

unprinted Latin works of Wiclif, of which, in some instances, not a single copy is to be found in England. By the kind mediation of the Saxon Government with the Imperial Government of Austria, I obtained from the latter the leisurely and unrestricted use of all those volumes of the collection which I required, and which were sent to me from Vienna as I needed them with the utmost liberality—a gracious furtherance of literary labours, for which, I trust, I may be allowed in this place to express my most respectful and most sincere thanks.

When I compare the two groups of *Sources* which serve to elucidate the personality and the entire historical position of Wiclif, I come in sight of the fact that (the English sermons and tracts most recently printed belong, almost without exception, to the four last years of his life (1381-1384).) They serve, therefore, to throw upon his latest convictions and efforts—however comparatively well-known these were before—a still clearer and fuller documentary light. The Latin works, on the other hand, so far as they only exist in MS., were for the most part written at earlier dates, some of them indeed going back as far as the year 1370. These latter, therefore, have a specially high value, because we learn from them the thoughts and doings of Wiclif during an earlier stadium of his life; and, what is most important of all, they open up to us a view of his gradual development—of the progress of his mind in insight and enlightenment.

I cannot allow the present opportunity to pass of expressing my conviction how much it is to be wished that several of these earlier Latin writings of Wiclif were printed and published. Not only would they be made thereby more accessible to learned investigators; they would also be secured against the possibility of

destruction, in view of the fact that some of them continue to exist only in a single copy. It is alarming to think what an irreparable loss might be caused by fire in a library rich in manuscripts. Should the Clarendon Press determine to include in the series of the *Select Works* an additional number of Wiclif's Latin writings, I would, with all submission, advise that works of an earlier date than 1381 should be the first to be selected. Most of all, the publication of the *De Veritate Sanctae Scripturae* is to be recommended; and next to this a collection of forty Latin sermons, preserved in the Vienna MS. 3928, and which reflect an earlier stage of Wiclif's opinions. The book *De Ecclesia*—the best MS. of which is the Vienna MS. 1294,—and the *De Dominio Civili*, would also be worthy of being sent to press.

In the summer of 1840, I studied in the University Library of Cambridge the MS. of *Repressor*—the interesting polemical treatise of the rationalising Bishop Pecock, directed against the Wiclifite "Biblemen" about the middle of the 15th century. Twenty years after I had made acquaintance with it, it was published by Babington. By that perusal I was conducted into the history of the Lollards; and from them I saw myself thrown back upon Wiclif himself. It was thus by a retrogressive movement that the present work gradually took shape, the main impulse to undertake it having come from my good fortune in obtaining access to the Vienna MSS. As I continued to be thus occupied with Wiclif's life and writings, my respect and love for the venerable man—"the evangelical doctor," as his contemporaries were wont to call him—went on ever growing. He is truly, in more than one respect, a character of the genuine Protestant type, whose portraiture it may not be without use to freshen up again

in true and vivid colours in the eyes of the present generation.

In the present English edition, several portions of the original work have been omitted which did not appear likely to interest English readers so much as what relates directly to England and Wiclif himself.

The Author can only congratulate himself that he has found in Professor Lorimer a translator who, along with a perfect acquaintance with German, combines so rich a knowledge of the subject, and, what is not the smallest requisite for the task, so enthusiastic a love for the personality of Wiclif. He has given a special proof of his love to the subject of this book, and of his learned knowledge of it, in a number of "Additional Notes." In these, with the help of medieval records and chronicles which have appeared since the publication of the German original (1873), he has been able sometimes to confirm, and sometimes to correct, the investigations of the Author. And as, in my esteem, the truth is above all else, I am able, without jealousy, to rejoice in every rectification which the views I set forth may receive from later researches among documents which were not accessible to me at the time of my own investigations.

May the Father of Lights, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift, be pleased to make His blessing rest upon this English edition of my work, to His own glory, to the furtherance of evangelical truth, and to the wellbeing of the Church of Jesus Christ.

GOTTHARD LECHLER.

LEIPZIG, 11th February 1878.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

PROFESSOR LECHLER'S work is not only a Biography of Wiclif, but also a preliminary history of the Reformation; beginning far back in the medieval centuries, and carried down along the parallel lines of the Lollards and the Hussites, to the first decades of the sixteenth century. The two volumes extend to 1400 closely printed pages; and it was found impracticable to carry out the original idea of publishing a translation of the whole work.

My design was then reduced to the reproduction of the Biography, and of so much of the preliminary history as concerned Wiclif's English Precursors. From the English point of view, it seemed perfectly fitting that the life and teaching of Wiclif should be presented as a subject complete in itself, without implication with the general history of the Church, either earlier or later; and it was found that a single preliminary chapter would suffice to communicate all that the Author had written respecting Grossetête, Occam, and the rest of Wiclif's forerunners upon English soil. Professor Lechler at once acceded to this reduced programme of the translation, and not only prepared for my use a new arrangement of the original text, so far as this was called for, but also made a careful revision both of text and notes, for the present edition.

The whole original work is of much value and well

worth translation, but its chief importance lies in the Biography of Wiclif himself. In the execution of this kernel portion of his work, the Author had the immense advantage of free and leisurely access to the Wiclif MSS. of the Imperial Library of Vienna; and he has used this advantage to the utmost, and with the best effect. Never before has the whole teaching of the reformer,—philosophical, theological, ethical, and ecclesiastical, been so copiously and accurately set forth; and never before has so large a mass of classified quotations from all his chief scientific writings been placed under the eyes of scholars.

It is a singular fact that 500 years should have passed away before it became possible to do this service of justice to the memory of so great a man—the very “Morning Star of the Reformation;” and it is much to be wished that the University of Oxford, Wiclif’s *Alma Mater*, should complete the service, by carrying out to the full her own noble design, already considerably advanced, of a collection of the “Select Works” of Wiclif—in the direction of the suggestions offered by Professor Lechler in the foregoing Preface.

The Author has referred in his Preface in the kindest spirit to the “*Additional Notes*” which I have been able to append to several chapters of the first volume. It had occurred to me that it might be possible to find some fresh collateral lights upon a medieval subject, in several volumes of the “Chronicles and Memorials” brought out under the superintendence of the Master of the Rolls, which had appeared since the publication of Professor Lechler’s work. The surmise was verified much beyond my hope. In particular, it is a great satisfaction to me that these sources supplied me with the materials of an argu-

ment to prove, with a high degree of probability, an unbroken connection of Wiclif with Balliol College, from the date of his entrance at the University, down to his resignation of the Balliol Mastership. This satisfaction has been much enhanced by Professor Lechler's concurrence in the same view, upon the ground of this fresh evidence ; and it would be complete if I might hope to obtain also the concurrence of the eminent scholars who now preside over that illustrious seat of learning—one of whose chief historic distinctions must always be that it was Wiclif's College.

THE TRANSLATOR.

ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE,
LONDON, *March* 1878.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION,	PAGE 1
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION,	11

CHAPTER I.

ENGLISH PRECURSORS OF WICLIF.

SECTION I.—Mixture and Consolidation of Races in the English People,	14
SECTION II.—Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln,	21
SECTION III.—Henry Bracton and William Occam and the Tone of Church Life and Politics in the Fourteenth Century,	40
SECTION IV.—Richard of Armagh and the Mendicant Orders,	54
SECTION V.—Thomas of Bradwardine, his Teaching and Spirit,	63
SECTION VI.—The Vision of Piers Plowman,	69
NOTES TO CHAPTER I.,	71
ADDITIONAL NOTES BY TRANSLATOR :—	
NOTE I.—Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh,	84
NOTE II.—The Vision of Piers Plowman,	85

CHAPTER II.

WICLIF'S YOUTH AND STUDENT LIFE.

SECTION I.—Birthplace and Family,	87
SECTION II.—Wiclif's Course of Study,	92
NOTES TO CHAPTER II.,	104
ADDITIONAL NOTES BY TRANSLATOR :—	
NOTE I.—Illustrations of the Educational Discipline of Balliol College in Wiclif's Time,	106
NOTE II.—Provisions of the Statutes of Sir Philip de Somerville for the Study of Theology by the Fellows of Balliol College in Wiclif's Time,	107
NOTE III.—State of Philosophical Parties in Oxford in Wiclif's Student Years,	107
NOTE IV.—Learned Fellows of Balliol in Wiclif's Time,	108
NOTE V.—Extract from Mr Riley's Report on the Archives of Balliol,	108

CHAPTER III.

WICLIF'S QUIET WORK IN OXFORD, A.D. 1345-1366.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—Wiclif as a Member of Balliol and Merton Colleges,	110
SECTION II.—Wiclif as Warden of Canterbury Hall and Doctor of Theology,	115
NOTES TO CHAPTER III.,	120
ADDITIONAL NOTES BY TRANSLATOR:—	
NOTE I.—Wiclif's Connection with Balliol,	132
NOTE II.—Identity of John Wiclif, the Reformer, with John Wiclif, Warden of Canterbury Hall,	137
NOTE III.—Wiclif-Researches of the late Prebendary Wilkinson,	138

CHAPTER IV.

WICLIF'S FIRST PUBLIC APPEARANCE IN THE ECCLESIASTICO-POLITICAL AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND.

SECTION I.—Wiclif as a Patriot,	139
SECTION II.—Wiclif's Concern in the Rejection of the Papal Claim to Feudatory Tribute,	142
SECTION III.—Wiclif's Action in Public Affairs from 1366 to 1376,	155
SECTION IV.—A Royal Commissary at Bruges—Probably a Member of the "Good Parliament,"	162
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV.,	177
ADDITIONAL NOTE BY TRANSLATOR on the Late Date at which Wiclif began his Attacks on the Mendicant Orders,	180

CHAPTER V.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HIERARCHY AGAINST WICLIF IN 1377 AND 1378.

SECTION I.—Wiclif summoned before the Convocation,	181
SECTION II.—Papal Bulls against Wiclif,	187
SECTION III.—First Effects of the Five Bulls in England,	192
SECTION IV.—The Process against Wiclif,	196
NOTES TO CHAPTER V.,	200

CHAPTER VI.

WICLIF AS A PREACHER; HIS EFFORTS FOR REFORM IN PREACHING AND FOR THE ELEVATION OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

SECTION I.—Wiclif as a Preacher; his Homiletical Principles,	203
SECTION II.—Wiclif's Itinerant Preachers,	213
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI.,	226
ADDITIONAL NOTE BY TRANSLATOR on the Popularity of Wiclif and his Earliest Disciples as Preachers in London,	230

CHAPTER VII

WICLIF AS BIBLE TRANSLATOR; AND HIS SERVICE DONE TO THE ENGLISH
LANGUAGE.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—The Novelty of the Idea of an English Translation of the whole Bible,	232
SECTION II.—How Wiclif came to engage in this Undertaking, . . .	237
SECTION III.—The Wiclif Translation,	243
NOTES TO CHAPTER VII.,	250

CHAPTER VIII.

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

SECTION I.—Wiclif's gradual development as a Thinker and Reformer, . .	253
SECTION II.—Wiclif as a Philosophical Thinker and Writer, . . .	253
NOTES TO SECTIONS I. and II.,	261
SECTION III.—Wiclif's Theological System. The Sources of Christian Truth,	262
NOTES TO SECTION III.,	277
SECTION IV.—Doctrine of God and the Divine Trinity,	281
NOTES TO SECTION IV.,	285
SECTION V.—Doctrine of the World; of the Creation; of the Divine Dominion,	286
NOTES TO SECTION V.,	293
SECTION VI.—Doctrine of Man and of Sin,	294
NOTES TO SECTION VI.,	298
SECTION VII.—Doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the Work of Redemption,	300
SECTION VIII.—Doctrine of the Order of Personal Salvation, . . .	306
NOTES TO SECTIONS VII. and VIII.,	316
SECTION IX.—Doctrine of the Church as the Communion of the Saved, .	321
NOTES TO SECTION IX.,	329
SECTION X.—The Worship of the Church,	330
NOTES TO SECTION X.,	338
SECTION XI.—Constitution of the Church,	340
NOTES TO SECTION XI.,	361
SECTION XII.—Doctrine of the Sacraments,	369
NOTES TO SECTION XII.,	391

CHAPTER IX.

THE EVENTS OF THE LAST YEARS OF WICLIF'S LIFE, 1378-1384.		PAGE
SECTION I.—The Papal Schism and its Effect upon Wiclif,	400	400
NOTES TO SECTION I.,	404	404
SECTION II.—Wiclif's Attack upon the Doctrine of Transubstantiation,	406	406
NOTES TO SECTION II.,	408	408
SECTION III.—The Peasants' Revolt in 1381,	410	410
NOTES TO SECTION III.,	416	416
SECTION IV.—Preparations for Persecution on the part both of the Church and the State,	417	417
NOTES TO SECTION IV.,	426	426
SECTION V.—The Wiclif Party intimidated by the Measures of the Archbishop,—Hereford, Repington, Aston, Bedeman,	428	428
NOTES TO SECTION V.,	440	440
SECTION VI.—The Cautious Proceedings of the Hierarchy against Wiclif Himself,	442	442
NOTES TO SECTION VI.,	446	446
SECTION VII.—The last Two Years of Wiclif's Life, and his Death,	447	447
NOTES TO SECTION VII.,	461	461
SECTION VIII.—Character of Wiclif and his important Place in History,	465	465
NOTES TO SECTION VIII.,	479	479
ADDITIONAL NOTE BY TRANSLATOR,	480	480

APPENDIX.

I.—"THE LAST AGE OF THE CHURCH,"	485
II.—WICLIF'S WRITINGS,	486
NOTE ON THE VIENNA MSS. OF WORKS OF WICLIF,	503
III.—WICLIF, DE ECCLESIA, c. 16,	506
IV.—FORMA JURAMENTI ARNALDI PAPE THEZAUARIJ,	507
V.—SERMON ON LUKE VIII 4-15,	511
VI.—EPISTOLA MISSA AD SIMPLICES SACERDOTES,	521
VII.—DE SEX JUGIS,	522
VIII.—A SECTION OF WICLIF'S BOOK "DE VERITATE SACRÆ SCRIPTURÆ," c. 14,	535
IX.—METRICA COMPILATIO DE REPLICATIONIBUS CONTRA MAGISTRUM JOHANNEM,	549
X.—LITERA MISSA PAPÆ URBANO SEXTO,	550

INTRODUCTION.

THERE now lies between the commencement of the Reformation and our own day an interval of 360 years, a period of time considerable enough to allow of our taking a tolerably free and comprehensive survey. We are thus placed in a position to embrace in one view the whole effects of the Reformation, in so far as these have as yet developed themselves; and it has also become possible for us to attain a right understanding of the conditions under which the movement took its rise, and of the manner in which its way was prepared in the preceding centuries.

Our power of insight, indeed, in this matter as in others, must have its limits. Beyond all doubt, a later time will here also command a wider horizon and gain deeper reaches of insight. For what the poet says of the past is not true of it in every respect—

“Still stands the past for evermore.”

On the contrary, the image of the past is for ever shifting and changing with the conditions of the present in which it is reflected. “The living man, too, has his right:” he has a right to the inheritance of the generations which have gone before him; he has also the right to put the history of the past in relations to the present—to study it in connection with the events and the needs and the questions of his own time—and thereby to arrive at the true vision and understanding of it for himself. Only our own experience can give us the interpretation of history. As a general truth, the actual knowledge which we are able to acquire is commensurate with our experience, and the more thorough and comprehensive the experience which any man has acquired, so much the deeper and more correct is the understanding of the past which he is in a condition to attain.

On this ground the period of more than three centuries and a half which has elapsed since the commencement of the Reformation, both enables and calls us, in a much higher degree than the generations which have preceded us, to

attain to a thorough understanding of its preliminary history, or the long series of events and transactions by which its advent was prepared. A beginning of such studies, indeed, was made as early as the sixteenth century; and even while the Reformation itself was still in progress, there were historical inquirers who cast back their eyes to men and religious brotherhoods of the past who appeared to bear some resemblance to the Reformers and Reformed Churches of their own generation. These excursions into comparative pre-Reformation history were of course of very different kinds, and issued in the most opposite results, according as they were undertaken by friends or foes of the Reformation itself.

When Luther received from the Utraquists of Bohemia one of Huss's writings, and studied it, he was lost in astonishment, for all at once the light dawned upon him that he and Stautpitz and all the rest had been Hussites all this while, without being aware of the fact.¹ A few years later, he became acquainted with the writings of John Wessel, which filled him with sincere admiration of the man, and with a wondering joy; so much so that he felt himself strengthened as Elijah was when it was revealed to him that he was not left alone, for there were 7,000 men still living who had not bowed their knees to Baal. "If I had read Wessel before now my enemies might have thought that Luther had taken all his ideas from Wessel, so much are we of one mind."² At a later date the Reformer gave his judgment on the subject in a quieter tone, but not more correctly, when he remarked that "Wiclif and Huss had attacked the life of the Church under the Papacy, whereas he fought not so much against the life as the doctrine."³ Still he sees in these men his fellow-combatants of an earlier time, and men of kindred spirit and principles to his own. When Luther, in 1522, wrote an Anthology from John Wessel, and in 1523 prefixed an appreciative preface to Savonarola's commentaries on the 31st and 37th Psalms; and when again, in 1525, the *Triologus* of Wiclif was published in Basel, the meaning of all these incidents was to justify the Reformers of the sixteenth century by the testimony of men of earlier ages who had fought the same battle.

The case is altered, of course, when writers opposed to the Reformation direct their inquiries to the same class of facts, the results at which they arrive being always unfavourable to the Reformers. In comparing the latter with their precursors of earlier times, their uniform aim is to throw them and their doctrines into shadow, either by

identifying Luther's principles with those of earlier heretics, so as to place them under a like condemnation, or by attempting to prove that Luther was even worse than his precursors of like spirit. The former was what was aimed at, when the Theological Faculty of Paris, in 1523, decided that the great work against Wiclif, of the English Carmelite, Thomas of Walden († 1431), *The Antiquities of the Catholic Faith*, was worthy to be printed and published, "because the same is of great use for the refutation of the destructive Lutheran errors;" for herein the Parisian doctors declared the doctrines of the Reformers to be essentially the same as those of Wiclif and the Lollards. John Faber, on the other hand, the South German polemic, who died Bishop of Vienna in 1541, drew a comparison in a controversial work of 1528, between Luther on the one hand, and John Huss and the Bohemian Brethren and John Wessel on the other, in which he reached the conclusion that the latter are all more Christian and less offensive than Luther. He even goes so far at the close of his treatise as to say that if it were possible for all the heretics who lived in the Apostles' days and afterwards, to rise from the dead and to come together face to face with Luther in a general council or otherwise, they would no doubt damn him as a godless arch-heretic, and refuse to have any fellowship with him; so unheard-of, dreadful, and abominable is the false doctrine which Luther has put forward.⁴

These first attempts to bring into view the historical parallels of earlier times, whether proceeding from the Reformers or their adversaries, were all of a partial and incomplete kind, and possessed no value beyond that of occasional pieces. A more comprehensive treatment of the Reformers before the Reformation, their doctrines and their fortunes—a treatment under which the different individualities were exhibited in the light of their unity of principle and spirit—became possible only after the work of the Reformation had, in some measure at least, been brought to a close, and admitted of being taken into one view as a completed work. And this point was not reached till the middle of the sixteenth century.

From that date important works of such a character began to appear on the evangelical side. On the side of Rome only one work has a claim to be mentioned in this connection, viz., the *Collection of Documents, Controversial Tracts, and the like, relating to Pre-Reformation Persons and Parties*, published by Ortuin Gratius of Cologne in 1535, in prospect of the general council which had then been announced. He

was himself one of the Cologne "*Obscuri Viri*," but was favourable to Church Reform in the Catholic sense; and it was with this view that he selected and published these pieces in the well known *Fasciculus*.⁵

The corresponding works on the evangelical side divide themselves into two groups, according to the point of view under which they range the particular facts which they embrace. The first group—and this is by far the most numerous—views its subject as a history of persecution, or of evangelical martyrs. The second group handles the personalities whom it introduces as witnesses of the truth, who in earlier times opposed themselves to the Papacy and its "superstition." The first group may be correctly described as more or less belonging to the sphere of the history of the Church, and the second as belonging to the history of doctrine.

The most important, and indeed almost the only representative of the latter group, is Matthias Flacius of Illyricum, properly called Matthias Vlatzich Frankowitsch. This greatest of the historians belonging to the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century, the founder of *The Magdeburg Centuries*, published in 1556 his *Catalogue of Witnesses to the Truth who opposed themselves to the Pope before our age*, as a work preliminary to the *Centuries*, which appeared in repeated editions, and continued to receive considerable enrichments even in the seventeenth century.⁶

The lead of the first group is taken by an Englishman, the venerable John Foxe. The experiences of his own life and of the church of his native country were what suggested to him the plan of a church history, arranged under the leading idea of persecution directed against the friends of evangelical truth. During the bloody persecutions which took place under Queen Mary, many faithful men fled to the Continent and found an asylum in the Rhine-lands and Switzerland,—e.g., in Frankfort and Strasburg, in Basel, Zurich, Geneva, and elsewhere. Among others John Foxe repaired to Strasburg, and here appeared in 1554 the first edition of the first book of his *History of the Church and its Chief Persecutions in all Europe from the times of Wiclif down to the Present Age*, a work which he had proceeded with thus far before he left England, and which he dedicated to Duke Christopher of Württemberg.⁷ He commenced the history with Wiclif, partly, no doubt, from patriotic feeling, but partly also because he regarded the measures adopted against Wiclif as the beginning of the storm of persecution which had continued to rage in England, Bohemia, and Scotland down to his own day. Nor must we omit to mention

here that at the end of the sixteenth century and in the first half of the seventeenth, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* was a favourite family book in many godly English households. Ladies were wont to read it aloud to their children, and to their maidens while at work; and boys as soon as they could read took to the much-loved book.⁸ It helped in no small degree to steel the Protestant character of the English people in the seventeenth century.

Foxe's work gave the key-note, and became a model for many similar works in the German, French, and Bohemian tongues; and in most cases these writings, under the title of *Martyrologies*, did not confine themselves, any more than Foxe had done, to the domestic persecutions of the countries of their several authors, but included Germany, France, and England, and went back also to the centuries which preceded the Reformation. When a new edition of Foxe was in preparation in 1632, the Bohemian exiles then living in the Netherlands were requested to draw up an account of the persecutions which had fallen upon their native church, with the view of its being incorporated with the English *Book of Martyrs*. But the new edition was finished at press before the narrative could be got ready, and the Bohemian work remained in manuscript till it appeared in 1648 in Amsterdam or Leyden, under the title, *Historia Persecutionum Ecclesiæ Bohemicæ*, which was subsequently translated into German and Bohemian.

During the polemical period which reached from the last quarter of the sixteenth down towards the close of the seventeenth century, all that was done in the field of pre-Reformation history and research was deeply tinged with a controversial character—a remark which applies equally to Germany, France, and England. The first Bodley librarian at Oxford, Thomas James, was an instance in point. This indefatigable scholar, one of the most learned and acute controversialists against Rome, published in 1608 *An Apology for John Wyclif*.⁹ It was written with a polemical view—but at that date it needed a learned and historical interest to be uppermost in the mind even of a polemical writer to induce him to take up the subject of a precursor of the Reformation. Most men were so completely engrossed by the controversies of their own time, that they had neither inclination nor leisure to make excursions into the history of the past.

It was not till the storm-waves of controversial excitement subsided that the early Reformers began to awaken a purer and more unprejudiced historical interest. From that time, about the beginning of the last century, two facts

meet the eye of the observer. On the one hand, writers occupied themselves with the lives and labours of single men of pre-Reformation times, and generally in the way of collecting and publishing materials which might serve the purpose of making our knowledge of them more assured and complete; while, on the other hand, other writers put forth reflections upon the different ways and means in and by which the pre-Reformation movement had been carried on as a whole.

The first of these functions was undertaken by men such as the industrious collector, John Lewis, a clergyman of the Church of England, who published in 1720 the earliest regular biography of Wiclif,¹⁰ a work full of material, which he had brought together from public archives and manuscript sources. His subsequent monograph on Bishop Pecock was designed to be a sequel to the biography of Wiclif, and had the same general character.¹¹ Both works leave much to be desired in point of literary execution; but for their wealth of original documents they are still of no little value.

Among German scholars, the man who rendered the most meritorious services in the collection and publication of pre-Reformation documents was Professor Hermann von der Hardt of Helmstädt. His vast and masterly collection of monuments, in illustration of the history of the Council of Constance,¹² had for its chief object to establish by documentary proof the necessity of Reformation which existed at the time of that reforming council.¹³ The excellent example set by Von der Hardt served as a spur to others, and stimulated, in particular, the younger Walch, to publish his *Monuments of the Middle Age*, which began to appear in Göttingen in 1757.¹⁴ The work consists entirely of documents relating to church reform, and all belonging to the fifteenth century, being in part speeches which were delivered in the Council of Constance, and partly treatises and tracts of John of Goch, John of Wesel, and others.

On the other hand, we find that since the commencement of the eighteenth century, works began to appear conceived in a purely historical and unprejudiced spirit, containing studies or reflections on the Reformation movements viewed together as a whole; on the various means and ways which were made choice of to promote them; and on the different groups of the Reformers. Walch calls attention in one place to the fact, that there are two classes of witnesses to the truth, those who complained of the vices of the clergy of all degrees, and those who complained of the errors of the teachers. It is well known that the number of writers belonging to the

second class is a small one; but all the more highly must the few works be valued in which Roman doctrines were confuted. Among writings of this category Walch rightly reckons John of Goch's tractate on errors in reference to the Evangelical law.¹⁵

This distinction among the Reformers was not new; it rests, at all events, upon the saying of Luther before mentioned, that Wiclif and Huss mainly attacked the life of the Popish Church, while he, on the contrary, attacked chiefly its doctrine. But, though not new, this reflection, taken along with others of a similar kind occurring in other writers of that period, indicates a mode of regarding the subject far removed from the bitterness of polemical feeling, and discovering a certain elevation and freedom of historical view.

In the second and third decades of the present century, when Protestant writers applied themselves to the production of historical monographs with so much interest, and in such a masterly style both of research and composition, it is at first sight surprising that no one, for a long time, took for a subject of portraiture any of the Reformation figures of the middle age. Chrysostom and Tertullian, Bernard of Clairvaux, and even Gregory VII. and Innocent III., all found at that time enthusiastic biographers; but no one had an eye for Huss, for John of Wesel, and least of all, for Wiclif. This is explained in some measure by the circumstance, that the historical branch of theology had to take a share in the general aim of those years, and was called upon, before every thing else, to contribute to the regeneration of Christian feeling, and the new upbuilding of the kingdom of God, after a long period of negation and deadness. This situation determined the choice which was made of subjects for fresh historical portraiture. Both writers and readers felt an inferior degree of sympathy for men in whom the critical spirit had prevailed, and who had taken up a position of antagonism to the Church-institutions and teaching of their age; and, perhaps, too, both writers and readers were less capable of understanding them.

It was not till the commencement of the second quarter of our century that due attention began again to be directed to "the Reformers before the Reformation;" and as, once before, in the middle age itself, England was the country where the first important precursor of the Reformation arose, so also, in our century, England led the way in recalling the memory of her own great son by the appliances of historical science, and thereby setting an example which other countries followed. Dr. Robert Vaughan published, in 1820, his *Life*

of *Wiclif*, a work founded upon a laborious study of the manuscript writings of Wiclif, especially of his English sermons and tracts.¹⁶ The way was now opened up, and other explorers soon followed, partly at first under the influence of national and provincial interest; for the first writers, so far as I can find, who followed Vaughan's example, as early as 1829 and 1830, were Netherlands, who chose for their subject the history of their countrymen, Gerhard Groot and the Brethren of the Common Life.¹⁷

But now German historical research appeared upon the field, and without confining itself to its own nationality, devoted to the precursors of the Reformation a series of investigations which were equally conspicuous for thoroughness and success. First in time, and most distinguished in merit as a labourer in the field was Carl Ullmann, with his monograph on John Wessel, which appeared in 1834, a work which he expanded so much in the second edition by the addition of accounts of John of Goch, John of Wesel, the German Mystics, and the Brethren of the Common Life, that he could give to the whole the title of *Reformers before the Reformation*.¹⁸ The first edition of Ullmann's work was speedily followed by two works on Savonarola, by German scholars, Rudelbach and Meier.¹⁹ And here I may be allowed to add the remark, that in 1860 a third work on Savonarola was published by an Italian, Pasquale Villari, a Roman Catholic, which discovers able research, earnest feeling, and deep veneration for his great and noble countryman. And this instance of an improved manner of treating such subjects, on the side of the Roman Catholic Church, does not stand alone. It is a gratifying fact, which we are here very happy to acknowledge, that much has been done in our own time by writers of that church, to put the Reformation efforts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in their due light. As instances, we may mention the work on the *Reforming Councils*, by Herr von Wessenberg,²⁰ and the monograph of Dr. Schwab of Würzburg, on John Gerson, a work of solid merit.²¹ It cannot of course astonish any one that there should be other writers of that church who still handle those men of Reform with undisguised aversion, as has been done, especially in the case of John Huss.²²

Returning to Protestant Church historians, the example of Ullmann has stimulated many to similar researches in the same field. On the subject in particular of the German mystics of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, the labour of investigation during the last thirty years has been so widely extended, that in order not to lose ourselves

in a useless enumeration of names and writings, we must content ourselves with mentioning one man instead of many, namely, Charles Schmidt, of Strasburg.²³ Nor would it be just to pass over here in silence the services of Dr. Paláček of Prague, in elucidating the history, not only of Huss, but his precursors and successors. Not only as a historian, but also as a collector and editor of original documents of history, Paláček has undeniable merits.²⁴ His collection of documents for the history of John Huss, in point of completeness, criticism, and orderly arrangement, is a veritable model.²⁵

It is a fact which applies generally to the third quarter of our century, that the labours of research among the original sources of history, have been such as to issue in the discovery and publication of a multitude of hitherto concealed or scarcely accessible original documents, and in the re-issue of several others which were known before, in a more critical and trustworthy form. To these belong, for example, the writings of Eckart, the speculative mystic, edited by Franz Pfeiffer, the edition of the works of John Staupitz, commenced by Knaake, and the publication of the collected Bohemian sermons and tracts of Huss, by Karl Jaroniér Erben.²⁶

In addition, Constantin Hofler, in Prague, has published a series of *The Historians of the Hussite Movement in Bohemia*.²⁷ Nor has England remained behind. Her most important achievement on this field, and the fruit of the industry and critical labour of many years, is the complete critical edition of the Wycliffite versions of the Bible, edited by the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederick Madden.²⁸ Among the numerous chronicles and documents bearing upon the mediæval history of England, which for a series of years back have been published at the cost of the State, some of them never before in print, and others in improved critical editions, there are found many writings in the department of ecclesiastical history, and especially such as have a bearing upon pre-Reformation subjects.

To mention only some of these, the *Political Poems*, edited by Thomas Wright, contain a whole series of polemical and satirical poems, which appeared for and against the Wiclif movement in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²⁹ Further, of important interest for our object, is the correspondence of Grossetête, the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln, edited by the Rev. H. R. Luard, of Cambridge.³⁰ A highly rich and acceptable new source for the history of Wiclif and his followers, has been opened up in the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*

Magistri Johannis Wyclif, collected without doubt by the controversialist, Thomas Netter, of Walden, and published for the first time in 1858, by Professor Walter Waddington Shirley, of Oxford, with an Introduction and Notes full of very valuable matter. At Shirley's suggestion, recommended on the strongest grounds, the curators of the Clarendon and University Press resolved to publish a selection of Wiclif's works. Of this collection first appeared the *Triologus*, with a text critically amended from four Vienna MSS. of the work; and next followed Wiclif's English sermons, and a large number of his short English tracts, edited by the Rev. Thomas Arnold, of Oxford.³²

Thus much has been done since the middle of the present century to elucidate Reformation history, partly by the opening up of new historical sources and the publication of original documents, and partly by the monographic elucidation of single parts of the subject. We venture to come forward as a fellow-labourer in the same field, in undertaking to set forth anew the life and teaching of Wiclif, according to the original sources. John Wiclif appears to us to be the centre of the whole pre-Reformation history. In him meet a multitude of converging lines from the centuries which preceded him; and from him again go forth manifold influences, like wave pulses, which spread themselves widely on every side, and with a force so persistent that we are able to follow the traces of their presence to a later date than the commencement of the German Reformation. Such a man deserves to have a historical portraiture which shall aim to do justice to the greatness of his personality, and to the epochal importance of his work.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION.

1. Compare letter to Spalatin (Feb. 1520), in Luther's Letters, by De Wette. Berlin, 1826. I., No. 208, 425. Comp. No. 162. Letter to Staupitz, 3 Oct. 1519, p. 341.

2. Luther's Opera. Walch. Ed. XIV., 220 f. In the preface to one of the earliest editions of Wessel's *Farrago Rerum Theologicarum*, Basel, 1522, Melancthon speaks of Wessel in the same way; he mentions him at considerable length in his *Postila*, in the following terms, among others:—"*De plerisque capitibus religionis evangelicæ sensu idem quod a nobis nunc traditur, postquam nostra aetate repurgatio ecclesiæ facta est.*"

3. Luther's Table Talk. Edited by Foerstemann. 1845. II., 441 f.; IV., 391.

4. This rare tract has the title:—"Wie sich Johannis Huss, der Pickarder, und Johannis von Wessalia Leren und Bücher mit Martino Luther vergleichen. Beschrieben durch Doctor Johann Fabri." Preface dated "Prag in Behem. 1 Sep. 1528." Under the name "Pickhards," the author no doubt refers to the Waldenses; but, in fact, he treats in this part of his tract, without knowing it, of the Bohemian brethren, for he founds his remarks upon the Confession presented by the latter to King Wladislaus.

5. *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum ac fugiendarum*. Colon, 1535, fol. It was not difficult for the English theologian, Edward Brown, to revise, with additions, this collection in the interests of Protestantism. London, 1690, fol. In 2 vols.

6. *Catalogus testium veritatis qui ante nostram aetatem reclamarunt Papae*. Basel, 1556, 8vo. 1562, fol. Geneva, 1608, fol. Frankf., 1666, 4to., with a supplement, printed in Cassel, in 1667.

7. "Commentarii rerum in Ecclesia gestarum, maximarumque per totam Europam persecutionum a Wiclivi temporibus ad hanc usque aetatem descriptio. Liber I. Autore, Joanne Foxo, Anglo. Argentorati. MDLIV." Small 8vo, 221 pp. The second Latin edition, considerably enlarged, appeared at Basel, in folio, in 1559. After his return to England Foxe published his work in English in 1563; and, after his death, in 1587, a second English edition came out in 1610. But the completest edition was that of 1684, in three large folios, with the title, *Acts and Monuments of Martyrs*. Several editions have also appeared in our own time, the best being that edited with copious and valuable notes, by Rev. Josiah Pratt, M.A., and a "Life and Defence of the Martyrologist," by Rev. George Townsend, D.D.

8. *E. g. Nicolaus Ferrar. Vide Mayor's Nicholas Ferrar. Two Lives*. Camb. 1858.

9. An Apology for John Wickliffe, showing his conformity with the now Church of England. Collected chiefly out of diverse works of his in written hand, by God's especial providence remaining in the Publike Library at Oxford, of the Honorable Foundation of Sir Thomas Bodley, Knight. Oxford, 1608, 4to.

10. The History of the Life and Sufferings of the Rev. and Learned John Wiclif, D.D. London, 1720. New Ed., Oxford, 1820.

11. The Life of the Learned and Right Rev. Reynold Pecock, faithfully collected from records and MSS. London, 1725 and 1742. New Ed., Oxford, 1820.

12. *Rerum Concilii Constantiensis*. Tomi I.-VI. Fol. 1696-1700.

13. *Monimenta Medii aevi*. Vol. I., fasc. 1-4 (1757-1760). Vol. II., fasc. 1-2 (1761-1764).

14. *Monimenta Medii aevi*. Vol. I., fasc. 4. *Præfatio*, p. xxxiv.

15. *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D.*, illustrated principally from his unpublished Manuscripts. 2 vols. London, 1828. The second improved edition appeared in 1831, and in 1853, Vaughan published a new work in one volume, entitled, "John de Wycliffe: A Monograph." London, 1853. The merits of Vaughan's labours on Wiclif consist of two things—(1.) In the copious information touching Wiclif obtained from manuscript sources. Vaughan was, in particular, the first who communicated a fuller knowledge of Wiclif's English sermons. (2.) In a certain degree of chronological order, which he introduced into the series of Wiclif's writings—a circumstance of much importance, because thereby it became possible to follow, in some degree, the gradual progress of the reformer's opinions, and a comparison of the dates of his numerous writings served to exhibit his character for consistency and firmness in a more honourable light. The chief defects of Vaughan's work were that he manifested less interest in the speculative and strictly theological element of Wiclif's writings than in their practical and religious element, and that he left almost entirely out of consideration his Latin works, being of opinion that they were scholastic treatises of comparatively little worth. But, notwithstanding these defects, Vaughan's work must always take a foremost place as the basis of all accurate knowledge of Wiclif, and it has, in fact, been drawn upon by many later writers—e. g., in England, by Le Bas, in his "Life of Wyclif," 1853; in the Netherlands, by De Ruever-Gronemann, *Diatribe in Johannis Wicliffe Vitam, Ingenium, Scripta*. Utrecht, 1837; in Germany, by Engelhard, "Wycliffe, als Prediger, Erlangen," 1834; by Neander and Gieseler, in their histories of the Church; and, further, in my Essay on Wiclif and the Lollards, *Zeitschrift für Histor-Theologie*, 1853. Boehrer in his "Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen," II. 4, 1856, has chiefly made use of the latter work of Vaughan—the Monograph.

16. So the two Clarisse—first the son and then the father—in two papers in the "Archives of Church History," edited by Kist and Royaards, *Over den Geest en de Denkwijze Van Geert Groot*, 1829. Also, *Delprat Verhandelng over de Broederschap van G. Groot*. Utrecht. 1830.

17. Johann Wessel, ein Vorgänger Lutheri. Gotha. 1834. The second edition, in two volumes, appeared in 1841, under the title, "Reformatoren vor der Reformation, vornämlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden." English translation by Rev. Robert Menzies. Clark, Edinburgh, 1855.

18. Rudelbach Hieronymus Savonarola und Seine Zeit, 1835. Fredr. Karl Meier Girolamo Savonarola aus zum grossen Theile Handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt. 1836.

19. Pasquali Villari. Geschichte Girolamo Savonarola's und seiner Zeit. Nach neuen Quellen dargestellt. In two volumes. The original appeared in 1860 and 1861. We use the translation of Berdushek. Leipzig, 1868.

20. "Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen der fünfzehnten und sechszenten Jahrhunderts, in Beziehung auf Kirchenbesserung geschichtlich und kritisch dargestellt. 4 Bände, Constanz. 1840.

21. Johannes Gerson. Eine Monographie. Würzburg, 1858.

22. Von Helfert, Hus und Hieronymus, 1858. Hoesler, Magister Johannes Hus. Prag., 1864.

23. Johann Tauler von Strassburg. Hamburg, 1841. Nicolaus von Basel. Wien, 1866.

24. Geschichte von Böhmen. 5 Theile. Prag., 1836–1867.

25. *Documenta Joannis Hus vitam doctrinam—illustrantia*. Prag., 1860.

26. Published in Prague in three volumes, 1865–8.

27. Published in Vienna, 1856, in three volumes, as parts of the "Fontes rerum Austriacarum. I. Division." Vol. 2.

28. The Wycliffite versions of the Holy Bible. 4 vols. 4to. Oxford, 1850.

29. Political Poems and Songs relating to English History. Composed during the period from the accession of Edward III. to that of Richard III. Edited by Thomas Wright. London, 1859. 2 vols.

30. *Roberti Grosseteste Episcopi quondam Lincolnensis Epistole*. Edited by Henry Richard Luard. London, 1861.

31. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico*. Ascribed to Thomas Netter of Walden. Edited by the Rev. Walter Waddington Shirley, M.A. London, 1858.

32. *Joannis Wiclif Trialogus cum [Supplemento Trialogi*. Edidit Gotthardus Lechler. Oxonii, 1869. *Select English Works of John Wiclif*. Edited by Thomas Arnold, M.A., Oxford. Vol. I. 1869. Sermons on the Gospels for Sundays and Festivals. Vol. II. 1871. Sermons on the Ferial Gospels and Sunday Epistles. Treatises. Vol. III. 1871. Miscellaneous works.

CHAPTER I.

ENGLISH PRECURSORS OF WICLIF.

SECTION I.—*Mixture and Consolidation of Races in the English People.*

IT is impossible to take a rapid survey of the course of English history during the middle ages, without being struck with the observation how many foreign elements mingled with it in ever varying succession, and how violent were the collisions and deep-reaching the contests which sprang from this cause.

We leave out of view, of course, the Romans who had quitted the soil of Britain before the close of ancient history, and had left the country to itself. In the middle of the fifth century, the Angles, Jutes, and Saxons, all sea-going tribes of lower Germany, effected a conquest of the land, and drove back the Celtic inhabitants to its western borders. That was an immigration of pure German races. Five centuries later the predatory and devastating expeditions of the Danes broke over the country. That was the Scandinavian invasion, which took the form in the end of a personal union between England and Denmark. But when, after two more centuries, the long-settled Saxon population stirred itself again and bestowed the crown upon one of its own race, Duke William of Normandy intervened with a strong hand; and with "The Conquest" the Franco-Norman nationality gained the ascendancy in England; and it was not till two more centuries had passed away that the Saxon element worked itself up again into prominence and power.

What a piebald mixture of peoples! What changes of fortune among the different nationalities! And yet the result of all was not a mere medley of peoples, without colour and character, but on the contrary, a nation and a national character of remarkable vigour, and extremely well defined. For the numerous collisions and hard conflicts which occurred among the different races served only to strengthen and steel the kernel of the Saxon element of the population. This effect can be clearly seen and measured in the language

and literature of the country, which are the first things upon which every people stamps its own impress.

It is a fact that after the first and earliest efflorescence of the Anglo-Saxon language, in the age immediately succeeding the conversion of the people to Christianity, a second took place in the days of Alfred the Great¹—not without a deep connection with the elastic reaction of the Saxon nationality against Danish despotism. And it is a circumstance of the same kind that the new Anglo-Saxon dialect developed itself from about the year 1100,—a fact which was unquestionably owing to the Conquest which had taken place not long before, and an indication that the old Saxon stock was once more gathering up its strength in reaction against the new Norman-French element. On the other hand, the first development of the language which is called “English,” in distinction from Anglo-Saxon—old English, we mean²—belongs to the period in which a fusion began to take place between the Norman families and the Saxon stock, and that in the direction of an approximation of the Norman nobility to the Saxons—not the converse. The former ceased to feel as Frenchmen, and learned to think and speak as Englishmen.

We shall soon have an opportunity of convincing ourselves what an important share the religious interest had in producing this change. Meanwhile so much as this is clear, that the introduction of the Norman-French element, like the Danish invasion of an earlier time, did not in the least hinder, but on the contrary gave a stimulus to, the development of a compact and independent Saxon nationality. It was in conflict with foreign elements and their usurped power that the Saxon nation first of all maintained its own individuality, and next developed itself into the English people.

When we turn our attention to the faith of the nation and the religious side of their life, the antagonisms and the successive changes which they present to view are scarcely less abrupt. The British inhabitants of the country had received the Gospel during the Roman occupation, but apparently not from Rome, but rather, in the first instance, from the shores of the Levant. When the Roman domination of the island came to an end, the Britons had already for the most part been converted to Christianity. On the other hand, the Saxons and Angles, the Frisians and Jutes, when they established themselves in the country, were entirely ignorant of the Gospel. They brought with them the old German Paganism, they drove back the British population

and Christianity along with it, and they stamped again upon the land, as far as they might, a heathen impress.

Then arrived, at the end of the sixth century, at the instance of Gregory the Great, a completely organised Christian mission; and within the comparatively brief period of less than a hundred years this mission accomplished the result of carrying over to Christianity the whole of the related kingdoms of the Saxon heptarchy. And now the old inhabitants of Celto-British descent and the Saxons (as the Britons called the others) might have joined hands as Christians, had it not been for an obstacle which could not be taken out of the way.

The social and liturgical form in which Christianity was planted among the Saxons in England was essentially different from the ecclesiastical order and usage of the old British Christians. Among the latter, to say nothing of smaller liturgical differences, the ecclesiastical centre of gravity was in the monasteries, not in the episcopate, in addition to which they were under no subjection to the Bishops of Rome—their church life was entirely autonomous and national. The missionaries to the Saxons had been sent forth from Rome, and the Anglo-Saxon Church was, so to speak, a Roman colony; its whole church order received, as was to be expected, the impress of the Church of the West, and in particular the government of the church was placed in the hands of the Bishops, who in their turn were dependent upon the See of Rome. The difference, or rather the opposition, was felt on both sides vividly enough, and led to severe collisions—to a struggle for victory, the prize of which on the one side was the exclusive domination of the Roman Church, on the other, if not the dominancy, at least the continued existence of the old British ecclesiastical constitution. On which side lay the better hope of victory it is not difficult to estimate. A like contest repeated itself somewhat later upon the German soil, where a missionary who went forth from the young Anglo-Saxon Church opened fight against the church which had been planted among the Germans in part by old British missionaries, and at last bound the German Church so closely and tightly to Rome, that it too was converted by Boniface very much into a Roman colony.

It would be an error, nevertheless, to believe that Rome obtained in England an absolute victory, or that the old British Church, with its peculiar independent character, disappeared without a trace in the Romish Anglo-Saxon Church.³ It is nearer the truth to say, that the British Church made

its influence felt in the Anglo-Saxon, at least in single provinces, especially in the north of England; and perhaps it was not without the operation of this influence that a certain spirit of church autonomy developed itself at an early period among the Anglo-Saxon people. It was not long after this development began to manifest itself, when the Danes invaded the country. They transplanted into England the heathenism of Scandinavia. The threatening danger woke up the Saxon elasticity to a vigorous resistance. The wars of freedom under King Alfred were animated by a Christian inspiration, and by the feeling that not only the existence of the nation, but also of the Church of Christ in the land was at stake.

But what a new spirit prevailed in church affairs after the Norman Conquest! It was a genuine adventure of the Norman type—an enterprise of bold, romantic daring, when Duke William, with a show of right, and availing himself of favouring circumstances, seized upon the English crown. But he took the step not without the previous knowledge and approval of the Pope. Alexander II. sent him, for use in the enterprise, a consecrated banner of St. Peter. The Duke was to carry it on board his own ship. With the conquest of England by the Normans, Rome hoped to make a conquest for herself, and not without reason. In the noble families of Normandy, the knightly lust of battle and conquest was most intimately blended with knightly devotion to the Church and the Pope. In point of fact, from the moment of the conquest, the bond between Rome and the English Church was drawn incomparably closer than it had ever been under the Saxon dynasty.

The clergy, partly of Norman-French, partly of pure Roman descent, to whom the English sees were now transferred, could have no national sympathies with Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Strangers, they passed into the midst of a strange church. It was natural that they should take up the position of abstract ecclesiastical right. Recall the instance of Lanfranc, a born Italian, who, in 1070, four years after the battle of Hastings, from being Prior of Bec, was promoted to be Archbishop of Canterbury. At the same date a Norman became Archbishop of York. As a general rule, the highest dignities of the English Church fell to Normans, and these priests of the Continent were all supporters of the new hierarchical movement, which began in the middle of the same century—of those ideas touching the supremacy of the Pope above the Church, and of the Church above the State, of which Hildebrand himself had been the deliberate

and most emphatic champion. William the Conqueror, indeed, was not the man to suffer in silence any encroachments of the Pope upon the rights of his crown, to say nothing of the pretensions of any ecclesiastical dignitary in his own kingdom. A serious discord, which took place between the crown and the Primate, now Anselm of Canterbury, arising out of the investiture controversy, was only composed by the prudent concessions of Paschal II. to Henry I. in 1106.

All the more formidable was the conflict between the royal and ecclesiastical powers under Henry II., exactly a hundred years after the conquest. The quarrel in the main concerned the limits of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions—the right of exemption, *e.g.*, from the jurisdiction of the municipal courts, which was claimed for the clergy by the Archbishop Thomas à Becket; and it may suffice to remind the reader in passing how in the end the Archbishop was assassinated (1170) by several knights, not without the indirect complicity of the king, and how, in consequence of that evil deed, Henry had to bow himself down in most humiliating penance (12th July 1174) at the grave of the now canonised champion of the Church's rights and liberties—a penance far more ignominious even than that of Canossa.⁴ The hierarchy obtained a great victory, as indeed had been in prospect for it ever since the Norman Conquest.

And yet this was not the culminating point to which the power of the Church attained in England. It did not reach that till forty years later. Innocent III. accomplished what Gregory VII. had striven for in the Conqueror's day in vain. King John, son of Henry II., finding himself in the greatest dangers, both from without and within the realm, had had recourse to a desperate step. On the 15th of May 1213, he had surrendered his kingdom, in favour of the apostles Peter and Paul and the Church of Rome, into the hands of Innocent III. and his successors. He received it, indeed, immediately back again from the Pope in fief, but not before taking for himself and his successors in all due form, the oath of fealty to the Pope as his liege lord, and binding himself to pay an annual tribute of 1000 marks sterling, in addition to the usual Peter's pence. Thereby England became literally a portion of the Church-State, the king a vassal of the Pope, and the Pope liege lord and sovereign of England. England entered into and became a member of the Papal state system, which already included Portugal, Arragon, the kingdom of Sicily,

Hungary, Bulgaria, and other States—a relation to the Papacy which was turned to practical account to the utmost of the Church's power, by the levying of imposts from the kingdom, as well as by the accumulation of English church offices and dignities in the hands of Italians.

But from the moment when King John made over to the Papal See a feudal supremacy in England, the moral influence of the Papacy in the country began to stoop towards its overthrow. The English nobility were the first to feel the humiliation most deeply, and complained indignantly to the king that he had brought what he had found a free kingdom into bondage.⁶ Within two years the condition of things for a considerable time was such that the revolted barons held the chief power of the State in their hands. And then it was that *Magna Charta*, the fundamental charter of the nation's liberties, was negotiated between John and his subjects (15th June 1215). In this document, the importance of which was even then universally felt, not a word was said of the liege-lordship of the Pope, although only two years had passed since this relation had been entered into, and no doubt this omission was intentional on the part of the barons.

Still the whole movement which had been called forth in ever-growing force against the despotic rule of the distrusted Prince, was also aimed, in the second instance, against Rome. The King himself, in a letter to Innocent III. (13th September 1215), assures him that the earls and barons of the kingdom publicly alleged as the chief cause of their revolt, his own act of submission to the Pope;⁷ and the Pope, on his side, considered the insurrection as directed in part against himself. An important reaction in the spirit of the Anglican Church, and in its attitude towards the Roman See, could not fail to be produced by the fact, that in that celebrated state-treaty there was a guarantee given for all the liberties and rights of the national church, as well as for all those of all other classes and corporations in the kingdom.⁸ While in the first instance, the great nobles and hierarchy, the lower nobility and the municipalities, all learned to feel their oneness as a nation, and to be sensible of their interests in common, there was no less a development in the ecclesiastical body of a national spirit. The spirit of insular independence began to make itself felt also in the religious sphere.

It had a powerful influence in the same religious direction, that from the beginning of the 13th century the Saxon element of the nation was again steadily coming to

the front, and pressing the Norman element more and more into the background. Already, in 1204, Normandy had fallen to the crown of France. This loss had naturally the effect of first diminishing the immigration from Normandy, and then, in time, of stopping it altogether. On the other hand, the families which had previously immigrated—to say nothing of the decimation which they had suffered in consequence of the political movements under King John and his successor, Henry III.—had in process of time drawn closer in many ways to the Saxon population. The arbitrary oppression which the nobles suffered at the hand of the kings brought up the memory of the earlier rights and privileges of the nobility under the Saxon kings. The barons began to claim the like for themselves, and appealed to them in support of their claim in their struggle with King John. The nobles no longer felt themselves to be Normans, but Englishmen; and all the more so, the more clearly men became conscious how much in questions of freedom and popular right was owing to the support of the lower nobility, and even to the municipalities, especially to the citizens of London.

This consolidation of the nation, in which the Saxon population constituted the kernel, could not remain without influence upon the self-consciousness and the hereditary independent genius of the Anglican Church. A symptom of this appeared in the secret combination of noblemen and priests, which, in 1231, addressed threatening letters to the capitular bodies and the abbacies, demanding of them to refuse payment to the agents of Rome of all imposts in money and kind. Not only so; but things, in fact, went so far that a Romish cleric, who was in possession of an English prelacy, was captured by the conspirators and not set at liberty again till five weeks after the loss of all his goods, while in country districts the full corn lofts of Roman parish priests were plundered and emptied.⁹ In 1240 the cardinal legate Otho himself was menaced most seriously by an insurrection of students in Oxford. Such tumultuous proceedings were of course not suffered by the government. But neither were there wanting lawful measures directed against the Roman usurpations. The nobles, in a letter to Gregory IX., put in a protest in support of their violated rights of church patronage; and even bishops and prelates submitted complaints, sometimes to the papal legates, and sometimes to the Pope himself.

SECTION II.—*Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln.*

OF this state of feeling the most important and venerable representative was indisputably the learned and courageous Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grossetête—a man who was held in exceptionally high admiration by his contemporaries, to whom England in the following centuries also deferred as a high authority, and who was ever regarded by Wiclif in particular (who refers to him on innumerable occasions) with the highest respect. To such a man it is due that we should here present at least in outline a sketch of his character and career.¹⁰

Robert Grossetête (in Latin *Capito*, in English *Greathead*) was one of those rare men who so harmoniously combine mastery in science with mastery in practical life, that they may be termed princes in the domain of mind. As to science, he united in himself the whole knowledge of his age to such an extent that a man so eminent in genius as Roger Bacon, his junior contemporary and grateful friend, said of him that "The Bishop of Lincoln was the only man living who was in possession of all the sciences."¹¹ But, however comprehensive and independent his knowledge was, it would be a great error to think of him as a man who was more than everything else a man of learning. On the contrary, with all his scientific greatness, Grossetête was still predominantly a man of action—a man full of character in the highest sense, a churchman such as few have ever equalled; and, from the day of his elevation to the episcopate, every inch a bishop.

But when I ask myself what was the moving-spring, the innermost kernel of his aims and actions, I am able to name nothing but his godly solicitude and care for souls. When he carries on for years a law-suit with his chapter for the right of episcopal visitation; when he contends for "the freedom of the church," apparently in a hierarchical spirit; when he repels with decision the encroachments of the Pope and his legates; when he brings sharp discipline to bear upon careless and worldly monks and priests, and labours to put a stop to the desecration of charities and churchyards; when he forms and draws out the young Orders of the Franciscans and Dominicans,—in all this he has nothing else in view but the good of souls. That is his last and highest aim, in the pursuit of which the consciousness of his heavy responsibility attends him at every step, while a sincere fear of God imparts such strength to his mind as to give him victory over all the fear of man.

How did Grossetête become the man he was? Let us glance at the course of his outer and inner life. There are at least some original materials from which we can attempt to obtain an answer to this inquiry.¹²

It is an accepted date that Grossetête was born in 1175, or one or two years earlier. For it is certain that at his death, in 1253, he was a man of great age; and when the learned Giraldus Cambrensis recommended him to the Bishop of Hereford, William de Vere, which took place at latest in 1199 (for in this year the bishop just named died), he gave him the title of *Magister*, so that he was already a Master of Arts, and must have been a young man of from twenty to twenty-five years; and this takes us back for his birth to nearly the same date as before. He was a native of Stradbroke, in the county of Suffolk, and according to some chronicles, of humble extraction. The chronicle of Lanercost has a notice, which is credible enough in itself, and significant of his character,¹³ that on one occasion Grossetête replied to an earl, who had expressed some astonishment at his noble bearing and manners, that it was true he was sprung of parents in humble station, but from his earliest years he had made a study of the characters of the best men in the Bible, and that he had formed himself upon their model.

Of his student and travelling years we know little. Only so much is certain that he studied in Oxford. It is less clearly established, but not in itself improbable, that he completed his studies in Paris. Later, as already stated, he was introduced by Giraldus to the Bishop of Hereford as a young man who would be of service to him, not only in his manifold public employment and judicial decisions, but also in the care of his health. In addition to theology, therefore, Grossetête must have prosecuted successfully the study of medicine and canon law. But Bishop de Vere died in 1199, and Grossetête betook himself again to Oxford, where he remained for the next thirty-five years, in the course of which he became Doctor of Theology and *Rector scholarum*. Several of his writings, including his Commentaries on Aristotle and Boethius, besides several theological works, no doubt had their origin in lectures which he delivered in the University. Several church preferments were also conferred upon him, such as a stall in the Cathedral of Lincoln, the Archdeaconry of Leicester, etc. Oxford appears to have continued to be his principal residence down to the year 1235, when he was chosen by the Chapter of Lincoln to be their bishop.

Some years before this he seems to have experienced

something of the nature of a religious awakening. In the end of October 1231 or 1232 he had a dangerous illness. On his sick-bed and during his recovery his heart appears to have been deeply moved. He took counsel with his conscience, particularly on the question whether it was right before God for him to hold several livings at the same time.¹⁴ It was, without doubt, at this time that, by the medium of a pious man whose name has not come down to us, he submitted to the Pope the question whether he could, with a good conscience, retain the parochial charge which he held, along with his sinecure prebends. The answer which was orally communicated to him was thoroughly Roman,—by no means could he retain such a plurality *without a dispensation*. But this was a mode of arrangement which his awakened conscience forbade him to make use of, and without more ado he resigned the whole of the benefices which he possessed, with the sole exception of his stall at Lincoln. We learn this from a letter of the year 1232 to his sister Inetta—a nun.¹⁵ The sister by no means approved of her brother's self-denying step. She feared that by his act of renunciation of income he had reduced himself to penury. But his only feeling was one of relief from a burden on his conscience, and he endeavours to remove her anxiety on that score, and to reconcile her to the resolution to which he had already given effect. The conscientiousness and the concern for his own soul, of which we have here a glimpse, awakened in Grossetête an earnest concern for the cure of souls at large, of which from that time forward he gave ever stronger proofs.

After the death of the Bishop of Lincoln, Hugh of Wells, with whom he was on terms of personal friendship, Grossetête, in the spring of 1235, was advanced to the bishoprick. As Chancellor of the University of Oxford, as Archdeacon of Leicester, and in other positions, he had already been successful in carrying out many measures of a practical kind; and now he was advanced to a post in which his action as an ecclesiastical ruler shone out conspicuously far and wide.

This was in part owing to the importance of this particular see. The diocese of Lincoln was then, and for some centuries afterwards, by far the largest and most populous in the whole of England. More than once in his letters Grossetête refers to its immense extent and numerous inhabitants.¹⁶ It included at that day eight archdeaconries, of which only two may here be mentioned, Oxford and Leicester, the former, because the University was subject to the Bishop of Lincoln

as its ordinary, and the latter, because to the archdeaconry, a century later, Wiclif, as parish priest of Lutterworth, belonged. The Cathedral,¹⁷ built at the commencement of the Norman period, stands, with the older portion of the city, upon a height, while the newer portion of the city descends the hill to the plain watered by the river Witham. None of the English cathedrals has so splendid a site as that of Lincoln; with its three towers it is seen at a distance of fifty miles to the north and thirty to the south, and is considered one of the most beautiful cathedrals in the kingdom.

As soon as he was installed, Grossetête grasped the helm with a firm hand, and took immediate steps for the removal of abuses which had found their way into the diocese. His first act was to address a circular letter to all his archdeacons, in which he instructed them to admonish the parishes of various evil customs which were on the increase, by which Sundays, festivals, or holy names were desecrated. This missive goes right into matters of practical life, and is inspired by a high moral earnestness, by a conscientious solicitude for the good of souls, and by a burning zeal for the House of God.¹⁸ Nor was it only in writing or by intermediaries, but also directly and personally, that the new bishop intervened. In the very first year after his admission to office he commenced a personal visitation of the monasteries of the diocese, which resulted in not fewer than seven abbots and three priors being immediately deprived.

Nor was it Grossetête's intention only to interfere in cases at a distance, and to shut his eyes to disorders which lay nearer home. He took steps to visit and reform the chapter of his own cathedral. But now his troubles began. The chapter, consisting of not fewer than twenty-one canons, took a protest against his proceedings, alleging that the bishop was allowing himself in unexampled encroachments of authority, and was touching their immemorial rights. The chapter had an autonomy of its own, and was subject only to its own dean; only if the dean neglected his duty, or himself appealed to the bishop, had the latter a right to say a single word.¹⁹ In 1239 the matter grew to a quarrel between bishop and chapter. The dispute became known all over the kingdom, and could not be healed either by the Archbishop of Canterbury or by Otho, the Pope's legate. Bishop Robert made a journey in November 1244 to Lyons, where Innocent IV. was then residing. A commissioner of the chapter was already there before him. The Pope's deci-

sion on the main point—the right of visitation—was soon obtained, and was entirely in favour of the bishop, and, this gained, Grossetête lost no time in making use of his right now finally set at rest, although he had still to encounter difficulties in carrying it into effect.

Along with this business he carried forward with zeal his visitation of parishes and cloisters. As the effect of this, several unworthy parish priests were removed, and many priors who had been guilty of acts of violence resigned their offices. Other bishops also were stimulated to do the like by the persistency and emphasis with which Grossetête prosecuted this visitorial work. It even appears as though the estimation and influence of the vigorous bishop rose higher and higher in proportion to the amount of conflict which it cost him to carry through his plans for the well-being of the church. In fact, his episcopal career was an almost unbroken succession of collisions and conflicts. Long before the affair with his own chapter had been brought to a settlement, he became involved in differences with powerful spiritual corporations—with the Abbot of Westminster, and with the convent of Christ Church in Canterbury. Nay, the heroic opposition to wrong which he was compelled from time to time to undertake, rose higher still. In repeated instances, sometimes single-handed, sometimes along with other bishops, he stood forward in resistance to King Henry III. himself; and what for a man in his position, and in view of the spirit of his age, will be seen to amount to a vast deal more—he remained true to his own convictions of duty and to his own resolves, even against the Pope himself, and that Pope a man like Innocent IV. But of this more in the sequel.

In view of this multitude of spiritual conflicts we can easily understand that his opponents accused him of a want of heart and a love of strife. Even at this distance of time, after the lapse of six centuries, upon a superficial consideration of a life so full of contention, one might easily receive the impression that this energetic man was all too fond of strife, if not even a hierarch of haughty and imperious temper. But on a closer inspection the case stands quite otherwise. A careful examination of his correspondence has forced upon me the conviction that in entering into these numerous contentions Grossetête was influenced, not by a violent temperament, but by the dictates of conscience. On one occasion he writes as follows to the Abbot of Leicester:—"You accuse us of iron-heartedness and want of pity. Alas! would that we had an iron heart, steeled against the flatteries of

tempters, a strong heart, proof against the terrors of the wicked, a sharp heart, cutting off sins and hewing in pieces the bad when they oppose themselves."²⁰

From this single utterance we may perceive that what he did could not have been the outflow of mere natural temperament, but must have been the result of principle and conviction. It was in this sense he replied to the dean and chapter of Sarum, who admonished him to live in peace with his own chapter. That peace, he said, was what he aimed at beyond everything else, but the true peace, not the false; for the latter is only a perversion of the true God-appointed order.²¹ But that he was not led by a determination to have everything his own way is plain, from the circumstance that what he laid the whole stress upon in his conflicts was not to have success in them, but to preserve in all of them a good conscience. While he was still Archdeacon of Leicester he had a difference with the Benedictine Convent of Reading—but he was prepared to submit himself unreservedly to the decision of an umpire whom both parties might be able to agree upon.²² And on a later occasion when he had expressed himself at full length against an appointment which Cardinal Otho had desired for a favourite of his, he contented himself with having thus referred the matter to the Cardinal's own conscience, and left it, in quiet, to his own decision.²³ It is his abiding sense of responsibility, and his fear of "Him who is able to destroy body and soul in hell," which moves him in all cases when he is compelled to place himself in opposition to personages of high influence and place.

But does not, at least, the suspicion of hierarchical pride still remain attached to him? The answer to this is, that however little Grossetête was inclined at any time to abate aught of his episcopal right, whether in dealing with his subordinates or his superiors, with the great men of the realm, or with the supreme Head of the Church himself, in every case the episcopal dignity and power was looked upon by him not as an end but a means. The last end to him was the good of souls. To that end, and to that alone, behoved to be subservient both priesthood and patronage, bishopdom and popedom, the Church's liberties and the Church's wealth, each in its own measure and after its own manner. When in his official journeys he gathered around him the parochial clergy of a rural deanery, and preached before them, he had in his thoughts the whole of the congregations of these parish priests, and used to say that "it was his duty to preach the Word of God to all the souls in his diocese; but

it was impossible for him to do so personally, considering the multitude of parish churches and the immense population of the diocese; and he could think of no other way of helping himself than to preach God's Word to the priests and vicars and curates of each deanery, assembled around him in the course of his visitations, in order to do through them, at least to some extent, what he found himself entirely unable to do for the people in person."³⁴

It is surprising, indeed, to hear a man of such sentiments as these laying down, at an earlier period of his life, to an officer of State, the principle that civil legislation behoves to conform itself to the laws of the Church, because temporal princes receive from the Church all the power and dignity which they possess; that both swords, material and spiritual, belong to St. Peter, with only this difference, that the princes of the Church handle only the spiritual sword, while they wield the material sword through the hands of temporal princes, who, however, are bound to draw it and sheathe it under their direction.³⁵ That is quite the language of an Innocent III.

It looks as if Grossetête, in his later life, must have passed over to the other camp. But that is not the true state of the case.³⁶ Even in his earlier life it was not the deepest meaning of his thoughts to surrender up all unconditionally to St. Peter's successor, or to claim plenary powers for the episcopate for its own sake. It is true that he puts the law of the Church on a footing of full equality with the commandments of God. It is true also, that he puts the State decidedly under the Church, and denies its autonomy. But he sees these things through the spectacles of his own century, and is unable to set himself loose from its ideas. Still, neither the episcopate nor the papacy exists in his view for itself; both exist for the glory of God and for the good of God's kingdom. The whole conduct and action of the man, not only in later but also in earlier life, justifies us in so interpreting his innermost thoughts. We can see from the rejoinder which he made to the statesman's reply, which would appear to have been couched in a tone of cutting irony, that our bishop had had no intention in his first letter, to mount upon the high horse of hierarchical pride.³⁷

If we look for the innermost kernel of all the thought and effort of this man who had an incredible amount of business to get through, we can find it in nothing else than in his earnest solicitude for souls. To this end he laboured with special zeal for the moral and religious elevation of

the pastoral office. A doctor of theology, William of Cerda, when he had himself been appointed to a pastoral charge, found much more pleasure in carrying on his lectures in the University of Paris than in taking personal charge of his parishioners in England. But Grossetête reminds him with equal tenderness and warmth that he should choose rather to be himself a pastor, and to feed the sheep of Christ in his own parish, than to read lectures to other pastors from the chair.²⁸ We see here how high a place he assigned to the pastoral office, and that though he stood at the top of the science of his time, he did not look upon science as the highest thing, but upon life, and especially the devoted cure of souls. What else but the reform of the pastoral office was the drift of all the visitation work which Grossetête undertook and carried through with such peculiar zeal? And the sermons which he was accustomed to preach in his visitation tours—at ordinations and consecrations of churches before the assembled pastors of one or other of his seventy-two rural deaneries, were nothing else but appeals of the chief pastor of the flock to the under shepherds, designed to quicken their consciences and to press the duties of their office close upon their hearts. Some of these addresses which have come down to us, form in fact a pastoral theology *in nuce*.²⁹ When, in the course of his visitations, he made use of his disciplinary powers to depose unworthy priests upon the spot, and when he used his patronage to fill vacant benefices with active, well-educated men, accustomed to preach, he did his utmost to raise the character of the pastorate. Add to this the watchful eye which he kept upon the appointments made to parishes in his diocese by private patrons and corporations, and even by the crown and the papal court. In how many instances did he put off the canonical admission of a presentee! and what a multitude of unpleasant conflicts were brought upon him by his conscientious vigilance in this respect! A considerable portion of his correspondence is taken up exclusively with this subject.

Grossetête had scarcely taken possession of his see when an officer of State, William of Raley (Raleigh), presented to a parish a youth called William of Grana. The bishop refused to confirm the appointment, partly on account of his being under age, and partly on account of his inadequate attainments; and the refusal was highly resented by the patron. We have still the letter in which the bishop stated his reasons for the act, and he does so in a way which fills us with high appreciation of his conscientiousness and piety.³⁰

And there were numerous other instances of a similar kind, in which he withheld his consent to appointments on account either of deficient age or inadequate scholarship, or both together; or on the ground of conduct and deportment wholly unbecoming the priestly office.

With no less vigilance did this faithful and watchful chief pastor take heed to the manner in which parish priests after their appointment fulfilled the duties of their office. As may be easily conceived, he looked with no friendly eye upon the accumulation of livings in the same hands—a practice in which personal revenue was the only thing considered, and the interests of parishioners were treated as quite a secondary affair. More than once he opposed himself to this *pluralitas beneficiorum*.⁸¹

At the time of his awakening, about 1232, he had been strict with himself in this respect, and now he was also strict with others. In repeated instances he insisted that every one who was intrusted with the care of souls should be resident in his parish. One of these was the case of a Magister Richard of Cornwall, to whom he had given a living on the recommendation of the Cardinal Egidius, and who had manifested a preference for Rome as a residence, to the neglect of his cure. The bishop sent to him, through the Cardinal, a very peremptory injunction to reside in his parish, begging him sarcastically not to refuse “to let himself down from the height of Rome to the level of England, in order to feed the sheep, as the Son of God had descended from the throne of His majesty to the ignominy of the Cross in order to redeem them.”⁸²

Another matter which from time to time gave the bishop much trouble, had a like bearing upon the elevation of the spiritual offices of the church, viz., the resistance which he opposed to the appointment of abbots and clerics to judicial functions, and his efforts to bring back all offices ordained for the good of souls to their purely ecclesiastical and religious destination and use. In the year 1236 the King appointed the Benedictine Abbot of Ramsey to be a Judge in Council, an appointment which gave great distress to the conscientious chief pastor. That an abbot should undertake such a function appeared to him to be irreconcilable with the vows of his order, and with the clerical office in general; and this all the more that a judge might easily find himself in the position of having to pronounce sentences of death. He therefore addressed himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury to request him to use his influence with the King to obtain, if possible, a recall of the appoint-

ment. The Archbishop was of opinion that the question of principle involved in the case ought to be referred for decision to the next general council. But for the bishop it became more and more urgently a question of conscience, whether it was not sin in a monk to undertake the office of judge.

It seemed to him clear that the question could only be answered in the affirmative. But, if so, then it was also certain that the bishop, who allowed this to be done, was likewise in sin. In a second letter, therefore, he begs and conjures the Archbishop to give a plain and clear answer to the question—whether, yea or nay, it is sin in a monk or cleric to accept a judge's commission, and whether, yea or nay, it is sin in a bishop to allow this to be done.³³ What the issue of the matter was cannot be learnt from the correspondence, and is of less interest to us than the fact that Grossetête laboured in this direction as well as in others for the restoration of good order in all the spiritual offices of the church.

But that both church and church-office did not appear to him to be their own end and object, that in his eyes the cure and the salvation of souls held a higher place than the pastoral office taken by itself, is manifest beyond all doubt, from the circumstance that Grossetête brought forward the new Mendicant orders to the work of preaching and cure of souls. Already, in his earlier days while he still worked in Oxford, he had entered into close relations with the Franciscans, and had done his best to bring them forward in the University.³⁴ When he became bishop he associated with himself both Franciscans and Dominicans as his coadjutors in his episcopal office.³⁵ And not only so—he gladly welcomed, protected, and promoted their activity throughout his diocese at large, and did not shrink from openly expressing his opinion, that by preaching and the confessional, by their example and their prayers, they were doing an inestimable amount of good in England, and compensating for the shortcomings and mischievous influence of the secular clergy.³⁶ In this matter Grossetête differed widely in judgment from many of his clergy, who looked upon it as an encroachment upon the pastoral office when a Dominican or Franciscan preached or heard confession in their parishes,³⁷ and did their utmost to keep back their flocks from listening to such sermons, or confessing to a begging friar. Bishop Grossetête, on the contrary, wrote on one occasion to Pope Gregory IX. as follows:—"O, if your Holiness could only see with

what devotion and humility the people flock together to hear from them (the Mendicant monks) the word of life, and to make confession of their sins, and how much advantage the clergy and religion have derived from the imitation of their example, your Holiness would certainly say the people who wandered in darkness have seen a great light."³⁸ Accordingly he sought to induce the parochial clergy of his diocese to stir up their parishioners to frequent the sermons and the confessionals of the friars,—a proceeding which shows clearly enough that however highly he valued the pastoral office, and however zealously he laboured to further and to elevate it, he was still far from exalting it only for its own sake. In his view, the fear of God and the salvation of souls, as the ultimate ends which the spiritual office was designed to subserve, were of immeasurably higher account.

Grossetête's whole views, religious and ecclesiastical, are to be seen in their purest and truest expression in a Memorial, in which he set down all his complaints concerning the disorders of the church of his time, and which he submitted in a personal audience to the Pope. The occasion of the memorial was this. The practice of what was called "appropriation" was becoming increasingly common, *i.e.*, the practice of transferring church tenures, tithe-rights, and glebe-lands, into the possession of monasteries, knightly orders, &c. This was a loss to local-church property—an impoverishment of the parochial churches concerned. The parish lands were no longer in a condition to secure a living to the parish priest. The consequence was that a priest could no longer reside on the spot. The charge was only supplied from without, either from a cloister or at the cost of a knight commander, sometimes by one, sometimes by another priest or monk. In short, the office was neglected—the parish was spiritually orphanised. In his later years, Bishop Grossetête observed in his visitations that this evil was always on the increase. He saw in it an injury, not only to the pastoral office, but to the souls entrusted to it, which called for the most serious attention. The first step he took to remedy the mischief was to obtain a Papal authorisation, enabling him to declare all transferences and compacts of this kind to be null and void.

As soon as these full powers reached his hands, he called before him all the monks of his diocese who had been provided with these livings, and produced and read to them the

Papal rescript. He was resolved, he said, to take over immediately into his own administration all those parish church-lands, the acquisition of which, with the consent of the Cathedral Chapter, the monasteries might not be able to establish by written documents. But experience proved that the Papal authorisation was of little avail. It was only too easy to obtain exemptions by means of corruption at the Papal Court, and the well-meant intentions of the bishop were frustrated. But Grossetête was not the man to give way before such an obstacle. Regardless of his advanced age, he determined to make a second journey to Lyons, where Pope Innocent IV. was still residing, as he had been six years before. In the year 1250 he crossed the Channel with a numerous spiritual train. Arriving in Lyons, he experienced from the Curia a much cooler reception than he had done on the previous occasion, and in the main business which brought him he accomplished as good as nothing. He remained, however, the whole summer in Lyons, occupied with various affairs.

In an audience obtained by him, 13th May, he handed to the Pope himself, and to three of the Cardinals in attendance, copies of the Memorial referred to in which he gave utterance to all that was in his heart. It was immediately read in the Pope's presence by Cardinal Otho, who had lived in England for some time as legate, and had come much into contact with Grossetête.

This Memorial has come down to us under the incorrect title of a sermon.⁴⁰ It is full of earnest moral zeal, and of fearless frankness of speech. Grossetête begins with the observation that zeal for the salvation of souls—the sacrifice most well-pleasing to God—had brought down to earth and humiliation the eternal Son of God, the Lord of glory. By the ministry of his Apostles and the pastors appointed by them among whom, above all others, the Pope bears the image of Christ, and acts as his representative, the kingdom of God came, and the house of God was made full. But at the present day, alas! the Church of Christ is sorely diminished and narrowed; unbelief prevails in the greatest part of the world; in Christendom itself a considerable portion of it has been separated from Christ by division,⁴¹ and in the small remainder heresy goes on increasing in some quarters, and the seven deadly sins prevail in others; so that Christ has had for ages to complain, "Woe is me, for I am as when they have gathered the summer fruits, as the grape-gleanings of the vintage. There is no cluster to eat, my soul desired the first ripe fruit. The good man is perished out of the earth, and there is none upright among men."

"But what is the cause of this hopeless fall of the church? Unquestionably the diminution in the number of good shepherds of souls, the increase of wicked shepherds, and the circumscription of the pastoral authority and power. Bad pastors are everywhere the cause of unbelief, division, heresy, and vice. It is they who scatter the flock of Christ, who lay waste the vineyard of the Lord, and desecrate the earth. No wonder, for they preach not the Gospel of Christ with that living word which comes forth from living zeal for the salvation of souls, and is confirmed by an example worthy of Jesus Christ; and to this they add every possible form of transgression,—their pride is ever on the increase, and so are their avarice, luxury, and extravagance;⁴² and because the life of the shepherds is a lesson to the laity, they became thus the teachers of all error and all evil. Instead of being a light of the world, they spread around, by their godless example, the thickest darkness and the icy coldness of death.

"But what, again, is the cause of this evil? I tremble to speak of it, and yet I dare not keep silence. The cause and source of it is the *Curia* itself! Not only because it fails to put a stop to these evils as it can and should, but still more, because, by its dispensations, provisions, and collations it appoints evil shepherds, thinking therein only of the living which it is able to provide for a man, and for the sake of that, handing over many thousands of souls to eternal death. He who commits the care of a flock to a man in order that the latter may get the milk and the wool, while he is unable or unwilling to guide, to feed, and protect the flock, such an one gives over the flock itself to death as a prey. That be far from him who is the representative of Christ! He who so sacrifices the pastoral office is a persecutor of Christ in his members. And since the doings of the *Curia* are a lesson to the world, such a manner of appointment to the cure of souls on its part, teaches and encourages all who have patronate rights to make pastoral appointments of a like kind, as a return for services rendered to themselves, or to please men in power, and in this way to destroy the sheep of Christ. And let no one say that such pastors can still save the flock by the ministry of middlemen. For among these middlemen many are themselves hirelings who flee when the wolf cometh.

"Besides, the cure of souls consists not only in the dispensation of the sacraments, in singing of "hours," and reading of masses, but in the true teaching of the word of life, in rebuking and correcting vice; and besides all this, in feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked,

lodging the strangers, visiting the sick and the prisoners—especially among the parish priest's own parishioners—in order, by such deeds of charity, to instruct the people in the holy exercises of active life; and to do such deeds is not at all in the power of these middlemen, for they get so small a portion of the church's goods that they have scarcely enough to live upon.⁴³ In the midst of such evils men might still have the consolation of hoping that possibly successors might follow who would better fulfil the pastor's calling. But when parish churches are made over to monasteries these evils are made perpetual. All such things end not in the upbuilding, but the destruction of the church. God defend that even the Holy See and its possessor should act against Christ, and thereby incur the guilt of apostacy and division! Further, the pastoral office, especially of the bishops, is at the present time circumscribed and restrained, particularly in England, and this in three ways. First, by the exemptions and privileges of monasteries, for when the inmates of these addict themselves outside their walls to the worst vices, the bishops can take no action against them—their hands are tied by the privileges of the convents. Secondly, the secular power puts obstacles in the way, in cases where investigations are made into the sins of laymen, in order to prevent other laymen from being sworn as witnesses. To which are to be added, thirdly, appeals to the Pope or Archbishop; for if the bishop takes steps according to his duty to punish vice and depose unworthy pastors, protest is taken, the "liberty" of the church is appealed to, and so the matter is delayed, and the action of the bishop lamed."

In conclusion, Grossetête invokes the Holy See to put a stop to all disorders of this character, and especially to put a check upon the excesses of its own courtiers, of which there were loud enough complaints, to leave off the unevangelical practice of using the interposition of the sword, and to root out the notorious corruption of the Papal Court. It was to be feared that the Holy See, unless it reformed itself without delay, would draw upon itself the heaviest judgments—yea, destruction itself. The Holy Father would not interpret as presumption what the author of this Memorial had ventured to lay before him in all devotion and humility, under many misgivings and tears, and purely at the bidding of dread of the prophet's "Woe," and of a longing desire to see a better state of things.

This utterance can only call forth the deepest respect for the godly-mindedness of the author and for his burning zeal for God's house, for the salvation of souls, and the reforma-

tion of the church. But on the other hand, it can easily be understood that such unheard-of freedom of speech was not likely to obtain for the strong man who uttered it any favour or influence at the Papal Court. When Grossetête left Lyons in September, and arrived again at home at Michaelmas 1250, he was for some time so much out of spirits that he had some thoughts of resigning his episcopal office. However, matters did not go that length. He gathered up his strength again, and from that day forward acted only with all the more emphasis, and with all the less reference to the Pope and the Crown. His visitation of convents and parish churches was taken up again with, if possible, still greater strictness than before. Unworthy pastors were set aside, and in all places where there was need for it he appointed vicars in their room, who were supported out of the revenues, in virtue of an authorisation to that effect, which he at last obtained from the Pope.

In Parliament his voice carried with it decisive weight. In a letter of 1252 which he addressed to the nobles of the realm, to the citizens of London, and to the "Community" of England, he expressed himself strongly enough on the subject of the illegal encroachments of the Apostolic See, by which the country was drained.

But in the year of his death there occurred an incident which raised the name of the Bishop of Lincoln to the highest celebrity. Innocent IV. had conferred upon one of his grandsons, Frederick of Lavagna (the Pope was himself a Count of Lavagna), a canonry in the Cathedral of Lincoln, and taken steps to have him immediately invested with it by a cardinal. From Perugia, on the 26th January 1253, an apostolic brief was addressed, not to the bishop, but to an Archdeacon of Canterbury, and to Magister Innocent, a Papal agent in England, with the distinct injunction to put the young man before named, in the person of his proxy, into actual possession of that dignity and living. And that there might be no delay, much less any obstacle put in the way, the Papal brief expressly set aside, in this instance, all and sundry opposing rights and statutes, even such as had received apostolic confirmation, nay, even all direct apostolic concessions to whomsoever given, and howsoever worded. Nor was this enough. In case any one should oppose himself to the carrying out of this injunction, either by word or deed, the Pope authorised his agents to call any such person immediately before them, so as within two months he should appear in person before the Pope and answer for himself to the challenge of Frederick of Lavagna. This, it was thought,

had made failure impossible; every imaginable means of escape was cut off, every bolt was made sure, and yet the measure issued in failure after all.⁴⁷

The Bishop of Lincoln, though now eighty years old, was not accustomed to allow himself to be frightened. With all the energy which a sense of right springing from the holy feeling of duty inspires, he stood forward to object to the proceeding, and to withstand it; and the document in which he couched his opposition had not only an electric effect upon the English nation at the time, but its influence continued to be felt for centuries afterwards, and more than all his learning—more than all the services of his long, active, and fruitful life—it made the name of the God-fearing, upright, and inflexible man popular and illustrious.

Grossetête had no thoughts of writing direct to the Pope himself;⁴⁸ and this was not prudent merely, it was also due to his own dignity. Innocent had intentionally passed by the bishop, though the question related to a canonry in his own cathedral, and it was therefore in every way suitable and well considered, that the bishop on his side should leave the Pope entirely out of the game. He addressed himself exclusively to the Archdeacon of Canterbury, and to Magister Innocent.⁴⁹

In this celebrated paper he takes up the position, that in opposing himself to the demand in question, he is giving proof of his veneration and obedience to apostolic mandates, and of his zeal for the honour of the Roman Mother Church. For this demand is not an apostolical one, inasmuch as it is in contradiction to the teaching of the apostles and of Christ Himself. It is also totally irreconcilable with apostolic holiness, and this upon a double ground—first, because the “notwithstanding” (*non obstante*) of the Brief, carries along with it a whole flood of inconsistency, recklessness, and deception, undermines truth and faith, and shakes to the centre all Christian piety, as well as all intercourse of confidence between man and man. In the second place, it is a thing entirely unapostolic and unevangelical, abhorred by Christ himself, and in the eyes of men nothing less than a sin of murder, when men’s souls, which should be brought unto life and salvation by means of the pastoral office, are destroyed by being deceived and defrauded in the matter of that very office. And this is what is done, when those who are appointed to a pastoral charge only use the milk and the wool of the sheep to satisfy their own bodily necessities, but have no wish or purpose to fulfil the ministry of their office for the eternal salvation of the sheep of Christ. The most holy

Apostolic See, to which Christ has given all power, "for edification, not for destruction" (1 Cor. x. 8), can command nothing which has such a sin for its issue. And a truly devoted subject of the Holy See can in no wise give heed to such a command, but must rather resist it with all his might. Such thoughts as this contemplated appointment, are in fact inspired by "flesh and blood, and not by the Father which is in heaven."

Such was the substance of this celebrated writing. The installation of the Pope's grandson into the canonry and prebend of Lincoln came to nothing, and the resolute bishop remained unmolested. So much we know for certain; and it may well be supposed that the men who were entrusted with the execution of the Pope's mandate, in the mortal difficulty which they were thrown into by the redoubtable protest of Grossetête, knew of nothing better to do than to forward it to Italy for the hand of the Pope, without a moment's delay. Matthew Paris, the Benedictine abbot of St. Alban's, who cannot, it is true, be accepted as an unprejudiced authority, says in his chronicle that Innocent IV. was almost beside himself with rage when he saw the letter. Who, he exclaimed, is that crazy, foolish, and silly old man who has the effrontery to sit in judgment thus upon my doings? Is not the King of England our vassal, yea, slave, who at a wink from us can shut him up in prison and send him to ruin? But the cardinals, and especially the cardinal deacon, Aegidius, a personal friend of the Bishop, are said to have quieted the Pope by representing to him "that it was of no avail to take severe measures against Grossetête, for to speak candidly, he was in the right, and no man could condemn him. The bishop was orthodox, and a very holy man; he was a more conscientious and holy man than they, the cardinals, were themselves. Among all the prelates he had not his match."⁶⁰

Whatever may be the truth of this account, it is certain that the bold answer of the bishop was ignored, and he was left in peace. Perhaps it was also remembered that he was now an old man, and that he could not much longer give any trouble. And so, in fact, it befell. In October of the same year, 1253, Grossetête had a serious seizure at Buckden, and on the 9th of the same month he died. On the 13th he was buried in the Cathedral of Lincoln.

Soon after his decease, it began to be reported that on the night of his death, sounds of bells, indescribably beautiful, had been heard high in the air, and ere long men heard of miracles taking place at his tomb. Fifty years later it

was proposed that he should be canonised, and the proposal came at one and the same time from the King, from the University of Oxford, and from the Chapter of St. Paul's. It was Edward I., in the last year of his reign, 1307, who made the suggestion;⁵¹ and in so doing, gave utterance to what was in the heart of the whole kingdom. But as may easily be supposed, the proposal did not meet with the most favourable acceptance at the Papal Court. The nation's wish was never complied with by the Curia, but none the less did the venerable bishop remain unforgotten in England, and his memory continue to be blessed through long centuries. His image was universally revered by the nation as an ideal—as the most perfect model of an honest Churchman. “Never for the fear of any man had he forborne to do any good action which belonged to his office and duty. If the sword had been unsheathed against him, he stood prepared to die the death of a martyr.” Such was the solemn testimony borne to him by his own University of Oxford, when it pleaded for his canonisation.

In the public estimation of England, Grossetête was, in point of fact, a saint. In the following century he appears to have been so regarded by Wiclif, who in numberless passages refers to him under the name of *Lincolniensis*.⁵³ And there is reason to think that this estimate was one not at all personal to Wiclif himself, but in harmony with the feeling of his countrymen at large. We have the testimony of Thomas Gascoigne, who died in 1457, that Grossetête was commonly spoken of by the people as St. Robert.⁵⁴ It was natural, too, that when, at a later period, the whole of western Christendom came to be strongly convinced of the necessity of a “Reformation in Head and Members,” the memory of the bold and outspoken Bishop of Lincoln should have flamed up again brightly among the English friends of Church Reform.

At that period an Anglican member of the Council of Constance, the Oxford divine, Henry Abendon, in a speech which he delivered before the Council, 27th October 1415, repeatedly referred as an authority to *Dominus Lincolniensis*; and on one occasion made express mention of the Memorial to the Pope which is mentioned above. As late as the year 1503, an English monk, Richard of Bardney, sung of Grossetête's life in a copy of Latin distiches, which conclude with an invocation of him in form as a canonised saint.⁵⁵ A fact like this, that Grossetête, in spite of the Papal refusal of his canonisation, continued to live for centuries in the mouth and the heart of the

English people as "St. Robert," is a speaking proof of the change which had already come over the spirit of the age; that the absolute authority of Papal decrees was already shaken; that the *nimbus* which surrounded the Holy See itself was paling. During the period when the Papal power was at its zenith, we can as little imagine the case of a man being venerated as a saint in a considerable portion of western Christendom, where canonisation had been positively refused by the Curia, as the converse case of a design on the part of Rome to canonise a churchman being upset by the opposition of a portion of the Catholic Church—an event which actually occurred when, in 1729, Benedict XIII. proposed to canonise Gregory VII., but was compelled to give up the idea out of regard to the decided declarations of France and Austria.

As Protestants, we have both a right and a duty to hold in honour the memory of a man like Grossetête. His creed, indeed, was not the pure confession of the Evangelical Churches; but his fear of God was so earnest and upright; his zeal for the glory of God was so glowing; his care for the salvation of his own soul and of the souls committed to him by virtue of his office was so conscientious; his faithfulness so approved; his will so energetic; his mind so free from man-fearing and man-pleasing; his bearing so inflexible and beyond the power of corruption,—that his whole character constrains us to the sincerest and deepest veneration. When, in addition, we take into view how high a place he assigned to the Holy Scriptures, to the study of which, in the University of Oxford, he assigned the first place as the most fundamental of all studies,⁵⁸ and which he recognises as the only infallible guiding star of the Church;⁵⁹ when we remember with what power and persistency, and without any respect of persons, he stood forward against so many abuses in the Church, and against every defection from the true ideal of church-life; when we reflect that he finds the highest wisdom to stand in this—"To know Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2-1)⁶⁰—it is certainly not saying too much when we signalise him as a venerable witness to the Truth, as a Churchman who fulfilled the duty which he owed to his own age, and in so doing lived for all ages; and who, through his whole career, gave proofs of his zeal for a sound reformation of the Church's life.

SECTION III.—*Henry Bracton and William Occam, and the Tone of Church Life and Politics in the 14th Century.*

A MAN of kindred spirit to Grossetête, though differing from him in important points, was Henry of Bracton, a younger contemporary of the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln.

Bracton, the greatest lawyer of England in the Middle Ages, was a practical jurist, but also a learned writer upon English Common Law.⁶¹ Both as a municipal judge and scientific jurist, he maintained the rights of the State in opposition to the Church, and sought to define as accurately as possible the limits of the secular and the spiritual jurisdictions. In particular, he treated as encroachments of the spiritual jurisdiction its claims of right in questions of patronage. On this point, it is true Bracton and Grossetête would hardly have been of one mind; but none the less they both stood upon common ground, in being decidedly national in their spirit and views, and in offering strenuous opposition to the aggressions of the Court of Rome.

Only a few years after Grossetête's death, contests arose on constitutional questions, in which the opposition of the barons was for some time in the ascendant. At the head of this party stood Simon of Montfort, Earl of Leicester, who had been a friend of Grossetête. In the year 1258, the Parliament of Oxford appointed an administration, which, while Henry III. continued nominally to reign, was to wield all the real power of the State; and it was by no means only the great barons of the kingdom who had a voice in this government. Earl Simon was the champion and hero of the lower clergy and the Commons, who stood behind him and his allied barons. The object in view was to put an end to arbitrary and absolute government, and to put in its place the rule of the Constitution, of Law, and of Right. The movement found its most powerful support in the Saxon population of the country. It was directed, not least, against the undue influence of foreigners upon public affairs. Under the powerful Edward I. (1272-1307) the kingdom again recovered its strength; and after the feeble, unfortunate reign of Edward II., national feeling was again roused by the French war of succession in the reign of Edward III. (1327-1377), when the nation gathered up its strength for the long wars with France, a struggle which had a powerful effect in developing both the national character and language.

What the kingdom had chiefly stood in need of was a higher authority and a more concentrated strength than had obtained under Henry III., and Edward I. was exactly the man to remedy that defect. He had made many concessions, it is true, to the estates of his kingdom in the matter of Parliamentary rights, under the repeated pressure of his undertakings against Wales, Scotland, and the Continent; but he had done this without any loss to the Crown. On the contrary, the Crown had only been a gainer by the freedom and rights which had been guaranteed to the nation. It was now, for the first time, that the Crown entered into a compact unity with the nation, acquired a full national character, and became itself all the stronger thereby.

This immediately showed itself when Boniface VIII. attempted to interfere with the measures of the King against Scotland, as he had done a few years before in the transactions between England and France. In a bull, dated 27th June 1299, Boniface not only asserted his direct supremacy over the Scottish Church as a church independent of England, but also put himself forward, without ceremony, as arbiter of the claims which Edward I. was then advancing to the Scottish Crown. "If Edward asserted any right whatever to the kingdom of Scotland, or any part thereof, let him send his plenipotentiaries with the necessary documents to the Apostolic See; the matter will be decided there in a manner agreeable to right."⁸³

In resisting such assumptions the King found the most determined assistance in the spirit of the country itself. He laid the matter, with the necessary papers, before his Parliament, which met in Lincoln on 20th January 1301; and the representatives of the kingdom took the side of their King without reserve. The nobles of the realm sent, 12th February 1301, a reply to that demand of Boniface VIII., in which they repelled, in the most emphatic manner, the attempted encroachment. No fewer than 104 earls and barons, who all gave their names at the beginning of the document, and sealed it with their seals at the end, declared in it, not only in their own name, but also for the whole community of England, "that they could feel nothing but astonishment at the unheard-of pretensions contained in the Papal brief. The kingdom of Scotland had never been a fief of the Pope, but from time immemorial of the English Crown; they had therefore, after mature consideration, with one voice resolved that the King should in no way acknowledge the Papal jurisdiction in this affair, yea, they would not even allow the King to acknowledge it if he were himself

disposed to do so. In conclusion, they implored his Holiness, in the most respectful manner, to leave untouched the rights of their King, a monarch who was entirely devoted to the interest of the Church." ^{as}

It was not till later that Edward himself addressed a letter of great length to Boniface, in which he confined himself to a historical proof of his alleged rights to the Scottish Crown, and referred to the Pope's claim of jurisdiction in the matter only in the briefest way, and only to decline and protest against it; and, in point of fact, the King went forward in his measures affecting Scotland without troubling himself further in any way about the claims of the Papal Court.

It was thus that the English Crown, by an appeal to the nation, successfully repelled the unrighteous aggression of the Roman Curia; and I know not if the fact has hitherto been sufficiently recognised by historians that England set an example in this business, which Philip le Beau of France only imitated a year later in his dispute with Boniface VIII., when, in April 1302, he assembled a national Parliament. It was also in imitation of the example of the English barons that the French nobles and the Third Estate protested, in a letter to the cardinals, against the Papal pretensions. If in this case the leaning of the King upon the nation issued in benefit to the Crown, no less, on the other side, did the national attitude of the Government lend strength and emphasis to the patriotic spirit of the people. When Edward I., in the last year of his reign, proposed the canonisation of the universally venerated Bishop of Lincoln, he was only giving utterance to what was in the heart of the whole country, and the effect of the movement could only be to heighten and strengthen the interest of the nation in ecclesiastical affairs.

The ablest and most strongly-marked representative of this state of feeling in the first half of the fourteenth century was a man who was born in England, and trained under the influence of the English spirit, but who spent the later portion of his life on the Continent, partly in the University of Paris, and partly at the Court of the Emperor Louis of Bavaria. We refer to William of Occam, a man who, as a scholar, as a copious writer, as a dignitary of the Franciscan Order, and finally, as a strenuous leader of the opposition against the absolutism of the Papacy, took a position of great prominence in his day. His philosophical nominalism had a prophetic and national significance, inasmuch as it prepared the way for that inductive method of philosophising which was put forward several centuries later by able

countrymen of his own, such as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke.

But what chiefly concerns us here in Occam was his character as a keen and independent thinker on matters of the Church. It is not a little remarkable that along with several other men, his personal friends of Italian birth, he was brought into a position of bold opposition to the Papacy, and came in sight of many great and free ideas, entirely through his standing as a member and provincial of the Franciscan order. It was a trifling question of the order, out of which was developed a grand world of thoughts.

In the year 1321 it came to the knowledge of a Dominican Inquisitor in Narbonne, in the south of France, that it was an opinion held by some that neither Christ nor his apostles had ever, either as individuals or as a society, been in possession of property. This proposition appeared to the Dominican to be heretical; but a learned Franciscan in that city, Berengar Taloni, maintained it to be perfectly orthodox, and, ere long, the whole Franciscan order, at a general chapter held in Perugia in June and July 1322, declared for the same view. Thus the point became a question of controversy between the two great Mendicant orders.

On an appeal being carried to the Papal See in Avignon, a decision was given on the side of the Dominicans. John XXII. (1316-1334) in truth was as far removed from apostolic poverty as the east is from the west. He kept his eye so steadily upon the interest of the Papal treasury, that twenty-five millions of gold crowns in coin and jewels were found in it after his death. Of course, such a chief of the Church could not be suspected to look upon absolute poverty as a requirement of Christian perfection. He would have preferred, indeed, to avoid giving a decision on the question which was at issue between the two Orders. But that was impossible. The controversy would admit neither of silence nor delay. A decision clear and round—yea or nay—was unavoidable.

In the year 1322-1324, the Pope pronounced against the Franciscans in a series of bulls. The two first (*Quia nunquam*, and *Ad Conditorem Canonum*), published in 1322, were only of a preparatory character. The third constitution of 1323 (*Cum inter nonnullos*) contained the decision upon the principle involved, declaring the proposition that Christ and his apostles were never either singly or collectively holders of property to be contrary to Scrip-

ture and erroneous. And, last of all, in 1324 followed two more bulls; in the Constitution, *Quia quorundam*, the Pope pronounced sentence of excommunication upon the opposers of his determination; and in the bull, *Quia vir reprobus*, he rejected the appeal of Michael of Cesena, the general of the Order.

✓ The majority of the Franciscan order now bowed to the decision, and after some years elected another general. But those who had stood forth as the firmest defenders of the doctrine of apostolic poverty withheld their submission. They left Avignon; and William of Occam, Michael of Cesena, and Bonagratia of Bergamo attached themselves, in 1328, to the service of Emperor Louis the Bavarian.

Out of this conflict between the Papal Court and the Minorites, ideas developed themselves which were of the greatest importance, and which made their influence felt in succeeding centuries; and of all the polemical writings produced by the repulsed and banished Franciscans, those of Occam were by far the richest in substance. While Michael of Cesena confined himself chiefly to personal polemics of defence and attack, Occam's writings, published several years later, though not altogether silent on topics of this nature, are in the main occupied with the substance of the great objective questions in dispute; and his investigations possess, in this way, a value and width of bearing which far outgo what was of mere ephemeral interest.

✓ This discussion, indeed, makes a highly mixed impression upon an evangelical reader who follows it after the lapse of more than 500 years. Who can miss seeing that the Franciscan, in his deep contemplation of the life of Jesus and the apostolic age, unconsciously looks at the Redeemer and his apostles from the stand-point of the begging friar, and conceives of them in a thoroughly monkish and ascetic manner. In opposing such a view, John XXII. was not without good ground to stand upon. But unquestionably the Pope fell into an error very much greater himself. Not so unconsciously, perhaps, as his opponent, he carried over to primitive Christianity the conditions of his own age, and influenced by his own interests, he allowed himself to justify, by the example of the Redeemer and the precedent of the apostles, the whole hierarchical system of his own time, richly endowed and secularised in spirit as it was, including even the territorial possessions of the Holy See, and its well-filled treasury. And therein, no doubt, the

Pope was in the wrong, and Occam, his adversary, in the right.

The deepest ground, however, of the unsparing antagonism of the Roman Court to the stringent principles of the Franciscans was, in truth, no other than this,—that the Popes felt that the spirit of world-abnegation which animated these men, was a tacit censure of their own spirit and habit of life; from which again sprang “the hatred of the evil conscience.” But it was the very persecutions which this hatred prompted which served, in the course of time, to bring to full light and ripeness all the principles touching the spirituality of Christ’s kingdom, which at first still lay in a deep slumber, and had only dimly revealed themselves to the presaging feeling of a few men of a better spirit than their contemporaries. Occam’s whole exposition on the subject of the kingdom of Christ being not an earthly but a heavenly and eternal kingdom—that Christ is indeed as to his Godhead, King, and Lord over all, but, as God-man, only King of his believing people, and in no respect the administrator of a worldly government—is a Scriptural critique in effect of the mediæval hierarchy—an unconscious evangelical protest against the Papacy in that form which it had assumed since the days of Gregory VII.

But, on the other hand, Occam’s protest against Papal absolutism—against the assertion of an unlimited *plenitudo potestatis* of the Pope—is the result of clear, self-conscious, profound reflexion. He declares it to be totally erroneous, heretical, and dangerous to souls, to maintain that the Pope, by the ordinance of Christ, possesses unlimited power, both spiritual and temporal. For if this were so, he might depose princes at his pleasure—might, at his pleasure, dispose of the possessions and goods of all men. We should all be the Pope’s slaves; and in spiritual things the position would be the same. In that case the law of Christ would bring with it an intolerable slavery, much worse than the Old Testament ever knew; whereas the Gospel of Christ, in comparison with the old covenant, is a law of liberty. In this connection Occam opposes, in the most emphatic manner, the assertion of some flatterers of the Roman Court, that the Pope has power to make new articles of faith; that he is infallible; that into no error, no sin of simony can he possibly fall. He starts from the general principle, that the whole hierarchy, including the Papal Primacy, is not an immediately Divine, but only a human order. In one place he even gives expression to the bold thought, that it would, to the general

body of believers, be of more advantage to have several primates or chief priests (*summi pontifices*), than to have one only; the unity of the Church does not depend upon there being only one *summus pontifex*; the danger of moral corruption of the whole body is much greater with only one head than with several.

In the event of a Pope becoming heretical, every man must have the competency to be his judge, but his ordinary judge is the Emperor. But the Church at large also has jurisdiction over the Pope in such an event, and hence also a General Council, as the representative of the whole Church; the bishops, in case of need, may even depose him. Here we have a practical question anticipated, which some sixty years later became a burning question in Christendom, and not only raised but determined precisely as it was one day to be solved in actual fact.

Further, in solving the doubt, whether a Council, in case of necessity, could assemble without Papal sanction, Occam came upon thoughts entirely his own. Every society (*communitas*) and corporation can enact laws for itself, and elect individuals to act for the whole body (*vice gerant*). Now, all believers are one body and one society (Rom. xii. 5); it is competent for them, therefore, to choose representatives of the whole body. When those thus elected meet together, they form a General Council of the whole of Christendom. He conceives of the carrying out of such a Council in this manner—that from every parish one or more should be sent to the synod of the diocese, or to the Parliament of the prince. This assembly proceeds to another election, and the meeting of all those chosen by the Diocesan Synods, or the Parliaments, constitutes the General Council. That is not a Papal Curial Synod, neither is it a church assembly constituted upon hierarchical principles; it is a Synod framed upon the parochial principle.

And yet it is not Occam's meaning to advise a leap from the ground of the absolute and sole domination of the Papacy to that of an unconditioned parochial principle, as if this latter contained in it all the safe-guards of truth and weal. No; only to the Church itself as a whole, but not to any part of it (and every council is only a part of it), is the promise given that it can never fall into any error contradictory to the faith. Although all the members of a General Council should fall into error, the hope would not need, on that account, to be surrendered, that God would reveal His truth unto babes (Matt. xi. 25), or would inspire men who already knew the truth to stand forth in its defence. And such an

occurrence must issue in glory to God, for thereby He would show that our faith does not rest upon the wisdom of men, such as are called to a General Council, but upon the Power who has sometimes chosen "the foolish things of the world" to confound the wise" (1 Cor. i. 27). In another place Occam expresses the thought that it is even possible that on some occasion the whole male sex, clergy as well as laity, might err from the faith, and that the true faith might maintain itself only among pious women. We see where all this is tending to. High above the Pope, and high above the Church itself, in Occam's view, stands Christ the Lord. "The Head of the Church and its foundation is one—Christ alone." Occam is conscious that his contention is for Christ and for the defence of the Christian faith.

It makes a touching and deeply mournful impression, to look into Occam's heart, as he opens it in the following confession:—

"The prophecy of the Apostle, 2 Tim. iv. 3, is now being fulfilled. Chief Priests and Elders, Scribes and Pharisees, are acting now-a-days exactly as they did then when they put Jesus on the cross. They have banished me and other honourers of Christ to Patmos. Yet we are not without hope. The hand of the Lord is not shortened yet. We live in trust in the Most High that we shall yet one day return with honour to Ephesus. But should the will of God be otherwise, still I am sure that neither death nor life, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, or draw us away from the defence of the Christian faith."

By the side of this testimony of pious, joyful trust in God, we place a passage where Occam speaks of the value of his own writings and their importance for the future. This occurs in his *Dialogue*, at the point where he passes on to a discussion which we may describe as a piece of political philosophy. Here he puts into the mouth of the scholar in the *Dialogue* the following words addressed to his master:—"Although we are unable at present to produce a complete work on the subject, as no treatise upon it, to my knowledge, has ever hitherto been attempted by any other writer, still it was useful not to be altogether silent upon a subject of so much importance, that we may stir up others who have the command of books, to produce complete works upon it. My meaning is this, that by means of our essay men of future times who are zealous for truth, righteousness, and the common weal, may have their attention drawn to many truths upon these matters which, at the present day, remain

concealed from rulers, councillors, and teachers, to the loss of the common weal."

Nor, in point of fact, was this saying too much. For Occam, along with the small group of like-minded independent thinkers with whom he was associated, represents a high flight of human thought which did not pass uselessly overhead like a transient meteor, but worked upon the minds of men with a kindling power. Out of a mere question affecting a religious order, developed itself an unimagined life-force, an antagonism to the Papacy as a centralising world-power, still blended, it is true, with ascetic convictions, and even deriving its moral strength from these, and still only half conscious of the extent of its own bearings, but none the less an antagonism to the Papacy, which in its positive kernel was a contention for Christ as the alone Head of the Church. In this conflict of minds by thrust and counter-thrust there were kindled sparks of evangelical thought and feeling, and there were struck out new lights of political truth, which proved of use and advantage to succeeding generations, and rendered essential service to progress in the direction of an evangelical renovation of the Church.

In the meanwhile, however, it will be easily understood, that ideas and sentiments like these, so far outrunning the current century, could not pass at once into the blood of the existing generation. In the first instance, only what concerned the autonomy of the State, in opposition to the Curia, was grasped and realised by the English nation during the fifty years' reign of Edward III. (1327-1377). Even the foreign wars, which fill up so large a portion of this period, were constrained to help to this end. Not, indeed, the expeditions against Scotland, which followed one after another during the first seven years, but none the less the French wars of succession which Edward III. commenced in 1339. These foreign relations had a reaction upon the domestic; the wars rendered necessary increased subsidies, and these were voted by the estates of the realm represented in Parliament, only at the price of assured political rights and franchises, as, *e.g.*, in the Parliament of 1341. But the more closely Crown and Parliament held together, the more resolutely they opposed themselves to all foreign attempts. This the Papal Court was compelled to feel acutely, and all the more that the Court at Avignon was seen to be dependent upon the same France with which England was at war.

When Clement VI., immediately after his accession to

the Holy See, endeavoured to make peace between Edward III. of England and Philip VI. of France, he succeeded, indeed, so far as to bring about a truce for a time; but as early as Easter 1343, with the full assent of his Parliament, Edward roundly declined all official intervention of the Pope as head of the church; only as a private individual and personal friend should Clement attempt a mediation.

But still more deeply felt than this declinature was the determination with which King and Parliament repudiated the Pope's nominations to English livings in favour of foreign prelates and priests. It is well known that the Popes of Avignon went far beyond the earlier Popes in draining the finances of the national churches. But, on the other side, there had also been no small growth of courage and resolution in opposing such abuses. In England, at least, the *provisions* granted by the Pope to foreign clergy were barred in the most effectual manner. When Clement VI. had granted to two newly-made cardinals—one of them his own grandson—*provisions* to English dignities and incomes worth in all 2,000 marks yearly, the barons, knights, and burgesses of the realm, in Parliament assembled at Westminster, 18th May 1343, joined in an open letter to the Pope, in which they respectfully, but in a firm tone, begged for the removal of the scandal which was given by reservations, provisions, and nominations to English dignities and livings, and which had become greater under Clement than ever before. They urged that the numerous rich endowments of their country had been designed for the upholding of God's service, for the furthering of the Christian faith, and for the benefit of the poor parishioners, and were intended only for such men as had been thoroughly instructed for their office, and who were able, in particular, to hear confessions in the mother tongue. On the other hand, by the appointment of strangers and foreigners, in some cases even of enemies of the kingdom, ignorant of the language of the country, and of the conditions of those among whom it was their duty to exercise the pastoral care, the souls of the parishioners are put in jeopardy; the spiritual cure is neglected; the religious feelings of the people impaired; the worship of God abridged; the work of charity diminished; the means of bringing forward young men of merit crippled; the wealth of the kingdom carried off to foreign parts; and all this in opposition to the design of the founders.⁴⁴

Nor did men stop at mere representations of the case.

When the cardinals referred to sent their agents to England to exercise their new rights and collect the revenues, these men fared badly enough. The population laid violent hands upon them; the king's officers put hindrances in the way of their proceedings; they were thrown into prison; and in the end were driven out of the country with insult and shame. The Pope with his own hand wrote to King Edward from Villeneuve, near Avignon, 28th August 1343, complaining of these proceedings, and requiring the King to interfere to put a stop to what was so "unreasonable."⁶⁵

But Clement had ill success in this step. The King sent a reply which was by no means conciliatory, but called upon the Pope with great emphasis to do away with the practice of "Provisions." He referred to an urgent petition which he had received from the last Parliament, praying that a speedy stop might be put to "impositions" of that kind, which were intolerable to the country; it was no more than the fact, he remarked, that these measures were fitted to inflict injury upon the kingdom in more ways than one, which he pointed out in terms partly borrowed from the Parliament's petition. In addition, he brings into view the violation of right which was involved in these provisions and reservations of the Curia: the right of patronage and collation belonging to the Crown and its vassals is thereby infringed; the jurisdiction of the Crown in questions of patronate right is ignored; by the export of money, as well as by the deterioration of the priesthood, the kingdom is weakened;—on all which accounts he turns himself to the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, who received from Christ the command to *feed* the Lord's sheep, and not to fleece them, to strengthen his brethren, and not to oppress them, with the urgent entreaty that this burden of "Provisions" may be taken away; that the patrons may have the use of their patronate rights; that the chapters may exercise, without hindrance, the right of election; that the rights of the Crown may remain without injury; and that the former long-descended devotion of England to the holy Roman Church may again revive.⁶⁶

But in Avignon men did not readily give ear to representations of this sort, let them be ever so well grounded. The abuse went on as before, as far as was practicable, and the nation was at last convinced that the Papal Court was not in the least disposed to abandon a practice which was so profitable to itself. A resolution was come to to take the matter into their own hand, and to put a stop to these usurpations by the legislature of the kingdom. In 1350, the

King, with consent of his Parliament, enacted a severe penal law against all who in any way should take part in the filling up of church-offices, injuriously to the rights of the King, or of the chapters or private patrons concerned. Every act of this kind was declared null and void; all offenders in this sort were threatened with fines and imprisonment; and all appeals against the same to foreign tribunals prohibited. This was the "Statute of Provisors;"⁶⁷ which was followed three years later by another penal act, which is commonly called simply the "Praemunire;"⁶⁸ which among other things was directed against the abuse of carrying appeals to the Pope from the English courts on questions of personal property. The law threatened offenders in this kind for the future with fine and imprisonment.

In connection with this legislation against "Provisions," we naturally recall again to mind the form of the venerable Bishop of Lincoln, who, exactly one century earlier, had manfully resisted the like encroachments, and whose spirit seemed now to inspire the whole nation. It was the same spirit, in fact, which animated Wiclif from the commencement of his public career—who attained to manhood just at this time—the spirit of national independence boldly opposing a course of proceeding which made use of church affairs as a handle for other ends. It was no unchurchly spirit which lay at the bottom of this opposition. The very contrary was the truth. It was no mere phrase-making, still less any hypocritical dissimulation, when Edward III., at the close of the document quoted above, said of himself and his subjects, "We all desire to render to your most holy person and to the holy Roman Church the honour which is due from us."⁶⁹ Only this honour rendered to the Church was not blind and unconditioned: it was manly and dignified, and was prepared, in case of need, to oppose the head of the Church himself, not only in word but in deed, in matters affecting the Church's temporalities.

In reference to this church-spirit of England, it is a significant and important circumstance, that up to a period later than the middle of the thirteenth century no sects and divisions had ever arisen in the National Church, nor any departures of any sort from the characteristic form of the Church of the West. We find no certain trace to show that during all the mediæval centuries, down to that time, any form of native heresy had ever sprung up upon the English soil.⁷⁰ Nor even were foreign heretical sects ever able to find a footing in England, however much, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries especially, these sects spread

and propagated themselves on the Continent. Only two instances are mentioned by the chroniclers of such heretics appearing in England, and in both cases they were immediately put down and extinguished.

In the first instance, under the reign of Henry II., in the year 1159, there arrived in the country a party of 30 persons of both sexes, apparently Low Germans, under the leadership of a certain Gerhard; but having soon fallen under suspicion of heresy, they were imprisoned and tried before a Synod in Oxford, by which they were found guilty, and delivered over to the secular arm. Their punishment was to be branded upon the forehead, to be flogged through the streets, and then, in their wounds and half-naked, to be driven out in winter into the open fields, where, without food and shelter, outcasts from all society, and by all men unpitied, they were left miserably to perish. But they met their fate with joy notwithstanding; they sang aloud, "Blessed are ye that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for yours is the kingdom of heaven." But the monkish chronicler, heartlessly enough, makes the following comment upon the incident:—"This pious severity not only purified the kingdom of the plague which had already crept into it, but, by striking terror into the heretics, guarded against any future irruption of the evil."⁷¹ Between forty and fifty years later, however, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, under the reign of John, as a later writer briefly informs us, several Albigenses came into England and were burnt alive.

That such merciless procedure should in the end act as a deterrent may be easily understood; and, in particular, to the Waldenses, who never seem to have made their way into England. At least, Peter of Pilichdorf, who wrote in 1444 against the Waldenses, attests that, with some other countries, England had always remained entirely pure and free from the Waldensian sect.⁷² And I find an indirect confirmation of this in the circumstance, that in all the writings of Wiclif which I have searched through in manuscript, I have never come upon a single trace to indicate that either in his own time, or in earlier centuries, heretics of any kind had made their appearance in England. Even the Waldenses are not once historically referred to by him, or so much as named. It is without all support, therefore, from original sources, when some writers put forth the conjecture that there were secret disciples of the Waldensian doctrines in England in Wiclif's time, who only came publicly into view when emboldened by his movement and the number of his followers.

If there had been any foundation for this conjecture the opponents of Wiclif and his party would certainly not have omitted to make use of such a fact, which they could so easily have turned to their own advantage. They would in that case have pilloried the Lollards as the adherents of a sect already long ago condemned by the Church. But of this, too, there is not a single trace. On the contrary, one of the earliest opponents of the Lollards, in a polemical poem written soon after Wiclif's death, freely admits that England, which now favours the Lollards, had hitherto been free of all stain of heresy, and of every form of error and deception.⁷⁵ In a word, it is irreconcilable with the known facts of history to attempt to bring the inner development of Wiclif or his followers into connection with any earlier manifestation of heresy on the European continent. And, in England itself, the history of the centuries before Wiclif has not a single manifestation of the heretical kind to show which was of any continuance or of any importance. ✓

It is no doubt true that in the intellectual, moral, ecclesiastical, and political character of the period in which Wiclif's youth and early manhood fell, there were elements which exercised influence upon him, and received from him in turn a further development. These, however, were all elements which were compatible with true zeal for the existing Church, and with a sincere devotion to the Papal See; being, on the one hand, a certain national self-includedness, favoured by insular position, but fostered still more by the spirit of Saxon nationality, which was evoked so powerfully during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, till it stood out conspicuously in the compact, united consciousness of the whole nation; on the other hand, a spirit of independence which did not shrink from defending the rights and interests of the nation and the National Church, even against all the power of the Papal See, and to wage open war against the abuses of the Church. In a word, there awoke in the Anglican Church of the thirteenth, and still more of the fourteenth centuries, "the true Reformation spirit which can never die out in the Church, but must rather from time to time break forth afresh with rejuvenescent strength, in order to remove the ever recurring rust of abuses and mischiefs."⁷⁷ ✓

SECTION IV.—*Richard of Armagh and the Mendicant Orders.*

WE must at this point recall the name of an important man in whom this Reformation spirit had a vigorous vitality—an older contemporary of Wiclif, to whom, as to Grossetête, he often refers, and with whom he has sometimes been placed in a closer connection than can, in our judgment, be historically justified. We refer to Archbishop Richard, of Armagh, Primate of Ireland, who had a high celebrity in his day.

Richard Fitzralph studied in Oxford, under Dr. John Bakonthorpe, who was an opponent of the Mendicant Orders, and in whose steps his disciple is alleged to have walked.* Fitzralph was recommended to Edward III. as a man of high ability, and was promoted to be Archdeacon of Lichfield; in 1333 he became Chancellor of the University of Oxford; and finally, in July 1347, Archbishop of Armagh. The only side on which he is still known at the present day is as the practical Churchman, especially in connection with his opposition to the encroachments of the Mendicant Orders.

But in his own age and in following times he was also held in high honour as a master of theological science. The reason why nothing is now known of him in this character is, that none of his dogmatic and polemical writings have ever been sent to the press.

But in addition to theological lectures delivered in Oxford, he left important writings behind him. Among these we are told not only of a commentary on the sentences of Peter Lombard, originating in his Oxford lectures, but also of several apologetico-polemical works, directed partly against Judaism—*De intentionibus Judæorum*—partly against the Armenian Church. The latter work, his nineteen books against the errors of the Armenians, called also his *Summa*, was the principal dogmatic work of "Richard of Armagh," as he was commonly called, or simply "*Armachanus*;" and Wiclif himself cites the books against the Armenians with extraordinary frequency. Richard composed this work under Pope Clement VI., about 1350, at the request of several Armenian Bishops. For since 1145, the Armenian Kings had entered into transactions and connections with Rome, which had for their aim a union of the National Church of Armenia with the Roman Church of the west. At the beginning of the fourteenth century several synods of the Armenians were held in Sis, the ancient Issus, in 1307, and in Atan (Adana) in 1316, with a view to this union. In this

* See Additional Note at the end of the Introduction.

connection the learned Englishman wrote the extensive work referred to,⁷⁷ at the instance of the Armenian John, bishop-elect of Khelat, and his brother Nerses, Archbishop of Manaz-Kjerd. Richard accordingly threw his book into the form of a dialogue. John, the bishop-elect, proposes questions, and brings forward objections. Richard himself answers and solves them. In the first six books are handled the Christological and Trinitarian doctrines; the seventh defends the Primacy of Rome; four books—8 to 11—are devoted to the Doctrine of the Sacraments; the 12th and following to the Doctrine of the Last Things; the five remaining books closing with philosophico-theological investigations of a general kind, which form the basis of the whole work.⁷⁸

We are told that Richard left behind him a translation of the Bible in the Irish tongue, which would have been an important fact if it had been well attested, but the allegation rests upon insufficient evidence.⁷⁹

But we have trustworthy information on the position taken up by the Irish Primate against the Mendicant orders. The following circumstances gave rise to this incident as related by himself:—Having occasion to come to London on the business of his Archbishoprick, he found that learned men there were engaged in animated discussions upon the question of the poverty of the life of Jesus, and whether He had even begged. This was no doubt an after effect of the debate formerly maintained between Pope John XXII. and a party of the Franciscans.⁸⁰ The Archbishop was repeatedly asked to preach in London upon the subject, and in the church of St. Paul he delivered seven or eight sermons in English, in which he set forth and maintained the propositions following:—

1. Jesus Christ, during His sojourn upon earth, was indeed always a poor man; but

2. He never practised begging as His own spontaneous choice.

3. He never taught any one to beg.

4. On the contrary, Jesus taught that no man should practice voluntary begging.

5. No man can either prudently or holily determine to follow a life of mendicancy.

6. Mendicancy forms no part of the rule of the Franciscans.

7. The Bull of Alexander IV. (of the year 1255) against a certain book (the *Introductorius in Evangelium eternum*) is not directed against any of the above propositions.

8. For the purposes of confession, the parish church is

always more suitable for the parishioner than any church or chapel of the begging monks.

9. For hearing confessions the parish priest is always preferable to the begging monk.

These nine propositions evidently fall into two groups. The first group—1 to 7—treats entirely of the moral question, in what "Apostolical Poverty" consists; in particular, whether begging, in its proper sense, is permitted to Christian men, and is in itself a virtue—yea or nay. The second group, consisting of the two last propositions, relates to the ecclesiastical question, whether it is advisable and right that parishioners should confess in a conventual church to a mendicant monk, instead of going to their parish church and parish priest. In both respects the high-placed dignitary expressed himself in opposition to the Mendicants, to their principles and to their privileges. No wonder that he was attacked in consequence. The Mendicant Orders raised accusations against him at the Papal Court, and he found himself obliged to undertake a journey to Avignon in 1357, and to prosecute his defence in person before Innocent VI. It is not improbable that the Irish Primate acted not only for himself, but in name and by commission of several English bishops; at least Wiclif mentions the rumour that the bishops in general had contributed to defray his travelling charges, etc.⁸¹ The address which he delivered at a solemn sitting of the Council, 8th November 1375, in presence of the Pope and Cardinals, affords us some insight into his ecclesiastical views.⁸² His contention is simply one for the rights of the pastoral office as against the privileges of the Begging Orders, by which these rights were infringed—a contest which was renewed in France about fifty years later, in 1409 and following years.⁸³

The first and by far the larger half of the discourse must be regarded as containing the main gist of the whole. It is this part which has procured for it the title, "A Defence of the Parish Priests;" for the second part, only a fourth of the whole, is taken up with the proof and justification of the first seven propositions quoted above. The preacher lays the main stress of his argument against mendicancy upon the fact, which he proves in a very convincing manner, that the Redeemer, during His life on earth, was neither a mendicant Himself nor ever taught His disciples to be such. His most weighty objection against the principles which he opposes lies, if we are not mistaken, in the assertion that the notion of voluntary mendicancy rests only upon ignorance of the Scriptures, or upon the covetous pretext that

the practice is conformable to the life of Christ.⁸⁴ But he takes up first the two last of those nine propositions, *i.e.*, the question of Confession and of the privileges of the Begging Orders, and he gives his reason for doing so at the beginning of his discourse. He does so, because a matter which is of common interest to the whole priesthood, yea, to all Christendom, takes precedence of a matter of private interest, whereas the principle of mendicancy is only a private affair of the Begging Orders. To guard himself, however, against misapprehension, as if he meant to assail the Begging Orders *on principle*, he not only enters a caveat at the very commencement of his discourse against any possible suspicions of his orthodoxy, but also against the surmise that his aim was to attack the whole position of the Orders which had received the sanction of the Church. What he aimed at was no more than this, that these orders should be restored to the purity of their original foundation.⁸⁵ In other words, it was their reformation he sought, not their suppression.⁸⁶

With regard to confession, the archbishop shows most convincingly that it is much more suitable, and, on moral grounds, much more advisable that confession should be made to one's own parish priest (*sacerdos ordinarius*) than to a begging monk; for the former stands much nearer than the latter to any member of his own parish coming to confess, and has personal knowledge both of the man and his previous sins; and naturally such a man has more feeling of shame before one whom he sees every day, than before a stranger whom perhaps he sees face to face only once a-year. It may also so easily happen, for want of personal knowledge of people, that a monk receiving confessions may absolve persons who are under the ban of excommunication. The speaker attests that in his own diocese, where perhaps there are not fewer than two hundred persons under excommunication for murders, fire-raising, thefts, and such like crimes, there are only forty at most of these who come for confession to him, or the confessors under him. People of this description prefer to confess to the begging friars, and are at once absolved and admitted to communion by them.⁸⁶

On the other hand, the archbishop urges that the parish priest is a more righteous judge, and less subject also to suspicion of avaricious motives, for he has his parish living, which the begging monk has not. Let it only be remembered that the Mendicant orders since the time when they obtained the privilege of hearing confessions, have built

everywhere the most beautiful monasteries and truly princely palaces, which, before that time, they were in no condition to do. It is never heard that they impose alms upon those who confess to them, for the repairs of a parish church or a bridge, or for the upholding of a country road; they prefer to impose them entirely for their own benefit and that of their order.

But he goes still farther. It is not only the abuse of their privileges which is the cause of manifold moral mischiefs, but the very existence and normal effect of these rights viewed by themselves, and apart from all their misuse. These rights are injurious to those who go to confession, because such persons are less ashamed of their sins before strangers, and pay no regard to contrition, which is the chief part of the sacrament of penance, and are led besides to undervalue their parish priests. They are injurious to the parish priests, by estranging from them their own parishioners to such a degree that the latter soon cease to have any personal knowledge of them. The mischief even extends to the spiritual order at large. For the begging monks know how to draw to themselves young men at the universities and elsewhere by means of the confessional; they entice them into their orders, and never allow them to leave again; even during the years of novitiate they permit them to have interviews with parents at most only in presence of a brother of the monastery. One day not long ago, on going out from his inn to the street, the archbishop met with a respectable English gentleman who had made a journey to Avignon for no other purpose but to obtain from the Curia the surrender of his son, whom the begging friars of Oxford had inveigled last Easter, though yet only a boy thirteen years old. When the father hurried to Oxford to rescue him, he was only permitted to speak with his son under the eyes of several monks. "What is this but man-stealing, a crime worse than cattle-stealing, which is a penal offence?" And this with mere children, before they have come to years of discretion!

And let it not be said such youngsters will serve God afterwards with all the more devotion, and therefore it is allowable to gain them by promises and lies. People "must not do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii. 8). No lie, in particular, is allowable for a good end, and no man, for any reason of his own invention, is at liberty to set aside any of the commandments. The theft, and the teaching which helps to it, are both mortal sins. It has come to such a pass in England that laymen no longer send their

sons to the universities, but prefer to make farmers of them, rather than run the risk of losing them in that fashion; and hence it is that whereas in the preacher's time there were 30,000 students in Oxford, there are now no more than 6,000. And this is a great mischief for the clergy in particular, though in every faculty alike the secular students (*i.e.*, non-monks) are constantly on the decrease, while the begging orders have been making no end of gains, both in the number of their converts and their members.

Add to this that it is now almost impossible to purchase good books at the universities, for they are all bought up by the mendicants; in all their convents are to be found large and valuable libraries. The Archbishop himself had sent three or four of his parish priests at a time to the university, but in every instance one at least of these had left and come back again, because they found it impossible to get a Bible to buy, or any other theological book. And thus, in the end, he thinks, there will cease to be any clergy, and faith will entirely die out in the Church. In the creation everything was ordered by measure, number, and weight (Wisdom of Solomon, xi. 22), but it is astounding how the Mendicant orders go on increasing beyond all measure, in the teeth of nature's law. How injurious the rights of the begging order were to the Christian people, the preacher depicts from the life. Already, says he, neither great nor small can any more take a meal without the friars being of the party; and not standing at the door, as might be supposed, to beg for alms, but pushing into the houses without ceremony. Yes! and they not only eat with the guests, but carry off bread, and meat, and cheese along with them; and quite in the face of Christ's express command, they go from hall to hall, from house to house.

But lastly, these privileges work mischief even to the mendicant friars themselves. For they lead them into disobedience of their own Rules, and cause them to fall into greed and avarice and ambitious aspiration after vain honours and dignities. As to the first, the preacher instances several violations of the original Franciscan Rule, which had all arisen from their later-obtained privileges and exemptions. But the friars are also guilty of avarice, for they have acquired only such rights as enable them to accumulate wealth. If it were not their aim to make money, they would at least hand over the burial dues, when funerals occur among them, to the parish churches and the parish priests; but this is what they never do, and their covetousness must be to blame for it. The right of hearing confessions, too, they

exercise with the same view. They receive the secret confessions of women, even of princesses; and there are even instances of their finding their way into the boudoirs of the most beautiful women of noble rank—scandals, these, enough which come of the abuse of the Confessional.

Although these privileges have been conferred upon them by Papal authority, they cannot continue to make use of them without mortal sin. Neither can they sincerely repent of these sins without making restitution, as far as they can, of the rights which they have taken away from the parish priests. In this connection, as in support of all his other representations, Richard of Armagh repeats the Bible-text which he has prefixed to his whole discourse, "Judge not according to the outward appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

The good man spoke out with frankness and courage. He displays in his sermons much dialectical skill and culture, and a solid and ripe theological erudition. But more than all, he is penetrated by a spirit of intense moral earnestness and of true manhood. Richard of Armagh has the spirit of a Reformer, in the noblest sense; he is a man who fights against modern degeneracy and ecclesiastical abuses with combined wisdom and zeal; with eye uplifted to Christ, and with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.⁸⁶

From this point let us cast a look backwards to Grossetête, and another forward to Wiclif. Richard of Armagh, and Robert of Lincoln, were in many respects men of kindred spirit, and yet in reference to the Mendicant orders all but antipodes; for the former attacked them and the latter patronised and promoted them. But let the times in which they lived be distinguished, and the two men come nearer in character to each other. At the time when Grossetête became a bishop—in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, the Franciscans (with whom he came into the nearest connection) were in their first period, and were animated by their first love; they numbered among them many men who were zealous and active for the good of souls. The Bishop of Lincoln rejoiced to find in them instruments and fellow-workers, full of insight and power. That was why he honoured them with his confidence, availed himself of their services, and extended to them his support.

A century passed away, and Richard of Armagh had experiences of the Order of quite another kind. The Mendicants were caressed by the Bishops and Popes; it fared with them as with children who are the pets of their families—

they were spoiled. Distinguished by privileges, they became more and more pretentious and encroaching; the Order and its honour, its interests, and its revenues, became now the chief objects of their aims, instead of the honour of God, the good of the Church, and the salvation of souls. Degeneracy, the moral corruption of both the Mendicant orders, was an accomplished fact. In such circumstances, a man who was an honest lover of goodness, and had a clear eye for the real state of matters, must of course take up quite a different position toward these Orders from a man of the same gifts and of like spirit who had lived a hundred years earlier, when they were in their moral bloom and glory. The difference of spirit, therefore, between the two men is more apparent than real.

But we also cast a look forward from Richard of Armagh to John of Wiclif. It has been conjectured that the latter, in the matter of the Mendicant orders, followed immediately in the footsteps of the former. This conjecture was favourably received, and for a long time has passed as a historical fact. What led to this was the circumstance that Wiclif, in several of his writings, made repeated and very severe attacks upon these orders. But the writings referred to belong not to the earliest, but precisely to the latest which he produced. 'In his earlier and earliest pieces I find none of this severe antagonism to the Mendicant monks, but, on the contrary, in many places a sentiment of recognition and high esteem. This will be pointed out more fully hereafter. We have no warrant, therefore, to suppose that Wiclif took up immediately the threads which had dropped from the hands of Richard of Armagh, when, after several years' residence in Avignon, he died there in December 1359. One thing only is certain that Wiclif, in his earnest and persistent warfare against church evils and corruptions—a warfare which he too carried on from love to Christ the Church's Lord, and with the weapons of God's Word—had Richard Fitzralph, in particular, as one of his nearest precursors.

The discourse of the Archbishop of Armagh called forth a reply from a Franciscan doctor of theology in Oxford, Roger Conway,⁸⁷ which appeared at latest in 1362, but probably some years earlier, in the Archbishop's lifetime. This production is a very different one from the Archbishop's, both in form and in spirit, for it is not a spoken discourse, but a treatise of twice the bulk, and the whole gist of the monkish doctor is the exact opposite of the Prelate's. The Franciscan's standpoint is entirely

that of the scholastic divine and the Church lawyer. In his mode of treating his subject, the pulsation of personal feeling is scarcely ever perceptible, which makes so pleasing an impression in the Archbishop. He asserts over and over again that the discourse of the Archbishop, whom he treats, however, with great respect, is nothing but a bill of accusation against the begging orders. What he puts in the forefront himself is the view-point of Law and Right. It is more the "Decretalist," the master of Church law, whom we listen to than the theologian; whereas in Richard Fitzralph the feeling of the devout Christian, of the true pastor, of the zealous Church prince pulsates throughout. But this purely legal posture of the defender of the Mendicants makes the inevitable impression that, however unconsciously, yet in substance and effect it is only the selfish interests of the orders that he undertakes to defend.

Here, too, we think we ought to mention another writing which dates from this century, more precisely from 1356, and which, so far at least, deserves to be put side by side with Richard Fitzralph's discourse, as both pieces are directed against the evils and abuses of the Church. We refer to the much-discussed, but as it seems to us, more discussed than known tract, *Of the Last Age of the Church*, which was long ascribed to Wiclif himself, and given out for a juvenile piece of his, but upon inadequate grounds, and in disregard of weighty reasons which make against the attribution.* The short essay is in substance nothing more than an indictment against the sins of the priests, and particularly against their traffic in offices (simony). This abuse the author considers to be the Third Trouble which comes upon the Church. The first consisted in the Persecutions, the second in the Heresies, the third in Simony. There is now only one more trouble to follow, viz., the Devil at broad noonday—i.e., the Antichrist. This view, and a great deal more in the tract, the author borrows from the writings of Abbot Joachim of Flore, but he bases it as Bernhard of Clairvaux also does in his sermons on the Song of Songs, (33), upon Ps. 95, vv. 5 and 6.

It is not difficult to discover that the author views the Church disorders of the time in a very narrow manner. He has an eye only for abuses and sins attaching to those of the clergy who are in possession of tithes and landed endowments. This shows that his position in the Church is one

* Vide Article I. in the Appendix.

different from theirs—a position from which this particular side of the Church's evils falls directly upon his eye; that is to say, he seems to belong to one or other of the Mendicant orders, like the last-named Roger Conway. The author, besides, in his whole style of mind, is a man of narrow views; his mode of thinking is apocalyptic in the meaner not grander sense, and he hangs entirely upon authorities such as Abbot Joachim, or rather the pseudo-Joachim writings. This last circumstance helps us to trace with certainty his connection with the Franciscans, particularly with that portion of the Order which was attached to Joachimism, and specially to the apocalyptic views of the so-called "Eternal Gospel." At all events, this production was entirely destitute of any strong, living germs of principle from which any future development could spring.

SECTION V.—*Thomas of Bradwardine—His Teaching and Spirit.*

VERY different is the case with the teaching of an important contemporary of the foregoing writer, who, like him, belongs to the period immediately preceding Wiclif's public career.

We refer to Thomas of Bradwardine, a Christian thinker, who knew nothing higher and holier than to do battle for "the cause of God," and especially to bring into recognition the free and unmerited grace of God as the one only source of salvation, in the face of an age whose strong leaning, on the contrary, was to build its salvation upon human merit.⁸⁸ Nor did he entirely fail in gaining the age's concurrence in his teaching. His contemporaries held him in high esteem; they gave him the honourable title of the "Profound Doctor" (*Doctor profundus*).⁸⁹ The lectures delivered in Oxford, in which he expounded his doctrine, found such high acceptance that many of his auditors, including men of high position, made repeated requests to him to embody his views in a work for publication. And Wiclif in particular, who could scarcely have known him personally, was full of esteem for him, which he manifests upon every mention of his name, although he strongly opposes some of his dogmatic views. We believe that we are not mistaken in maintaining that the principles which lay at the basis of Bradwardine's teaching were not without important influence upon Wiclif. In the fifteenth century, also, his credit still stood very high. A man like John Gerson (†1429) often quoted

him as an authority in his work on *The Spiritual Life of the Soul*.

At the period of the Reformation he seems to have been little known, but at the beginning of the seventeenth century George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury (1610-1633), revived the memory of his celebrated predecessor, and had the merit of suggesting and promoting the publication of his principal work, which was prepared for the press by Henry Savile, Warden of Merton College, upon the basis of a collection of six manuscripts.⁹⁰ But this service to his earlier fame came too late, for Bradwardine and his work have never obtained, in later times, the high consideration to which they are entitled.⁹¹

Thomas of Bradwardine⁹² was born near the end of the thirteenth century, but where and in what year cannot be determined with certainty.⁹³ He takes notice himself, on one occasion, that his father lived in Chichester.⁹⁴ As, however, it appears, from Oxford documents of the year 1325, that he then held the office of a Proctor of the University, it is concluded, on good grounds, that he must have been born in 1290 at the latest. Further, we have certain knowledge that he went to Oxford as a student, and was there admitted into Merton College, which had been founded in 1274. Here he studied not only scholastic philosophy and theology, but also mathematics and astronomy, with such success as to obtain the highest reputation in all these branches of learning.

It was at this period, also, that an incident occurred to him which gave a decisive turn to his inner life, and which we fortunately learn from his own pen. His narrative is as follows:—"I was at one time, while still a student of philosophy, a vain fool, far from the true knowledge of God, and held captive in opposing error. From time to time I heard theologians treating of the questions of Grace and Free Will, and the party of Pelagius appeared to me to have the best of the argument. For I rarely heard anything said of grace in the lectures of the philosophers, except in an ambiguous sense; but every day I heard them teach that we are the masters of our own free acts, and that it stands in our own power to do either good or evil, to be either virtuous or vicious, and such like. And when I heard now and then in church a passage read from the Apostle which exalted grace and humbled free-will,—such, *e.g.*, as that word in Romans ix., 'So then it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that showeth mercy,' and other like places,—I had no

liking for such teaching, for towards grace I was still unthankful. I believed also with the Manicheans, that the Apostle, being a man, might possibly err from the path of truth in any point of doctrine. But afterwards, and before I had become a student of theology, the truth before mentioned struck upon me like a beam of grace, and it seemed to me as if I beheld in the distance, under a transparent image of truth, the grace of God as it is prevenient both in time and nature to all good deeds—that is to say, the gracious will of God which precedently wills, that he who merits salvation shall be saved, and precedently works this merit of it in him, God in truth being in all movements the primary Mover. Wherefore, also, I give thanks to him who has freely given me this grace (*‘Qui mihi hanc gratiam gratis dedit’*).⁹⁵

From this interesting testimony from his own lips, it appears that Bradwardine, while still a student, and even before he had begun the regular study of theology, had experienced a spiritual awakening which brought him off from the Pelagian way of thinking, and led him to the conviction that the grace of God is prevenient to all God-pleasing action, instead of being acquired by such action preceding. This awakening had evidently occurred in connection with such utterances of St. Paul as that in Romans ix. 16, which had suddenly struck upon the young man's soul with a clear light and arresting force, insomuch that from that day forward the all-determining power of grace became the central truth of his Christian thinking.

It has been already mentioned that Bradwardine held a University office in 1325. We next hear of him delivering lectures for some time as a Doctor of Theology in the University, by which he laid the foundations of his theological reputation, and at a later date he became Chancellor of St. Paul's in London. When the war with France broke out, and Edward III. made the campaign in person, John Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury (1333—1348) proposed him to the King for war chaplain and confessor. In this capacity he accompanied the king in his campaigns in 1339 and subsequent years, and so great was his religious and moral influence upon Edward and his army, upon whom he knew how to press the claims of humanity, that many historians of those wars were convinced that the English victories were more due to the holiness of this priest than to the warlike virtues of the King and the valour of his troops.

In 1348 Archbishop Stratford died, and the Chapter of

Canterbury chose Bradwardine to be his successor; but the King's attachment to him was such that he could not make up his mind to release him from attendance on his person. But upon the death of John Ufford, who was nominated in his stead in May 1349, before receiving consecration, and the chapter having a second time made choice of Bradwardine, the King at length gave his consent to the arrangement. Thomas of Bradwardine was nominated Archbishop by King and Pope, was consecrated in Avignon in the beginning of July, and returned immediately to England to assume his office. But only a few weeks after, 26th August 1349, he died in the Palace of Lambeth.

Bradwardine's theological views are exhibited in a systematic form in the work already named. It bears the title *Of the Cause of God*, for the author has the consciousness of appearing like an advocate in defence of God's honour, in standing forward to oppose Pelagianism, and to exalt the agency of God's free and unmerited grace in the conversion and salvation of man. He by no means conceals from himself that in so doing he is swimming against the current of prevailing opinion, for it is his own remark that "the doctrine is held by many either that the free will of man is of itself sufficient for the obtaining of salvation; or if they confess the need of grace, that still grace may be merited by the power of the free will, so that grace no longer appears to be something undeserved by men, but something meritoriously acquired. Almost the whole world," he says "has run after Pelagius and fallen into error." But, Bradwardine does not allow himself to be disheartened by this state of things. He knows for certain that one man, if the Lord is with him, will be able to chase a thousand foes, yea to put twelve thousand to flight. (1 Sam. xviii. 7).

This joyful courage in conflict, this devout confidence of victory in pleading the cause of God's grace as the alone source of salvation, cannot fail to remind us of the Reformers, who were essentially heralds of the same grace, and opposers of the delusion that salvation can be earned by human merit. The method, it is true, which the scholastic divine followed was different from theirs, owing to the peculiar character of mediæval culture. The Reformers went to work theologically, Bradwardine philosophically. He gives as his reason for adopting this method, that the later Pelagians had

asserted that Pelagius had been overcome purely by church authority and by theological proofs, but in a philosophical and rational way it had never been possible to confute him. Bradwardine's design, therefore, is to make use mainly of philosophical arguments and authorities. In regard to authorities he adheres, in fact, so closely to his declared design, that he gives more space to the sayings of philosophers, old and new, and attaches more stress to them, than he does to his own independent reasonings. However, he also elucidates the question theologically, namely by arguments of Scripture and appeals to the Fathers and Scholastics, with the view, as he says himself, of showing the right sense of many passages of Holy Scripture and the Fathers, which had often been misunderstood and perverted by the Pelagians of ancient and later times.

Waiving, for want of space, any analysis of the doctrinal contents and reasonings of a work so bulky and profound, it may be observed, in general terms, that the scientific success of the performance is less satisfactory than the religious and moral spirit with which it is imbued. For the *absolute determinism* which Bradwardine sets forth, labours under an inappropriate mixing up of metaphysical and physical ideas with an ethical question, and thus rests the doctrine that salvation is grounded exclusively upon grace upon an insecure foundation.

But the spirit which animates him is worthy of all recognition. He is filled with a moral pathos—a lofty earnestness of Christian piety, which cannot fail to make the deepest impression.¹¹³ His drift is to exhibit grace as a free and unmerited gift of God, and to strike down every imagination of human merit in the work of conversion. It is for this reason that he controverts in particular the favourite dogma of the Scholastics that man can qualify himself to receive grace, in other words, that he can *deserve* grace, if not to the strict extent of full worthiness (*de condigno*), still in the sense of meetness and suitableness (*de congruo*). To acquire merit before God, Bradwardine holds to be impossible for man in any sense whatsoever.¹¹⁴ He who affirms the contrary turns God, in effect, into a poor trafficker; for he who receives grace on the footing of any kind of merit, has purchased the grace and not received it as a free gift.

Bradwardine sets out, in fact, as pointed out above, from his own experience—from actual life—and he keeps actual experience ever in his eye. And in regard to

the authorities for the doctrine of unmerited grace to whom he cares most to appeal, he is thoroughly alive to the fact that it was by their own living experience that they too were brought to the knowledge of that grace. The apostle Paul, for example, was "a chosen vessel of grace," inasmuch as, at a time when he was not thinking of good works at all, nor was even standing aloof from deeds of wickedness; at a time when he was thirsting for Christian blood, and was even persecuting the Lord himself, suddenly a light from heaven shone round about him, and the grace of Jesus Christ at the same instant preveniently laid hold upon him. He speaks of the Apostle as emphatically a child of grace, who, in gratitude for the same, makes devout and honourable mention of this grace—his mother—in almost all his epistles, vindicating her claims, particularly in his Epistle to the Romans, where he makes grace the subject of a large and acute investigation¹¹⁵ which fills the epistle almost from beginning to end. And quite in a similar spirit he remarks upon Augustine that, "like the Apostle, he was at first an unbeliever, a blasphemer, and an enemy of the grace of Jesus Christ, but after the same grace had converted him with like suddenness, he became, after the apostle's example, an extoller, a magnificent and mighty champion of grace."¹¹⁶ And like the Apostle Paul, like Augustine the great church-father of the west, Thomas Bradwardine too became, by the light from heaven which shone upon him in his youth, an extoller and champion of the grace of God, in opposition to the Pelagian and self-righteous spirit which prevailed in his time.

It was by no means his intention, indeed, in so doing, to place himself in antagonism to the Church of Rome. On the contrary, he declares expressly his steadfast belief in the doctrinal authority of the Church. He submits his writings to her judgment; it is for her to determine what is orthodox in the questions which he has investigated; he wishes with all his heart to have her support where he does battle with the enemies of God; where he errs, to have her correction; where he is in the right, to have her confirmation.¹¹⁷ But still, in the last resort, he consoles himself with the help of God, who forsakes no one who is a defender of His cause.¹¹⁸

SECTION VI.—*The Vision of Piers Plowman.*

WHILE the learned Doctor was defending God's cause with the weapons of science, and seeking to bring back his age from the paths of Pelagian error into the one only way of salvation, the same cry for grace was also heard from the conscience of the common people, in their feeling of the urgent need of a better state of things.

About twelve years after Bradwardine's death, this feeling of society found expression in a great popular poem, which yet remains to be noticed by us as a speaking sign of the times. We refer to *The Vision of Piers Plowman*, which reveals to us, not so much by the social position of its author, as by the circle of readers for whom he wrote and the spirit of which the work is full, the deep ferment which at that time was spreading through the lowest and broadest stratum of the English people. The author himself undoubtedly belonged to the educated class, or rather to the learned class, which was then almost identical with it. He is familiar with the whole learning of his time; he knows the Classics and the Fathers, the Scholastics and the Chroniclers, and also the Canon Law; he quotes the Bible according to the Vulgate and the "Glossa;" quotes likewise Latin Church hymns in the original; in short, he was a scholar, and probably a monk. In the sixteenth century the tradition existed that his name was Robert Longland or Langland, born at Cleobury Mortimer, in Shropshire, educated in Oxford, and then admitted a monk in the Benedictine Priory of Great Malvern, Worcestershire.

Several allusions to localities, such as the Malvern Hills and the like, point to the fact that he must have lived in the west of England, on the borders of Wales. Perhaps he sprang from the agricultural population; at all events, he shared their feelings, and wrote for them and from their point of view; and this he did to such good purpose, that his poetry went straight to the people's hearts, and continued to be loved by them and committed to memory, and frequently imitated, for several generations, down to the middle of the fifteenth century.

From the first appearance of this poem, the figure of Piers Plowman became, and long continued to be, a favourite one with the friends of moral and religious reform. The great popularity of the work is attested by the very considerable number of manuscripts of it which still exist, most

of them written towards the end of the fifteenth century.¹¹⁹ Add to this the circumstance that these manuscripts are seldom written in a beautiful hand, and are scarcely ever adorned with illuminated initials, which is a pretty plain proof that they were not intended for the higher ranks of society, but for the middle class. A highly remarkable document of the time of the Peasants' War, under Richard II., viz., the "Call" of the ringleader, John Ball, to the people of Essex, contains several manifest reminiscences of *Piers Plowman*.¹²⁰ The poet himself, however, was as little a sower of sedition as he was a heretic. He preaches constantly the duty of obedience to the higher powers. But the pleasure he takes in lowering the great in the estimation of the people, and in raising the credit of the lower classes, could not fail to make him a great favourite with the multitude. And although he did not attack a single doctrine of the Church, yet his unsparing exposure of the sins of the clergy must have aided the growing public sentiment in favour of reform.

In view of the oppression which prevailed among the nobility, the corruption among the clergy, and the dishonesty among the tradesmen, the simple heart of the peasant appears to the poet to be the only remaining seat of integrity and virtue. It is the husbandman in his mean position, not the Pope and his proud hierarchy, who exhibits upon earth an image of the humble Redeemer. In its language and poetical form, too, the work has quite a popular cast. With the exception of the Latin citations, and some Norman-French phrases which occasionally occur, the language is pure Middle-English; while in form it is the most beautiful example extant of old Anglo-Saxon verse. For it is not rhyme, properly so called, which is here used, but what is called alliterative rhyme. Instead of the Anglo-Saxon alliteration, the Normans, since the twelfth century, had introduced the *romance* rhyme, which continued in prevailing use till the middle of the thirteenth century. Later, we find in use a combination of rhyme and alliterative in one and the same line. Still, it is not improbable that during the whole of that time the pure Saxon alliterative continued to maintain itself along with the Anglo-Saxon tongue among the lower strata of the population. Its coming up again to the surface, about the middle of the fourteenth century, appears to be only one aspect of the great social and national movement before referred to which took place at that period. Seen from this point of view, in the literary history of the country, Langland's poem has a special claim upon our attention.

The old Saxon alliterative verse was now so much again in favour that it was used in long romances like *William and the Werewolf*, a position which it continued to hold as late as the fifteenth century, at which date it found imitators even in Scotland. The author of *Piers Plowman* is well acquainted indeed, it is true, with common rhyme, and he introduces it occasionally, but only in Latin of the ecclesiastical type. But in his own English composition he employs exclusively alliterative rhyme; his constant usage being the following, that in every connected couplet of lines (each line having two rising and two falling accents), the two most important words of the first line begin with the same letter, while in the second line the first accented word also begins with it.¹²³

The poem belongs to the allegorical class, and consists of a long series of visions, in which the poet has revelations made to him in the way of dreams, of the condition of human society, and of various truths relating to it. The date of the composition admits of being fixed pretty exactly. That dreadful plague, which, under the name of the Black Death, laid waste the half of Europe in 1348 and following years, was already several years past. Mention is made more than once of the "Pestilence;" it forms, so to speak, the dark back-ground from which the figures stand out. But a second "sickness" is also referred to which raged in England in 1360-62, and with this agrees the circumstance that the lines, beginning with number 1735, contain an undoubted allusion to the peace of Bretigny, which was concluded in the year 1360, and formed an important incident in the history of the English and French war. Further, the poet touches in vv. 2499 f. upon a great storm from the south-west, which occurred on a "Saturday evening," to which he alludes also in vv. 4453 f. We know from chronicles that this tempest, which threw down towers and high houses, and almost all the great trees, took place on 15th January 1362,¹²³ and the exactness with which the date of that event is fixed by the poet warrants us in assuming that the poem must have been written no long time thereafter, perhaps at the end of 1362.¹²⁴

The poet goes forth, in the warm summer time, to wander into the wide world. On a May morning, already fatigued by his walk, he lays himself down on the Malvern Hills beside a well, and falls asleep. There, in a dream, he sees wonderful things—upon a hill in the east a tower, built with great art, the tower of truth; in the west the fortress of care, where dwells the wicked fiend. Upon a charming

plain between the two he sees a multitude of men of all ranks and conditions, rich and poor, going about their different works and ways. Clergy, too, are not wanting, begging friars, preachers of indulgences, priests in the service of the King or the nobles, and so forth. With this begins the first of the poet's visions, of which the work, closely examined, is found to contain ten, although this number does not at once meet the eye; for the usual division of the text into twenty *passus* taken from the manuscript copies is rather a superficial one. The visions have a tolerable amount of connection with each other, though by no means a very close one.

A variety of allegorical figures step upon the scene; some talking, some acting, and occasionally a sort of drama develops itself. First appears an honourable lady—the Church—and instructs the poet in the significance of the spectacle before him, and especially on the point that truth is the truest of all treasures, and that the chief subject of truth is nothing else but love and beneficence. Then enters in dazzlingly rich array the lady "Reward," i.e., earthly reward. To her all ranks and conditions of men do homage. She is on the point of being betrothed to "Falsehood," instead of to "Truth." Then "Theology" puts forward his claim to her hand, and all parties repair to Westminster to bring the matter to a judicial decision; but "Truth" hurries on before to the king's palace, and speaks in the ear of the Knight "Conscience." The knight speaks with the king, and the king gives command to put "Reward" in prison as soon as she arrives. But in prison she fares by no means amiss. The judges in Westminster gain the palace for her cause, a begging friar visits her, hears her confession, and gives her absolution. At last the King sends for her to his presence, gives her a reprimand, and sets her at liberty upon her promises of amendment; he even proposes to wed her to his knight "Conscience," but the knight, while thanking him in the most courtly terms, draws a picture of her character in the blackest colours. She defends herself in a way to win for her the king's grace, whereupon "Conscience" appeals to "Reason," and in the end the king takes "Conscience" and "Reason" to be his councillors.

The poet awakes, but soon falls asleep again, and now begins the second vision. He sees again the same plain full of people, to whom "Reason" is preaching a sermon, in which he tells every rank and condition of people his mind. The sinners before him are seized with remorse

They fall upon their knees, and "Penitence" gives them absolution. And now thousands rise to their feet and set out on a pilgrimage to "Truth." But nobody knows the way. At last a ploughman calls out that he knows the way. It is here that Piers Plowman comes upon the scene. He offers to show the pilgrims the road in person if they will only wait till he has ploughed and sown a bit of ground, and in the meantime several help him at his work. When it comes, however, to the ears of "Truth" that Piers purposes to make a pilgrimage to her, she sends him a letter of indulgence, desiring him to stay at home and work, and informing him that the indulgence is applicable to all who assist him in his work, a message which awakens among all the greatest joy. But, in the end, nothing more is found in the brief of indulgence than these two lines, "And those who have done good shall go into everlasting life, but those who have done evil, into everlasting fire" (Matt. xxv. 46). Then the poet awakes again; he reflects upon his dream, and he is convinced that "Do Good" will be better in the last judgment than a whole pocketful of indulgences, or letters of fraternity.

From the third to the tenth vision the representation principally turns upon the three allegorical persons, "Do Good," "Do Better," and "Do Best." The allegorical action passes over more and more into didactic poetry, "the Plowman" coming repeatedly upon the scene, but in such a way that under the transparent veil of that figure the Redeemer Himself is here and there to be recognised.

The whole drift of the poem is to recommend practical Christianity. The kernel of its moral teaching is the pure Christian love of our neighbour—love especially to the poor and lowly; a love of our neighbour reaching its highest point in patient forbearance, and love towards enemies—a love inspired by the voluntary passion of Christ for us. As the "Luxenburgers" (a false coin then circulating widely in England) resemble a "sterling" in the stamp, but are of base metal, so many nowadays bear the stamp of the heavenly King and His crown, but the metal—the soul—is alloyed with sin. The poet accordingly lays bare, on the one hand, the evil works and ways of all ranks and conditions of men, dealing castigation round among all classes with the lash of his satire; while, on the other hand, he commends the good wherever he finds it. That he is by no means a heretic has already been remarked. He assumes without question the whole body of Church doctrine; the doctrine of transubstantiation, *e.g.*, he takes for granted as something

self-evident; and however much value he attaches to the conscience and the natural understanding of man, he is by no means a despiser of learning, and especially of theology. But what he demands is, that the seven liberal arts and every science should be cultivated in no selfish spirit, in order to acquire wealth; nor from a motive of vanity, in order to be styled "Magister;" otherwise men only lose their time in them; but from love to our Lord and to the people. In other words, learning has value in his eyes only when benefit accrues from it to mankind; and therefore he thinks it a practice to be censured, when mendicant-friars and masters of arts preach to the people about matters above human comprehension, instead of speaking to them of the Ten Commandments and the seven sins. Such men only wish to show off their high learning, and to make a boast of it; they do not act from sincere love to their neighbour.

On the other hand, he commends all princes and nobles, bishops and lawyers, who in their dignified places are useful to others, and render real service to the world. But "Truth" gives her "brief and seal," not only to men of learning and rank, but also to men of trade and traffic, to assure them that they shall not come short of salvation, if with all their diligence in trade and money-making, they give out of their gains for the building of bridges, the feeding of the poor, to help in sending children to school, or teaching them a trade, or in setting out poor young women in marriage, and in promoting the cause of religion. Industrious and honest married people are also highly commended; it is they who hold the world together, for from marriage spring both kings and knights, emperors and servants, father-confessors, holy virgins and martyrs. Evidently Piers the Plowman is made the chief figure of the poem, not merely on account of his humble condition in life, but also to do honour in his person to labour, joined with the fear of God. Both points of view are inseparably connected in the poem. Undoubtedly there is something of a democratic spirit in the teaching of the author, but it is a Christian democracy, like that word of the Redeemer, "To the poor the Gospel is preached." More than once it is remarked by the poet, how much better off in that respect people in low condition are than the high-placed and the educated. The seven sins are far more dangerous for the rich than for the poor. Augustin himself (the most enlightened doctor and the greatest of the four, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerom, and Gregory the Great), is appealed to as a witness for this, for the poet has read in

one of his sermons the passage, "Behold the ignorant themselves take the kingdom of heaven by violence."

That none come into the kingdom of God sooner than the poor and lowly is a thought which he dwells upon in several parts of the poem. For the Church the poet cherishes deep veneration, but this by no means prevents him from speaking openly of her faults. In one place, he makes the general remark, that while uprightness and holiness spring from the Church by the instrumentality of men of pure character and life, who are the teachers of God's law, all sorts of evil, on the other hand, spring from her, when priests and pastors are not what they ought to be. What he has chiefly to censure in the priesthood of his time is their worldliness, their sins of selfishness and of simony. Other shortcomings and failings, indeed, are also mentioned, as when the ignorance of many priests is satirized by the introduction of a curate who knows nothing of the cardinal virtues, and never heard of any cardinals but those of the Pope's making, or when indolence owns frankly that he has been priest and parson for more than thirty winters, but can neither sing by notes nor read the lives of the saints. He can hunt horses better than tell his parishioners the meaning of a clause in *Beatus Vir*, or *Beati Omnes* in the Psalter.

But it is the worldliness of the clergy that the satirist chiefly lashes. His complaint of the abuse that foreign priests should have so much office and power in England, reminds us vividly of Grossetête's demands, as well as of the measures which King and Parliament, twenty years before, had adopted against Papal provisions and reservations. Hardest and bitterest of all are his complaints of the self-seeking and avarice which prevail in the Church.

"Conscience" complains before the king's tribunal of the Lady Reward, on this as well as other grounds, that she has infected the Pope with her poison, and made evil the holy Church. She is in the confidence of the Pontiff, for she and Master Simony seal his bulls; she consecrates bishops, be they ever so ignorant; and she takes care for the priests to let them have liberty to keep their mistresses as long as they live. Time was when men lived in self-denial and privation, but nowadays men value the yellow gold piece more than the cross of Christ, which conquered death and sin. When Constantine endowed the Church with lands and lordships, an angel was heard to cry aloud in Rome, This day the Church of God has drunk venom, and the heirs of St. Peter's power "are a-poysoned all."

"If possessions be poison,
And imperfect them make,
Good were to discharge them
For holy Church sake,
And purge them of poison
E'er more peril befall."

The suggestions of this passage take the form in another place of a prophecy—the prophecy of a coming king, who will punish with heavy blows all monks and nuns and canons who have broken their rules, and, in league with his nobles, will reform them by force.

"And yet shall come a king
And confess you all
And beat you, as the Bible telleth,
For breaking of your rule,
And amend you monks and monials,
And put you to your penance,
Ad pristinum statum ire.
And barons and their bairns,
Blame you and reprove."

If it is the "monks possessioners," or landed orders, who are here meant, neither are the Mendicant orders spared in other places, as, *e.g.*, in the passage where a begging friar visits the all-fascinating Lady "Reward" in person, and gives her absolution in return for a horse-load of wheat, when she begs him to be equally obliging to noble lords and ladies of her acquaintance who love to wanton in their pleasures. "And then," says she, "will I restore your church for you, and build you a cloister-walk, and whiten your walls, and put you in painted windows, and pay for all the work out of my own purse; so that all men shall say I am a sister of your house."

It is thus that the Visions of Piers the Plowman attack, not indeed the doctrine of the Church of that age, but in the most outspoken manner, all the prevailing sins of the clergy from the highest to the lowest, and in so doing, render distinguished service in helping forward the work of reform.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I.

NOTES TO SECTION I.

1. Thomas Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria. Anglo-Saxon Period.* London, 1842, p. 384 f.
2. Compare C. Friedrich Koch, *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache.* Vol. I, p. 8. Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language*, p. 349.
3. Ranke, *Englische Geschichte* vornehmlich in xvi. and xvii. Jahrhundert. Vol. I., p. 16.
4. Compare the carefully accurate representation given in Reuter, *Geschichte Alexander's III.*, and *der Kirche Seiner Zeit III.*, p. 188; also pp. 713-724, "Zur Kirchengeschichte England's in den Jahren, 1171-4.
5. Constantine Hoefler has the merit of having been the first to call attention to what he has called the Papal State System in his "Anna von Luxemburg," p. 6; and in "The Avignon Popes." Vienna, 1871, p. 7 f.
6. The complaint against King John, made by the barons, "quod suo tempore ancillavit regnum quod invenit liberum," is given by Abbot William in his *Chronicle of the Monastery of St. Andrew in d'Achery's Spicilegium*, Vol. II., p. 853.
7. Rymer, *Foedera.* Vol. I., Part 1, p. 138.
8. So the Church was called even thus early—e.g., in *Magna Charta* itself—Rymer, I, 132. Comp. *Pauli Geschichte von England*, vol. III., pp. 898, 909.
9. Matthew of Paris, *Historia Major*—in truth, Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum* in Matthew of Paris. London, 1686, p. 313 f. Comp. Roberti Grosseteste *Epistolæ.* Luard. Lond. 1861, p. 22.

NOTES TO SECTION II.

10. What follows is a revision of my "Programm," Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. Leipzig, 1867, 4to.
11. *Opus tertium.* Ed. Brewer, 1869, pp. 31, 91.
12. Of Grosseteste's numerous works nothing more than a few pieces have as yet been published. At the beginning of the sixteenth century his Commentaries on the works of Aristotle, and on the Mystical Theology of the Pseudo Dionysius were printed, the latter in Strasburg in 1502; but these subjects have very little interest for the present age. In the seventeenth century one of his successors in the See of Lincoln, John Williams (1612-1641), who died Archbishop of York in 1649, conceived the design of publishing his collected works in 3 folios, and he had already made collections and preparations with that view; but the outbreak of the civil war prevented the execution of the design. Towards the end of the same century, Edward Brown published in his appendix to the *Fasciculus Rerum Expendarum*, etc., several pieces of Grosseteste, especially several of his sermons, theological thoughts, and a portion of his correspondence. This correspondence has recently been edited more critically and in a complete form by Luard of Cambridge, in the collection of "Rerum Britannicarum Medii ævi Scriptores," published at the cost of the English Government, under the title "*Roberti Grosseteste, episcopi quondam Lincolnensis Epistolæ.* London, 1862." This valuable correspondence is the most trustworthy source for learning the development of the man and his character. Repeated attempts have been made to furnish a Biography of Grosseteste, but several of these never got beyond the stage of the collection of

materials. So it befell Bishop Barlow of Lincoln, Samuel Knight, Anthony Wood, and Edward Brown. It was not till the end of last century that a biography of the venerable man was prepared and sent to the press—Samuel Pegge's "Life of Grosseteste." Lond., 1793. But the book was an ill-starred one; most of the copies are said to have perished in a fire which broke out in the printing office. The fact is certain, that the book is a very rare one even in England, and that there is hardly a single copy of it to be found in all the libraries of Germany. Luard, in his preface, has thrown some fresh light upon the life of Grosseteste.

13. In Luard's *Roberti Grosseteste's Epistolæ*. Preface, p. xxxii.

14. Grosseteste alludes to this question having been put by him in a letter to the Cardinal-Legate Otho, written in 1239,—Ep. 74 of Luard's Coll., p. 242; and I know of no incident in his life with which I can more suitably connect it than with that given in the text.

15. *Epistolæ*, p. 43 f.

16. *Epistolæ* 40, p. 132; 41, p. 134; 50, p. 146; 83, p. 275.

17. Dugdale, *Monasticum Anglicanum*. New ed. by Caley, Ellis, and Bandinel, 1830 fol., v. 6, p. 1266, with plan and 4 views of the Cathedral.

18. *Epistolæ* 22, p. 72 f.

19. *Epistolæ* 73, p. 235 f.

20. *Epistolæ* 55, p. 170.

21. *Epistolæ* 93, p. 290 f.

22. *Epistolæ* 4, p. 32.

23. *Epistolæ* 74, p. 241 f.

24. *Epistolæ* 50, p. 146. "The *Sermones ad Clerum*," published by Edward Brown in 1690, were no doubt made use of by the Bishop in his visitations in addressing the clergy of the different rural deaneries.

25. *Epistolæ* 23, p. 90. Comp. his Letter to King Henry III. No. 124, p. 348.

26. Comp. Brown's *Appendix ad Fasciculum*, p. 322.

27. *Epistolæ* 24, p. 95 f.

28. *Epistolæ* 13, p. 57 f. Comp. 51, p. 147 f.

29. *E.g. Sermo ad Clerum*, in Brown. *Monitio et persuasio pastorum*, on the text, "I am the Good Shepherd," p. 260 f.

30. *Epistolæ* 17, p. 63 f. Comp. 11, p. 50 f., where his feeling of responsibility for the salvation of the souls committed to his episcopal charge is strikingly expressed.

31. *Epistolæ* 26, p. 102. Ep. 19 and 71, pp. 68 and 204.

32. *Epistolæ* 74, p. 241 f. With special earnestness he appeals in this matter to the conscience of a certain Hugo of Pateshull (Ep. 25, p. 97 f.), who died in 1241, Bishop of Lichfield.

33. *Epistolæ* 46, p. 130 f.

34. *Epistolæ* 27 and 28, pp. 105 f. and 108 f., and still more fully in Ep. 72, p. 205, 13.

35. Comp. Pauli's *Programm* on Grosseteste and Adam of Marsh. Tübingen, 1864.

36. Epp. 40 and 41, pp. 131 f. ! 133 f.—the former addressed to the General of the Dominicans, the latter to the Franciscan General, both pretty much in the same terms.

37. *Epistolæ* 34, p. 121.

38. *Epistolæ* 107, p. 317.

39. *Epistolæ* 58, p. 180.

40. In the "Circulars" to the Archdeacons above referred to. Ep. 107, p. 317.

41. *Sermo Roberti*, etc., in Brown. *Appendix*, pp. 250, 257. The state of the text of which, however, leaves much to be desired.

42. An allusion to the Greek Church.

43. We confine ourselves to the simplest outlines of the course of thought. The way in which he gives expression to his thoughts, while making use of the most powerful rebukes of the inspired prophets, is sometimes such as must have made the hearers tremble.

44. Here he comes to speak of the evil state of matters which was the occasion of his undertaking the journey to Lyons.

45. *Non obstantibus privilegiis*, etc.—the clause so often made use of when the Pope of the day evaded, or rather set aside, *ad hoc*, the ordinances of his predecessors or even his own, still in legal force, in favour of a special case, or in behalf of some favoured individual.

46. The Papal Brief has been printed in full by Brown in his Appendix, p. 399, and in Luard, p. 432 f., note.

47. This is indeed the view commonly taken. Even Luard in his Preface, p. lxxix. f., and Pauli in his Programm on Grossetête, and Adam von Marsh, p. 24, assume that the letter was addressed to the Pope. The superscription, also, which Luard has given to the letter, no doubt on MS. authority, indicates that the letter was addressed to the Pope himself. Nevertheless, this superscription is in my judgment erroneous and unguinea. For in the first place the style, *discretio vestra*, is quite unsuitable to the Pope. Grossetête himself makes use of *sanctis vestra* in the two Epp. 110 and 117, pp. 328 and 338, which were certainly addressed to the Pope—a circumstance which was not unnoticed by Brown. But next, the fact is a decisive one that toward the end of the letter, the address, *reverendi domini* occurs, which undeniably presupposes a plurality of persons addressed. Besides, the tone of the letter, on the supposition that it was addressed to the Pope, would have been quite unaccountable. The fact is not ignored by Luard, that the style of this letter differs greatly from that of the two which were, without doubt, intended for the Pope, Preface lxxix. f. But what he brings forward to account for this difference is not quite satisfactory, if we suppose that this letter, too, was addressed to the Pope. Still, however, Brown is right in maintaining that the letter was intended for the eye of the Pope, whether it came to his hands directly or indirectly. Undoubtedly so, and for this reason, it required no little courage and good conscience to write to both the Pope's commissaries in such a strain; whereas we should be compelled to think far otherwise of the tact and good taste of the writer if it were certain that he had meant his words directly for the eye of the Pope himself. The mistake, however, is explained in some measure by the circumstance, that the Pope's agent, Innocent, bore the same name as the Pope himself.

49. This celebrated letter is to be found in Brown, p. 400 f.; in Oudin's *Commentaria de Scriptoribus Eccles. Antiquae*, vol. III., p. 142 f.; and in Luard, Ep. 128, pp. 432 f. Luard tells us that it occurs times without number in the MSS. Among those who have referred to it, I have to name Wiclif himself. He was not only well acquainted with its contents, but he has also in one place reproduced it almost entire—I mean in his still unprinted work, *De Civili Dominio*, lib. I., c. 43, MS. 1841, of the Imperial Library of Vienna, side by side with the Pope's two letters. And Wiclif not only incorporated the letter with his own work, but also added to it a kind of commentary in the way of justifying its contents, in which he states precisely its principal thoughts, and adopts them as his own. Huss also knew the Bishop's Epistle, and cited it in part in his work, *De Ecclesia*, c. 18, Opera, 1558, v. I., p. 235 f. As to the state of its text, it is by no means free from errors in the Wiclif MS. just named, but still in some places this MS. supplies readings materially superior to those of Brown and Luard. May I add in this place one more remark in conclusion. Luard has observed, p. xli, that it is not known when or by whom the collection of Grossetête's letters was made. Now, as the MSS. used by Luard, which comprise the whole collection or the greater part of it, are of no higher age than the fifteenth century, and as only single letters were found in copies dating from the fourteenth century, I do not think it superfluous to mention that I find in Wiclif, who more than once gives accurate citations from other letters of Grossetête besides the one mentioned above, exactly the same ordering or numbering of the letters which Brown gives, and which is retained also

by Luard. As now those writings of Wiclif, which contain accurate quotations from the letters of Grossetête, belong to the year 1370-78, the fact becomes certain that even as early as that date the collection existed the same in extent and order as we now know it. And as Wiclif quotes the letters by their numbers, and assumes this order to be already known, we may very well infer that the collection is at least fifty years older, and may even be carried back in date to the thirteenth century.

50. Matth. Paris, *Hist. Maj. Angliæ*. Edit., W. Wats, p. 872.

51. The letter of Edward I. to Clement V., of 6th May 1307, is to be found in Rymer, *Foedera* II., p. 1016, and in Wood, *Hist. Univ. Oxon.*, Vol. I., p. 105.

52. Wood, *Hist. et Antiquit. Univ. Oxon.*, Vol. I., p. 105, from a MS. of Gascoigne. The Oxford Declaration does not belong to the year 1354, as Luard seems to suppose, p. lxxxiv., but was first made in 1307, in connection with the proposal for the canonisation of the Bishop. Wood introduced this subject under the year 1254, merely because Grossetête's death had occurred immediately before.

53. Especially in the passage quoted above from *De Civili Dominio*, Wiclif calls the Bishop of Lincoln a Saint, *ex istis . . . istius sancti . . . primo sequitur*.

54. In the same passage in Wood, Vol. I., p. 106, which has already been used immediately above.

55. Printed in Walch, *Monimenta mediæ ævi*, Vol. I., Fasc. 2, p. 181 f. Comp. especially pp. 190, 192.

56. Precor, O pater alme, Roberte, etc. The whole is printed, with few omissions, in Henry Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*. Lond., 1691. Vol. II., pp. 325-341.

57. Comp. Hase, *Handbuch der Protestantischen Polemik*. First Edit., p. 315.

58. *Epistolæ*, 123, p. 346 f.

59. *Hæc sola ad portum salutis dirigitur Petri navicula*. Ep. 115, p. 336. The *hæc sola* answers completely to the Reformation principle—*verbo solo*—which constitutes the formal principle of Protestantism.

60. *Epistolæ* p. 85, 269.

NOTES TO SECTION III.

61. His work in five books, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliæ*, written in the years 1256-59, ranks among jurists, not only as the earliest, but also as the foremost scientific treatment of English law in the middle age. Comp. Karl Jüterbock's *Henricus de Bracton und sein Verhältniss zum Römischen Recht*. Berlin, 1862, p. 40 f.

61a. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, vol. III., pp. 713-724.

62. Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. I., p. 907 f. Dated Anagni, 27th June 1299.

63. Rymer, *Foedera*, I., p. 928 f.

64. John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*. Lond., 1870. Vol. II., 689 f.

65. The Brief is printed in Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*. Ed., Riley, 1863, I., 259 f.

66. The King's reply also in Walsingham, I., 255.

67. A Statute of Provisors of Benefices in Ruffhead, the *Statutes*, 1786, 4to, pp. 260-64.

68. The word *præmunire* (instead of *præmonere*) does not stand in the text of the law itself, but used to be employed in the writ of the sheriffs appointed by the law to issue; vide Barrington's *Observations on the more Ancient Statutes*. London, 1796, 4to, p. 279.

69. In Walsingham, as cited above, p. 258.

70. A letter, numbered 113, in Vol. xxiv., p. 1208, of the *Biblioth. Maxima*, P.F., from Peter de Blois, Archdeacon of Bath, to the Archbishop of York, calling upon him to arrest the progress of the enemies of the Church by Councils and severe

penalties, might seem to prove a different state of matters, if the description of the heretics referred to were a little more exact. These are manifestly described as *Cathari*, but as to their doings and proceedings nothing definite whatever is stated. It is possible that the reference may be to imported Catharism, of which mention is to be made immediately.

71. Chronicle of the Augustinian Canon, William of Newbury, in Yorkshire, †1208. *Historia Rerum Anglicarum Willelmi Parvi*, ad fidem codd. MSS., rec. Lond. 1856. 8vo., Vol. I., 120 f.

72. Henry of Knighton, Canon of Leicester, in the second half of the fourteenth century, *Chronica de eventibus Angliæ*, in Twysden's *Historiæ Anglicæ Scriptores*. Lond., 1852. T. III. Col. 2418.

73. Petri de Pilichdorf contra sectam Waldensium tractatus in Biblioth. Maxima Patrum, Lyon 1677, xxv., especially c. 15, p. 281. Here the author's drift is to show to the Waldenses a number of "peoples and races and tongues," where, by God's grace, all are orthodox in the faith, and have remained utterly untouched by this sect, *ubi omnes homines sunt immunes a tua secta penitus conservati*; and among these he mentions England first of all, then Flanders, etc.

74. Flathe, *Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation*. II. p. 159 f., 184, 196.

75. The poem is printed in the collection, "Political poems and songs relating to English History," ed. Thomas Wright, Vol. I., pp. 231-219, under the title added by the editor, *Against the Lollards*. The date assigned to it, 1381, I cannot for weighty reasons regard as correct. In the seventh strophe, says the author,

O terra jam pestifera,
dudum eras puerpera
omnia sanæ scientiæ,
haereticis labe libera,
omni errore extera,
exors omnis fallaciæ.

76. I make use here intentionally of the words of Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen, Papethum und Kirchenstaat*. München, 1861, xxx. f.

NOTES TO SECTION IV.

77. When King Leo IV. of Lesser Armenia applied to Pope Benedict XII. for assistance against the Saracens, the latter replied, in 1341, that before he could do anything for this object, the Armenians must renounce their many errors. A schedule of these errors was appended to the Brief, extending to the number of 117. From that time attention was directed in the west of Europe to the differences in doctrine and usage of the Armenian Church. Hence the subject and title of Richard's work, *De Erroribus Armenorum*.

78. Vid. Dr. Karl Werner's *Geschichte der Apologet und, Polemisch. Literatur der Christl. Theologie*. Schaffhausen, 1864. III., 409 f. Comp. Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte*, IV., p. 569 f., p. 425 f.

79. Joh. Bale, *Scriptorum Britannicorum Centuriæ*, p. 246.

80. *Dialogus*, IV., c. 36. Ed. Lechler, p. 575.

81. *Defensorium curatorium contra eos qui privilegiatos se dicunt*, printed in Goldast's *Monarchia*, II., pp. 1392-1410, with a better text in Brown's *Appendix ad Fasciculum rerum expetend*, etc., V. II., pp. 466-486. This speech, however, is said to have been printed in Lyons as early as 1496, and in Paris in 1511, along with a tract in reply to it, to be mentioned further on; vid. d'Argentré *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus*, 1-379.

82. Schwab, Joh. Gerson, p. 459 f.

83. *Unde non video, qualiter ista opinio de observantia mendicitatis spontaneæ fuerit introducta, nisi ignorando scripturam, aut fingendo eam esse Christi vitæ conformem, ut per ipsam quæstus amplior haberetur*; vid. Brown, p. 466.

85. Brown's *Fasciculus*, etc., p. 466.

85A. *Ibid.*, p. 468.

86. Of course, the Mendicant orders themselves, as a deeply interested party, could not be expected to give an impartial judgment on the proceedings of the archbishop. We learn from the History of the Franciscans, by Lucas Wadding, how they sought to explain such an opposition on his part. The archbishop, it was alleged, had set his heart upon getting for his own palace an ornament belonging to a neighbouring convent of the Order, and when this was refused him, and the magistrates of Armagh had taken the monks and their rights under their protection, the Archbishop conceived a malicious feeling against them, and now did all he could to increase the opposition which had already begun to be stirred up against the Order in England.—*Annales Minorum*, IV., p. 62.

87. His name is written Connovius or Chonoe. The piece is entitled *Defensio Religionis Mendicantium*, and is printed in Goldast's *Monarchia*, pp. 1410-1444.

NOTES TO SECTION V.

88. In what follows, I present a revision of my Essay, De Thomas Bradwardino Commentatio. Lipsia, 1862-4.

89. It seems to me very probable that this epithet may have been suggested to his admirers by his frequent use of the word *profound*, e. g., *profundissima hæc abyssus*. De Causa Dei, p. 808.

90. Thomas Bradwardini Archiepiscopi olim Cantuariensis De Causa Dei, et de Virtute Causarum Libri tres. Lond., 1618, fol. Edited by Henry Savile, Head of the same College in Oxford (Merton) where Bradwardine had once been a student and fellow.

91. In Germany, Schroeckh, it is true, in his "Kirchengeschichte," gave a pretty long extract from the "Causa Dei," v. 34, pp. 226-240. But from his time down to the present day, if I am not quite mistaken, all our most learned Church historians have bestowed little attention upon the work, or as good as none at all. Neander, at least, in his General History of the Christian Religion and Church, has passed over Bradwardine in profound silence; while Gieseler, though he gives several important passages from him (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 3 Edit., II., p. 239), has entirely misconceived the fundamental principle of his teaching; as Baur also does, in his "Christliche Dogmengeschichte," p. 265, 2 Edit.

92. The most reliable account of his life is contained in Savile's Preface to the "Causa Dei."

93. The small village in the county of Hereford, not far from the borders of Wales, from which Thomas took his second name, is still called Bradwardine.

94. De Causa Dei, III., c. 22.

95. *Ingrata mihi gratia displicebat*. The word-play here cannot be imitated in English.

96. De Causa Dei, Lib. I., c. 35, p. 308.—*Postea vero adhuc nondum Theologia factus auditor; prædicto argumento velut quodam gratiæ radio visitatus, sub quadam tenui veritatis imagine videbar mihi videre a longe (i. e., e longinquo) gratiam Dei omnia bona merita præcedentem tempore et natura, scilicet gratiam Dei voluntatem, qui prius utroque modo vult merentem salvari et prius naturaliter operatur meritum ejus in eo, quam ipse, sicut est in omnibus motibus primus Motor; unde et ei gratias refero qui mihi hanc gratiam gratis dedit.*

97. In proof of this, I point to the fervent prayer with which Bradwardine towards the close of the whole work, begins Cap. 50 of Book III., p. 808. He invokes the Redeemer thus:—"Good Master,—Thou my only Master,—my Master and Lord, Thou who from my youth up, when I gave myself to this work by Thy impulse, hast taught me up to this day all that I have ever learned of the truth, and all that, as Thy pen, I have ever written of it,—send down upon me, also now, of Thy great goodness, Thy light, so that Thou who hast led me into the profoundest of depths, mayst also lead up to the mountain-height of this inaccessible truth. Thou who hast brought me into this great and wide sea, bring me also into the haven. Thou who hast conducted me into this wide and pathless desert, Thou my Guide, and Way, and End, lead me also unto the end.

Show me, I pray Thee, Thou most learned of all teachers, show to Thy little child, who knows no outlet from the difficulty, how to solve the knot of Thy Word so hardly knit. . . . But now I thank Thee, serenest Lord, that to him who asketh, Thou hast given; to him that seeketh, Thou hast shown the way; and to him that knocketh, Thou hast opened the door of piety, the door of clearness, the door of truth. For now when Thou liftest the light of Thy countenance upon Thy servant, I believe I see the right understanding of Thy word," etc. In one place, after he had been warmly defending Augustin against a misinterpretation of Peter Lombard, and had subjected the scholastic to a somewhat sharp critique, maintaining that the latter interpretation is in direct opposition to the meaning of that Father (Lib. II., c. 10, p. 502), he is almost alarmed at his own boldness, and pleads in excuse for himself "the zeal for the house of God and catholic truth, which fills him with a vehement ardour against the error of the Pelagians; for it is not against Lombard himself that he has said a word, but against his error, because it is so nearly akin to the false teaching of Pelagius.

98. De Causa Dei, I., c. 38, p. 319. Compare c. 39, p. 347.

99. Ibid. I., c. 43, p. 392, f.

100. Ibid. I., c. 35, p. 311.—*Factus est gratiæ laudator, gratiæ magnificus ac strenuus propugnator.*

101. Ibid. Bradwardine's Preface, p. 7 f. Also the end of the work, III., c. 53, p. 872 f.

102. Ibid. p. 8.

NOTES TO SECTION VI.

103. In the British Museum there are eight of these MSS., from ten to twelve in the different libraries of Cambridge, and as many in those of Oxford, etc.

104. In Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*, under the year 1381. Ed., Riley, II., p. 33 f.

105. Comp. Introduction of Pickering to his edition of Pierce Plowman. London, 1856, I., cxviii. f.

122. *E.g.* Vs. 1901 f. The command of God to Saul in his war with the Amalekites, to put every man, woman, and child to death, as well as the cattle, is expressed thus:—

"Burnes and beastes,
bren hem to dethe,
widwes and wyves,
women and children."

123. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*. Ed., Riley, I., 296.

124. Our citations are from the newest edition of the poem, 1856, by Thomas Wright, 2 vols. 8vo., London. This is properly a second edition, following upon that which was prepared by Pickering. The Introduction, from which we have derived several of the facts mentioned above, was drawn up by Pickering, after whose death Thomas Wright, the well-known historian of literature, took charge of the new edition. As early as the sixteenth century two different editions of the Vision appeared—the first, published in 1550, was edited by Crowley, and went through three editions in a single year. Crowley belonged to that estimable class of publishers who in the sixteenth century united in themselves the character of the scholar and author with that of printer and bookseller, and who deserved so well of literature. The other edition, which appeared in 1561, was also published in London by a famous printer, Owen Roger. In 1813 Whitaker published an edition of the book, upon the authority of a MS. which exhibits a peculiar recension of the text.

125. Passus xv., v. 10, 607; 10, 659. The poet proceeds upon the mediæval tradition of the Donation of Constantine. Comp. Döllinger, the Pope-Fables of the Middle Age. Munich, 1863, p. 61. Like the poet of our "Visions," Dante, in the "Inferno," canto xix., v. 115, curses that Donation as the source of all the avarice and simony in the Church—

"Abi Costantin, di quanto mal fa matre
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote,
Che de te pere il primo ricco patre!"

The legend in particular of the angel's voice, "*Hodie effusum venenum in ecclesia*," is found in the scholastic divines, chroniclers, and poets of the thirteenth century. See Döllinger, as above.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER I., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

(1.) RICHARD FITZRALPH, Archbishop of Armagh—

There are two well authenticated facts in the earlier life of this remarkable prelate left unmentioned by Professor Lechler, which it is desirable to bring into view. The first of these is his early connection with Balliol College, of which he was for some time a Fellow. This fact is distinctly stated in the following passage of Anthony Wood's *History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*. Having stated the chief provisions of the original statutes of the college—those of the Lady Devorguilla—he goes on to say, that "the said statutes were for divers years kept inviolable, yet not so much but that divers of the said scholars, about forty years after, having raised some doubts from them, would not content themselves to study the liberal arts—only such that were performed in the schools of arts by artists according to the aptest sense of the statutes, but also would ascend to higher faculties, though prohibited so to do by the then extrinsic masters or procurators named Robert de Leycester, D.D., a Minorite, and Nicolas de Tingwyke, Doctor of Physic and Bachelor of Divinity. At length, the matter being controverted among them a considerable time, was in 1325 referred, with the procurators' consent, to two doctors and two masters that were formerly fellows of this house, Drs. Richard de Kamsale and Walter de Hockstow, who then, after both parties were heard, decided this matter in the Common Hall thus: That no Fellow of this house, whether Master or Scholar, learn any Faculty, or give his mind to it, either in full term or vacation, besides the liberal arts that by artists are read and practised in the School of Arts." The college incident here referred to occurred only about ten years before the coming of Wiclif to Oxford and his probable admission to Balliol, and will be found in the sequel to have a bearing upon the course of study through which Wiclif passed as a member of the University of Oxford. (*Vide Additional Note to Chap. III.—Wiclif's connection with Balliol College.*) As Fitzralph was undoubtedly a man of enlightened views, which were considerably in advance of his age, his connection with Balliol in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, taken along with Wiclif's in its second quarter, may serve to suggest that Balliol, then one of the youngest of the colleges of the University, was also one of the most free and liberal in its ideas; and probably, too, the remarkable impatience of divers of its scholars of being limited to the studies usually included in arts, and their eager desire to read in "the higher faculties," may be taken to indicate, in these young men, a more than ordinary amount of intellectual life and ardour. The archives of Balliol contain a brief Latin record of the conclusion arrived at by the four referees to whose decision the question was submitted, and a full transcript of this record is given in the recent report of Mr. Riley on the Balliol Papers to the Royal Commission on Historical MSS. This interesting document will be found below in the Additional Notes to Chap. II., note 5. The other fact in the career of Archbishop Fitzralph remaining to be mentioned is that he, as well as Bradwardine, was for some time private chaplain to the famous Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham, who was consecrated 19th December 1333, and died 14th April 1345. This bishop was the greatest book-lover and collector of his time, and wrote a work on his favourite subject, entitled "*Philobiblos*." His library was one of the choicest in England; and passed, after his death, to Durham College, in Oxford. His name comes into connection with some matters of Balliol College during his episcopate as will appear in the sequel, these matters having an interesting bearing upon the early academic life of Wiclif. (*Vide Additional Note to Chap. III.*) His high apprecia-

tion of two such men as Fitzralph and Bradwardine may perhaps be taken as an indication of his own spirit and bearing on the great Church-questions of the time. For the fact of their connection with him as his chaplains, see Introduction to *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense*, edited by Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records.

(2.) "THE VISION OF PIERS PLOWMAN."

Professor Lechler's numerous quotations from Langland's Poem, only a few of which we have thought it necessary to reproduce for English readers, are all taken from the text of the two editions brought out by Thomas Wright in 1842 and 1856. But it may be useful to mention here, for the benefit of English readers who would like to look farther into this really great moral and religious allegory of the age of Wiclif, that in 1867, 1869, and 1873, three editions of the poem, representing the three distinct forms which its text assumed successively under the author's own hand, were brought out by Rev. W. W. Skeat, in connection with the early English Text Society. This work of Mr. Skeat is characterised by Professor Henry Morley, in his "Library of English Literature," as singularly thorough. He publishes, with a special introduction, each of its three forms separately, as obtained from a collation of MSS., with various readings and references to the MSS. containing each form. A fourth section is assigned to the General Introduction, Notes, and Index. Besides this work on the whole Poem, Mr. Skeat has contributed to the Clarendon Press Series the first seven Passus of "The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman, by William Langland, according to the version revised and enlarged by the author about A.D. 1377, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary," as an aid to the right study of early English in colleges and schools, and also as a guide to the reading of the whole Poem by those to whom its English, without such help, would be obscure." Mr. Skeat's thorough study of the Poem from all points of view makes him our chief authority in any question concerning it.

Professor Morley himself has given a long and lucid analysis of the whole Poem, extending to twenty-five pages double-columned in the second department of his "Library of English Literature" (Cassell's), devoted to the literature of religion; and his high appreciation, both of the Poem and the Poet, may be gathered from the closing paragraph of his extremely painstaking account:—"So ends the vision, with no victory attained, a world at war, and a renewed cry for the grace of God; a new yearning to find Christ, and bring with Him the day when wrongs and hatred are no more. The fourteenth century yielded no more fervent expression of the purest Christian labour to bring man to God. Langland lays fast hold of all the words of Christ, and reads them into a Divine law of love and duty. The ideal of a Christian life shines through his poem, while it paints with homely force the evils against which it is directed. On points of theology he never disputes, but an ill life for him is an ill life, whether in Pope or peasant. He is a Church Reformer in the truest sense, seeking to strengthen the hands of the clergy by amendment of the lives and characters of those who are untrue to their holy calling."

It is gratifying to meet with so hearty a sympathy with aims so evangelical and holy as those of "Piers Ploughman," in a literary critic of our time of such mark as Professor Morley. Nor can we deny ourselves and our readers the pleasure of bringing up again into view, side-by-side with the appreciations of a German scholar and divine who has so much sympathy with Wiclif and all his English precursors as our learned author, the noble words in which the illustrious historian of Latin Christianity has put on record his estimate of the author of Piers Plowman's vision:—"The extraordinary manifestation of the religion, of the language, of the social and political notions, of the English character, of the condition of the passions and feelings of moral and provincial England, commences, and with Chaucer and Wiclif completes the revelation of this transition period, the reign of Edward III. Throughout its institutions, language, religious sentiment, Teutonism is now holding its first initiating struggle with Latin Christianity. In Chaucer is heard a voice from the court, from the castle, from the city, from universal England. In Wiclif is heard a voice from the University, from the seat of theology and scholastic philosophy, from the centre and stronghold of the hierarchy—a voice of revolt and defiance, taken up and echoed in the pulpit throughout the land against the sacerdotal domination. In the Vision of Piers Plowman is heard a

voice from the wild Malvern hills, the voice, it should seem, of an humble parson, a secular priest. He has passed some years in London, but his home, his heart, is among the poor rural population of central mercantile England. . . . The visionary is no disciple, no precursor of Wiclif in his broader religious views. The Loller of Piers Plowman is no Lollard—he applies the name as a term of reproach for a lazy, indolent vagrant. The poet is no dreamy speculative theologian—he acquiesces, seemingly with unquestioning faith, in the Creed and in the usages of the Church. It is in his intense, absorbing, moral feeling that he is beyond his age. With him outward observances are but hollow shows, mockeries, hypocrisies, without the inward power of religion. It is not so much in his keen, cutting satire on all matters of the Church, as his solemn installation of Reason and Conscience as the guides of the self-directed soul, that he is breaking the yoke of sacerdotal domination. In his constant appeal to the plainest, simplest, scriptural truths as in themselves the whole of religion, he is a stern Reformer. The sad, serious satirist, in his contemplation of the world around him, the wealth of the world and the woe, sees no hope but in a new order of things, in which, if the hierarchy shall subsist, it shall subsist in a form, with power, in a spirit totally opposite to that which now rules mankind. . . . The poet who could address such opinions, though wrapt up in prudent allegory, to the popular ear, to the ear of the peasantry of England; the people who could listen with delight to such strains, were far advanced towards a revolt from Latin Christianity. Truth, true religion was not to be found with, it was not known by Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Clergy, Monks, Friars. It was to be sought by man himself, by the individual man, by the poorest man, under the sole guidance of Reason, Conscience, and the Grace of God vouchsafed directly, not through any intermediate human being or even sacrament, to the self-directing soul. If it yet respected all existing doctrines, it respected them not as resting on traditional or sacerdotal authority. There is a manifest appeal throughout, an unconscious installation of Scripture alone, as the ultimate judge. The test of everything is a moral and purely religious one—its agreement with holiness and charity.”—(*Dean Milman's History of Latin Christianity*, xvi, p. 536. Ed. 1855.)

CHAPTER II.

WICLIF'S YOUTH AND STUDENT LIFE.

SECTION I.—*Birth-place and Family.*

WE are always more accurately informed of Wiclif's birth-place than of the date of his birth, and we owe this information to a learned man of the sixteenth century, John Leland, who has been called the father of English antiquarians.¹

In his *Itinerary* he has inserted a notice of Wiclif's birth-place, which, though only obtained from hearsay, yet as the earliest, and recorded only about 150 years after the great man's death, must always be regarded as of high authority. Leland's remark runs as follows:—"It is reported that John Wiclif, the heretic, was born at Spresswell, a small village a good mile off from Richmond."²

This notice, it is true, has its difficulties. The first is, that Leland himself appears to contradict his present statement in another of his works, for he says in his *Collections* in mentioning "Wyclif" in the county of York, that "Wyclif" the heretic sprang from that place.³ These two statements appear, at first sight, to contradict each other, and yet, when looked at more narrowly, they are easily reconciled; for in the first-named work Leland is speaking of Wiclif's birth-place proper; while, in the other, he is rather making mention of the seat of his family. But there is a more considerable difficulty in the circumstance, that in the neighbourhood of the town of Richmond, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, no village of the name of Spresswell has ever, by the most reliable accounts, been known to exist. This fact has given rise to various conjectures, *e.g.*, that Leland, in the course of his inquiries, had heard of a place called Hipswell or Ipswell, and had mistaken its name for Spresswell, or that Spresswell may have been the name of some manor-house or estate of the Wiclifs. It was also thought by some that Leland could not have personally travelled through that district of the county; for, in giving its topography, he has fallen into many mistakes.⁴

But very recently Leland's credit for accuracy on this

point has been redeemed, and his account has received a confirmation which sets the subject itself in the clearest light. The same scholar, Dr. Robert Vaughan, who, since 1828, has rendered important services to the history of Wiclif, has, by means of correspondence with other scholars in the north of England, established the following facts:—

Not far from the River Tees, which forms the boundary between the North Riding of Yorkshire and the county of Durham, there was formerly a town of the name of Richmond, of higher antiquity than the existing Richmond, and which is to be found in old topographical maps under the name of Old Richmond.

About an English mile off from Old Richmond, there was still in existence in the eighteenth century, close to the Tees, a small village or hamlet called Spresswell or Spesswell. An old chapel also stood there, in which were married the grandparents of an individual living in that neighbourhood, who vouched for the truth of this information. These were, however, the last pair married in the chapel, for it fell down soon after, and now the plough passes over the spot where it stood.⁵

Only half a mile from Spresswell lies the small parish of Wycliffe,⁶ the church of which still stands on the level bank of the Tees, without tower, and in part grown over with ivy. Upon a high bank, not far from the little church, is a manor-house, which formerly belonged to the family of Wycliffe of Wycliffe. From the time of William the Conqueror down to the beginning of the seventeenth century, this family were lords of the manor and patrons of the parish church. In 1606 the estate passed, by marriage of the heiress, to the family of Tunstall. Another branch of the family, however, carried on the name, and only about sixty-four years ago the last representative of the family, Francis Wycliffe, died at Barnard Castle, on Tees. The tradition both of the locality and the Wycliffes of Wycliffe has always been, that it was from this family that the celebrated forerunner of the Reformation sprang.

It no longer, then, admits of a doubt that Wiclif was born at Spresswell, not far from Old Richmond. His birth-place belongs to the district which, though not a county itself, but only part of one, is commonly called Richmondshire, forming the north-western portion of the great county of York, or, more exactly, the western district of the North Riding, a hilly, rocky highland, with valleys and slopes of the greatest fertility. The valley of Tees in particular, and especially that part of it where Spresswell was

situated, is described as a region of great and various beauty, and presenting landscape scenery of equal grandeur and softness.⁸

It was a country of strongly marked character upon which the eyes of Wiclif rested in his childhood and boyish years; but we should lose ourselves in the domain of poetry if we endeavoured to paint the kind of influence which was rained upon Wiclif's development by the characteristic features of the region in which he was born and grew up. We have a surer foothold for the history of the man in the peculiar character of the population of those northern counties of England. In Yorkshire especially, though also in other counties of the north, as Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, the Anglo-Saxon element maintained itself with greater purity, tenacity, and force, than in the south of England. In the centuries next succeeding the Norman invasion, much more of the old English nature continued to keep its hold in those parts of the kingdom than in the midland and southern counties.⁹ It is said that there are still families there at the present day, who have remained in uninterrupted possession of their estates from the time of the Norman invasion, and almost even from the period of the Saxon immigration; these old Saxon families, it is added, belonging not to the higher but the lower nobility, those who are called "the gentry," in distinction from the nobility. The country people at the present day, in the whole of Yorkshire, and most of all in the remote dales of the interior, still speak an ancient dialect, which, like the Scottish tongue, bears an unmistakeable German impress. The whole nature of the Yorkshire people has an antique cast about it. In the rest of England, the Yorkshireman passes for a robust, stout-hearted, and honest man—who is every inch a man.

It was from the bosom of this tenacious old Saxon people that Wiclif sprang; and the more it holds true that it was precisely the German element of the English population which formed the strength of the national movement of the fourteenth century, the more full of importance, unquestionably, is the circumstance that a man like Wiclif, who rendered, in particular, such important services to the development of the English language, should have belonged to a province and people who had always been distinguished by faithful and persistent adherence to old Saxon nature and ways. And it appears that the family of Wiclif belonged precisely to those families of the lower nobility in Yorkshire who have persistently preserved for

centuries, not only their estates, but also the characteristics of their Saxon descent.

The family of the Wiclifs must at one time have been numerous, and of many branches; for documents of the second half of the fourteenth century give information of different men of this name.¹⁰ In 1368 we find mention of Robert of Wycliffe, as priest of a chapel in Cleveland, in the diocese of York, probably the same priest who, in 1362, was made parish priest of Wycliffe, and in 1363 made an exchange of this office for another. Besides him, we know, from church documents, of another priest of the same period, who bore the same name as our Reformer, written "John Wycclive," who, on 21st July 1361, was appointed parish priest of Mayfield by Archbishop Islip, that being an estate of the See of Canterbury. He remained priest there for nearly twenty years, and in 1380 was made rector of the parish of Horsted Kaynes, where he died in 1383, one year before his more illustrious namesake. We shall have occasion, below, to return to this second John Wycclive.¹¹

It is, moreover, a remarkable fact, that the family of the Wiclifs, after the death of their most celebrated member, and in particular from the Reformation down to their extinction, was always distinguished for special fidelity to the Church of Rome. In 1423, a certain Robert Wyclif, parish priest of Rudby, in the diocese of York, made a will which leaves no room for doubt that the testator was very far from sharing the views of John Wiclif. At the commencement of the document he commends his soul to "Almighty God, to Saint Mary, and to all Saints;" he passes over the Redeemer in entire silence; he makes more than one provision for masses for the repose of souls; and he leaves several legacies in favour of nuns and Mendicant monks, etc. From the circumstance that such soul masses are to be said, not only for himself, but also for the souls of his father, mother, and all his benefactors, it is plain that the parents of the testator must also have been strict Romanists. Among the four churches, for the repair of each of which he left forty shillings, is named the church of "Wyclif," and to the poor of the same parish is also left a sum of forty shillings. These two latter dispositions are unquestionable indications that the testator was connected by birth with that locality.¹²

It looks as if Wiclif's family, feeling themselves exposed to danger by his keen assault upon the Church of Rome, had become all the more devoted to the Papacy on that

account. At all events, even after the English Reformation, the Wiclifs remained Roman Catholic, and along with them about a half of the inhabitants of the village—a division which still continues at the present day. The old church on the bank of the Tees belongs to the Anglican Establishment, while the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Wycliffe repair to a chapel built at the side of the manor house on the neighbouring height.

Touching the date of Wiclif's birth,¹³ no direct documentary information has come down to us. John Lewis was the first who fixed upon the year 1324; and he has been followed in this date by the great majority of writers without further inquiry, although he never makes even an attempt to produce documentary evidence in support of it. But it may be conjectured that he proceeded upon the fact that when Wiclif died at the end of 1384, he may have been a man of sixty, and counting back from that year, he arrived at 1324 as the approximate year of his birth.¹⁴ But we have no voucher for the fact that Wiclif at his death was exactly sixty years of age. Younger than that he could hardly have been, but he might easily have been older. We know that during the last two years of his life he suffered from the effects of a paralytic attack, as he afterwards died from a repetition of the shock. If we assume that 1324 was his birth-year, he must have had a stroke at fifty-eight, a comparatively early age; whereas all the notices which we have of his latest life are far from leaving the impression that his vigour had been broken at an unusually early period. This circumstance taken alone makes it probable, that when Wiclif died he had reached a more advanced age than is usually supposed, and was, at least, well on towards seventy. Add to this, that some expressions in his writings, where he speaks of his earlier years, when taken without bias, naturally produce the impression that the man who could so express himself must have been pretty well advanced in life. Thus, he says in one of his Saints' Day sermons,—“When I was still young, and addicted myself to a great variety of favourite pursuits, I made extensive collections from manuals on optics, on the properties of light,” etc. That does not sound as if we should take the speaker for a man of only fifty-four or fifty-six years, but rather for a man considerably older; and as those sermons, by sure marks, could not have been delivered later than 1380, and not earlier than 1378, Wiclif could not have been more than from fifty-

four to fifty-six years of age, if the common date of his birth is correct. All these indications make it appear probable, in our view, that when Wiclif died he must have been considerably older than is usually supposed. He must, in that case, have been born at least several years earlier than 1324; but we have no positive data for fixing with precision that earlier date.

SECTION II.—*Wiclif's Course of Study.*

WE have as little historical information on the subject of Wiclif's earliest education as on that of his birth-year; and it would answer no good purpose to fill up this blank with the suggestions of our own fancy. But so much is implied in the nature of the case, that in the years of his childhood and early youth, he grew up vigorously into the old Saxon pith of the family stem to which he belonged, and of the whole people among whom he was brought up. No doubt, also, the historical recollections and folk-traditions which lived among the population of Yorkshire, especially in their connection with certain localities, had very early made a deep impression on the susceptible soul of the boy, and become all his own. For I find the writings of Wiclif so full of allusions and reminiscences of the early times of his fatherland, as to justify the assumption that from his youth up he had been familiar with patriotic scenes and pictures. The boy, no doubt, received the first elements of instruction at the hand of some member of the clergy. Probably the parish priest of Wycliffe was his first teacher, and taught him the rudiments of Latin grammar; and doubtless, too, the youth, who must from childhood have had a lively and inquisitive genius, spent his whole time at home till he removed to Oxford. For as yet there were no schools in existence to prepare youth for the universities, except the cloister and cathedral schools. The universities themselves had rather the character of Latin schools and gymnasias than universities proper; at least a multitude, not only of growing young men, but even of mere boys, were to be found in Oxford and Cambridge, and that not as the pupils of schools collateral to the university, but as proper members of the university itself. We know, *e.g.*, from the loud complaints of Richard Fitzralph, archbishop of Armagh, that many young people under fourteen years of age were already considered to be members of the university. The importance of the universities in the

middle ages was a great deal more comprehensive than in modern times. While the universities of the present day, at least on the Continent, are essentially of use only to young men above eighteen in acquiring for several years the higher education,—whereas grown-up men ordinarily belong to the academic body only as teachers or officials, and in comparatively small numbers,—the mediæval universities included in their structure an additional storey, so to speak, both above and below—an upper storey, what we might call an academy in the narrow sense—and a lower storey, a species of grammar school and gymnasium. . . As to the former, the number of grown-up men who belonged to the mediæval universities, not exclusively as teachers of the student youth, but in the general character of men of learning, and as full members of the self-governing corporation (*Magistri Regentes*) was very large and important. The English universities are now the only ones in Europe which have preserved this feature to a great degree unimpaired, in the fellows of colleges, whose numbers are considerable. On the other hand, in the lower storey, the mediæval universities included a multitude of young people who were not as yet out of boyhood, and who for the present could only enjoy the benefit of a preparatory learned training. This latter circumstance must especially be kept in view, when we meet occasionally with statistical notices of the attendance at universities like Oxford, which astonish us by their enormous figures.

In view of this last fact, it would be in itself quite conceivable that Wiclif might have gone to Oxford even as a boy. But it is not probable, notwithstanding. For his home, close on the northern boundary of Yorkshire, was so far distant from the University that the journey, in the fourteenth century, must have been an affair of no inconsiderable time and fatigue and even danger. Prudent and conscientious parents would hardly be able to bring themselves to the resolution of sending a son upon such a journey before his fourteenth or sixteenth year; indeed, to let him pass away for ever (for this was necessarily involved in it) from their parental oversight.¹⁷ It is more probable that Wiclif was already a youth at least from fourteen to sixteen years old when he went to Oxford. Positive testimonies as to the exact date are wholly wanting, but assuming that he was born in 1320, and that he did not repair to the University before his fifteenth year, we would be brought to 1335 as the approximate year.

At that time, of the twenty colleges and more which

exist to-day in Oxford, there were five already founded, viz., Merton founded in 1274; Balliol, 1260-82; Exeter, 1314; Oriel, 1324; and University College, 1332. These foundations were originally designed purely for the support of poor scholars, who lived under the oversight of a President, according to a domestic order fixed by the Statutes of the Founders. It was only at a later period that they became, in addition to this, boarding-houses for students in good circumstances. Queen's College was not erected before 1340. It took its name from the circumstance that Philippa, Queen of Edward III., contributed towards its foundation. The proper founder, however, was Sir Robert Eggesfield, one of her court chaplains. It has been commonly accepted as a fact that when Wiclif went to Oxford he was immediately entered at Queen's College. This he could only have done on the supposition that he did not come up to the University till the year 1340. But we have already shown that an earlier date for that incident is more probable. Apart from this chronological consideration, there is a want of all sure grounds for the assumption that Wiclif entered into any connection with Queen's College at so early a date. The oldest records of the College go no farther back than the year 1347; and the name of Wiclif does not occur in them earlier than 1363; and even then he appears not properly as a member of the College, but only as a renter of some chambers in its buildings;¹⁸ a relation to it which appears to have continued for nearly twenty years—down to the time when Wiclif's connection with the University as a corporation entirely ceased.

If the question thus recurs, into what college Wiclif was received when he first came to Oxford, we must fairly confess it is one to which, in the absence of all documentary evidence we are unable to supply any distinct or confident answer. We know that in the course of years he became a member, and sometimes head of several colleges or halls. Merton and Balliol, in particular, are named in this connection, to say nothing at present of a third hall of which we shall have to speak hereafter. But all the notices we have of this kind relate to a later period—not to Wiclif as a young scholar, but to his mature years. If mere conjectures might be allowed, nothing would appear to us more probable than that he must have been entered at Balliol on his first coming to the University. For this college owed its foundation (1260-82) to the noble family of Balliol of Barnard Castle, on the left bank of the Tees, not more than five

miles from Spresswell, Wiclif's birth-place; and that there existed a connection of some kind between the Wiclif family and Balliol College, appears from the circumstance that two men, who were presented to the parish of Wycliffe, by John Wycliffe of Wycliffe, as patron, in 1361 and 1369, were members of Balliol College—the one William Wycliffe, a fellow, and the other John Hugate, then Master of the college.¹⁹

But here we must confess we are only hinting at a possibility which, however, will be raised to a probability in an investigation which we shall have to enter into at a subsequent stage.

But if the college into which Wiclif entered as a scholar, does not admit of being determined with certainty, there is none the less certainty, on the other hand, in regard to the "nation" in the University, to which from the first he belonged. It is well known that all the universities of the middle ages divided themselves into "nations," according to the countries and provinces, sometimes even the races, to which their members belonged. Thus, in the University of Paris, from a very early period, there were four nations—the French, the English (at a later period called German), the Picard, and the Norman. The University of Prague had, in like manner, from its foundation, four nations—the Bohemian, Bavarian, Polish, and Saxon. In the University of Leipzig, the division with which it started at its foundation in 1409 as a colony from the University of Prague, into the Meissnian, Saxon, Bavarian, and Polish nations, continued down to the year 1830;²⁰ and even at the present day this ancient arrangement continues to be of practical moment in many respects, in relation, *e.g.*, to particular endowments. It was the same with the English Universities in the middle ages, but in Oxford there were only two such "nations," the northern and the southern (*Boreales* and *Australes*). The first included the Scots, the second the Irish and Welsh. Each nation, as in the universities of the Continent, had its own self-chosen president and representative, with the title of Procurator (hence *Proctor*).

That Wiclif must have joined himself to the northern "nation," might of course be presumed; but there is express testimony to the fact that he was a *Borealis*.²¹ And this is not without importance, inasmuch as this "nation" in Oxford, during the fourteenth century, was the chief representative, not only of the Saxon or pure Germanic folk-character, but also of the principle of the national autonomy. But this connection of Wiclif with the "northern

nation" had a double effect. It had, first of all, a determinative influence upon Wiclif's own spirit and mental development; and on the other hand, as soon as Wiclif had taken up an independent position, and began to work upon other minds, he found within the University, in this nation of the *Boreales*, no inconsiderable number of men of kindred blood and spirit to his own, to form the kernel of a self-inclusive circle—of a party.

And now, as respects the studies of Wiclif in the years of his scholar-life, the sources here also fail of giving us as full information as we could have wished. We are especially left in the dark as to the men who were his teachers. It would have been of great importance to know whether he was personally a hearer of Thomas Bradwardine and of Richard Fitzralph. The latter point is quite possible, so far as date is concerned, as Richard was, in 1340 and following years, still resident in Oxford as Chancellor of the University, and was still, without doubt, delivering theological lectures; for it was not till 1347 that he was made Archbishop of Armagh. On the other hand, it seems very doubtful whether, at the time when Wiclif was a student, Thomas Bradwardine was still in Oxford, and was not rather already in France, in the train of Edward III., as a military chaplain. Wiclif, indeed, more than once makes mention in his writings of the *doctor profundus*, but he does this in a way which decidedly leads us to infer only a knowledge and use of his writings, not a personal acquaintance with himself.

But if we are left in the dark on the subject of Wiclif's principal teachers, we are not altogether without light on the question as to what he studied and how. The knowledge which we possess at the present day of the character of the mediæval universities and of the scholastic philosophy is sufficient of itself to give us some insight into these points. For one thing, it is beyond all doubt, that the more the middle ages made exclusive use of the Latin tongue (not, it is true, in its classical form) as their exclusive scientific organ, they were all the less familiar with the Greek language and literature. It may, with full warrant, be maintained, that the scholastic philosophers and divines were, as a rule, ignorant of Greek, and attained to any knowledge they had of what was contained in the Christian and classical literature of the Greek tongue, only by means of Latin translations; and, in part, only by the medium of Latin tradition. Men like Roger Bacon, who had some acquaintance with Greek, are rare exceptions to that rule.²² It was only in the course of the fifteenth century, that, as a consequence of

certain well-known events, the study of the Greek language and literature was diffused. But even at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Greek scholars and teachers like Erasmus and Philip Melancthon were rare enough. Manifestly the re-rising of the sun of Hellenic speech and culture on the horizon of western Europe, was one of the chief causes of the advent of the modern epoch; as on the other hand, the prevailing ignorance of the Greek language and of any direct acquaintance with Greek literature, was one of the most essential *momenta* which conditioned the one-sidedness and narrowness of mediæval science.

This want, in point of fact, we recognise also in Wiclif. His writings supply manifold proofs of his total ignorance of Greek. This is shown, not only by very frequent mistakes in the writing of Greek proper names and other words, the blame of which, it might well be thought, lay at the door of the copyists, not of the author himself, but also by the etymological explanations of Greek terms which Wiclif not seldom introduces, which for the most part are beside the mark, and erroneous.²³ He is always more successful when on questions which pre-suppose a knowledge of Greek, he leans on the authority of others, as, *e.g.*, on Jerome, as *linguarum peritissimus*, *De Civili Dominio* iii., c. 11. When Wiclif quotes a Greek writer, it is his custom, quite frankly, to give, at the same time, the name of the Latin source from which he drew his knowledge of the Greek work. In short, it is quite plain that in all cases he looked at the Greeks only through Latin spectacles. But this defect was, no doubt, entirely owing to the education which Wiclif had received in his youth, especially as a scholar in Oxford. If there had been any possibility at that time of acquiring a knowledge of Greek in the University, Wiclif was just the man who would certainly not have neglected the opportunity of acquiring it. For how ardently he thirsted after truth, and with what unwearied industry he sought to obtain a many sided culture for his mind, we shall immediately have occasion to convince ourselves.

Another point is, the course of study which was pursued in the middle ages. This differed from the course of modern university training, as the latter has developed itself on the Continent, in one very important respect: that much greater stress was laid upon, and in consequence, much more time was devoted to general scientific culture; whereas, in the present day, professional studies have the preference, and certainly more so than is wise and good. For at that time a large space was occupied by the study of the

"Liberal Arts." And these seven *artes liberales*, from which the Faculty of Arts took its name, behoved to be completed in a strict order and course: first, the *Trivium*, including grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric; then the *Quadrivium*, embracing arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. The *Trivium* was also named compendiously the *Artes Sermocinales* or Logic, and not without reason, inasmuch as λόγος designates equally speech and thought; those who were engaged in this stadium of study were called *Logici*. To the *Quadrivium*, on the other hand, was given sometimes the collective name of "Physics," in the comprehensive ancient sense of science of nature, and sometimes the name of the Mathematical Arts.²⁴

That Wiclif possessed a special faculty and taste for natural philosophy we shall immediately point out; but first let us dwell a little longer upon his logical studies. We know from the communications of the talented John of Salisbury, who died in 1180, that in the twelfth century many who devoted themselves to the sciences never got beyond the *Trivium*, and especially dialectics;²⁵ and this is all the more conceivable the more it was usual in the scholastic age to look upon dialectic as the science of sciences, and even, in a certain degree, as the philosophy of all science (*Wissenschaftlehre*). In the logic and dialectic of the middle ages, the formal schooling and discipline of scientific thought joined itself partly to a kind of philosophy of speech, partly to a metaphysical ontology, or to what Hegel has called speculative logic. If we consider, however, the imposing rôle which was played in the scientific life and action of the middle ages by the Public Acts of Disputation, those tournaments of the learned world, we may well conceive what an unnameable charm dialectic, as the art of disputation, must have had for the men of that time. How close to hand lay the temptation to forget or to hold cheap everything compared with dialectic, and to look upon it as a world in itself, revolving round itself as its own absolute self-end!

To these logical and dialectical studies Wiclif, without doubt, devoted himself in his student days with the greatest zeal, as is attested by the numerous writings of this character produced in his mature age, which he left behind him. Indeed we may say that all his writings, upon whatever subject and of whatsoever content, not excepting even his sermons, confirm this attestation, inasmuch as all of them are everywhere stamped with the dialectic genius of the author. But even if this testimony had not been forth-

coming, it was the unchallenged and universally admitted brilliancy of his dialectical genius which acquired for Wiclif his high scientific fame, and without which it would never have been his.

But he was still far from overvaluing the arts of logic, as if these alone and by themselves constituted science. The mathematical sciences of the *Quadrivium* had also an extraordinary attraction for him. It is worthy of all consideration how often in his writings, and with how much love, he refers precisely to this department of science. At one time it is arithmetic or geometry which must do him service in illustrating certain truths and relations; at another time it is physical and chemical laws, or facts of optics or acoustics, which he applies to illuminate moral and religious truths. And not only in scientific essays is that the case, or only in sermons preached before the University, but even in his English sermons he makes unhesitating use of such illustrations.²⁶ But it was not in his riper years that Wiclif first began to apply himself to such natural studies: he had begun to do so in his youth, while he was still a student in Oxford. This is probable in itself, and is expressly confirmed by his own testimony, which we quoted on a preceding page. The reference there, indeed, is limited to collections which he had made in his younger days from works upon optics, but it is an obvious enough inference to suppose that he had occupied himself with other branches of natural science as well, *quando fuit junior*. No doubt it was under the instructions and by the personal example of some teacher in the University that his sense and taste for these studies were first awakened and kindled; but who this teacher was we ask in vain. Neither the tradition of contemporaries or men of later times, nor any occasional expressions of Wiclif himself, afford us any knowledge upon the subject. It may, however, with some reason be conjectured that at the time of Wiclif's student life some disciples of the gifted Roger Bacon, who lived long in Oxford and survived till 1292, may still have been working there, and that the enthusiasm for natural science, which we are so often sensible of in Wiclif, was derived to him by this medium and from that great mind, who was called, not without reason, *Doctor Mirabilis*, and who, anticipating his namesake, Francis Bacon, had already, in the thirteenth century, grasped and exemplified the experimental method of science. It is matter of fact that among the learned men who were the ornaments of Oxford in the first half and in the middle of the fourteenth century, not a few were distinguished by mathematical, astronomical,

and physical knowledge. Thomas Bradwardine, *e.g.*, who died in 1349, mentioned above as a theological thinker, was held in high estimation as a mathematician and astronomer; John Estwood, at one time a member of Merton College, was celebrated about 1360 for his astronomical attainments; as was also William Rede, who built the library of that college, and in 1369 became Bishop of Chichester.²⁷ These are only a few names selected out of a greater number of contemporaries who were all members of the University of Oxford as scholars, or masters and doctors. We are not, then, too bold if we conclude from such facts that in the first half of the fourteenth century there prevailed in that University a special zeal for mathematical and physical studies, which also laid hold of Wiclif.

But the natural sciences could as little enchain him, exclusively and for ever, as logic and dialectic had been able to do so. Wiclif passed over from the seven liberal arts to theology. This was, no doubt, the design with which his parents had from the first determined him for a life of study. He was to become a cleric, for the priestly calling was still, in the public opinion of that age, the highest in human society; and if the Wiclif family cherished perhaps some ambitious wishes for the talented scion of their house, it was a course of theological education and the standing of priesthood, which in that age, and especially in England, formed the surest stepping-stones to the highest dignities of the State. But we find no warrant either in his life or in his writings to attribute such ambitious designs to himself. What drew him as a young man to theology was, in our judgment, neither an ambition which looked upon the science only as the means of attaining selfish ends, nor a deep religious need already awakened and consciously experienced, which sought the satisfaction of its own cravings in the Christian theology. It rather appears to us, in so far as the personal self-revelations scattered here and there in his writings justify a retrospective inference touching his student life, that the motive which impelled him, apart from all external considerations, to devote himself to theology, was entirely of an intellectual and scientific character. His passion for knowledge and his thirst for truth drew him to theology with all the more zeal, the more it was still regarded as the highest science of all, or the queen of the sciences. His industry as a student of Divinity was assured by the general studies which he had already passed through, and he devoted himself with indefatigable diligence to all the different branches into which theology was then divided, as is evident

from the contents of his own writings. The scholastic theology, it is true, was entirely wanting in the historical discipline of various kinds of our modern theology, and it knew only a small part of practical and exegetic theology, or the wide field of Biblical science, while almost the whole body of theological science took the form of systematic theology. That had been the case since the second half of the twelfth century—i.e., since the Sentences of the Master *κατ' ἑξοχὴν*, the Lombard, Peter of Novara, had become the manual of dogmatic instruction.

But we should greatly err if we were to suppose, on this account, that the theological studies of the middle ages comprehended, as a general rule, only a narrow amount of scientific matter. On the contrary, they extended themselves to large fields of knowledge, of which the Protestant theology, at least of later and the latest times, takes little or no account. In particular, the Canon Law, since the time when it was collected and sanctioned, formed an extremely comprehensive and important subject of the theological course. Nor must we undervalue the reading of the Fathers, *e.g.*, of Augustin, and of the Doctors, *i.e.*, the Scholastics, which at the same time occupied, in some degree, the place of dogmatic history. Nor was the practice amiss of dividing the theological course into two stages, which we may briefly describe as the Biblical and the Systematic. The former came first in order. It consisted in the reading and interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. The interpretation took the form of Glosses, as in fact the whole of mediæval science developed itself from Glosses—Dialectics from Glosses on the writings of Aristotle—Law from Glosses on the *Corpus Juris*—Theology from Glosses first on the Bible and then on the Sentences of the Lombard. That the original text of the Bible, in all this process, remained a book sealed with seven seals, and that only the Latin Bible, the Vulgate, could be the subject of translation, need not be dwelt upon after what has been said above. To interpretation proper (*expositio*), which consisted in explanations more or less short, verbal, or also substantial, sometimes aphoristic in form, and sometimes running on at large, succeeded learned investigations, in the scholastic manner (*questiones*), in the form of disputational *excursus*.

As already hinted, the prefixing of a Biblical course to the dogmatic one was in itself commendable and suitable to the object in view, for the students in this way were taken, before everything else, to the fountain-head, and

obtained possession of a knowledge of sacred history and Bible doctrine, if only this Biblical instruction was of the right kind. But there was lacking *immediateness* of view. Men looked into the Bible text only through the coloured spectacles of the Latin version. And that was not all: men were, at the same time, so entirely bound and pre-occupied by the whole mass of ecclesiastical tradition, that the possibility of an unprejudiced interpretation of the Scriptures was out of the question. The Biblical course, besides, was looked upon, not as that which laid the foundation of, and gave law to all the rest, but rather as an entirely subordinate preliminary discipline to theology properly so called. This appeared in the division of labour which was made in the matter of theological lectures; for bachelors of theology of the lowest degree were allowed to deliver lectures on the Bible, and usually this work was left to them alone; whereas bachelors of the middle and highest degrees (*baccalaurei sententiarum* and *formati*),²⁸ as well as the doctors of theology, read on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, and sometimes on "sums" of their own. The "doctors" would have thought it beneath their dignity to lecture on the Biblical books; the bachelors who were relegated to this work were called in a depreciatory tone only *biblici*, in contrast to *sententiarum*. When Wiclif, then, went forward from this stage to what passed for the higher one, in which he studied what is now called systematic theology, it was chiefly, as already said, lectures on the Sentences of the Lombard which he had to listen to. And here, too, that mode of treatment prevailed which began by glossing the text of the master, and then followed this up with different "Quæstiones." In addition, the numerous "Disputations" which were always held, served to promote the culture of the students. To which was added the reading of patristic and scholastic works. Among the latter, at the time when Wiclif studied, the works chiefly in favour, in Oxford at least, were the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, the writings of Bishop Robert Grossetête (*Lincolniensis*), and the comprehensive work of Archbishop Richard Fitzralph (*Armachanus*) against the errors of the Armenians. Beyond all doubt, Wiclif was a diligent reader of all these works, which he makes so frequent use of in his writings, in his student years. Further, as no one could have the credit of being a true theologian who was not at home in Canon Law, Wiclif came up to this last requirement in a degree which is best evinced in his yet unprinted works, in which he shows himself to have been quite a master of Canonical

Jurisprudence; and that he had laid the foundations of this learning, even as a student, we assume with all confidence. When Lewis adds that Wiclif also studied Roman Law,²⁹ and the Canonical Law of England, the assumption is indeed a probable one that he was no stranger to either of these branches of law, as is shown, not only by many of his writings, but also by the practical share which he took at a later period in ecclesiastico-political affairs; but whether he had thrown himself into the study of these subjects in his youth, is a point which we must leave in a state of uncertainty.

We have no positive data to show to what length of time Wiclif's student course extended; we can only arrive at a probable judgment upon the point with the help of our general knowledge of university usages in that age. We know that in England, as well as on the Continent, university life in the middle ages was accustomed to claim a far longer period of study than at present. It has been truly said that "men were not then misers with their time."³⁰ To study for ten years was by no means uncommon; for two years, at least, were allowed to the *Trivium*, and as many to the *Quadrivium*, so that four years at the shortest were taken up by the general sciences in the Faculty of Arts. But the study of theology in its two stages lasted for seven years as a rule, not seldom even longer, although in some cases also not so long, but even then for five years at the least. We shall, therefore, scarcely err if we suppose that Wiclif gave six years to the study of theology, and it can scarcely be too high an estimate if we reckon up his whole term of study to a decade of years. And if we were right in our conjecture above, that he entered the University about the year 1335, the end of his curriculum would have to be placed about the year 1345. Later data of his life say nothing, at the least, against this computation. At all events, we must assume that he had already taken all the academic degrees in order, up to that time, with the single exception of the theological doctorship. Thus, without doubt, he had become *baccalaureus artium*, and two or three years later *magister artium*. And again, after an interval of several years, he must have become bachelor of theology, or, as it was then expressed, bachelor of the *sacra pagina*. Whether before the year 1345 he became licentiate of theology must be left undetermined. Herewith we leave Wiclif's student years, and pass onward to his manhood.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II.

1. Leland had received in 1533, from Henry VIII., the commission to examine the libraries and archives of all cathedrals and monasteries, colleges and cities, and he employed six years in travelling all over England and Wales, in order to collect materials for a history of the kingdom. He spent other six years in working up these collections into an account of the antiquities of England, but the work was never finished, for his excessive labours brought on disease of the brain, and he died in 1552. His *Itinerarium*, however, in nine volumes, was published in Oxford 1710-1712.

2. *Itinerarium* V., 99. [They say] that John Wyclif *Hæreticus* [was borne at Sprewel, a poore village a good myle from Richemont.] I quote from Lewis, *History of Wiclif*, p. 1, note a. The words between brackets do not stand in Leland's original MS., but only in a transcript of Stowe. Vide Shirley, Fasc. Zizan Introd. X., note 3.

3. Unde Wiclif hæreticus originem duxit. *Collectanea*, I., 2, 329. Cited by Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, I., 232, note 8.

4. Shirley, Introd. XI.; Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, I., 233; and John Wycliffe, a Monograph, 1854, p. 5 f.

5. *Athenæum*, 1861, 20th April, p. 529.

6. In 1353 the population of the little village did not reach 200 souls.

7. Vaughan's Monograph, p. 2 f.

8. Dibdin, *Observations on a Tour through almost the whole of England* London, 1801, 4to. I., 261 f.

9. Kohl, *Reisen in England and Wales*, 1841, II., 50 f, 123, 165, 178. *E.g.*, people say *lig* instead of lie; to *spier anybody* (aufspüren), instead of to ask or inquire; *I do not kenn*, instead of know.

10. In 1362 a certain Robert of Wycliffe was made parish priest of Wycliffe by Catherine, widow of Roger Wycliffe; and in the following year we find a William of Wycliffe presented to the same place. In the interval, however, the patronage had changed hands, for the patron in 1363 is John of Wycliffe, who, we may conjecture, was the son, now come to his majority, of Catherine and her deceased husband, Roger Wycliffe.

11. Whitaker, *History of Richmondshire*, I., 197, quoted by Vaughan, *Monograph*, p. 5; and Register of the Archbishop of Canterbury, also quoted by Vaughan, p. 548.

12. Vide the Documents from the Episcopal Register of Durham, in Vaughan's Monograph, p. 545 f.

13. On the orthography of the family name Wiclif, I may here introduce the following remarks:—There was an endless variety of ways of spelling it in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and some of this variety has reappeared among English writers in recent times. Vaughan states that the name is written in nearly twenty different forms, but this is far from being a high enough estimate. I have found as many as twenty-eight varieties in the usage of these centuries. They divide themselves into two chief classes, according as the vowel used in the first syllable is *i* or *y*. The explanation is to be found in the generally wretched condition of orthography in the middle ages, which prevailed specially in the names of places, and in surnames taken from these. It was not merely that every author adopted at his own pleasure his own way of spelling such names, while preserving

uniformity of usage after choosing it, but one and the same author or copyist allowed himself unbounded liberty and caprice in the writing of the same name, as Walsingham, the chronicler, does in the case of Wiclif, who writes the name in at least eight different forms. *Vide* the Critical Edit. of Riley, I., 335 f.; II., 50 f.

As to the question of the best way of writing the name at the present day, this can best be decided, no doubt, upon the authority of documents nearest in date to Wiclif's own age. Now the oldest document of a strictly official character is the Royal Commission of 26th July 1374, in which Edward III. nominates the commissioners who were to negotiate with the Papal legates at Bruges. Wiclif was one of these commissioners, and the King's edict names him *Magister Johannes de Wiclif*, *Sacrae Theologie Professor*. *Rymer's Foedera*, VII., 41. The same mode of writing the name I find not unfrequently occurring in other documents and MSS. of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, though for the most part in capricious variation with other spellings. The recent usage of most English scholars is to spell the name with *y* in the first syllable — e.g., Wyclif (Shirley and Thomas Arnold); Wycliffe (Vaughan); or Wyckliffe (Todd); and it must be confessed that with Englishmen of the fourteenth century the *y* was an extraordinary favourite, and was often unjustifiably used, not only in foreign words, like *hysteria*, *dyaconus*, *peryodus*, etc., and in proper names, like Ysaac, Yoseph, Hispania, Lincoln, etc., but even in pure English words, as kyng, infyrmytyes, even in *ys*, *yt*, instead of *is*, *it*. In making use, since 1853, of the contemporary spelling *Wiclif*, we employ an orthography which has not been antiquated but rather confirmed by the later development of the language, and which, at the same time, seems the simplest and most obvious.

14. Comp. Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan*, XI. f.

15. *Quum fui junior, et in delectacione vaga magis sollicitus, collegi diffuse proprietates lucis ex codicibus, perspectiva*, etc. No. 53 of the Sermons on Saints' Days (*Evangelia de Sanctis*), MS. 3928 of the Imperial Library of Vienna. *Denis*, No. CD., fol. 106, col. 1.

16. Buddensieg (*Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1847, p. 302 f) follows Shirley in adopting a later rather than an earlier year than 1324 for Wiclif's birth, perhaps 1330, founding upon the age of his antagonist, the Carmelite friar, John Cunningham. But on the only point of importance to the validity of this argument, viz., the relation of the *birth year* of Cunningham to that of Wiclif, all positive evidence is wanting, so that what is gained by this combination is by no means clear.

17. Comp. Vaughan, *John de Wycliffe*, a Monograph, p. 16 f, where travelling and intercourse in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are graphically described on the authority of ancient sources.

18. *Vide* Extracts from the Bursars' Accounts of Queen's College as given by Shirley in an Excursus to the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 514 f. Vaughan, indeed, has maintained in his *Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe*, and also in his more recent "Monograph," that Wiclif's name occurs in a list of the original members of the college, who entered it in 1340, immediately after its foundation. But Shirley, who lived in Oxford, gives the most positive assurance that no list of members of so early a date exists among the papers of the college, p. xiii.

19. Comp. *Wycliffe, his Biographers and Critics*, an article of Vaughan, in the *British Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1858. Printed separately, p. 26 f.

20. The Book of Statutes of the University of Leipzig for the first 150 years after its foundation. Edited by Friedrich Zarncke. Leipzig, 1861, 4to, 3, 42 f.

21. The Chronicler of St. Albans, Thomas Walsingham, commences his account of Wiclif under the year 1377, with the words, "*Per idem tempus surrexit in Universitate Oxoniensi quidam Borealis, dictus Magister Joannes Wyclef*," etc. Edited by Riley, I., 324.

22. It has been usual to ascribe to Gerbert in the tenth, and to Abelard and John of Salisbury in the twelfth century, a knowledge of Greek, but Schaarschmidt, in his *Johannes Saresberiensis*, 1862, p. 108 f., has proved convincingly that they had no claim to this praise.

23. Greek proper names are often written in the Bohemian MSS. of Wiclif's works so erroneously as to be almost unrecognisable, e.g., *Pictagerus* instead of

Pythagoræ. *De veritate Sacræ Scripturæ*, c. 12. And who would guess that "cassefatum" in the same MS. was meant to be nothing else but *κακῶπαρον*? But the false writing of a Greek word is not always to be put to the account of the copyist, for in one place, e.g., the mis-written word *apocrius* (instead of *apocryphus*) is immediately followed by an etymological remark which presupposes *s* to have been written instead of *f*; the word, it is remarked, comes from *apo=de*, and *crisis=secretum*, because the subject is the secrets of the Church, or, according to others from *apos=large*, and *crisis=judicium*. *De Veritate Scripturæ*, c. II. Another etymological attempt is no better—*elemosia* is alleged to be compounded of *elemosia=misericordia*, and *sina*, or of *elia*, which comes from *Eli=God*, and *sina=mandatum*; it signifies, therefore, God's command. *De Civili Dominio*, III., c. 14, MS.

24. E.g., Wiclif, *Tractatus de statu innocentie*, c. 4, quoad artes mathematicas quadrivales. Vienna MS., 1339 f, 244, col. 2-245¹. Roger Bacon is also wont to include the sciences of the *Quadrivium* under the general term *Mathematicæ*.

25. Comp. Reuter Johannes von Salisburg. Berlin, 1842, p. 9 f. Schaarschmidt Johannes Saresberiensis. Leipzig, 1842, p. 61.

26. So in the 26th of his sermons on Saints' Days (*Evangelia de Sanctis*). Vienna MS., 3928; also in the 51st sermon of the same collection, and in the 24th sermon of another collection, included in the same MS. vol. Explanations of this kind are not uncommon in his learned treatises, e.g., in the *De Dominio Divino* II., c. 3; *De Ecclesia*, c. 5, etc.

27. John Lewis, *History of the Life of Wiclif*, following Leland's *De Scripturibus Britanniciæ*.

28. Comp. Thurot, *De l'Organisation de l'Enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au Moyen-âge*, 1850, p. 137 f.

29. John Lewis, *History of the life of John Wiclif*, p. 2.

30. Matter in Article, *Sorbonne*, in Herzog's *Theol. Realencyclopædie*.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER II., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

1. ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL DISCIPLINE OF BALLIOL COLLEGE IN WICLIF'S TIME.

By the fundamental statutes of Devorguilla, which were still in full force in Wiclif's student days, it was provided as follows:—

"That the scholars speak Latin in common, and whoever acts anything against it, shall be rebuked by the principal. If they mend not after twice or thrice admonition, they are to be removed from common table, and eat by themselves, and be served last. If incorrigible after a week's space, to be ejected by the procurators.

"Every week a sophism to be disputed and determined in the house among the scholars by turns, so that they both *oppose* and *answer*; and if any sophister profiteth so much that he may deserve in a short time to *determine* in the schools, then shall the principal tell him that he shall first determine *at home* among his fellows. At the end of every disputation the principal shall appoint the next day of disputing; and shall moderate and correct the loquacious; and shall appoint the sophism that is next to be handled, and also the opponent, respondent, and determiner, that so they may the better provide themselves for a disputation." *Vide* Wood's *History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*, p. 71.

2. PROVISIONS OF THE STATUTES OF SIR PHILIP DE SOMERVILLE FOR THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY BY THE FELLOWS OF BALLIOL COLLEGE IN WICLIF'S TIME.

These Statutes came into operation in 1341, and assuming, as a high probability (the grounds of which will be found stated in an additional note at the end of Chap. III.), that Wiclif became a student of Arts and Theology at Balliol on his first coming to Oxford, these Provisions throw an interesting light upon the probable course of his theological studies. The Statutes empowered the Fellows, now increased from 16 to 22, to elect six of their number to hold Theological Fellowships, which they should continue to enjoy till, in due course, they obtained the usual degrees in Theology; and the curriculum of study laid out for them was a singularly liberal one. The men elected *ad intendendum sacrae theologiae* were to become *opponents* in the theological disputations in the sixth year of their studies, and were to continue to oppose for one year, or if it seemed expedient to the society, during two years. In the ninth or tenth year they were to read the Book of Sentences; and in the twelfth or thirteenth year they should be held bound to *commence, incipere*, in the same faculty, unless hindered by legitimate and honest cause. If, as is highly probable, Wiclif became one of these Theological Fellows of Balliol, his whole course of study in Arts and Theology must have extended, allowing four years for his Arts course, to sixteen or seventeen years, viz., from 1335 to 1351 or 1352.

The utmost care was to be taken in the election of men to these Theological Fellowships; under the sanction of a solemn oath, none were to be chosen, "*praeter honestos, castos, pacificos et humiles, ad scientiam habiles ac proficere volentes,*" and none who were not already "Regents in Arts."

3. The following extract from Anthony Wood's "History of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford," Vol. I, sub-anno 1343, gives us a curious glimpse of the condition of philosophical parties in the University at the time when Wiclif was engaged in the profound study of the philosophy and theology of his age:—

A.D. 1343.—"Clashing controversies in disputations and writings among the learned sort, especially the followers and disciples of the authors of the Nominals and Reals (Occam and Scotus), both which sects were now so fixed in every house of learning that the divisions between the northern and southern clerks were now as great, if not more, as those before. Those of the north held, as 'tis said, with Scotus, and those of the south with Occam, and in all their disputations were so violent, that the peace of the University was not thereby a little disturbed. . . . Now, forasmuch as these controversies were frequent in Oxford, causing thereby great emulation, which commonly ended in blows, the statutes for the election of the Chancellor were, without doubt, made; for whereas about these times great variance fell out in the election of that officer, some aiming to have him a northern, others a southern man, divers statutes and injunctions, chiefly reflecting upon such disorders, were, I say, this year enacted, of which was that concerning two scrutators in the elections,—that is, that one should be a northern, the other a southern man, lest underhand dealing should be used, and consequently parties injured."

For further information concerning these two parties or factions in the University, see additional note at the end of Chap. III. Wiclif took side with the Scotists or Realists in these subtle disputations and "clashing controversies," and it is curious to reflect how much this philosophical preference may have been owing to the accident of his having been born a *Borcalis* instead of an *Australis*. John Scotus Eriugena himself was, of course, a north-countryman, and all north-countrymen in Oxford appear to have belonged to his following. The Balliol scholars in particular were the natural allies of the great Realist, for they claimed him to have been a Balliol man before he connected himself with Merton. For, as Savage dryly observes in his Balliol-fergus, "There is as much contending for the breeding-place of this rare man as hath been for the birth of Homer. We conjecture him to have been of this College of Balliol, inasmuch as he was by county of Northumberland, and of Duns there, as might be seen not only in Pittsaeus, but before every volume of his works in MSS. in our library, of the gift of Bishop Gray, but torn off in the time of the late war; and for that in Northumberland was the first endowment of our College. He lived anno 1300, which was after Devor-

guilla's Statutes, but before those of Sir Philip Somerville, yet not after the time when it was granted by the Pope that the scholars might live in the house after they became Masters of Art; and therefore he might, for that reason, depart from this to Merton College."

4. The following names of learned Fellows of Balliol College in Wiclif's time are given by Savage in his *Ballio-fergus*, and we probably discern in them two of the partners of the Reformer's studies in philosophy and divinity:—

"William Wilton, professor in his faculty, which could be no other than divinity, by the statutes of this house made by Sir Philip de Somervyll, after which he lived here and wrote many things:—

Super Priora Aristotelis.
Quaestiones de Anima.
Super Ethica.

He was Chancellor of the University in 1373.

"Roger Whelpdale, fellow of this house, afterwards Provost of Queen's, lastly Bishop of Carlisle, a great mathematician. He wrote many books, whereof in our College library are there—

Summularum logicalium.
De Universalibus.
De Aggregatis.
De Quanto et Continuo.
De Compositione Continui.
De Rogando Deo.

He lived in the time of Edward III., and was the first who enriched the library with MSS., besides those of uncertain donation."

5. The recent "Report" of Mr. Riley upon the Archives of Balliol, published by the "Royal Commission on Historical MSS.," 1874, has put us in possession for the first time of the following document: "a small parchment deed, in good preservation, with four seals appended in a mutilated state," which "throws light," as he remarks, "upon the studies of the house some forty years after its foundation, and is otherwise a very interesting document." It is quite in place here, as it describes a state of things which still prevailed in the College when Wiclif, in all probability, became a student of it in 1335, or even later, in 1340. It reveals also a state of dissatisfaction with existing arrangements and restrictions which had a great deal, no doubt, to do with the drawing up of the new statutes of 1341, which, as we gather from themselves, were not dictated by the College benefactor, Sir Philip de Somervyll, but had been agreed upon by mutual deliberation between him and the Master and Fellows, and had, no doubt, been suggested to him by them for the increased usefulness of the house. The substance of the document has been already given from Wood in Note I. of Additional Notes to Chap. I.

"Tenore praesentium pateat universis quod anno domini MCCXXIV. in Festo Sanctae Margaritae Virginis, dubitatione suborta et quaestione mota inter scholares domus de Balliolo in Oxonia, an liceret sociis ibidem commorantibus aliam scientiam audire quam artes liberales, prout artes liberales intelliguntur, quae in Scholis Artistarum ab Artistis legi possunt; auditis et pensatis motivis hinc inde, ac sufficiente deliberatione praehabita, demum declaratum extitit, et diffinitum hujusmodi auditionem nullo modo licere, prout apparuit, secundum intentionem fundantis domum praedictam, inmo totaliter fore contra mentem ejusdem, necnon et contra consuetudines laudabiles per socios domus ejusdem hactenus approbatas et diutius usitatas. Et ideo inhibuit fuit et interdictum per Magistros Robertum de Leycestria de ordine Fratrum minorum Sacrae Paginae Professorem, et Nicolaum de Tyngewick Doctorem in Medicina et Baccalarium Sacrae Theologiae, tunc Magistros extraneos domus antedictae, ni aliquis socius domus ejusdem, Magister vel Scolaeris aliquam facultatem audiat, seu eidem intendat in pleno termino seu vacatione, praeter artes liberales quae ab Artistis in Scholis artium de jure legi possunt, prout superius est expressum. Acta sunt ista in aula de Balliolo, coram tota communitate ipsa non reclamante, die Sanctae Margaritae Virginis anno supradicto, praesentibus Magistris, Sacrae Theologiae professoribus, Magistro Ricardo de Camsale, et Magistro Waltero de Horkeslaw, una

cum Magistris Ricardo filio Radulphi et Ricardo de Retford qui omnes quondam dictae domus socii extiterunt; quibus omnibus et singulis dicta diffinitio et inhibitio iusta simpliciter videbatur. Et si aliquis contra istam inhibitionem aut injunctionem verterit, ac legitime monitus per Principalem dictae domus desistere noluerit tanquam rebellis Statutis et Constitutionibus domus praedictae, arbitrio magistrorum qui pro tempore fuerint, merito puniatur. Et ne istud factum postea in dubium revocetur, Sigilla praedictorum Magistrorum Roberti et Nicolai, una cum Sigillis Domini Cancellarii Universitatis Oxoniae et Decani ejusdem villae sunt apposita. Et nos Cancellarius Universitatis Oxoniae et Decanus ejusdem villae Sigilla nostra ad rogatum dictorum magistrorum apposuimus in perpetuam memoriam praemissorum. Scriptum Oxoniae in festo Sancti Jacobi Apostoli anno superius praedicto."

"The above-named Richard Fitzralph was afterwards the celebrated Archbishop of Armagh, also known as St. Richard of Dundalk, the antagonist of the Mendicant orders."

CHAPTER III.

WICLIF'S QUIET WORK IN OXFORD—1345-1366.

SECTION I.—*Wiclif as a Member of Balliol and Merton.*

IN commencing this period of Wiclif's life with the year 1345, we have before us two full decades of years during which he in no way appeared, as yet, upon the stage of public life, either in Church or State. That is the reason why, in those chronicles which record the history of England in the fourteenth century, there does not occur the slightest mention of his person during these years. In fact it is not till ten years later still, that the chroniclers mention him for the first time (1377). It is for this reason that we designate this stage of his life, the period of his quiet work. And Oxford was the exclusive field of his work during all these twenty years.

We have to think of Wiclif at this time as a member in full standing of a college (*socius, fellow*), as one of the Regent Masters (*magistri regentes*), i.e., as a man taking an active part in the independent, and in some sense republican government of his own college and of the whole academic body—a position to which he had been in due order admitted, after passing through certain stages of academic study, and after he had acquitted himself of certain learned tasks (disputations and the like).

The college, indeed, of which Wiclif became a Fellow, is a question which lies under as much uncertainty as that other which has been discussed in the last chapter, viz.: what college it was with which he had been previously connected as a scholar.

Since the appearance of Lewis's life in 1720, the common understanding has been that he was first a Fellow of Merton College, and afterwards, about the year 1360, was promoted to the presidency of Balliol College.¹ In support of the first point, there exists a single documentary proof, but this a proof not absolutely free from question. It consists of an entry in the Acts of Merton College, according to which, in January 1356, "John Wiclif" held the office of seneschal or

rent-master of the college.² This has hitherto been understood of our Wiclif, without hesitation; but Shirley maintains, on the contrary, that that notice probably refers to his namesake and contemporary, John Wiclif or Wyclyve, who, according to trustworthy documents, was parish priest of Mayfield. The grounds upon which this scholar relies are the following:—The fact is certain beyond challenge, that the Reformer Wiclif and no other was Master of Balliol in 1361. Now, the relations which existed between this college and the Wiclif family, make it natural to presume that he belonged to Balliol from the first; while, on the other hand, it is in the highest degree improbable that the members of the college would have chosen for their Master a man who was a member of another college (Merton).³ The difficulty presented by this last remark will find its solution in an inquiry which we shall enter upon immediately; and as to Shirley's first ground of doubt, it is obvious to reply that John Wiclif of Mayfield is still also a Wiclif, and therefore stands as nearly related to Balliol College as our Wiclif, and to Merton College no nearer than he. Thus the most important element of the question still continues to be the established fact, that our Wiclif was Master of Balliol in 1362. We are unable, for our part, to recognise any decisive weight in the critical observations of Shirley, in opposition to the view which has hitherto prevailed, that Wiclif for some time was a member of Merton. On the other hand, we believe that we are able to throw some new light upon a subject which has hitherto been somewhat obscure, and this, not by means of mere conjectures, but of documentary facts.

The difficulty lies chiefly here, that it has been found hard to explain the frequent change of colleges through which Wiclif is alleged to have passed, inasmuch as according to the older tradition, he was first admitted into Queen's, then transferred to Merton, and was soon thereafter made Master of Balliol; or, in case we set aside Queen's College (as the mention of it in connection with Wiclif's student-life is unhistorical), and prefer to assume that he belonged from the first, as a scholar, to Balliol, then it becomes almost stranger still to suppose that Wiclif should have afterwards left this college and become a member of Merton, and then should have returned again to Balliol, and that too in the capacity of Master. But precisely here is the point upon which we think we are able to throw light, from a document which, till now, has hardly been considered in relation to the subject. We refer to the Papal Bull of 1361, first pub-

lished by Lewis, not indeed in the original, but in extensive extract, in which the incorporation of the parish church of Abbotesley with Balliol Hall (so the college was then called) is approved and sanctioned.⁴ This apostolic writ makes reference, at the same time, to the representation which the members of Balliol had submitted to the Papal See in support of their petition for the confirmation of the incorporation. From this representation we see pretty clearly what had been the financial condition of the college up to that time. For it states that by means of the pious beneficence of the founder of the college, there are indeed numerous students and clerics in the hall, but aforetime each of them had only received*—farthings weekly; *and as soon as they became Masters of Arts, they had immediately to leave the Hall*, so that, on account of poverty, they were no longer able to continue their studies, and found themselves, in some instances, obliged to have recourse to trade for the sake of a living. Now, however, Sir William Felton, the present benefactor of the foundation, formerly patron of Abbotesley, but who had already, in 1347, transferred his right of collation to Balliol College,⁵ has formed the design, out of sympathy with its members, to increase the number of scholars, and to make provision for their having the common use of books in all the different faculties; and also, that every one of them should have a sufficient supply of clothing and twelve farthings a-week; and further, *that they should be at liberty to remain quietly in the Hall, whether they were masters and doctors or not, until they obtained a sufficient church-living, and not till then should they be obliged to leave.*

From this it appears as clearly as we could possibly desire, that up to the year 1360 the extremely limited resources of Balliol had made it necessary that every one belonging to the foundation should leave as soon as he obtained his Arts degree, and that the incorporation of the Church of Abbotesley, according to the intention of the benefactor, was designed, among other things, to provide that in future the members of Balliol, even when they became masters or doctors, might continue to live in the college as they had done before. If, therefore, Wiclif, as we have reason to presume, was received into Balliol as a scholar, the circumstances of the college at that time must have obliged him to leave it as soon as he graduated. As now the above-mentioned notice in the papers of Merton mentions John Wiclif, in 1356, as seneschal of the college, there is not only nothing any longer standing

* The blank here should be filled up with the number 8; vide Additional Note I. at the end of the chapter.

in the way of identifying this "Wyclif" with our Wiclif, but we have even the satisfaction of learning from this source what had become of him since the time when, as we may now presume, he was obliged to leave Balliol as a promoted magister. And as it was customary in the colleges that every one behoved to be for some considerable length of time a Fellow before he could undertake such a function as that of seneschal, the inference may be allowed that Wiclif had been for several years a member of Merton before he entered upon the office, and in all probability since the date of his graduation as a master. The circumstances just mentioned serve to show, in addition, how easily it might come to pass that Wiclif, although he had left Balliol, where he had originally studied, might yet at a later period be called back again to that college, and even be placed at its head; for as his leaving was by no means a spontaneous act of his own, but was entirely due to the financial situation of the college, every surmise that it may have given rise to some feeling to his disadvantage is entirely out of the question, whereas, under other circumstances, such a feeling might have stood in his way to his subsequent promotion to the headship of the house.

We have thus been able, we believe, to clear up a point which has hitherto been obscure. But however this may be, the fact at least stands perfectly firm that Wiclif was Master of Balliol in the year 1361. This appears from four different documents which are preserved in the archives of this college, and which have all a bearing upon the fact that Wiclif, as "*Magister seu Custos Aulæ de Balliolo*," takes possession, in name of the college, of the already mentioned incumbency of Abbotesley in the county of Huntingdon, which had been incorporated with the foundation. From these documents it appears that Wiclif must already before this date have been Master or Warden of Balliol; and yet it cannot have been long previously that he acquired the dignity, for in November 1356 the name of Robert of Derby occurs as master. Nor was even he Wiclif's immediate predecessor, but another whose name was William of Kingston. Three of these documents, dated 7th, 8th, and 9th April 1361, have immediate relation to the Act of Incorporation itself, while the fourth document, dated July in the same year, is that along with which Wiclif, as master, sent to the Bishop of Lincoln, John Gynwell, the Papal bull wherein the incorporation was sanctioned. But before this last date Wiclif had been nominated by his college, 16th May 1361, to be Rector of Fillingham. This is a small parish in the

county of Lincoln, lying ten miles north north-west from the city of Lincoln. This appointment did not imply that Wiclif immediately thereafter left the University and lived entirely in the country, in order to devote himself to pastoral duties. This does not appear to have been contemplated in the nomination. Agreeably to law and usage prevalent at the period, he remained after as before, a member of the University, with all the powers and privileges belonging to him as such; and without doubt he continued, for all important purposes, to reside in Oxford. What provision he made for the work of the parish, perhaps by the appointment of a curate, and whether, perhaps, during the recesses of the University he resided regularly in Fillingham, in order to discharge his pastoral duties in person—these are points which we are obliged to leave undecided. But it is matter of fact that an entry exists in the Acts of the See of Lincoln, to which diocese Fillingham belonged, from which it appears that Wiclif applied for and obtained in 1368 the consent of his bishop to an absence of two years from his parish church of Fillingham, in order to devote himself to the studies of Oxford.⁷ It may be conjectured that he had obtained similar leave of non-residence on previous occasions, in each instance for a like period of two years.

On the other hand, his nomination to the rectorship of a landward parish made it a necessity that he should relinquish the mastership of Balliol. That this took place in point of fact may be inferred from a circumstance of which documentary proof still exists in the account-books of Queen's College, that Wiclif, in October 1363, and for several years afterwards, paid rent for an apartment in the buildings of that college. We know, besides, from other sources, that in 1366 a certain John Hugate was Master of Balliol.

During the twenty years which we have in view in the present chapter, Wiclif's work in Oxford was twofold, partly scientific, as a man of scholastic learning, and partly practical, as a member, and for some time president of a college, and also as *Magister regens* in the general body of the University. That he did not apply himself continuously to pastoral labours in Fillingham (from 1361) may be assumed with certainty. With respect to his scientific labours, he commenced while yet only a master in the faculty of Arts by giving disputations and lectures on philosophical subjects, particularly in Logic. From many passages of his extant manuscript works it appears that he gave courses of such lectures with zeal and success. But from the time when he became Bachelor of Theology, he was at liberty to

deliver theological lectures in addition—*i.e.*, only, in the first instance, on the Biblical books, not on the Sentences of the Lombard, which latter privilege was reserved exclusively for the higher grades of Bachelorship and the Doctors of Theology. But the Biblical lectures which he delivered, it may be conjectured, proved of the greatest use to himself, for, in teaching the Scriptures to others, he first learned the true meaning of them himself (*docendo discimus*); so that these lectures unconsciously served as a preparation for his later labours as a Reformer.

But Wiclif had also the opportunity of acquiring practical ability, and of making himself useful, by taking part as a Fellow of Merton College in the administration of that society. Doubtless, the fruitfulness and utility of his activity in this position contributed essentially to bring about his appointment to the headship of Balliol. What was chiefly valued in him in this relation appears in the clearest manner from the document by which the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Islip, an earlier fellow-student of his, appointed Wiclif to the Presidency of "Canterbury Hall." The archbishop gives as his reason for this nomination, apart from Wiclif's learning and estimable life, his practical qualifications of fidelity, circumspection, and diligence.⁹

SECTION II.—*Wiclif as Head of Canterbury Hall and Doctor of Theology.*

IN the meantime, as has just been mentioned by anticipation, Wiclif had been appointed to the headship of a small newly-founded college. But this position also, without any blame on his part, proved to be one of only short duration. We mean the position of Warden of Canterbury Hall—a point in his biography, however, which is attended with more than one historical difficulty. Up till 1840 it was the universally received understanding that Wiclif was for some time head of this new hall.

Simon Islip, Archbishop of Canterbury, founded a Hall in Oxford which should bear the name of the Archiepiscopal See. Its first warden was a monk of violent character named Woodhall, under whom there was no end of contention among the members; to remedy which the Archbishop removed Woodhall from the headship, and replaced three other members, who were monks, by secular priests. In 1365 he appointed "John of Wiclif" to be second warden, and entrusted to him the oversight of the eleven

scholars, who were now all seculars. But in the following spring (26th April 1366), the active Archbishop Islip deceased, and was succeeded, as Primate of England, in 1367, by Simon Langham, a man who had previously been a monk, and continued to cherish a thoroughly monastic spirit. By him Wiclif was deposed from his wardenship, and the three members who had been introduced along with him were removed from the college. Langham restored Woodhall to the headship, and the three monks who had been deprived along with him were once more made members. Wiclif and the three Fellows appealed from the Archbishop to the Pope, but the process proved an uncommonly protracted one, and ended in 1370 with the rejection of Wiclif and his fellow-appellants, and with the confirmation of their opponents in their several places.

The termination of this affair exceeds by several years the limit of the present period of Wiclif's life; but for the sake of connection we shall dispose of the whole subject in the present place. From the fourteenth century down to our own time, this chapter of Wiclif's history has been turned to polemical use against him by his literary adversaries. They knew how to attribute his antagonistic tendencies, and especially his attacks upon the Pope and the monastic system, to motives of petty personal revenge for the losses which he had incurred on this occasion, and thus to damage his character and fair fame. We shall, therefore, have to inquire whether this imputation is well-grounded or not, keeping before us, however, here as always, the truth as our highest aim.

We might, indeed, have entirely dispensed with the elucidation, if it could be shown that this whole account had been smuggled into the biography of the precursor of the Reformation only by confounding him with another individual of the same name. This view of the subject has, in fact, been recently entertained and defended with no inconsiderable amount of learning and acuteness. It is due to truth, however, at once to state that it was by no means the design of the scholars whom we have now in our eye in this investigation, to offer any defence against these imputations, but simply and solely to bring to the light the historical facts of the case as they really occurred.

The historico-critical difficulties which have here to be solved, may be comprised in two questions:—

1. Is John Wiclif, the Warden of Canterbury Hall, identical with Wiclif the precursor of the Reformation, or is he not?

2. Was the appointment of Wiclif to the headship of the Hall, and of those three secular priests or members of the same, contrary to the terms of the foundation, or not?

We shall be obliged to distinguish these two questions, but we cannot keep them mechanically separate in our inquiry.

In August 1841, there appeared an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, whose anonymous author was professedly a member of the Court of Heraldry—*Courthope*. This article first made the attempt to show that "John Wycliffe" the Warden of Canterbury Hall, was a person to be carefully distinguished from the celebrated Wiclif.¹⁰ The writer had been led to this conclusion in the course of drawing up a local history of the Archbishop's Palace of Mayfield, in Sussex. He discovered, that is to say, in the Archives of Canterbury, that on the 20th July 1361, a "John Wycliffe" was appointed parish priest of Mayfield by Archbishop Islip—the same prelate who, four years later, was to nominate John Wycliffe to the presidency of Canterbury Hall; and, what is remarkable, the deed of this later nomination is dated at Mayfield, 9th December 1365, where Islip seems to have had his ordinary residence since the time when he appointed "John of Wycliffe" to the parish. Further, the tone in which the Archbishop speaks in the deed, of the learning and excellent qualities of the man whom he nominates to the wardenship, presupposes intimate personal acquaintance, and does not leave the impression that this commendation was mere language of form.¹¹ In addition to all this, it seemed to the critic to be a circumstance worth consideration, that the name itself in both documents, viz., in the deed of appointment to the parish, and in that of appointment to the wardenship, is written with *clive* in the second syllable, whereas the name of our Wiclif and the Warden of Balliol is found in all documents written with *lif* or *life*. Last of all, the critic lays stress upon the fact that the Archbishop shortly before his death, in April 1366, was taking steps to allocate the income of the parish church of Mayfield to the support of the Warden of the Hall, which, however, was prevented by his death. But all this appears decidedly to imply that it was the parish priest of Mayfield who was promoted to the Wardenship of the Hall; he was, however, in 1380 transferred to the neighbouring parish of Horstedkaynes, and received a prebend in the cathedral church of Chichester. He died in 1383, only one year before our Wiclif.

This learned and acute investigation attracted much attention. On the one hand it commended itself to many,

and there were not wanting men of learning who went even farther, and undertook to prove that three or even four men of the name of John Wiclif, and all belonging to the clerical order, lived at the same time. This last assertion we leave on one side as resting upon a misunderstanding. But all the less ought we to accept, untested, the view that it was John Wiclif, parish priest of Mayfield, and afterwards of Horstedkaynes, and not the celebrated Wiclif, who was promoted by Islip to the Wardenship of the New Hall in Oxford, deposed by the Archbishop's successor, and thereby occasioned to carry on a process before the Roman Curia. For this view has been accepted and supported with additional arguments by other investigators, and especially by the late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Oxford, Walter Waddington Shirley.¹⁹ The latter is also of opinion that that John Wyclif, who is mentioned as member and seneschal of Merton College in 1356, must likewise have been the Wycliffe of Mayfield, and not our Wiclif. To this last point, which we believe we have already disposed of by what was said upon it above, we shall, however, have occasion once again to return. But the question whether John Wiclif, the head of Canterbury Hall, is, or is not, one and the same person with our Wiclif, is one which (if we mistake not) still remains to-day undecided, inasmuch as Shirley and others answer it in the negative, while Vaughan and the learned editors of the Wiclif Bible, Rev. Josia Forshall and Sir Frederick Madden, affirm it in the most decided manner.

Let us first examine the grounds which are alleged against the identity of our Wiclif, and in support of the identity of the less celebrated Wiclif of Mayfield, with the Warden of Canterbury Hall. 1. The argument founded upon the form of the name is converted, upon closer examination, into an argument in favour of the identification of our Wiclif with the Warden of Canterbury Hall. By careful investigation among documents of the period, the late Prebendary Wilkinson established the fact that the name of the parish priest of Mayfield is always written Whitcliff, or Whytclife, etc., i.e., is uniformly written with *t* in the first syllable, while the name of our Wiclif and of the Warden of that Hall never appears with *t* in the first syllable. 2. The argument founded upon the circumstance that the Archbishop's deed of appointment is dated at Mayfield is a precarious one, for this fact, taken by itself, by no means necessarily leads to the inference which has been drawn from it. 3. Hence this second ground is combined with a third, viz., that the terms

of the deed imply a personal acquaintance of the Archbishop with his nominee. This is undoubtedly the case. But it does not follow from this that the Archbishop's nominee was the parish priest of Mayfield, with whom, of course, from his frequent residence there for several years, he was perfectly well acquainted. For it is certainly quite possible that the Archbishop was also personally acquainted with our Wiclif; and if it is true, as from what has been said above there is no reason to doubt, that the Wiclif known to fame was for several years after his student course a member of Merton College, it is extremely probable that he and the said Archbishop, who was also of the same college, were from that time on a footing of mutual acquaintance and regard. The other points alleged in support of the same view, we leave aside as of less importance; but the observations already made warrant us, we believe, to maintain that the grounds which have been alleged against the identity of our Wiclif with that personage of the same name who was for a short time at the head of Canterbury Hall, prove absolutely nothing.

On the other hand, if we are not quite mistaken, the positive testimonies in favour of the identity are entirely decisive. 1. The oldest testimony in support of it is that of a younger contemporary of Wiclif. The learned Franciscan and Doctor of Theology, William Woodford, who wrote against Wiclif while he was still living, and of whom Wiclif, so far as I can find, speaks with genuine respect, in a controversial treatise, entitled *Seventy-Two Queries concerning the Sacrament of the Altar*, of the year 1381, mentions, as a well-known fact, the circumstance, that Wiclif was driven by prelates and endowed monks from his position in Canterbury Hall. Still further, Woodford brought Wiclif's subsequent antagonism to the endowed orders into a connection of his own suggestion with that incident of his life.¹⁴ This testimony seems scarcely to leave room for any remaining doubt, because its date reaches up to Wiclif's own lifetime. It has been attempted, notwithstanding, to diminish the weight of Woodford's testimony by the observation that he could not have had any personal recollection of that incident, for as his latest writing occurs in the year 1433, he must have been still a boy at the time of the event in question; besides which, these *Seventy-Two Queries* were written, it is alleged, in great haste, and in a time of strong excitement and zealous controversy, when every damaging story about Wiclif might be expected to find willing ears; last of all, Woodford never repeated this allega-

tion in his later writings, and his scholar, Thomas of Walden, never once touches upon this story in his great polemical work—from which it may be concluded that Thomas of Walden had no belief in its truth.¹⁵ To all which we reply that though Woodford was a younger man than Wiclif, he must yet have lived in Oxford with him for some considerable time, as is manifest from the language of Wiclif in the passage quoted in note 15, last referred to. He could very well then have an exact and certain knowledge of the whole affair; and his manner of referring to the subject corresponds well with this, for it is no more than a short incidental allusion, to a well-known fact, introduced chiefly for the sake of the alleged connection between the fact and Wiclif's polemics against the endowed orders. Nor can the circumstances that Woodford does not recur to the subject in his later writings, and that Thomas of Walden, who wrote after him, never once mentions it, be of any avail as proof against the truth of a fact vouched for by such testimony. It is well known how precarious arguments *a silentio* are wont in general to be. We are, therefore, still prepared to assign to the testimony of Woodford a decisive weight in support of the fact that our Wiclif was nominated to the headship of Canterbury Hall, but before two years had passed away was again driven from his position.*

2. It is remarkable that in Wiclif's own writings a passage is found where he treats of that affair; and it is not in the nature of a passing allusion, as in Woodford, but a pretty full investigation of the subject. But Wiclif handles the matter so much upon the merits, and so little as a personal affair, that at first sight it might admit of a doubt whether he had himself really taken any part in the business. In fact his manner of speaking has even been thought to admit of being used as a testimony against the identity of his person with that of the head of the Hall so often mentioned. With all the more exactness must we look into the language which he employs, having regard to the whole connection of the passage.¹⁶ In the section of his book, *De Ecclesia*, containing the passage, he is treating of the property of the Church, and the question in chap. 16, is whether the provision of *landed property* for the Church is really a necessity and a benefit for her, and not rather a mischief. In particular, the author investigates the question, assuming, as he does, the pretended Donation of Constantine to be a historical fact, whether Silvester did right in accepting that Donation. This question Wiclif answers in the negative.

* *Vide*-additional note 2, at the end of the chapter.

But he also brings under review all the arguments adduced by opponents against this negative. Among others, he brings into view the fifth objection laid against his opinion, viz., that if Bishop Sylvester in Rome committed a sin in accepting the permanent endowment of the Church with lands, then in like manner the colleges in Oxford have sinned in accepting gifts of temporal estates for the support of poor clerics, and it must consequently be the duty of the members of these colleges spontaneously to forego the continued possession of such lands; yea, they ought in strict propriety to solicit their promoters and patrons to take back again these dangerous rights and properties. But by such a course essential injury would be done to the religious liberality of the people, and not only to the income of the clergy derived from such foundations, but also to the provision made for the poor. The indirect mode of proof used by his opponents takes the form of reasoning *per deducens ad familiare inconveniens*, i.e., they are fain to deduce from Wiclif's contention a consequence which touches very nearly the interest both of himself and the corporation to which he belongs (*familiare*), and the intolerableness of which or its practical mischievousness (*inconveniens*) must at once be obvious.

In his reply Wiclif denies the pretended logical exigency of this reasoning, as if it followed from his premises that all endowments for the benefit of the University were sinful which is by no means the case; but he urges that it is still possible for a sin of inadvertence to creep in, not only in a thing which is good in itself, but also in a transaction which is morally good in respect to the personal motive from which it proceeds. And this he will make plain *in familiariore exemplo*, in an example lying still nearer to himself, or touching himself still more closely.¹⁷ But this example is none other than the incident of the foundation of a college in Oxford by Archbishop Islip. He does not mention Canterbury Hall by name, but that this college and no other is meant cannot admit of the slightest doubt. Wiclif mentions two chief particulars in relation to this Hall: first, its original foundation by Simon Islip, and its endowment with landed property; and next, the upsetting of that foundation by Archbishop Simon Langham, to whom he gives the name of Anti-Simon, because, with the same baptismal name as Islip, his way of proceeding was antagonistic. To the founder he ascribes a pious motive in his provision for the college, even a more pious intention than had found place in the provision of any of the monasteries of England; but Wiclif was of opinion, notwithstanding, that Islip had acted in the matter

not without sin, for the incorporation of a parish church, or the alienation of an estate in mortmain, has never taken place without sin, both in the giver and the receiver.¹⁸ But as to Islip's successor in the primacy, who had completely upset his arrangements in reference to the college, Wiclif maintains, in the most distinct manner, that he sinned in so doing, much more than Islip himself. Now, the circumstance that Wiclif in this passage does not bring his own person into view in a perfectly unmistakeable manner, as one who was concerned in the college and the change which it underwent, is insufficient to shake our conviction that he had this personal concern in it notwithstanding. The objective mode of speaking in the third person we are familiar with in other instances; and that the incident had a special relation to his own person, he gives us clearly to understand in his use of the words *familiarius exemplum*.

Fully ten years had passed away, when he wrote thus, since his removal from the position of Warden of Canterbury Hall, for the book *De Ecclesia*, which contains the statements before us, was written, as we undertake to show with precision, in the year 1378. The affair had long ceased to give pain; and although at the time he had felt it keenly, the author was now able to speak of it with perfect coolness, and simply as a matter of fact. Like his opponent Woodford, however, Wiclif speaks of the incident in a manner which implies that it was one well known to all; for, with the exception of the founder himself, he does not mention a single name—neither that of the College nor that of Langham, nor even a single name of any of the members of the College earlier or later. And it is only a few features of the business which he brings into prominence, and these only such as were of substantive importance. On the one hand, that the design of the endowment of the foundation was a truly pious one; that the statutes and arrangements of the house were worthy of praise, and fitted to be of advantage to the Church; and that only secular clerics—i.e., learned men not belonging to any of the monastic orders—were meant to devote themselves therein to science. On the other hand, Wiclif mentions no more than that, after Islip's death, his instructions were frustrated, the members who were in the enjoyment of the foundation dispossessed, and several people introduced who were by no means in need of it, but on the contrary in very comfortable circumstances. But it is not mentioned that the latter were monks exactly, and members of the Benedictine foundation of Canterbury, although this comes out indirectly from the connexion; while it is plainly told that the whole

change in the membership of the College had been carried through by means of false representations (*commenta mendacii, fucus*), and not without simony besides (*symoniace*).

This occurrence, Wiclif thinks, must be a warning to the Bishop of Winchester, to use foresight that a similar fate may not befall his own foundation. William of Wykeham, one of the most leading prelates and statesmen of England in the fourteenth century († 1404), had occupied himself since 1373 with the foundation of a great college in Oxford; he had already formed a society in that year, for whose maintenance he provided; in 1379 he concluded his last purchases of ground for the building of the house; and on the 13th of April 1386, several years after Wiclif's death, took place the solemn consecration of "St. Mary's College of Winchester in Oxford," which soon afterwards received the name of New College, under which it still flourishes at the present day. The way in which Wiclif speaks of this foundation of Wykeham shows clearly that the fact was not yet a completed one, but was still only in the stage of preparation. Otherwise, the advice which he modestly gives the bishop (*consulendum videtur domino Wyntoniensi, etc.*) would have come too late.¹⁹

Let us now proceed to examine the second question, Was the appointment of Wiclif as Warden of Canterbury Hall, and of the three secular priests, William Selby, William Middleworth, and Richard Benger to be members of the same, contrary or not to the provisions of the foundation?

The opponents concerned answered this question, of course, in the affirmative. They represented the matter in this light: that the statutes of the College prescribed, as a fixed principle, that a Benedictine of the chapter of Canterbury must be warden, and that three monks in addition from the same chapter must be members; implying that Wiclif and those associated with him had put forward unwarranted claims in demanding that the government of the College should lie in the hands of secular priests, and that Wiclif should be made head. It was Wiclif and his friends, they alleged, who had carried through the proceeding of excluding from the College Henry Woodhall, the then warden, and those members who, like him, were Benedictines of Canterbury.²⁰

According to Wiclif's showing, the exact opposite of all this was the truth, viz., that Archbishop Islip had ordained that secular priests alone should study in the College; it was only after the death of the founder that members of the archiepiscopal chapter, in contrariety to his will, had

placed themselves in possession. These two statements are so directly contradictory as to nullify each other. It is necessary to look about for information from other sources in order to arrive at clearness on the subject. And fortunately such information is available in the eight documents relating to this business, which Lewis obtained from the archiepiscopal archives, and has published in the Appendix to his life of Wiclif. Two royal edicts in particular are here of importance. In the first, dated 20th October 1361, Edward III. grants his consent to the proposal of Archbishop Simon Islip to found a Canterbury Hall in Oxford, and to attach to and incorporate with this hall, as soon as it is erected, the Church, *i.e.*, the Church revenues of Pagham in Sussex. The second royal ordinance, of 8th April 1372, contains the confirmation of the Papal judgment of 1370, by which Wiclif and his associates of Canterbury Hall were finally excluded. In both these decrees mention is made of two classes of members of the college, who, according to the intention of the founder, were to live together in it—monks and non-monks;²¹ and in the second decree, consistently with this, a charge of departure from the terms of the original royal confirmation is laid equally against the determination of the founder himself, by which he subsequently set aside the monkish members, so that only non-monks should remain in the College, and against the Papal decision, in virtue of which, in all time coming, monks alone from the Benedictine Convent of Canterbury should be members.²² But notwithstanding this charge, Edward III. in the latter edict grants remission for these violations of the fundamental statute of Islip, but not without requiring the Prior and Convent of Canterbury to pay into the King's treasurer beforehand 200 marks,²³ a *naïve* condition, which confirms in the fullest manner the accusation which, as we saw, Wiclif himself makes, that simony had had a part in the game. Thus, it appears that the royal confirmation of the foundation originally proceeded on the assumption that two classes of members should be united in the College, monks and non-monks.

This confirmation, however, was set forth before the new hall was actually founded, when the archbishop had first determined upon its plan, and was desirous of paving the way for carrying it out by obtaining the necessary consent on the part of the State. The document, therefore, allows conclusions to be drawn from it only in regard to the original intentions of the founder, but gives no assurance that when Islip, a year later (1362), actually completed the foundation

and carried it into effect, that two-fold description of membership was ordained in the statutes of the foundation. In this connection it is in the highest degree worthy of attention that the archbishop himself, in his deed of 13th April 1363, wherein he gifts to the hall his estate of Woodford, refers, indeed, to the number of the members as twelve, who should form the College, but does not, in a single word, give it to be understood that part of the places therein must be filled with monks.²⁴ The deed of nomination, it is true, has a different sound, wherein, on 13th March 1362, the Prior and Chapter of Christ Church in Canterbury propose to Archbishop Islip for the headship of the new-founded Canterbury Hall in Oxford three of their brethren of the Benedictine Abbey (Henry Woodhall, Doctor of Theology, Dr. John Redingate, and William Richmond), from among whom he may himself appoint a warden. In this document, in fact, they refer themselves to an order made by the archbishop himself, in virtue of which this nomination should be made by them.²⁵ There is no room, therefore, to doubt that the archbishop, in the first instance, desired that at least the head of his College should be taken from the Benedictine order, and more specifically from the chapter of Christ Church in Canterbury, and that he secured this by his statutes. But it does not appear that any provision was made by the deeds of foundation that, in addition to the dignity of the headship, three places of the membership must also be filled with monks;²⁶ but, as a matter of fact, there were found in the hall, during the first stage of its existence, in addition to Henry Woodhall, who was its first warden, three additional monks from the Benedictine monastery of Canterbury.

How it came to pass that a change in this respect was introduced does not clearly appear. The monk party represent the course which things took in this manner: that Wiclif and his associates (Selby, Middleworth, and Benger), in an overbearing spirit, and without warrant, put forth the claim that the government of the College behoved to be in the hands of the secular priests, and in particular that John Wiclif ought to be warden; and so they had expelled the said warden, Henry Woodhall, and the other Benedictines, from the College, and taken the property of the foundation into their own possession.²⁷ But that this representation is in contradiction to the actual course of the affair is evident, beyond any doubt, from the royal edict of 8th April 1372, before produced, in which it is said, in plain terms, that it was the archbishop himself who displaced the existing warden and those members who were monks, and allowed only those

scholars who were not monks to remain, and who had appointed one man of the same category to the wardenship.²⁸

The testimony of this royal warrant is all the more trustworthy from its apparent impartiality, for with these words is immediately joined the inculpatory remark, that this measure of the archbishop was in contradiction to the original approval on the part of the State; and the words of the document sound indeed as if Islip had not merely intervened in a passing act, but had put his hand to an essential alteration of the statutes. And it is at this point that the remark of Wiclif (*De Ecclesia*, c. 16) comes in, that Islip had appointed that secular clerics alone should study in the College, which also took effect. Taken by themselves, his words might, indeed, lead one to think that Wiclif is speaking of the original statute. But this is not the true sense: he is speaking rather of the last ordinance of the archbishop, making an alteration on the first statute; and the term *ordinance* can undoubtedly have this meaning. If we so take the words, the contradiction disappears which at first sight exists between Wiclif's representation of the proceeding and that contained in the royal edict. But the representation of the opposite party exhibited to the Papal curia, as gathered from the mandate of Urban V., is irreconcilable with both these representations, and must be characterised as a manifest misrepresentation of the facts and a malicious calumny. The result of our investigation, therefore, is the following:—That the appointment of Wiclif to the headship of Canterbury Hall was contrary to the original foundation-statutes as approved on the side of the State, but it proceeded upon an alteration of the first statutes subsequently made by the founder himself.

On 9th December 1365, Wiclif was nominated Warden of Canterbury Hall by Archbishop Islip. Five months from that date were not yet full when the worthy archbishop died (26th April 1366). His successor, Stephen Langham, was enthroned 25th March 1367, and on the sixth day thereafter (31st March) he nominated John Redingate to be Warden of the Hall. Wiclif, of course, must have been previously deposed. The new Warden was a Benedictine of Canterbury, and one of the original members of the hall. Three weeks later, however (22nd April 1367), the archbishop recalled this nomination, and re-appointed the earlier head of the hall, Henry Woodhall, to the wardenship, to whose authority Wiclif should now, along with the other members, be subject.²⁹ But even so much as this reduced position in the college was not allowed to him. On the contrary, the

restoration now destined by the monkish archbishop for Canterbury Hall, led to the exclusion of all the secular members. Wiclif and his fellows appealed from the archbishop to the Pope; but as Langham, in the next year after his being made archbishop, was promoted to the cardinalate, and went to Avignon, the issue of the appeal was a judgment by which Wiclif and his fellows were definitively expelled, and the college was thenceforward exclusively filled with monks of Christ Church in Canterbury.

This decision was at all events still more opposed to the original meaning and intention of the foundation, than that the hall should have been for a time exclusively in the enjoyment of men who were not monks. For from the first the secular element had at least outweighed the other, even if we assume, what is by no means proved, that, according to the original statutes, four members of the twelve behoved to be monks; still more if the only point fixed by the statutes was that the Head of the house should be a Benedictine of Canterbury, while the introduction of three other Canterbury monks was possibly not prescribed in the statutes, but had only proceeded from the free determination of the founder. Wiclif himself, as we have seen, uses very strong language respecting the contrast in which the measures of the new archbishop stood to the ordering (more accurately the last ordering) of his predecessor (*eversum est tam pii patroni propositum. Anti-Simon*, etc.). And the government decree itself appears to look upon the last re-constitution of the college as a much more serious contradiction to the original foundation approved by the State than the alteration which was made by Islip himself; for of this latter it is only said that it was done *præter licentiam nostram supradictam*—beyond or in excess of our foresaid licence—whereas the exclusion of all secular members is declared to be *contra formam licentiæ nostræ supradictæ*—in the teeth of our licence, and not merely beyond or in excess of it. This difference of language is plainly intentional, and it will certainly be allowed that the latter expression is the stronger and more decisive of the two. Here the *original statute* is the only standard of judgment, for in this decree, issued by the Government, it is only the legality of the different acts in question which is dealt with.

But Wiclif does not apply to the question this low formal standard only, but forms his judgment of the last organic change which had been made, upon its substantive merits in point of congruity with the ends contemplated by the foundation. And here his judgment is one of entire disapproval, because the newly-appointed

members being already over-richly provided for, were by no means in need of the bounty of such a foundation. He has here in his eye the extensive landed possessions belonging to the Benedictine monastery of Canterbury, which was organically connected with the Archbishopal Cathedral, while the colleges in Oxford, as in Paris and other universities, were originally and principally intended for the support of the poorer class of students, and of masters without independent means. This language of Wiclif, however, as before remarked, is used in a purely objective sense, and by no means in such a tone as would warrant us to assume that the painful experiences which he had had to endure in his relations to the oft-mentioned college, may have had a determining influence upon his ecclesiastical views and work. It is only, however, a thorough exhibition of his public conduct that can throw light upon the question, whether there is any truth in the hostile allegation that the position of antagonism taken up by Wiclif against the Church, and especially against prelates and monastic orders, took its rise in injury done to his own private interests, and was thus inspired by low motives and personal revenge.

Canterbury Hall no longer exists in Oxford as an independent foundation, for after the Reformation the buildings of the hall passed over to the stately college of Christ Church, founded by Cardinal Wolsey.

Returning now to the year 1366—the limit of the period assigned to the present chapter, and which we have been led to exceed by four or six years in order to finish the topic now discussed—this year was possibly the date at which Wiclif reached the highest degree of academic dignity, that of doctor in the Theological Faculty. Since the sixteenth century it has been assumed, on the authority of a statement of Bishop Bale, that Wiclif became doctor of theology in 1372.⁹⁰ In assigning this date, Bale, it may be conjectured, proceeded upon the fact that in the royal ordinance of 26th July 1374, which nominated commissioners for negotiations with the Papal Court, Wiclif is introduced as *sacrae theologiae professor*, at which date, therefore, he must have been already doctor.⁹¹ And here let me remark by the way, that the title of professor of theology given to Wiclif, has generally been misunderstood, as though it meant that he had been appointed to a professorial chair. But this rests upon an anachronism. The mediæval universities, down at least to the fifteenth century, knew nothing of professors in the sense of modern universities. The title *sacrae paginae*, or *theologiae professor*, denotes in the fourteenth century, not an university office, to be thought of

in connection with particular duties and rights, and especially with a fixed stipend, but only an academic degree; for it is equivalent to the title of doctor of theology. Such an one had the full right to deliver theological lectures, but was under no special obligation to do so, nor, apart from some trifling dues as a member of the Theological Faculty, had he any salary proper, except in cases where, along with the degree, some church-living might be conferred upon him.³²

So much as this we know from the royal document just mentioned, that Wiclif was a doctor of theology in the year 1374. But it is only the latest possible date which is thus fixed; and Bale conjectured with good reason, that Wiclif must have become a doctor some considerable time before, and suggested the year 1372.³³ Shirley, on the other hand, believes that he is able to make out, with some probability, that Wiclif was promoted to this degree as early as 1363. He supports this view upon several polemical pieces of the Carmelite John Cunningham, directed against Wiclif, which he has himself published. And it is indeed worth remarking that that monkish theologian in his first essay, as well as in the introduction to it, speaks of Wiclif exclusively under the title of *magister*, whereas in the second and third, he uses the titles *magister* and *doctor* interchangeably.³⁴ But now the first of these essays where the latter title never once occurs, has reference to a tract of Wiclif, in which he mentions that it is not his intention to go, *for the present*, into the question of the right of property (*de dominio*);³⁵ while a fragment upon this question, which Lewis gives in his appendix to the life of Wiclif,³⁶ was probably written in 1366, and the larger work of Wiclif, *De Dominio Divino*, from which that fragment, it is likely, was taken, was written at latest in 1368. Hence Shirley believes that he may perhaps indicate the year 1363, as that in which Wiclif received his degree.

We are unable, however, to concur in this conjecture, because we have positive testimony to show that in the end of the year 1365, Wiclif was only master of arts, and not yet doctor of theology. For Archbishop Islip describes him in the document of 9th December 1365, in which he nominates him to the headship of Canterbury Hall, as *magister in artibus*, whereas³⁷ the whole connection shows that he would certainly have laid stress upon the higher academic degree, if Wiclif had already possessed it.

The fact then stands thus, that Wiclif, in 1374, was a doctor of theology, but not yet in 1365. In the intervening period between these two dates he must have taken that degree; but to fix the time with precision is impossible, for lack of documentary authority.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III.

1. *John Lewis, History, etc.*, I. 4. *Vaughan, Life and Opinions*, I. 241. *Monograph*, p. 39 f.

2. *Compotus Ric. Billingham, bursarii 30 Edward III.*, Rot. in thesaurario Coll. Merton, as referred to by the Editors of the *Wiclif Bible*, p. 7.

3. Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 511.

4. *Lewis, History, etc.*, p. 4.

5. *Comp. Sam. Lewis, Topographical Dictionary*, 5 ed., Lond. 1842; 4to. Abbotale.

6. Shirley gives an exact account of these documents in notes 4 and 5 on p. XIV. of the "Introduction." [Several of them are transcribed in "Riley's Report to the Royal Commission on Historical MSS. on the Archives of Balliol College."—*Translator*.]

7. The entry in the Episcopal Register of Lincoln, Bishop Bokyngham's, 1363-1397, is as follows:—"Idibus Aprilis, anno domini millesimo CCCmo. LXVIII. apud parkum Stone concessa fuit licentia magistro Johanni de Wycheve, rectori ecclesie de Fytingham, quod posset se absentare ab ecclesia sua insistendo literarum studio in Universitate Oxon. per biennium."

8. The remarks made by Buddensieg in opposition to this view (*Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, 1874, p. 316) rest upon what I consider to be an erroneous interpretation of the entries in the account-books of Queen's College, communicated by Shirley in the "*Fasciculi*," p. 514; for these entries manifestly refer, not to short stays in the college rooms, but to rents of rooms paid by the year, with which sense alone agrees the recurring mention of Wiclif's *camera*. In a passage of his paper further on, Buddensieg himself understands all the entries in question of a two years' rental.

9. *Lewis History*, Appendix No. 3, p. 290.

10. The substance of the article is given in the appendix to Townsend's edition of *Foxe's Acts and Monuments*, III. 812, and in the appendix to *Vaughan's Monograph*, p. 547 f. In the latter, however, the year 1844 is printed by mistake for 1841.

11. "Ad vitæ tuæ et conversationis laudabilis honestatem, literarumque scientiam, quibus personam tuam in artibus magistratam Altissimus insignivit, mentis nostræ oculos dirigentes, ac de tuis fidelitate, circumspectione et industria plurimum confidentes in custodem Aulæ nostræ Cantuar.—te Prefecimus," etc.—*Wood's History and Antiquities, Oxon.*, I. p. 184; *Lewis History, etc.*, p. 290.

12. In a long *Excursus* to his edition of the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 513-528.

13. Wiclif calls him *Doctor meus Reverendus Mr. Willelmus Wodford* in his work *De Civili Dominio*, iii. c. 18, Vienna MSS., 1340, fol. 141, col. 2. He says of him—"Arguit contra hoc compendiosè et subtiliter more suo. Et revera obligacior et amplius huic doctori meo, quo in diversis gradibus et actibus scolasticis didici ex ejus exercitatione modesta multas mihi notabiles veritates."

14. Of this writing, which has never been printed—*Septuaginta duo Quaestiones de Sacramento altaris*—there is preserved a MS. in the Bodleian, No. 703. Harl. 31, fol. 31. Under *Quaestio 50* the author speaks of the polemic of Wiclif against the monks in the following style:—"Et hæc contra religiosos insaniam generata est ex corruptione. Nam priusquam per religiosos possessionatos et

prælatos expulsus fuerat de aula Monachorum Cantuariæ, nihil contra possessiones attemptavit quod esset alicujus ponderis. Et prius quam per religiosos Mendicantes reprobatus fuit publice de heresibus in sacramento altaris, nihil contra eos attemptavit, sed posterius multipliciter eos diffamavit; ita quod doctrinæ suæ malæ et infestæ contra religiosos et possessionatos et Mendicantes generatæ fuerunt ex putrefactionibus et melancoliis."—*Shirley*, p. 517 f.

14. *Shirley*, as above.

15. *Shirley* was the first to call attention to this passage, and he has given it, though not at full length, in the "Note on the two John Wiclifs," at the end of the *Fasciculi*, p. 526. I had found the passage before I observed that he had already given an extract from it. But I found it necessary to reproduce the context with somewhat greater fullness. *Vide* Appendix III.

16. The words in *familiariori exemplo* cannot be understood in any other sense. The *comparative* here points back to the preceding *positive*, *familiare inconveniens*. Opponents had pointed to the endowments of the University and its colleges as matters nearly affecting Wiclif's interest, but Wiclif replies by pointing to something which touched his personal interest more nearly and more directly still; and it is this comparative *familiariori exemplo*—not *Shirley's* reading of the MS. *familiari*—which is of decisive importance for our inquiry.

17. Wiclif here no doubt alludes, in addition to the estate of Woodford, to the church of "Pageham" (Pagham in Sussex, on the coast of the Channel) which the archbishop had incorporated with the foundation of his hall, as appears from several documents which have come down to us. (*Vide* Lewis, pp. 285, 293. *Shirley* is right in referring the alleged sin of Archbishop Islip to this act of incorporation, whereas Dr. Vaughan, in an article in the *British Quarterly Review*, October 1858, erroneously refers Wiclif's censure to the circumstance that the Primate had, in the first instance, introduced into his foundation both monks and seculars.

18. Robert Lowth, *Life of William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester*, 1758, pp. 93, 176 f.

19. The identity of our Wiclif with the warden of Canterbury Hall is indirectly confirmed by the circumstance that Benger, Middleworth, and Selby, who were members of the hall under John Wiclif, 1365-66, had previously been members of Merton College, like Wiclif himself, and were afterwards, with the exception of Benger, members of Queen's College, with which Wiclif also, as is well known, stood in a certain connection.—*Vide* Buddensieg; *Zeitschrift*, etc., as above p. 336.

20. We learn that this was the representation of the case made in the complaint addressed by Wiclif's opponents to the Papal See, from the mandate of Urban V. of 11th May 1370, by which the process was decided.—*Vide* Lewis, p. 292 f, for the documents.

21. *Aula (Cantuariensis) in qua certus erit numerus scholarium tam religiosorum quam secularium*, etc.—No 1 in Lewis, p. 285; No. 8, p. 297, 301.

22. *Præter licentiam nostram supradictam. Contra formam licentiæ nostræ supradictæ*.—Lewis, pp. 298, 299.

23. *De gratia nostra speciali, et pro ducentis marcis quas dicti prior et conventus nobis solverunt in hanaperio nostro, perdonavimus omnes transgressiones factas*, etc.—Lewis, p. 229.

24. *Quam (aulam) pro duodenario studentium numero duximus ordinandam*.

25. *Juxta formam et effectum ordinationis vestre factæ in hac parte*.—Lewis, 287, No. 2.

26. Lewis, No. 4, p. 290.

27. The latter was maintained by Wiclif's opponents in their representation to the Curia; but that the matter was not placed beyond doubt is plain from the language of the deed, which intentionally left it indeterminate.

28. *Falsa asserentes, dictum collegium per clericos seculares regi debere, dictum*

Johannem fore custodem collegii supradicti. Monachos de ipso collegio excluderunt.—Lewis, No. 7, p. 292.

29. Amotis omnino per prædictum archiepiscopum—Custode et cæteris Monachis scolaribus—ab aula prædicta, idem archiepiscopus quandam scolarem (secularem !) custodem dictæ Aulae, ac cæteros omnes scolares in eadem seculares (so to be read instead of *scolares*) duntaxat constituerit, etc.—Lewis, No. 8, p. 298.

30. Lewis, No. 6, p. 292. An extract from a document of the archiepiscopal archives.

31. Decrevit et declaravit solos Monachos prædictæ ecclesiæ Cant. secularibus exclusis, debere in dicto collegio perpetuo remanere.—Lewis, No. 7, p. 295.

32. So Vaughan in his latest work on Wiclif, the *Monograph*, p. 138.

33. Lewis, in Appendix No. 11, p. 304.

34. Comp. *Thurot De L'Organisation de l'Enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au moyen Âge*, p. 158.

35. Shirley, *Fasciculi*, etc., pp. 4, 14, 43, particularly pp. 78 f and 88 f. Comp. Introduction, p. xvi.

36. Do. p. 453.

37. Do. p. 456.

38. Lewis, No. 30, p. 349.

39. Lewis, No. 3, p. 290. *Personam tuam in artibus magistratam*,—so it should be read with Anthony Wood, not *magistratum*, as Lewis has it.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER III., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

NOTE I.—WICLIF'S CONNECTION WITH BALLIOL COLLEGE.

On looking recently into the *Registrum Palatinum Dundelmense*, issued in 1873, under the editorship of Sir Thomas Hardy, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, my attention was attracted by a document (Vol. III., p. 381) entitled "Appropriation of the Church of Micklebenton to the Master and Scholars of Balliol Hall in Oxford, by Philip de Somerville, and Statutes for the Regulation of six new Fellows of the said Hall, A.D. 1340." The date being nearly coincident with that at which Wiclif must have begun his college career in Oxford, and his mastership of Balliol only twenty years later being a matter of indisputable record, it at once occurred to me that the document might possibly have some collateral bearing on the question of Wiclif's connection with Balliol at an earlier stage than his Mastership. Nor was I disappointed in this surmise. I found, on a careful perusal, that this deed of Sir Philip de Somerville supplied some links which had hitherto been missing from the reasonings of Wiclif's biographers on the interesting question of the place and the course of his earliest studies in the University.

There are two copies of this deed given in the *Registrum*, the one forming part of the Register itself, the other printed in the Appendix from the original preserved among the archives of Balliol College. The editor printed the latter "because in many instances it appears more correct than the transcript in the Register, and gives clauses which are there omitted. In some cases, however, the last-named MS. contains what are apparently better readings." The original deed is signed and sealed by the Bishop of Durham (Richard de Bury), at Auckland, 18th October 1340; by the Prior and Convent of Durham, 24th October 1340; by the Chancellor of the University of Oxford on the day after the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, 1340; and by the Master and scholars of Balliol on the same day.

On turning next to the Histories of the University and its colleges, by Anthony Wood, and his predecessor Brian Twyne, and to the work entitled "*Ballio-Fergus*," a Commentary upon the foundation, founders, and affairs of Balliol College, by Henry Savage, Master of Balliol, published in 1668, I found not only that Sir

Philip de Somerville's Statutes had been in print for two centuries, but that a good many other facts in the annals of Balliol and the University were equally available as side lights for the elucidation of Wiclif's early University career; not indeed to the extent of determining anything connected with it with absolute certainty, for which we have not the attestation of express record, but to the effect of making it appear that there is a high degree of probability that instead of having ever been connected at any period of his University life, prior to his mastership of Balliol, either as a commoner with Queen's, or as a Postmaster or Fellow with Merton, he was all along a Balliol man, from his first coming up to Oxford in 1335 (taking Lechler's approximate date) to his election to the mastership of his college.

In bringing together the materials of our argument, we begin with the date of Wiclif's mastership, which has recently been ascertained to have been as early at least as A.D. 1360. The year usually assigned hitherto was 1361, but Mr. Riley, in his recent "Report to the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts," 1874, states that Wiclif's name and style as "Master of the Hall called Le Baillo halle in Oxford" occurs in a Latin memorandum, existing among the College archives, having reference to a suit brought against the college in the matter of some house property belonging to it in the parish of St. Lawrence, Jewry, London, in the 34th year of the reign of King Edward the Third—i.e., A.D. 1360.

No man, however, could be elected Master of Balliol unless he was at the time one of the Fellows; for it was one of the fundamental statutes of the house that the Fellows should always choose the Principal or Master *from their own number*.

The statute stands thus in the original statutes of Devorguilla, A.D. 1282:—"Volumus quoad scholares nostri *ex semetipsis eligant* unum principalem cui ceteri omnes humiliter obediant in his quae officium principalis contingunt, secundum statuta et consuetudines inter ipsos usitatas et approbatas."

Nor was this fundamental statute afterwards changed by any of the additional or altered statutes which were successively introduced. The statutes of Sir Philip de Somerville, which were added in 1340 to those of Devorguilla, contained a provision "that nothing was to be done under the former contrary to the provisions of the latter." Though nothing therefore is said in these new statutes to the effect of restricting the choice of the Fellows in the election of the Master to their own number, the very reason of this omission was that this provision had been clearly laid down in the fundamental statutes. And it is a strong confirmation of the fact that the original principle of election was not departed from under Sir Philip's new statutes, that when the statutes were revised in 1364 by the Bishop of London, the provision for the election of Master remained still the same—"Qui *de se ipsis* habeant unum magistrum;" and again in 1433, when a further modification of the statutes was made by the authority of another Bishop of London—the same restrictive words were continued in force—"Qui *de se ipsis* habeant unum magistrum."

Wiclif, then, was unquestionably a Fellow of Balliol before he was elected Master, and if a Fellow or Postmaster of Merton of the same name had not appeared upon the records of that college in the year 1356, who has for centuries been identified with the master of Balliol, the inference from the fact of his having held a Balliol Fellowship, would have been natural and easy, that he had all along from the first been a member of that House, up to the date of his election to the Mastership. But in view of that Merton record, such an inference is attended with great difficulty, to surmount which we must either adopt the opinion of the late Professor Shirley, that John Wiclif of Balliol was a different man from John Wiclif of Merton; or if we still hold them to be the same, we must conclude that as Wiclif the Reformer was a Fellow of both houses, he must either have surrendered his Fellowship of Balliol to go to Merton, or have been elected for the first time a Fellow of Balliol, when he ceased, some time before his election to the Mastership of the latter, to be a Fellow or Postmaster of Merton.

To enable us to choose between these alternatives of two different Wiclifs and one only, there are several important facts available, touching the relations of these two colleges to one another, and touching the financial conditions of Balliol College in particular, which, so far as we know, have never yet been brought into view in connection with the question of Wiclif's relation to either or both of these ancient seats of learning.

If it be supposed that Wiclif could pass easily during the first twenty years of his university life in Oxford, from Balliol to Merton, and from Merton to Balliol, or could be in official connection with both at the same time, no supposition could be more contrary to all probability, in view of the actual and well-ascertained relations of these two colleges at that very time. These two houses were the headquarters of the two great antagonistic factions of the University during the fourteenth century. Both the chief historians of Oxford, Brian Twyne and Anthony Wood, give us ample and graphic information of these rival parties of the *Borcales* and the *Australes*—the north countrymen and the south countrymen of the University; and if Merton stands out prominently in their accounts as the centre and head of the faction of the south, it is not difficult to discover that Balliol was the chief focus of the faction of the north.

To what a pitch of violence the contests of these factions had reached in 1334—the year preceding that on which Wiclif is conjectured by Professor Lechler to have come up to Oxford, will appear from the following passage of Wood's *History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, vol. i., p. 425.

"This year several students of the University, as well as masters, bachelors and scholars, did, under colour of some discord among them, and upon some pretences sought after, depart hence to Stamford in Lincolnshire, and there began or rather renewed or continued an academy in the months (it should seem) of May, June, and July. Camden and Mr. Twyne say that that university, or rather school of Stamford, began from a discord that happened between the northern and southern clerks of Oxford, the first of which having the worst, retired to the said place and began there to profess letters; yet when this controversy began they tell us not. That such controversies between the northern and southern men have often happened, is evidently apparent from what is before delivered; and that also they were now on foot, I doubt it not, forasmuch as the members of Merton College refused, at this time and before, to elect northern scholars into their society, because they and the University should be at peace; as from several complaints of the church of Durham against the Mertonians, is apparent."

The sources which Wood here refers to are *Registrum diversarum Epistolarum de officio Canc. Monachorum Eccl. Dunelmensis*, fol. 18 et 48. "*Et in quodam parvo Registro in Cesta Economica in Scacc. Coll. Mert.*, p. 19." I had hoped to find these ancient epistles among the extant archives of Merton College, but a recent visit to the strong vaulted chamber in which these are deposited, with all the hearty aid of the college bursar, Mr. Edwardes, failed to bring the documents to light. Nor do they appear to have met the practised eye of Mr. Riley, when he drew up his recent report upon the Merton papers.

This secession from the University continued till 1336—when the opposition schools at Stamford were forcibly suppressed by the authority of the King, and the secessionists were under the necessity of returning, no doubt with the worst grace, to Oxford. Who can doubt that the passionate grudges engendered by such a high quarrel, must have continued to embitter the life of the University for many years to come, and that the north countrymen in particular must long have cherished resentful memories of a struggle which had been marked on their side by such violent contrasts of proud disdain and ignominious submission. And this was the state of feeling which Wiclif found to exist in the University in the earliest years of his membership—a feeling with which, as a *Borealis* himself, he could scarcely fail to sympathise. Under date, A.D. 1343, Wood has the following entry:—"Clashing controversies."

But it was in the year 1349, when Wiclif had been probably fourteen years in Oxford, that the southern faction, headed and organised by the Merton men, reached the climax of violence and outrage. "But no sooner," says Wood, "was that quarrel (among the junior scholars) finished, but another happened among the masters concerning corrupt elections made about the office of Chancellor the last year. Mr. John Willyot, lately Fellow of Merton College, was designed to that office by the generality, but some discovering an opposition caused all the quarrel, and at length divided the University into parties; for while Mr. Willyot and his men were plotting and contriving to bring their designs to pass, his antagonist would do the like, and take all advantages to draw off, or at least lessen his party. The said factions continuing to the beginning of the year, Willyot's party about

the end of March entered rudely into St. Mary's Church, at the time when the Chancellor was to be elected, and there with clamour and shoutings cried him up to be their Chancellor, and on those that did oppose them they laid violent hands, beat, kicked about, and cudgelled, till some were severely wounded and others in a manner killed. At length after much ado, Willyot's party had the better, installed him, and put the fasces of authority into his hand, and caused Robert Ingram, the northern proctor, who was a great opposer of Willyot's party, to be banished Oxford. In this riot one of the University chests was broken open, and the common seal, with money, books, and certain chattels therein, were taken away, and divers insolences relating to other matters committed. These things being done, the particulars came to the King's knowledge, who forthwith sent his letters, dated 2nd April, to Mr. John Willyot, Philip Codeford, William Hayes or Hues, Robert de Wotton, Richard de Bellyugham, Michael Kylligrew, John Banbury, Richard Wanwayne, and Richard de Swyneshead, the chief leaders of the said riotous election, and most of them, as also those before-mentioned, Merton College men, that they should under pain of forfeiting all that they have or enjoy, restore the said seal and goods and other things taken away into the proctor's hands, to be by them put in their usual place, and to have the chest sealed up as it was before.

"At the same time also, another command was sent to the said Mr. Willyot, denoting that whereas he and his accomplices had proceeded against the customs and statutes of the University in their late election of Chancellor, and had banished one of the proctors with other persons, and had imprisoned divers, that he forthwith upon the sight thereof cause them to be recalled and restored to their liberty, to let them rest quietly without the disturbance of any person in the University; and withal that neither he nor any of his party hold any meetings, conventicles, congregations, etc., to the disturbance of the peace, under forfeiture of all that they were worth. Not long after, several commissioners were sent to Oxon. to examine or make search into the said riot, and after they had so done, were to settle a right understanding between the said parties. But in their proceedings, finding much wrong to have been committed, they punished divers persons, and would have removed Mr. Willyot from his place had they not feared the scholars, whom they saw ready (notwithstanding the King's letters for the conservation of the peace) to vindicate their late actions. So unanimous were they to defend what they had done, either by argument or blow, that rather than their man should be put by, they would venture their greatest strength, and if that would not do, then they were resolved to to relinquish the University and settle themselves elsewhere to study, and so by that means draw all the southern men after them."

Such was the state of University factions in 1349. Merton was one of the two foci of faction, and no doubt Balliol was the other, as a north country college drawing most of its men and revenues from the country north of the Humber. By recent additions to its revenues and the number of its members, its Master and Fellows were now on a footing of full equality with those of Merton in point of income and social standing, and would be regarded as the natural leaders of all the *Boreales* of the University, including the Provost and Fellows of Queen's College, then newly founded and not yet very rich. Wiclif in 1349 was one of its twenty-two Fellows, and for fourteen or fifteen years had doubtless been an energetic sharer in all the intellectual and social excitement of the academic life. Is it likely, then, that a Fellowship at Merton could ever have been an object of ambition to a Balliol man like him? Or if it could have been so, is it in the least probable that the Merton men would have been disposed to gratify him in that point? Only a few years before, as we have already seen, the Merton authorities had been systematically excluding north-country men, and had drawn upon themselves the remonstrances of the powerful Monastery of Durham; and the offence taken at Durham must have been felt even more strongly in Durham College in Oxford, which was a branch house recently founded of the great Benedictine Monastery of the north, and with which Balliol had been brought into a close administrative connection by the Somerville Statutes. These two Colleges were no doubt as closely united in feeling against Merton and its proceedings as they now were by statutory ties. It is in the highest degree improbable, therefore, that Wiclif, if already a Fellow of Balliol, would have sought to exchange that

position for a Postmastership of Merton; or that the Fellows of Merton would have admitted him to the membership of their society. And it is quite incredible that if he had left his own college to go to Merton, which could not have failed, at a time when party feeling ran so high, to be condemned as an act of treachery to his party, the Fellows of Balliol would, a few years afterwards, have elected him to their Mastership—the highest post of honour which they had to bestow.

To explain what is meant by the administrative connection between Balliol and Durham College just now referred to, let me add here, as briefly as possible, that the Somerville Statutes provided that the Prior or Warden of Durham College, set over it by the Prior of the Monastery of Durham, should have an effective voice in the confirmation of the election or removal of the Master of Balliol; and also in the confirmation of all Fellows who were elected to the Theological Fellowships, founded under those statutes, who must always be presented to him after their election, to be by him either confirmed or rejected as he might see cause. What influences led to this singular statutory tie between Balliol and the Durham monks in Oxford I do not find anywhere stated, but it is a curious subject of inquiry. The Durham College was a royal foundation of Edward III., the fulfilment of a vow made to the Virgin on the eve of his battle with the Scots at Homildon Hill, near Berwick; and in the execution of his design he probably acted under the advice of Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham, and Chancellor of the kingdom, who had been his tutor; and this advice had no doubt the aim of strengthening the interest of north-country scholars in the University. "Durham College" was one of the youngest institutions of the University, and it was apparently judged to be a good way of giving it prestige to bring it into a vital connection with one of the oldest; and the consent of Balliol to such an arrangement, so unusual and so open to objection, is, on the face of it, a strong proof of the zeal of that ancient house for the north-country interest, and a collateral confirmation of its claim to be regarded as the head-quarters of that interest in the University.

The financial conditions of Balliol, at the period of Wiclif's connection with it, are equally unfavourable to the notion that he ever left it to go to Merton. Precisely at this period its revenues had been brought into a condition of comparative ease and affluence by two benefactions from Sir William Fenton and Sir Philip de Somerville. The year 1341 was the date of both of these, and whether Wiclif came up to the University in 1340 or in 1335, he entered at Balliol just in time to be helped in the long progress of his studies in Arts and Theology by these new endowments. Till these additional revenues accrued, the scholars or fellows of the college were limited to sixteen in number, receiving a weekly allowance which was inadequate, and were obliged to leave the house as soon as they had taken their Master's degree; and no provision existed to aid them in prosecuting their studies in the Theological Faculty. But the new joint-endowments brought up the number of Fellows to twenty-two, increased the weekly allowances by an addition of one-half more, and provided for the support of six Theological Fellows chosen out of the twenty-two, who were to continue in residence till they took the degree of Bachelor in Theology. These ample provisions made it quite unnecessary for any Balliol man "of mark and likelihood" to remove to any other college of the University in order to obtain the means of prosecuting his studies. The Merton men themselves were in no respect better off. When Professor Lechler suggested that Wiclif may have exchanged Balliol for Merton on account of the stringency of the fundamental statute of Devorguilla, which required men to leave the house on their taking their Master's degree, he wrote under the impression that Sir William Felton's benefaction did not become available till 1361, whereas it accrued in fact in 1341; and he was not aware of the benefactions and the accompanying statutes of Sir Philip de Somerville of the same year. These new statutes, intended to regulate the administration of the increased revenues of the college, were a windfall for Wiclif and other young theologues of the favoured house. Balliol from that red-letter year became a nursery not only of Arts but of Scholastic Theology; and we no longer need to doubt that it was under the hospitable college roof of the Lord and Lady Balliol of Barnard Castle that the great Reformer grew up, during a long residence of a quarter of a century, to be one of the most consummate philosophers and divines of his nation and age.

Full details in regard to both these benefactions and their accompanying statutes will be found in Henry Savage's *Ballioferg* ; Oxford 1668 ; and in Anthony Wood's *History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*, Oxford 1786.

NOTE II.—IDENTITY OF JOHN WICLIF THE REFORMER WITH JOHN WICLIF THE WARDEN OF CANTERBURY HALL.

Dr. Lechler has omitted to bring forward a material argument in support of the identity of Wiclif with the Warden of Canterbury Hall, which is supplied by one of the original chronicles of the period, an omission which may have been owing to the discredit thrown upon the authority of the chronicle by Professor Shirley in his *Note on the Two John Wiclifs*, appended to the *Fasc. Zizaniorum*. This omission can now be supplied with more effect than it could have been four years ago, owing to the recent discovery of the original Latin Chronicle, the contents of which were only partially known before from the fragment of an old English translation of it made in the 16th century, which was published in the *Archæologia*, xiii., p. 253.

This Chronicle has recently been given to the world in the series of *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*, brought out under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, under the following title : *Chronicon Anglia, ab anno domini 1328, usque ad annum 1388 ; Auctore Monacho quodam Sancti Albani*. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson, Assistant Keeper of the MSS. of the British Museum, 1874.

It is printed from a MS. of the Harleian Collection, No. 3634, written on vellum towards the close of the fourteenth century, which has hitherto escaped the notice of historians. The MS. once belonged to Archbishop Parker, and was lent by him to Foxe, the martyrologist, who several times refers to it under the title of "*Chronicon Monachi D. Albani*." In one place his reference is in this form, "*Ex Historia Monachi D. Albani, ex accommodato D. Matth. Archiepis. Cant.*" John Joceline, the archbishop's secretary, in his "*Catalogus Historico-rum*" described it thus : "*In ea multa continentur de Wicliffo, Papali Schismate et de magna Rusticorum rebellione, quæ facta fuit per id tempus.*" "*It contains,*" says its discoverer and editor, Mr. Thompson, "*an important detailed history of the close of Edward Third's and the beginning of Richard Second's reign, which is now printed in its original shape for the first time, and which has hitherto been considered lost. The former existence of a Latin original for the translation used by John Stow in his Chronicle of England [the same translation printed in the Archæologia] has been generally admitted by historians. The only writer who has thrown any doubts upon it is the late Professor Shirley, in his edition of the Fasciculi Zizaniorum. The translation being one of the authorities brought forward in support of a tradition that Wiclif held the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall at Oxford, Mr. Shirley rejects its testimony on the ground of its being a compilation of the sixteenth century, while admitting, however, that the author had before him one, or perhaps two, contemporary authorities which he has indolently interwoven with his narrative, without changing one even of those expressions which most clearly reflect the image of passing events.*" All this criticism is, of course, superseded by the facts that we have now before us the original Latin text of the *Chronicon Anglia* in a MS. dating from the last quarter of the fourteenth century ; and that this was indisputably the work of a cotemporary historian. What, then, is the testimony of this cotemporary of Wiclif, who evidently shared largely in all the ecclesiastical passions and prejudices of his time, upon the point of the Reformer's connection with Canterbury Hall ? It is contained in the following passage of his Chronicle :—

"*Dux (referring to John, Duke of Gaunt) aggregaverat sibi quandam pseudo-theologum, sive, ut melius eum nominem, verum theomachum, qui jam a multis annis in scholis, in singulis actis suis contra ecclesiam oblatraverat, eo quod juste privatus exlitterat per archiepiscopum Cantuariensem quodam beneficio, cui injuste incubuerat in Universitate Oxoniensi situato.*" The words of the translation, published in the *Archæologia* are, that "he was justly deprived by the Archbishop of

Canterburye from a certayne benefice that he unjustly was incumbent upon within the cytye of Oxforde."

The incident, then, in question, in the life of Wiclif, viz., his short Wardenship of Canterbury Hall, may now be considered to be put beyond the range of reasonable doubt. Shirley admitted that "great weight must undoubtedly be allowed to the cotemporary statement of Woodford;" to which has now to be added a second cotemporary statement by the Monk of St. Alban's, as it now stands before us cleared of all the doubts which were thrown upon it by the acute and learned editor of the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*.

NOTE III.—THE WICLIF-RESEARCHES OF THE LATE PREBENDARY WILKINSON.

Some portion of the fruits of the researches of the late Prebendary Wilkinson has recently appeared in *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 9. This portion relates entirely to the connections of Wiclif with the Oxford Colleges, and his able criticism is chiefly directed against Professor Shirley's views on the same subject. He agrees with Dr. Lechler in maintaining the identity of the Reformer not only with John Wiclif, Warden of Canterbury Hall, but also with John Wiclif, Fellow or Postmaster of Merton. In his investigation of the latter point none of the facts brought together above (Additional Note I.) appear to have fallen under his notice. He is much more successful in his argumentation on the question of the Reformer's Wardenship of Canterbury Hall, and he claims, upon good grounds, "to have established that Dean Hook was premature in regarding the question as conclusively settled in the negative by Professor Shirley's arguments."

CHAPTER IV.

WICLIF'S FIRST PUBLIC APPEARANCE IN THE ECCLESIASTICO-POLITICAL AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND.

SECTION I.—*Wiclif as a Patriot.*

AFTER having followed with attention the course of Wiclif's purely academic career up to the present point, we can only be astonished to behold him all at once appearing upon the stage of public life. Hitherto we have known him only as a man of science—as a quiet scholar. From his youth up to the most vigorous years of manhood, he had only seldom left, so far as we can see, the precincts of the university-city of Oxford. He seems even to have visited but rarely his parish of Fillingham, to which he had been presented in 1361, and on each occasion only for a short time. We know in fact that he obtained a dispensation from his bishop to enable him to remain at the University, and devote himself without interruption to science.

It is true that as Fellow and Seneschal of Merton College, as Master of Balliol, and as Warden of Canterbury Hall, he had had practical problems of many kinds to solve, and been occupied much with business of an economic, legal, and administrative description. The judgment of his patron in high place, Archbishop Islip, when he entrusted him with the government of Canterbury Hall, is assurance to us that Wiclif had already, both in Merton and Balliol, proved himself to be a man of practical talent, and upright, circumspect, and energetic in matters of business. Still, all this activity had been put forth within a narrow circle, and one which was more or less closely connected with properly scientific life. But now we see the scholar step out from the quiet spaces of the University to take part in public affairs. For it was not merely that Wiclif began to manifest his interest in the affairs of the kingdom in a Christian and literary way, which he might possibly have done without leaving his own chamber in the cloister-like buildings of his college; but he came personally forward to take an active part in the public business of Church and State. This change of position comes upon us with surprise; but yet

we are not to imagine that Wiclif has become an altered man; rather must we say to ourselves that we only now come in view of what has hitherto been an unobserved side of his nature. For Wiclif was a many-sided mind; a man of high mark, who not only felt powerfully all that moved, on many different sides, his own people and times, but who, in some things, was far in advance of his age—a prophet and type of what was still in the future. And it is only when we bring into view, without abridgement, all that he united in himself, when we sharply distinguish the manifold sides of his nature, and again take them together in their innermost unity, that we shall be able to draw a true and faithful picture of his powerful personality.

At this moment it is Wiclif the patriot whom we have to place before the eye. He represents in his own person that intensification of English national feeling which was so conspicuous in the fourteenth century, when, as we have seen above, Crown and people, Norman population and Saxon, formed a compact unity, and energetically defended the autonomy, the rights and the interests of the kingdom in its external relations, and especially in opposition to the Court of Rome. This spirit lives in Wiclif with extraordinary force. His great works, still unprinted, *e.g.*, the three books *De Civili Dominio*, his work *De Ecclesia*, and others, leave upon the reader the strongest impression of a warm patriotism—of a heart glowing with zeal for the dignity of the Crown, for the honour and weal of his native land, for the rights and the constitutional liberty of the people. How often in reading his works do we come upon passages in which he recalls the memories of English history! The different invasions of the country by "Britons, Saxons, and Normans," all stand before his mind's eye; (the Danes alone seem to be already forgotten). St. Augustine, the "Apostle of the English," as he calls him in one place, he mentions repeatedly, as well in learned writings as in sermons; he frequently touches upon the later Archbishops of Canterbury, especially Thomas à Becket; of kings too, as Edward the Confessor and John, he speaks ever and anon; he refers to *Magna Charta* with distinguished consideration as the fundamental law of the kingdom, binding equally king and nobles. That Wiclif had made the law of England the subject of special study, in addition to canon and Roman law, has been known since the days of Lewis, and we have come upon several confirmations of this fact. In the same context where *Magna Charta* is held up to view, Wiclif brings forward *Statutes of*

Westminster and *Statutes of Gloucester*; at another time he contrasts, in connection with a particular question, the Roman law (*lex Quirina*), and the English law (*lex Anglicana*), and he gives his preference to the latter.³ But so far from taking merely a learned interest in these subjects, and showing only a historical knowledge of them, he manifests the most immediate concern in the present condition of the nation, and a primary care for its welfare, its liberties, and its honour. It is not meant that, on this account, he limited his intellectual horizon to the national interests of his own island people. On the contrary, he has all Christendom, and indeed the whole human race, in his eye; but his cosmopolitanism has a solid and ripe patriotism for its sound and vigorous kernel.

It is not wonderful that such a man—a Churchman and highly regarded scholar on the one hand, and a thorough patriot on the other—rich in knowledge, full of insight, and inspired with zeal for the public good—should have been drawn into the career of the statesman and the diplomatist. Yet he never lost himself in purely political affairs; it was only on questions and on measures of a mixed ecclesiastical and political kind that he gave his co-operation; and in the end his whole undivided strength was concentrated upon the ecclesiastical domain.

But before we follow him into public life, it is necessary to set aside an impression which has hitherto almost universally prevailed. As early as the sixteenth century the literary historians, John Leland and John Bale, put forward the view—which, in the eighteenth, Lewis fully developed in his *History*, and which is still, in substance, maintained by Vaughan himself—that Wiclif commenced his exertions for a reform of the Church with attacks upon the monastic system, especially upon the Mendicant Orders.

The view which is commonly taken is the following:—As early as the year 1360, immediately after the death of the celebrated Archbishop of Armagh, Richard Fitzralph, Wiclif opened an attack in Oxford upon the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, the Augustinians and the Carmelites, on the ground of their fundamental principle of living upon the free-will alms of the people. Indeed, it has even been thought that when Richard of Armagh died, his mantle descended upon Wiclif, by whom his work was immediately taken up and carried farther. Critical investigation, however, is unable to find any confirmation of this common opinion.

Vaughan, in 1831, had followed Anthony Wood in the

confident statement that Wiclif publicly censured the errors and failings of the Mendicant Orders as early as 1360, and became the object of their hostility in consequence.³ But in his later work, as the fruit of more careful investigation of the subject, he is no longer able to arrive at the same confident result upon the point. He remarks, with truth, that there is no direct evidence to show that Wiclif began that controversy at the precise date which he had previously assigned. But he continued to the last, notwithstanding, to be of opinion that Wiclif began his work as a Reformer with attacks upon the Monastic, and especially upon the Mendicant Orders; he believed, besides, that while the exact date at which Wiclif began the controversy could not be ascertained, it must yet be fixed at a period not much later than 1360.⁴ But on this subject we are unable to agree with him, not only because we are not aware, like himself, of any direct and decisive proof that Wiclif began his attacks upon the monks even in the years next following 1360, but because, on the contrary, we have in our hands direct proofs that Wiclif continued to speak of the begging Orders with all respectful recognition during the twenty years which elapsed between 1360 and 1380. We content ourselves in this place with stating, in anticipation, so much as this, that the reading of the unpublished writings of Wiclif, among others, yields the most weighty confirmation to the statement of his opponent, Woodford, that it was in connection with the controversy opened by Wiclif on the subject of Transubstantiation, and therefore after 1381 at the earliest, that he began to oppose himself, on principle, to the Mendicants, who had come forward as his antagonists on that fundamental question.⁵ But to this point we shall return in the sequel, and we leave it in the meanwhile, to fix our attention upon the part which Wiclif took in the public affairs of England in Church and State.*

SECTION II.—*Wiclif's concern in the Rejection of the Papal Claim to Feudatory Tribute.*

IN the year 1365, Pope Urban V. had renewed his claim upon Edward III. for the annual payment of one thousand marks, in name of *Feudatory Tribute*; he had even demanded the payment of arrears extending over a period of no less

* See Additional Note at the end of the Chapter.

than thirty-three years. For so long a time had the payment of the tribute been discontinued, without the Papal Court having ever till now made any remonstrance upon the subject. In case, however, the King should decline to comply with this demand, he was invited to present himself in person before the Pope as his feudal superior, to answer for his proceeding. The payment in question was imposed in 1213, as we before saw, by Innocent III. upon King John, for himself and his successors, but in point of fact it had been paid from the first with the greatest irregularity, and King Edward III., from the time of reaching his majority, had never allowed it, as a matter of principle, to be paid at all. When Urban reminded him of the payment, this prince acted with the greatest possible prudence; he laid the question before his Parliament. He had often enough been obliged, in order to meet the cost of wars, to ask Parliament to consent to increased burdens of taxation; and all the more acceptable to him was the opportunity of giving into the hands of the representatives of the country the repudiation of an impost which had been in abeyance for more than a generation. Should Parliament adopt this resolution, the Crown was covered by the country. But the burden of taxation was not the principal point of view from which the Parliament looked at the Papal demand; much more than that, the honour and independence of the kingdom was the determining consideration for its representatives; and this all the more, that, on the one hand, the war with France, and the victories obtained in it, had given a powerful stimulus to the national spirit, while, on the other hand, the political rights and liberties of the people had been heightened and secured in equal proportion to the sacrifices which they had been called to make of property and blood.

The Parliament assembled in May 1366, and the King immediately laid before it the Papal demand, for its opinion. As may well be conceived, the prelates were the party who were placed in the greatest difficulty by this question, and they begged therefore a day's time for consideration and counsel by themselves alone. But on the following day they had already agreed upon a conclusion, and they were of one mind with the rest of the estates. Thus the Lords spiritual and temporal, along with the Commons, arrived at an unanimous decision to the effect that King John had acted entirely beyond his right in subjecting his country and people to such a feudal superiority without their own consent, and besides that this whole com-

pact was a violation of his coronation oath. Further, the Lords and Commons declared that in case the Pope should carry out his threatened procedure against the King, they would place the whole powers and resources of the nation at the disposal of the King for the defence of his crown and dignity. This language was intelligible; Urban quickly gave in; and since that day in fact, not one word more has ever been said on the part of Rome of her feudal superiority over England, to say nothing of a payment of feudal tribute.

In this national affair of the highest importance Wiclif also bore a part. That this was the case has long been known, but in what form or way he took his share in it has been less clear down to the present time. Since Lewis wrote his "History" of the Reformer, it has been known that Wiclif published a polemical tract upon that question of political right, entirely in the sense of the Declaration of Parliament; and that he did so in consequence of a sort of challenge which had been addressed to him by name by an anonymous Doctor of Theology, belonging to the Monastic Orders.⁶ But how came it to pass that Wiclif and no other was the man to whom the gauntlet was thrown down? In his reply, Wiclif expresses his astonishment at the passionate heat with which the challenge to answer the arguments of his opponent had been directed in particular to his address. Nor is the explanation of the puzzle, which he mentions as having been suggested to himself by others, one which is at all satisfactory to ourselves. Three grounds, he says, had been named to him upon which the man had so acted—(1) in order that Wiclif's person might be compromised with the Court of Rome, and that he might be heavily censured and deprived of his church benefices; (2) that the opponent himself with his connections might conciliate for themselves the favour of the Papal Court; and (3) that, as the effect of a more unlimited dominion of the Pope over England, the abbacies might be able to grasp in greater numbers the secular lordships of the kingdom, and without being amenable any longer to brotherly hindrance and control. Leaving the two last points untouched, the first point is indeed of a personal character, but it is at the same time of such a nature that we must of necessity ask again, how are we to explain the hostile interest which opponents had in selecting precisely Wiclif's person on this occasion, for the purpose of blackening his character at the Court of Rome, and to bring upon him in particular

censures and material losses? The controversy alleged to have been commenced at an earlier date, between Wiclif and the Mendicant Orders, cannot be used for the explanation of this fact,⁷ because documentary history knows nothing of such a controversy carried on at that alleged date. Besides, Wiclif has here to do, beyond question, with a member of the *endowed* Orders, whose interests were by no means identical with those of the Mendicants, but often enough ran counter to them.⁸ And when it is urged that Wiclif must already before that time have made himself remarkable as an upholder of the independence and sovereignty of the State in relation to the Church, this, indeed, is extremely likely; but it is a mere conjecture, without any positive foundation, and is therefore of no real service to us as a solution of the difficulty.

Let us look more narrowly at the contents of the tract itself, and see whether it does not itself supply us with a solution of a more distinct and trustworthy kind. The anonymous doctor had taken his stand upon the absolutely indefeasible right of the hierarchy. He had maintained, as regards persons, that under no circumstances could the clergy be brought before a civil tribunal (exemption); and in regard to Church property, he had laid down the proposition that temporal lords must never, nor under any conditions, withdraw from Churchmen their possessions. And with respect to the immediately pending question, touching the relation of the English Crown to the Papal See, he had maintained that the Pope had given the King the fief of the government of England, under condition that England should pay the yearly tribute of 700 marks to the Papal Court; but now this condition had remained for a time unfulfilled, and therefore the King of England had forfeited his right of monarchy.

In now addressing himself to exhibit this latter assertion in its true light, Wiclif begins by assuring his readers that he, as a humble and obedient son of the Church of Rome, would put forward no assertion which could sound as an injustice against that Church, or which could give any reasonable offence to a pious ear. And then he points his opponent for a refutation of his views to the votes and declarations of opinion which had been given in the Council of temporal lords.¹⁰ The first lord, a valiant soldier, had expressed himself thus: The kingdom of England was of old conquered by the sword of its nobles, and with the same sword has it ever been defended against hostile attacks. And even so does the matter stand in regard to the Church of Rome.

Therefore my counsel is, let this demand of the Pope be absolutely refused, unless he is able to compel payment by force. Should he attempt that, it will be my business to withstand him in defence of our right.

The *second* lord had made use of the following argument:—A tax or a tribute may only be paid to a person authorised to receive it; now the Pope has no authority to be the receiver of this payment, and therefore any such claim coming from him must be repudiated. For it is the duty of the Pope to be a prominent follower of Christ; but Christ refused to be a possessor of worldly dominion. The Pope, therefore, is bound to make the same refusal. As, therefore, we should hold the Pope to the observance of his holy duty, it follows that it is incumbent upon us to withstand him in his present demand.

The *third* lord observed—It seems to me that the ground upon which this demand is rested admits of being turned against the Pope; for as the Pope is the servant of the servants of God, it follows that he should take no tribute from England except for services rendered. But now he builds up our land in no sense whatever, either spiritual or corporeal, but his whole aim is to turn its temporalities to his own personal use and that of his courtiers, while assisting the enemies of the country with gold and counsel. We must, therefore, as a matter of common prudence, refuse his demand. That Pope and Cardinals leave us without any help either in body or soul, is a fact which we know by experience well enough.

The *fourth* lord—My mind is, that it is a duty we owe to our country to resist the Pope in this matter. For, according to his principles, he is owner-in-chief of all the property which is gifted to the Church or alienated to her in mortmain. Now, as one-third of the kingdom at least is so held in mortmain, the Pope is head over the whole of that third; but in the domain of civil lordship, there cannot be two lords of equal right, but there must be one lord superior, and the other must be vassal; from which it follows that during the vacancy of a church either the Pope must be the vassal of the King of England, or *vice versa*. But to make our King the inferior of any other man in this respect, we have no mind, for every donor in mortmain reserves to the King the right of feudal superiority. During that interval, therefore, the Pope behoves to be the inferior or vassal of the King. But now the Pope has always neglected his duty as the King's vassal, and, therefore, by this neglect he has forfeited his right.

The *fifth* lord puts the question, "What then may have been originally the ground upon which that undertaking (of King John) was entered into? Was that annual payment the condition of the King's absolution and his reinstatement in the hereditary right to the crown? For a pure gift, and a mere beneficence for all coming times, it could not in any case have been. On the former supposition (*viz.*, that the payment was a condition of absolution), the agreement was invalid on account of the simony which was committed therein; for it is not allowable to bestow a spiritual benefit in consideration of the promise of temporal gains to be bestowed—"Freely ye have received, freely give" (Matt. x.). If the Pope imposed the tax upon the King as a penitential penalty, he ought not to have applied this alms-gift to his own uses, but should have given it to the Church of England which the King had wronged, as a compensation for the wrong.

But it is not in accordance with the spirit of religion to say—"I absolve thee under condition that thou payest me so much in all time coming." When a man in this way breaks faith with Christ, other men may also break faith with him, in the matter of an immoral treaty. In all reason a punishment should fall upon the guilty, not upon the innocent; but as such an annual payment falls not upon the guilty King, but upon the poor innocent people, it bears more the character of avarice than of a wholesome penalty. If, on the other hand, the second case be supposed, *viz.*, that the Pope, in virtue of his concordat with King John, became feudal superior of the Royal House, it would then logically follow that the Pope would have power at his will and pleasure to dethrone a King of England under pretext of having forfeited his throne rightly, and to appoint, at his discretion, a representative of his own person upon the throne. Is it not, then, our duty to resist principles like these?

The *sixth* lord—It appears to me that the act of the Pope admits of being turned against himself. For if the Pope made over England to our King as a feudal fief, and if, in so doing, he did not usurp a superiority which did not belong to him, then the Pope, at the time of that transaction with King John, was the lord of our country. But as it is not allowable to alienate Church property without a corresponding compensation, the Pope had no power to alienate a kingdom possessed of revenues so rich for an annual payment so trifling; yea, he might at his pleasure demand our country back again, under the pretence that the Church

had been defrauded of more than the fifth part of the value. It is necessary, therefore, to oppose the first beginnings of this mischief. Christ himself is the Lord-Paramount, and the Pope is a fallible man, who, in the event of his falling into mortal sin, loses his lordship in the judgment of theologians, and therefore cannot make good any right to the possession of England. It is enough, therefore, that we hold our kingdom as of old, immediately from Christ in fief, because *He* is the Lord-Paramount, who, alone and by Himself, authorises, in a way absolutely sufficient, every right of property allowed to created beings.

The *seventh* lord—I cannot but greatly wonder that you have not touched upon the over-hastiness of the King, and upon the rights of the kingdom. And yet it stands fast that a hasty, ill-considered treaty, brought on by the King's blame, without the country's consent, can never, with competency and right, be allowed to operate to its permanent mischief. According to the law of the land (*consuetudo regni*), it is necessary, before a tax of this kind is imposed, that every individual in the country, either directly or by his lord-superior, should give his consent. Although the King and some few misguided persons gave their consent to the treaty, they had no warrant to do so, in the absence of the authority of the kingdom, and of the full number of consenting votes.

To these utterances of several lords in Parliament, Wiclif, in the tract referred to, adds little more, so far as it is known from the copy furnished by Lewis. He points out, with reason, that the treaty in question was proved, by the arguments developed in these speeches, to be both immoral and without authority. The speeches unmisstakeably constitute the chief bulk of the tract, both in matter and space.

Before we proceed to a closer examination of the speeches which the tract communicates, let thus much be observed in a general way, that Wiclif in this piece, in opposition to the censures cast by the monks upon the recent legislative action of the kingdom, takes up the defence of that action with warmth and emphasis. The question was, whether the State, in certain cases, is entitled to call in Church property, or whether such an act would, in all circumstances, be a wrong. The latter view was maintained by his opponents, the former is the contention of Wiclif; and this view, we shall find below, he systematically developed and established at full length.

Returning to the above speeches, it immediately appears

upon an attentive examination, that the question of State-right, whether the payment demanded by the Pope as feudal superior of the kings of England ought to be made without delay, or ought to be decidedly repudiated, is elucidated in these speeches from the most manifold points of view. The first lord—a soldier—takes for his stand-point the right of the strongest,¹¹ trusts to his own good sword, and reckons with the amount of material force on both sides of the dispute. If this first speech is the outcome of a warrior-like realism, the second is inspired by a Christian idealism; for the speaker grounds his argument upon the ideal of a Pope as the follower of Christ *par excellence*, and would carry back the existing Pope to the condition of evangelical poverty. The third lord takes the stand-point of the country's interests, which it behoves the Pope, as "servant of the servants of God," to promote, in order to acquire a right to corresponding services; but this he does neither spiritually nor materially. The fourth lord applies to the question the standard of *positive* law, especially of the feudal law. The Pope, upon his own principles, is the owner of all church property in England. Now Lord-Paramount of all this he cannot be, for such alone is the King; he must therefore be a vassal, but he has always disregarded his feudal duty to the throne, and therefore has forfeited his right. The fifth speaker enters into an examination of the different motives which may have led to the concordat in question under King John, and proves the nullity of this concordat from the objectionable character of all the motives that can be thought of; for either there was an unchristian simony in the game, or else a usurpation which, for England, was insufferable. The sixth speaker, like the fourth, takes the feudal law for his starting point, but seeks to prove, that not the Pope, but Christ alone, is to be regarded as Lord-Paramount of the country. Last of all, the seventh lord applies to the question the standard of the constitution of the kingdom, and arrives at the conclusion that the concordat between King John and Innocent III. was invalid from the very first, by reason of its lacking the consent of the country in the persons of its representatives in Parliament.

If we compare, further, the ground ideas of these speeches with the decision of Parliament, of May 1366, of which, however, only the most general features have come down to us, it is immediately seen that the speeches and the decision in all essential respects agree. The vote of the seventh lord in Wiclif's tract is indeed entirely identical with the

first ground given by Parliament in its Act of Repudiation, and the declaration of the first lord with the Parliament's concluding declaration. The conjecture, indeed, has been made, that the whole of these speeches may very well have been merely free compositions of Wiclif himself, preferring to put the bold thoughts which he wished to express into the mouths of others, rather than to come forward with them directly in his own person; and in doing so he has kept to the Act of Parliament and to the views of its most distinguished members, but not in the sense of reporting speeches which were actually delivered in Parliament.¹⁸ But why it should not be believed that we have here a report of speeches actually delivered, we fail to perceive. But if the ancient accounts of the proceedings in Parliament, notwithstanding their extremely summary character, are nevertheless in remarkable agreement with some, at least, of Wiclif's somewhat fuller speeches, in respect to the whole grounds assigned for these proceedings, and in the whole tone of confident defiance with which they conclude, this fact is in itself a weighty reason for thinking that Wiclif here introduces actual Parliamentary addresses.

But independently of this argument, it deserves to be well weighed that the whole effect of this polemical piece of Wiclif (the main substance of which, so far as it has come down to us, lies precisely in these speeches), depended essentially upon the fact that these speeches had been actually delivered. It may be thought, indeed, that the earls and barons of the kingdom at that period could hardly be credited with the amount of insight, and even occasionally of learning, which is conspicuous in these addresses. But this view can be maintained with all the less force of reason that the Parliamentary life of England at that day had already held on its course for more than a century, and could not fail to bring with it an amount of practice in political business by no means to be under-estimated, as well as an equal development of interest in public affairs, arising from constant participation in their management. The only thing which can be alleged, with some appearance of force, against the view here taken, is the circumstance that some of the thoughts referred to are spoken, it may be alleged, from the soul of Wiclif himself, *e.g.*, what the second lord says of the Pope, that before all others it behoves him to be a follower of Christ in evangelical poverty, and the like. But at the present day men often fail to have any correct idea of the wide extent to which, since the thirteenth century, the idea of "Evangelical Poverty" had prevailed. And

it may well be conceived that ideas of Wiclif's own, too, may at length have penetrated into those circles of English society to which the language now in question was attributed. So much, indeed, as this must be conceded, that the speeches, as they lie before us, were grouped together by Wiclif, and in some particulars so moulded by him that they bear unmistakeably here and there the peculiar colouring of the reporter. But this concession need not hinder our belief, that the principal substance of the several speeches was, in fact, taken from the actual proceedings in Parliament.¹³

If this is so, we cannot avoid the question, From what source did Wiclif learn so accurately these Parliamentary proceedings? The answer would be very simple, if the opinion expressed by some were well grounded, that Wiclif was personally present at that session of the Legislature as a hearer.¹⁴ But it is in the highest degree doubtful whether the proceedings of Parliament in that day were open to the public. The Parliament of that period was rather regarded as an enlarged Privy Council of the King, and if we are not mistaken, all traces are lacking of any man being permitted to be present at its sittings, who was neither a member of Parliament nor a commissioner of the King. On the other hand, it has been thought that Wiclif had received accurate information from one or other of those lords who were personally acquainted with him, and with whom he was associated by similar patriotic sentiments, and that he reported the speeches published by him upon the good faith of his informant. This conjecture is worth listening to; but what if Wiclif was himself a member of that Parliament? If he was, it would then at once be plain how it came to pass that he and no other man was made the object of attack in reference to that Parliament.

At first sight, this idea may seem to be a conjecture more bold than probable. But however little known, it is a fact established by documentary evidence, that from the end of the thirteenth century, elected representatives of the inferior clergy were summoned to serve in Parliament.¹⁵ The fact, besides, is ascertained, that to the Parliament of 1366, besides bishops, abbots, and lords, six masters of arts were summoned by royal order.¹⁶ With these facts in view, it is quite conceivable that Wiclif might have had a seat and voice in that Parliament as an elected representative of the inferior clergy, or in virtue of a royal summons. The step, it is true, is still a long one, from abstract possibility to probability. But now I find, in the unprinted works of

Wiclif, one passage at least, from the wording of which it appears clearly enough that he must have been once in Parliament, although this was some years later. In his book, *De Ecclesia*, he has occasion to remark that the Bishop of Rochester (this, without doubt, was Thomas Trillek) had told him under great excitement, in open sitting of Parliament, that the propositions which he had set forth in controversy had been condemned by the Papal Court.¹⁷ It is true that in this passage we must understand the reference to be to a later Parliament than that of 1366. I conjecture that the incident took place in 1376 or 1377, namely, before the Papal censure of Gregory XI. upon several of Wiclif's theses was publicly known. But though no more than this is attested, that Wiclif was ten years later a member of Parliament, it becomes not only possible but probable that he may already have been in Parliament sometime before that date.

However, I find also in his own writings a hint that Wiclif belonged to the May Parliament of 1366. If otherwise, what could be the sense and bearing of his words, when in the same tract which contains his speeches of the Lords, he says in one place,¹⁸ "If such things had been asserted by me against my King, they would have been inquired into before now, in the Parliament of the English Lords." If Wiclif had only published the views of which he speaks, in lectures or writings, it would have been impossible to understand why these must needs have become the subject of inquiry in Parliament. At least he could not himself have entertained such a thought, to say nothing of giving it utterance, without betraying an amount of vanity and excessive self-esteem such as formed no part of his character as we know it. The case is very different when we draw from the above words the conclusion (which seems to be the presumption which they logically imply), that Wiclif was himself a member of that Parliament in which that highly important question was the order of the day, and that he had there fully and emphatically unfolded his views. For indeed, in that case, if the view he took had touched too nearly the honour and the rights of the crown, it would not have been allowed to pass without decided contradiction on the part of men so patriotic as those speakers were.

Last of all, I believe that there is still another utterance of Wiclif which should be applied to this incident, although hitherto, indeed, it has been otherwise understood. At the very beginning of the remarkable tract still before us, Wiclif declares his readiness, in consideration of his being *peculiaris*

regis clericus, i.e., in a peculiar sense a king's cleric, to take upon himself the office of replying to the opponent, who attacks the law of the land.¹⁹ Lewis and Vaughan, and all who follow the latter, have understood this allusion to mean that Edward III. had nominated Wiclif to the office of king's chaplain.²⁰ But we do not find elsewhere a single trace of evidence by which this conjecture is confirmed. For this reason, it has been thought necessary to give the words another meaning—this, namely, that Wiclif meant by that expression to distinguish himself as a cleric of the National Church, in opposition to a cleric of the Papal Church.²¹ But this explanation does not quite satisfy us, on account of the "*talis qualis*" of the passage. For this expression of modesty is only in place if the three preceding words denote a certain function or social position, but not so if they indicate only a certain tendency and mode of thought. But what sort of distinguished position are we to think of under the title of a king's cleric, *peculiaris regis clericus*? I hold it to be not only possible but probable also, that under that title the summoning of Wiclif to Parliament by the act of the King is meant to be indicated; that is to say, that Wiclif had been called to the Parliament in question as a clerical expert, or in modern phrase, as a Government commissioner. This sense would answer very well to the *peculiaris regis clericus*. At least this view may be worth examination as a suggestion, as the meaning of the title used by Wiclif is still so far from being settled.

But the result itself, that Wiclif had a seat and vote in the Parliament of 1366, I venture to put forward as one for which I have produced sufficient grounds. The only adverse consideration which might be alleged against it rests upon the way in which Wiclif introduces his account of the speeches of those Lords. For his words sound in such a way as to convey, at first, the impression that the author's knowledge of the matter is only by hearsay. To this circumstance, however, no decisive weight can be assigned, for this reason, that possibly Wiclif wished to avoid the appearance as if he was boastful of having been himself an ear-witness of the speeches, and that he preferred to make his appeal to matters which were well enough known and talked about (*fertur*). But if the real state of the case was that which we think we have made probable, we have then an easier explanation, not only of the detailed character of the report of several of the speeches, but also of two additional points,—first, of the agreement of several ideas in those addresses with certain favourite views of Wiclif, for if Wiclif was a

member of that Parliament he would be able to find all the easier access to men in high position, with the convictions which he cherished upon the great question of the day. And secondly, if Wiclif was then in Parliament, and had exercised some influence upon the decision arrived at, it will then be the more easy to understand why he in particular should have been singled out for challenge by the unnamed monk to whom the action of that Parliament was a thorn in the eyes. Under all circumstances, so much as this is clear, as the result of our investigation, that Wiclif took part, in a powerful and influential way, in the great Church and State questions of the day, and this in the direction of having much at heart the right and honour of the Crown, and the liberty and welfare of the kingdom.

If in this matter he was compelled to oppose himself to the claims of the Court of Rome, we are still without the slightest reason to regard as mere phraseology his solemn declaration that, as an obedient son of the Church, he had no wish to touch her honour too closely, or to injure the interests of piety. We are unable, however, to agree with the observation, that Wiclif's dauntless courage and disinterestedness come out all the more conspicuously from his conduct in this business, that the process touching the headship of Canterbury Hall was at that time in dependence before the Roman Court. For if it be true, as we take it to be, along with other scholars before us, that the controversial tract before us was drawn up after the May Parliament of 1366, *i.e.*, in the year 1366 itself, or at latest, in the first months of the following year, Wiclif was still at that date in undisturbed possession of that position. For though Islip had died on 26th April 1366, Simon Langham was not installed Archbishop of Canterbury till 25th March 1367, and it was on the 31st March that he transferred the Wardenship of that Hall to the Benedictine, John Redingate. It appears, therefore, more than doubtful whether Wiclif was, at the date of the composition of this tract, already deposed from his dignity in the Hall; on the contrary, precisely this dignity may have been included among the "Church benefices," of which he was to be deprived, if things went agreeably to the wishes of his adversaries.

SECTION III.—*Events after 1366.*

WICLIF manifested the same spirit on another occasion, some years later. Unfortunately the sources of history do not flow here so richly as to enable us steadily to follow the course of his inner development and his external action. We are obliged, therefore, at this point to pass over an interval of six or seven years—the years next following which were sufficiently ill-fated for England in her foreign relations.

In May 1360, after the war with France had lasted for twenty-one years, the peace of Brétigny had been concluded. In this treaty the whole south-west of France, along with several cities on the north coast, was surrendered to the English Crown, without any reservation in favour of France of the feudal superiority of these possessions, but including full rights of sovereignty. On the other hand, England expressly renounced all claims to the French Crown, and to any further acquisitions of French territory. What was ceded to her, however, was a magnificent acquisition as it stood. But the peace of Brétigny became only a new apple of discord. Soon enough there sprang from it first a tension of feeling between the two nations, then a misunderstanding, and at last an open breach. The brilliant, but in the end barren, expedition of Edward the Black Prince to Spain in 1367, with the view of restoring Pedro the Cruel to the throne of Castile, led to a renewed outbreak of hostility with France, which had given its support to the usurper of the Castilian Crown, the Bastard Henry of Trastámara. This expedition brought upon the heir-apparent of the English throne an attack of gout, as the effect of the Spanish climate, under which he continued to suffer till, in 1376, he died. And when the war with France broke out again in 1369, it was an irreparable misfortune for England that the great general (who had developed, indeed, more military than administrative talent in the government of his principalities of Aquitaine and Gascony) was incapacitated by bodily disease to resume the post of command. Insurrection burst forth into flames in the ceded provinces of France, and could never again be subdued. One place of strength after another fell into the hands of the enemy. In August 1372 the city of Rochelle was again French. The English rule over a good part of France was broken into fragments. But this was not all. The English fleet, too, could no longer, as hitherto, maintain its superiority; on the contrary, the coasts of England were left a defence-

less prey to every landing of the enemy's ships. Public opinion in England, as may readily be supposed, was much disconcerted and disturbed. So long as successes and martial glory had been the harvests of war, the nation had willingly borne the great sacrifices which had to be made in money and blood. But when the successes thus obtained vanished away like shadows, when disaster was heaped upon disaster, and when the country itself was menaced by the enemy, complaints became louder and louder, and grievances more and more bitter, till it was at last resolved to take action against the Government itself.

A Parliament met during Lent of 1371, and when Edward III. laid before it a demand for a subsidy in aid of the war of 50,000 silver marks, this proposal led, as it would appear, to very animated debates. On the one side a motion was made, and was also eventually carried, that the richly-endowed Church should be included, to a substantial amount, in the incidence of the new tax; and on the other, the representatives of the Church, as was to be expected, did not fail to offer opposition to such a proposal. They used every effort to accomplish the exemption of the clergy, the rich monasteries, foundations, etc., from the new burden of taxation. It was very probably in that Parliament that one of the lords replied to the representations of some members of the endowed Orders in the form which Wiclif has preserved in one of his unpublished works." The far-seeing peer, in the course of the discussion, told the following fable:—"Once upon a time there was a meeting of many birds; among them was an owl, but the owl had lost her feathers, and made as though she suffered much from the frost. She begged the other birds, with a trembling voice, to give her some of their feathers. They sympathised with her, and every bird gave the owl a feather, till she was overladen with strange feathers in no very lovely fashion. Scarcely was this done when a hawk came in sight in quest of prey; then the birds, to escape from the attacks of the hawk by self-defence or by flight, demanded their feathers back again from the owl; and on her refusal each of them took back his own feather by force, and so escaped the danger, while the owl remained more miserably unfledged than before."

"Even so," said the peer, "when war breaks out we must take from the endowed clergy a portion of their temporal possessions, as property which belongs to us and the kingdom in common, and we must wisely defend the country with property which is our own, and exists among us

in superfluity." The hint was plain enough whence all church-property originally comes, as well as the menace—

"And art thou not willing,
Then use I main force."

The result was that the clergy had the worst of it. Taxes of unexampled weight were imposed upon them for all lands which had come into their hands by mortmain for the last 100 years, and even the smallest benefices which had never been taxed before, were subjected to the new war impost.

It cannot be doubted that there was an intimate connection between this financial measure and a new proposition which the same Parliament submitted to the Crown. The Lords and Commons proposed to the King to remove all prelates from the highest offices of State, and to appoint laymen in their places, who could at all times be brought to answer for their proceedings before the temporal courts. This proposal of Parliament was in fact accepted by Edward III. The Bishop of Winchester, William of Wykeham, filled at that time the highest office in the State, as Lord Chancellor of England. The Bishop of Exeter was Treasurer, and the Lord Privy Seal was also a prelate. It does not appear, indeed, that Parliament had any personal objections against Wykeham and his colleagues—the proposal was made upon its own merits, and was chiefly designed to secure ministerial responsibility. But as early as the 14th of March, the Bishop of Winchester laid down the dignity of Chancellor, and was succeeded by Robert Thorp; and at the same date the offices of Treasurer and Keeper of the Seal were bestowed upon laymen. In February 1372, we find the whole Privy Council filled with laymen.²³ This change of ministers had its chief importance from its openly declared anti-clerical character. Apart from its bearing upon questions of home administration, especially financial ones, the aim of the measure was also to put the Government in an attitude of emphatic opposition to the encroachments of the Papal Court.

Under such circumstances, it is no wonder if the demands of the Papacy excited decided resistance on the part of a country exhausted by an unfortunate turn of the war, and even gave occasion to measures of precaution on the part of the Government. No doubt it was felt by very many to be an expression of what lay deep in their own hearts, when Wiclif stood forward against one of the Papal agents who were traversing the land to collect dues for the Curia, and in the form of a commentary on the obligations which these

men took upon themselves by oath, opened an attack upon the doings and traffickings of the Pope's nuncio as dangerous to the kingdom.

The occasion was this. In February 1372 appeared in England an agent of the Papal See, Arnold Garnier by name (Garnerius, Granarius), Canon of Chalons in Champagne, and licentiate of laws. He bore written credentials from Gregory XI., who had ascended the Papal Chair in 1370, as Papal nuncio and receiver of dues for the apostolic chamber. The man travelled with a train of servants and half-a-dozen horses. He remained for two years and a half in the country without a break, and may probably have collected no inconsiderable sums. In July 1374 he made a journey to Rome with the reserved intention of returning to England, for which purpose he was furnished with a royal passport, dated 25th July. which was of force till Easter 1375; and from a letter of Gregory XI. to Bishop Wykeham of Winchester, it appears that Garnier returned to England in due time, to carry forward his work as Nuncio and Receiver.²⁴ When this agent of the Roman Court arrived, in the first instance, he had obtained the consent of the Government to his collectorship, only under condition of swearing solemnly beforehand to a form of obligation in which the rights and interests of the Crown and kingdom were guarded on all sides. The Frenchman acceded to this condition without the slightest scruple, and on the 13th February 1372, in the royal palace of Westminster, in presence of all the councillors and great officers of the Crown, he formally and solemnly took the oath.²⁵

But with this formality all the misgivings of patriotic men had by no means been put to rest. Wiclif was one of these patriots, and by and bye he wrote a paper on the sworn obligations of the Papal Receiver, the drift of which was to inquire whether Garnier was not guilty of perjury, in so far as he had taken an oath never to violate the rights and interests of the country, while yet such a violation was entirely unavoidable, when, according to his commission, he collected in England a large amount of gold and carried it out of the kingdom.²⁶ The proper aim of the inquiry appears to have been to show that there was an irreconcilable contradiction between the permission given by the State to collect monies for the Court of Rome on the one hand, and the intention to guard the country against all wrong to its interests on the other.

This short paper, it is true, was not written in 1372 or in one of the years next succeeding, but not till 1377, but

Garnier was still in England at this later date, and was still plying his business as a Papal collector.²⁷ Its title, indeed, is not to be found in the catalogues of Wiclif's writings given by Bishop Bale and other literary historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it stands in a pretty full list of the works and tracts of Wiclif, which is found at the end of a Vienna manuscript (Cod. 3933, fol. 195). There is also an additional circumstance forming an external testimony to its Wiclif authorship not to be undervalued, that the paper forms part of another Vienna MS. (Cod. 1377) which contains in all no fewer than fifty pieces, most of them short ones, which are all the productions of Wiclif. This little tract, besides, in its thoughts and style of speaking, bears unmistakeable features of Wiclif's characteristic manner. In particular, we observe a remarkable agreement between this tract and the piece last examined, dating several years earlier, in the peculiar stand-point assumed by the writer, and the sentiment which lies at the basis of both. In both tracts, which in modern phrase we might call "publicistic articles," Wiclif stands before us chiefly in the light of a patriot, who has the honour and the best interests of the country very deeply at heart. In both also, especially in the latter, we learn to recognise him as a Christian patriot; we see in the patriotic defender of his country's interests, the ecclesiastical Reformer already beginning to be moulded into shape; and we discern in him the vigorous germs of a coming development. The difference between the two tracts is partly in form and partly in matter. In form the earlier is defensive, the later aggressive. In substance the later piece goes deeper into Church questions than its predecessor, owing to the difference of the two occasions which called them forth.

To elucidate more exactly the peculiar character of the tract at present before us, we bring into view, before everything else, this feature of it—that it recognises the domestic prosperity of the country, and the wealth of the public purse, and the military strength of England in relation to foreign enemies, as valuable blessings which must not be allowed to suffer damage. And from this mention of the enemies of the kingdom, it appears clearly enough how much at that time the actual and possible incidents of the French war were occupying all minds, and filling them with earnest anxiety.

A second characteristic feature which strikes the eye in the reading of these pages is the decidedly *constitutional* spirit which is conspicuous in them. The Parliament

occupies in them an important position as the representative of the nation, having authority to sit in judgment upon the question of what is injurious to the national interests. And it is to be referred to the same point of view when the author desires to see the State take under its protection the long-descended civil rights of the priests and clerics of the National Church, in opposition to the encroachments of the Papal Receiver.

Further, it is not to be overlooked that Wiclif is conscious of giving expression in the main only to what is felt and thought by no small portion, yea, by the majority of the population. He knows that he is uttering what is in the minds of great numbers.²⁸ But equally strong, and still more important than the national and patriotic spirit of the author, is the religious and moral, and even the evangelical spirit which he manifests in the way in which he handles the matter with which he is occupied. When Wiclif puts forward the principle that the assistance of God is greatly more valuable than the help of man, and that remissness in the defence of Divine right is a more serious sin than negligence in the duty of defending a human right, he makes his reader feel that he is not in this only formally repeating, perhaps, a traditional maxim, but giving utterance to a weighty truth out of the deepest conviction, and with the innermost sympathy, of his heart and conscience. And it is only an application of this general principle when, as if to complete and give the right interpretation of what he has said on the subject of the national welfare, Wiclif makes the remark that the well-doing of the kingdom rests upon the religious beneficence of its people, particularly on pious foundations in behalf of the Church and the poor. We also feel the moral earnestness of his tone, and especially the conscientiousness with which he pressed the duty of truthfulness when, in allusion to the sophistical speeches and excuses made use of either by the Papal agents themselves, or by their friends and defenders, he pronounces with great emphasis against a species of craft and guile, which, by means of mental reservations, would bring things to such a pass that even the oath would no longer be "an end of all strife" (Heb. vi. 16). Again, it is a principle of morals and religion which we find expressed by Wiclif in this piece, as so often elsewhere, with peculiar emphasis, that a common participation in sin and guilt is incurred when one knows of the evil-doings of a second party, and might put a stop to them if he would, but neglects to do it. And it is

only the positive side of this thought when it is asserted that the command to inflict brotherly punishment (Matt. xviii. 15), makes it a duty to offer resistance to a transgressor whose evil doing might be expected to spread by contagion to others.³⁰

But more characteristic than all else is what Wiclif gave expression to in this tract respecting the Pope and the pastoral office. That the Pope may commit sin was expressed before in one of the parliamentary speeches of the earlier piece; but in the present one that proposition is repeated more strongly still.³¹ In connection with this view, Wiclif also declares himself opposed to the theory which maintains that absolutely everything which the Pope thinks fit to do must be right, and have the force of law, simply because he does it. In other words, we find Wiclif already in opposition here to the absolutism of the Curia. He is far removed, however, from a merely negative opposition. On the contrary, he puts forward a positive idea of the Papacy, according to which the Pope is bound to be pre-eminently the follower of Christ in all moral virtues—especially in humility and patience and brotherly love. And next, the views which he expresses respecting the pastoral office are well worthy of observation. Whilst severely censuring the Papal collectors for compelling, by help of ecclesiastical censures, those priests who had to pay annates (*primi fructus*) to the Curia, to make their payments in coin instead of in kind (*in natura*), he brings into special prominence, as a crying abuse, the fact, that by this undue pressure put upon them, the priests find themselves under the necessity (as they must have the means of living) of holding themselves harmless at the expense of their poor parishioners, and, on the other hand, neglecting the services of public worship, which they are bound to celebrate. From this allusion thrown out only in passing, we perceive what a watchful eye he must have kept upon the pastoral office and upon its conscientious execution—a subject to which, at a later period, he gave all the fullness and energy of his love. Last of all, we will only call attention to this further point, that already, in this small and essentially "publicistic paper," the principle makes its appearance which Wiclif afterwards asserted in a manner which introduced a new epoch, viz., that Holy Scripture is for Christians the rule and standard of truth. There is a hint, at least, of this principle when Wiclif says of the payments in question to the Court of Rome that they are obtained by begging in a manner contrary to the gospel (*elemosina præter evangelium mendicata*).

From all this, this small piece, which has remained unknown till the present time, appears to us to be not without value, in as much as, on the one hand, it shows us the manner of Wiclif's intervention in an affair of weighty public importance, and lets us clearly see, on the other, in the patriot inspired with undaunted zeal for his country's good, the earliest germs of his later strivings for the Reformation of the Church.

SECTION IV.—*Wiclif as a Royal Commissary in Bruges, 1374, and his Influence in the "Good Parliament" of 1376.*

IN the year 1373 the Parliament had raised again, once more, loud complaints that the rights of patrons were ever more and more infringed and made illusory by Papal provisions. To a petition of the Parliament drawn up in this sense, the King gave answer, that he had already sent commands to his commissioners, who were at that very time engaged in peace negotiations with France, to negotiate also upon this business with the Roman Court. He had in this behalf given a commission to John Gilbert, Bishop of Bangor, with one monk and two laymen. These commissioners proceeded to Avignon, and treated with the commissaries of Gregory XI. for the removal of various causes of complaint on the part of the kingdom, especially of the Papal reservations in the filling of English church offices, encroachments upon the electoral rights of cathedral chapters, and the like. The commissioners received conciliatory promises, but no distinct and definite answer. The Pope reserved himself for further consultation with the King of England, and for a decision at a subsequent date.³¹

The further negotiations thus held out in prospect were opened in 1374, in connection with the conferences for the peace, which were still going on in Bruges between England and France. At the head of the peace embassy stood a Prince of the Blood, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, third son of Edward III., with the Bishop of London, Simon Sudbury. For treating with the commissaries of the Pope on the pending ecclesiastical questions, were commissioned by the King the before-named John Gilbert, Bishop of Bangor, and in addition, John Wiclif, Doctor of Theology, Magister John Guter, Dean of Segovia,³² Doctor of Laws, Simon of Multon, William of Burton, Knight, Robert of Belknap,³⁴ and John of

Kenyngton. The commission, dated 26th July 1374, conveyed to the King's commissaries plenary powers to conclude such a treaty with the Papal nuncios on the pending points, as should at once secure the honour of the Church, and uphold the rights of the English Crown and realm.³⁵ It is, on the one hand, characteristic of the views by which the Government of England at that time was guided, that a man like Wiclif should have been made a royal commissioner for these diplomatic transactions with the Roman Court. On the other hand, it was a high honour for Wiclif that he, and that, too, as first in order of the commissaries after the Bishop of Bangor, was selected along with others to represent the rights of the Crown and the interests of the kingdom in a treaty with the plenipotentiaries of the Pope. We see in this fact what confidence was felt in his spirit and insight, in his courage and power of action, on the part both of the Government and the country.

On the very next day after the commission had been issued, namely 27th July 1374, Wiclif embarked in London for Flanders.³⁶ It was the first time in his life that he had been abroad. Bruges was at that time a great city of 200,000 inhabitants, which, from its important industries, its widely extended trade, the wealth of its burghers, its municipal freedom, and its political power, had a large number of instructive objects of attention to show to the stranger; especially at a time when an important congress was assembled within its walls. On the side of France two royal princes, the Dukes of Anjou and Burgundy, brothers of the reigning King, Charles V., were present, in addition to many bishops and notables of the kingdom. As English plenipotentiaries appeared, in addition to the Duke of Lancaster, the Earl of Salisbury, and Simon Sudbury, Bishop of London. The Pope sent in behoof of the treaty between France and England the Archbishop of Ravenna and the Bishop of Carpentras; and commissioned several other prelates, with full powers to negotiate with England on the questions of ecclesiastical right still in dependence. These nuncios were Bernard, Bishop of Pampelona, Ralph, Bishop of Sinigaglia, and Egidius Sancho, Provost of the archi-episcopal chapter of Valencia.³⁷ There was no lack, therefore, in Bruges of men in high place and of great political or ecclesiastical importance, with whom Wiclif, as a prominent man among the English envoys, must have come more or less into contact in the transaction of public business, and no doubt also in social intercourse.

It was, we may be sure, of lasting value for him, that he should have had on this occasion the opportunity of transacting business and cultivating intercourse with Italian, Spanish, and French dignitaries of the Church—all of them men who enjoyed the confidence of the Pope and the cardinals. Here he had it in his power to take many observations in a field of view which could not easily be laid open to his eye among his own countrymen, even among those of them who were most conspicuous for their devotion to the Roman Court. For "The Anglican Church" (this name is no anachronism) had within a century attained to a certain degree of independence in regard to principles and views of ecclesiastical law, to which the life and spirit of the Italian and Spanish Church of that period formed a sensible contrast. Upon a personality like Wiclif, of so much independence of mind, and already inspired with so much zeal for the autonomy of his native church, this residence in Bruges, and its negotiations of several weeks duration with the plenipotentiaries of the Curia, must have made impressions similar to those which Dr. Martin Luther received from his sojourn in Rome in 1510.

But even apart from his relations to foreign notabilities, Wiclif's sojourn in Bruges had important consequences for him, by the nearer relations into which it brought him with the Duke of Lancaster. This Prince at that time already possessed great and decisive influence upon the Government. He was usually called "John of Gaunt," for he was born in Ghent, when Edward III., at the beginning of the French war, was in alliance with the rich cities of Flanders, and, with his Queen Philippa, was keeping his court in that city in 1340. The Prince's first title was Earl of Richmond, but after his marriage with Blanche, a daughter of the Duke of Lancaster, he became, on the death of the latter, the heir of his title and possessions. After the death of his first wife, in 1369, he entered into a second marriage in 1372, as before stated, with Constance, the daughter of Peter the Cruel, of Castile and Leon, and now took the style by hereditary right of "King of Castile." But this was never more than a title. He never himself wore a crown; but in the following century three of his descendants ascended the English throne, viz., his son, his grandson, and his great-grandson—Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI.—the House of Lancaster and the Red Rose, from 1399-1472.

Already, however, the father of this dynasty manifested ambition enough to awaken the suspicion that he was aiming at the English crown for his own person. In military

talent he stood far behind his eldest brother; the Black Prince was an eminent military genius. John of Gaunt was a brave swordsman and nothing more. But in political and administrative capacity he was indisputably superior to the Prince of Wales. When the latter found himself obliged to return to England at the beginning of 1371, on account of the obstinate disease which he had contracted in the Spanish campaign, instead of recovering his vigour on his native soil, he had fallen into a chronic condition of broken health and low spirits, which unfitted him for taking any active part in the business of government; whilst his father, too, Edward III., was now become old and frail. Lancaster had known how to make use of all these circumstances for the ends of his own ambition, and had acquired ever since his return in the summer of 1374 from the south of France the most decided influence over the King, and the conduct of public affairs. The second prince of the blood, Lionel, Duke of Clarence, was already dead in 1368. For the present, indeed, Lancaster undertook only the lead of the peace negotiations in Bruges; but it almost appears as if even from Flanders he had governed both the King and the kingdom.

That it was first in Bruges that the Duke became acquainted with Wiclif, or entered into closer relations with him, is by no means probable. It was he, no doubt, who was the cause of Wiclif's being appointed to take part in these ecclesiastical negotiations. In regard, at least, to John Guter, the Dean of Segovia, who had perhaps accompanied the Duke to the Spanish campaign in the capacity of Field-Chaplain, it can hardly admit of a doubt that it was to the Duke he was indebted for his nomination upon the commission, as well as for his Spanish prebend; and it would have been truly surprising if a statesman like the Prince—a zealous promoter of lay government, a persistent opponent of the influence of the English hierarchy upon the administration—had not already for years had his attention and his favour directed to Wiclif, as a man of whose gifts and bold spirit he might hope to be able to make use for his own political objects. I quite concur, therefore, in Pauli's conjecture³⁸ that it was probably Lancaster himself who had brought about the employment of Wiclif upon a mission of so great importance. But be this as it may, these two men could not fail to be much in contact, and to have much exchange of ideas with each other, both in matters of business and in social intercourse, during all the time that they were occupied with that congress in Flanders. The

Duke, indeed, in the first instance, had to transact only with France, and his business with the Papal Plenipotentiaries was limited to giving his consent to the conclusions arrived at. But still he stood at the head of the whole English legation, and on this account alone, as well as by reason of his personal tendencies and way of thinking, he could not fail to take the liveliest interest in the course of those negotiations which bore upon the ecclesiastical *gravamina* of the country; and among the members of this ecclesiastical commission Wiclif was at least one of the most free from prejudice, and of the deepest insight.

A few years later, we see the Duke of Lancaster step forward publicly as Wiclif's patron and protector. This favour, grounded upon esteem and personal knowledge of Wiclif, no doubt increased during the conference of Bruges, though it could scarcely have commenced there.

Wiclif returned to England, after the close of the congress, before the middle of September. Neither official documents nor any accounts of contemporary or later chronicles, have come down to us respecting the proceedings of the congress in the matter of the Church-grievances of England, although, no doubt, some original papers belonging to the subject lie concealed in the archives of Rome.

We can only draw some inferences from the final result arrived at, as to what was the course of the transactions. In this respect, indeed, it would seem that the negotiations between the Papal Court and England had come to a similar issue as those between France and England. The Chronicler of St. Alban's, Walsingham, has no good to say of the behaviour of France in the peace congress. The thoughts of the French, he says, during all that time were craftily running not on peace, but on war; they were preparing again their old weapons and forging new ones in order to have all the requirements of war in readiness; while the Englishmen had no thoughts of this kind, accustomed as they are not to be led by prudence and foresight, but only to be driven like unreasoning brutes by the goad. But no doubt they trusted everything to the wisdom of the Duke, and thinking that his eloquence would suffice to obtain for them the blessings of peace, they gave themselves up to carousals and all manner of amusements. Thus it came to pass that the Englishmen unawares came to grief, for the congress was broken off without "the conclusion of peace."³⁹ And the congress between England and the Curia came to a like fruitless conclusion. The representatives of the Roman See, like the plenipotentiaries of France, appear to

have busied themselves with the refurbishing of their old weapons, while they were, at the same time, preparing new ones. The Convention in which the congress issued was not of a kind to secure for the future a redress of the Church-grievances of which the country complained. England undoubtedly fared the worst in the arrangements arrived at, although the Pope made some concessions upon single points; for these concessions were more apparent than real, and consisted more in matters of detail than in general principles.

On the 1st September 1375, Gregory XI. directed to the King of England six bulls relating to this business,⁴⁰ which amounted in effect briefly to this—to recognise accomplished facts, and to leave the *status quo* untouched. Whosoever was in actual possession of a church living in England should no longer have his right of incumbency challenged on the side of the Curia; whosoever had had his right to a church office disputed by Urban V., should no longer have his confirmation in the office *reserved*; benefices which the same Pope had already reserved, in the event of a vacancy, should, in so far as they had not already become vacant, be filled up by the patrons themselves; and all annates or first fruits not yet paid should be remitted. In addition, it was conceded that the Church revenues of several cardinals who held prebends in England should be subject to impost, to cover the costs of the restoration of churches and other church edifices belonging thereto, which the holders had allowed to fall into ruin.

At first sight these appeared to be numerous and important concessions, but when carefully examined they were of small consideration, for they all related to matters which belonged to the past. For the future the Pope remitted nothing of his claims, not even in the smallest trifle. Besides, these concessions referred merely to single cases—they regulated only matters of detail, and left the principle entirely untouched. The bulls, it is true, contained also matters of greater importance; the Pope abandoned for the future his claim to the reservation of English Church livings; but the King was also bound, on his side, to abstain in future from conferring Church dignities in the way of simple royal command. But first of all, the Pope herein conceded a surrender of right on his side, only in consideration of a corresponding concession on the side of the Crown; and in the second place, the concession contained no security, even the least, that the electoral rights of the cathedral chapters should remain thenceforward untampered with. And yet

this had been a capital point aimed at in the efforts of the country, and especially of Parliament, to obtain ecclesiastical reform. That this decisive point had not been made clear and plain by the treaty of 1374, is brought into view and censured even by Walsingham himself, with all his disposition to favour the Church.⁴¹

Whether the other members of the ecclesiastical commission had fulfilled their duty, may be fairly asked; but in regard to Bishop John Gilbert, who stood at the head of it, it is a highly significant fact that eleven days after the drawing up of the above bulls—12th September 1375—he was promoted by the Pope to a more important bishoprick. He had lost nothing of Gregory's favour by his conduct at Bruges. Hitherto he had been Bishop of Bangor; his diocese embraced the most distant northwest corner of the principality of Wales. But now, when the Bishop of London, Simon Sudbury, was made Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Hereford, William Courtenay, was promoted to London, Gilbert was nominated to the See of Hereford.

The "concordat" which had been concluded between England and the Pope had little enough of importance. It would have been incomparably better to have advanced on the same path which had been trodden in 1343 and 1350, and to have stemmed the evils of the Church by means of national legislation, than to make the attempt to find a remedy for them by diplomatic transactions with the Papal Court. In the very next spring it became manifest that the complaints of the country were by no means silenced by that convention. Louder and bolder than ever sounded forth the grievances of Parliament, when it assembled in the end of April 1376; and that the representatives of the country uttered, in point of fact, the true feeling of the people, is evident from the fact that this Parliament lived long afterwards in the grateful memory of the nation, by the name of the Good Parliament.⁴²

The Parliament represented to the King, in a lengthened memorial, how oppressively and perniciously the encroachments of the Roman See operated;⁴³ the aggressions of the Pope are to blame for the impoverishment of the kingdom,—for the sums which are paid to Him for the dignified offices of the Church amount to five times as much as the whole produce of the taxes which accrue to the King. There is no prince in Christendom so rich as to have in his treasury even the fourth part of the sum which iniquitously goes out the kingdom. Moreover, the Church Brokers in the dissolute city of Avignon, promoted for money many

wretched creatures, who were utterly destitute of learning and character, to livings of one thousand marks annual income; while a Doctor of Theology or the Canon Law must content himself with a salary of twenty marks; and hence the decay of learning in the country. And when foreigners, yea, enemies of the country, are the possessors of English Church livings, without ever having seen their parishioners, or giving themselves any trouble about them, the effect is to bring the service of God into contempt, and to do more injury to the Church than is done by Jews or Saracens. And yet the law of the Church prescribes that Church livings ought only to be conferred from pure love, without payment or solicitation; and reason and faith, as well as law, demand that Church endowments which have been founded from motives of devotion, should be bestowed for the glory of God and suitably to the founder's intention, and not upon foreigners living in the midst of our enemies. God has entrusted the care of the sheep to the Holy Father, the Pope, to feed them, not to fleece them. But if lay patrons witness the avarice and simony of the churchmen, they will learn from their example to sell the offices to which they have the right of collation, to men who will devour the people like beasts of prey—just as the Son of God was sold to the Jews, who thereupon put him to death.

A considerable portion of the complaint of Parliament is directed against the Papal Collector, a French subject who lives in the country along with other foreigners who are the king's enemies, and is ever on the look-out for English places and dignities, and seeking to spy out the secrets of the kingdom, to its great damage. This Receiver, who is at the same time the collector of Peter's Pence, has a great house in London, with clerks and officers, as if it were the custom-house of a Prince, and from thence he sends to the Pope about twenty thousand marks a year. This same man, in the present year, has, for the first time, put forward a claim to the first-fruits of all newly-conferred livings, a claim which has hitherto been limited to offices which have become vacant in the Papal Court. Even if the kingdom at this moment had as great a superfluity of gold as it ever possessed, the Pope's collectors and the agents of the Cardinals would soon enough carry off the whole of this income to foreign parts. As a remedy for this evil, let a law be laid down, that no Receiver or agent shall take up his residence in England, upon pain of life and limb; and that upon a like penalty, no Englishman shall become such a Receiver or agent in behalf of others who

reside in Rome. For the better investigation of the facts, in relation especially to the Papal Receiver, inasmuch as the whole clergy are dependent upon the favour or disfavour of the latter, and would not willingly run the risk of drawing upon themselves his displeasure, it would conduce to the end in view, if the Lords and Commons of the present Parliament would call before them the priest of St. Botolph's, John Strensale, who resides in Holborn. He could, if strictly required to do so, give them much information, as he has for more than five years done service as a clerk to the said Receiver.

It was further set forth, that Cardinals and other prelates, some of them, it is true, natives of England, but the most of them foreigners who reside in Rome, are occasionally possessed of the best prebends in England. One Cardinal is Dean of York, another of Salisbury, a third of Lincoln; another again is Archdeacon of Canterbury, one of Durham, one of Suffolk, and so on; and these Cardinals cause to be remitted to them in foreign parts a yearly revenue of twenty thousand marks. The Pope will in time hand over to enemies of the kingdom all the lands which belong to the prebends referred to, as he deals so arbitrarily from one day to another with the Kingdom and the Regalia. When a bishopric becomes vacant by death or otherwise, he translates from four to five other bishops in order to obtain from each of them the first year's fruits;⁴⁶ and the like takes place with other church dignities in the realm. As to the abbeys and convents, a loud complaint is made that all those of them which have hitherto possessed the right of free election of their own superiors, have been deprived of this right by the usurpation of the Pope, who claims the right for himself. Last of all, and to come back again to the point of finance, the petition of Parliament called attention to this fact, that the Pope is in the act of raising subsidies from the English clergy in order to buy off Frenchmen who were taken prisoners by the English, and to aid him in carrying on wars of his own in Lombardy. In addition to which, the English Clergy are required to bear the cost of every mission which the Pope sends to the country, and all this is done purely out of love to the kingdom and to English gold.

Such was the long array of grievances. The Parliament emphatically assured the King that they brought them forward solely from an honest zeal for the honour of the Holy Church; for all the troubles and disasters which had recently befallen the land were only just judgments for the sin of

allowing the church to become so deformed and corrupt. Great injustice has always been followed by misfortune and ruin, and will always have the like consequences. Let measures, therefore, be devised to provide a remedy, and this all the more that the current year is the jubilee of the fifty years reign of the King, and therefore a year of grace and joy;⁴⁶ but greater grace and joy for the kingdom there could not be, and none which would be more well-pleasing at once to God and his Church than that such a remedy should be provided by the King.

Some positive proposals were in fact made touching the ways and means of accomplishing the end in view. The first step must be to send two letters to the Pope, the one in Latin under the King's seal, the other in French under the seals of the high nobility, pressing for redress in the matters mentioned, a course which had on a former occasion been taken at the instance of Parliament.⁴⁷ Further, it was pressed upon the attention of the Government that they might renew all those ordinances which had already been published against provisions and reservations on the side of Rome. It would also be advisable to provide, that on pain of imprisonment, no money should be taken out of the kingdom by exchange or otherwise. What measures, in addition, were proposed to be taken against the traffic of the Papal collectors, have already been mentioned.

To this representation the King sent for reply that he had already on previous occasions provided a sufficient remedy in the way of legislation for the evils complained of; he was, besides, at that very time in communication with the Papal See upon the subject, and would further continue to make such communications from time to time until a remedy was provided. This answer sounded lukewarm enough, especially when contrasted with the petition of Parliament, which was so warmly expressed, and adduced at great length so many grounds in support of its prayer. But though the patriotic zeal of the latter must have been considerably cooled by this royal decision, the Parliament of the next year, January 1377, took up the thread again at the point where the present Parliament had suffered it to drop; and for the sake of connection, this incident may as well be anticipated in this place. The Commons, in 1377, gave in a petition to the King to the effect that the statutes against *provisions*, which had from time to time been passed, should be strictly carried into execution, and that measures should be adopted against those Cardinals who had obtained for themselves in the two provinces of Canterbury and York reservations, with the

clause *anteferri*, to the annual value of from twenty to thirty thousand golden crowns. They renewed also their complaints against the Pope's collectors. It was Englishmen who had always been wont to hold that office, but now it was a Frenchman, who lived in London and kept a large office, which cost the clergy 300 pounds a-year; and this man sends every year to the Pope 20,000 marks, or 200,000 pounds. It would be a means of resisting these innovations and usurpations, if all foreigners, so long as the wars lasted, were driven out of the country, and if all Englishmen were prohibited, upon pain of outlawry, to farm these revenues from the Papal Court, or to make remittances of money to the same without express permission.⁴⁸

The proposals of the Good Parliament of 1376, the echoes of which we still catch in 1377, are of such a character that I am bold to maintain that they afford strong evidence of the influence of Wiclif. In proof of this I point first of all to the circumstance that the proceedings of the Papal Collector of that time were one of the Parliament's heaviest subjects of complaint. And this collector was certainly no other than that Arnold Garnier, to whose doings and traffickings Wiclif's tract of the year 1377 refers. Further, I bring into view the fact that in the petition presented by Parliament various national calamities, including not only the rapid impoverishment of the country, but also famine and disease among men and cattle, are set forth as consequences of the moral disorders which had spread and prevailed in the Church as the effect of the Papal usurpations, and of the blameworthy negligence of the Government and the people.⁴⁹ Now, exactly this thought is one to which Wiclif so often recurs in different writings, that I must designate it one of his favourite ideas. But independently of this, it is much more allowable to think that an idea so peculiar was thrown out at first by some personage of mark, and afterwards adopted by a whole body, than that a political body first gave expression to it, and that the idea was afterwards taken up and appropriated at second hand by one of the greatest thinkers of the age. Add to all this yet another circumstance, viz., the incident already mentioned of the Bishop of Rochester,⁵⁰ in a solemn sitting of Parliament, casting in Dr. Wiclif's face the accusation that his Theses had already been condemned by the Roman Court. This incident can in no case have occurred in an earlier Parliament than that of 1376. For the excited language of the Bishop cannot possibly have

been uttered after the Papal censure of Wiclif's nineteen propositions had been published to the world. Evidently the speaker's intention was to make public mention of a fact which up till that time had remained a secret, and the censure of Gregory XI. was formally signed on 22d May 1377. Accordingly it might be thought a possible case, that the scene referred to occurred in that Parliament which assembled on 27th January 1377, the year of Edward III.'s death; and in support of this view the consideration would be of weight, that at this date the information of what had been concluded in Rome against Wiclif might have reached the ear of a member of the English episcopate.

But still this conjecture does not bear examination. For the language of the Bishop of Rochester cannot well have been made use of after Wiclif's summons to appear before the English prelates, and this summons had already been issued on 19th February 1377. Various circumstances, therefore, make the supposition a probable one, that the reproach of the Bishop against Wiclif was uttered in some sitting of the Parliament of 1376. But this date need not have been too early for the Bishop's knowledge of what was then doing in Rome against Wiclif; for it may well be presumed that a step such as that which Gregory XI. took in the bulls of 22d May 1377 must have originated in a suggestion from England made a considerable time before that date, and must have been prepared in Rome itself during an interval of considerable length. All this warrants the supposition that Wiclif himself was a member of the Good Parliament of 1376, by virtue, we may conjecture, of royal summons. And presupposing this fact, we do not doubt for a moment that he was one of the most influential personalities in the mixed affairs of Church and State, which formed so conspicuous a part of the business of that Parliament. If, at an earlier period, he had shared strongly in the outburst of national feeling, and of the constitutional spirit which was so characteristic of England in the fourteenth century; still more had he become, in the course of years, one of the leaders of the nation in the path of ecclesiastical progress. This Parliament, indeed, was the culminating point of the influence of Wiclif upon the nation. From that date his influence upon it rather declined, at least in extent of surface, or, so to say, in breadth. On the other hand, the effects which he produced from that time went deeper down into the heart of the English people than they had ever done before.

There was still another direction in which the Parlia-

ment of 1376 employed its efforts for the improvement of public affairs. In 1371, as before stated, under the influence of a prevailing anti-clerical sentiment, the representatives of the nation had brought forward and carried into effect a proposition that the highest offices of the State should be entrusted to the hands of laymen, instead of the bishops and prelates. But in the course of years there had spread a marked discontent with the Government, as it was from that time conducted. King Edward III. had become almost worn out with old age. Since the death of his queen Philippa (1369), one of her ladies, Alice Perrers, had obtained his favour in an extraordinary degree, and had not only taken a conspicuous position in the Court, but had also unduly meddled in many affairs of State. The influence of this lady the Duke of Lancaster had now turned to his own account, in order to acquire for himself a preponderating weight with his royal father in the business of Government. He was credited, indeed, with designs of a much wider reach. The Prince of Wales, diseased and near his end as he was, was still able to perceive the danger, and, in spite of his forced retirement from the business of State, took into his hand the threads of an intrigue by which the succession to the Crown should be assured to his son Richard, a boy only nine years of age, and the party of his younger brother, John of Gaunt, should be thwarted in their designs. He found means to induce the House of Commons and the clergy to form a coalition against the dominant party of the Duke of Lancaster.

Foremost in the management of the affair was Peter de la Mere, chamberlain of the Earl of March, a nobleman who, in virtue of the hereditary right of his Countess, had the nearest presumptive claim to the Throne. This officer of the Court was, at the same time, Speaker of the House of Commons. Upon occasion of the voting of subsidies, the representatives of the counties complained, through their Speaker, of the evil condition of the financial administration, and even of dishonest under- and over-charges which were practised. The persons who were accused and convicted of these mal-practices were the Treasurer, Lord Latimer, a confidant of the Duke of Lancaster, and Alice Perrers herself. The former was put in prison, the latter banished from the Court. The Duke himself, who was the party really aimed at, no man was bold enough expressly to name; on the other hand, it was proposed, evidently with the view of making the Camarilla incapable of mischief, to strengthen the Privy Council by the addition of from ten

to twelve lords and prelates, who should always be about the King, so that without the assent of six, or at least four of their number, no royal ordinance could be carried into effect. This decisive action of Parliament against the Court party of the Duke of Lancaster was so much after the nation's own heart, that it was principally for this service that the Parliament received the honourable epithet of "The Good."⁵¹ While this movement was in progress, Edward the Black Prince died 8th June 1376—held in equally high esteem as a warrior, and as a man of upright and amiable character. The last care of the deceased prince had been to secure the right of his son and heir, and the House of Commons, sharing the same solicitude, presented an urgent petition to the aged King that he would now be pleased to present to the Parliament his grandson Richard of Bourdeaux, as heir-apparent to the Throne; which was also done on the 25th of June.

But scarcely was Parliament prorogued at the beginning of July, when all the measures which it had originated were again brought to nothing; the Duke of Lancaster once more seized the rudder; Lord Latimer recovered again his share in public affairs; and another friend of the Duke, Lord Percy, was named Lord Marschall. Even Alice Perrers came back again to Court. The Camarilla completely surrounded the aged King. The leaders of the party of the deceased Prince of Wales were compelled to feel the revenge of the small but powerful Court party. Peter de la Mere, Speaker of the House of Commons, was sent to prison, where he remained in durance for nearly two years. The Bishop of Winchester was impeached and banished twenty miles from the Court, and the temporalities of his see were sequestrated.

The question arises, what share Wiclif had in the efforts of the Good Parliament to secure the rightful succession to the throne, and to purge the court as well as the administration of unworthy elements. Assuming that he was a member of that Parliament, and co-operated influentially in its ecclesiastico-political proceedings, he could not have remained entirely without a share in its endeavours to secure the succession to the throne, and to reform the Court and the Government. He must have taken his place either on one side or the other. It is true that we hear nothing definite from himself upon the subject, nor very express testimony concerning it from any other quarter. But we may be sure at least of as much as this, that in no case can he have played a prominent part in the effort to drive the

favourites of the Duke of Lancaster from the court, and from all influence in state affairs, for otherwise the Duke would certainly not have lent him his powerful protection only half-a-year later (on 19th February 1377). But on the other hand, it scarcely admits of being supposed that Wiclif would join the party of Lord Latimer and his colleagues especially as in this business the interests at stake were of that moral and legal character for which, in accord with his whole tone of thought, he must always cherish a warm sympathy. These considerations taken together lead me to the opinion that Wiclif did not indeed oppose himself to the majority of the Parliament who laboured to effect a purification of the Court and Government, but neither did he take any prominent part in the discussion of this subject; and this all the less, that, as a general rule, he was accustomed and called upon to take a personally active share only in matters of a mixed ecclesiastical and political character.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV.

1. *De Civili Dominio*, II., c. 5, MS. In Magna Carta, cui rex et magnates Angliæ ex iuramento obligantur, cap. 16, sic habetur : Nulla ecclesiastica persona—censum. This wording and numbering of the passage do not exactly correspond to those of the document now regarded as the original authority. Wiclif has a second reference to Magna Charta in the same chapter.

2. *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 34.

3. *Life and Opinions of Wycliffe*, I., 262.

4. *John de Wycliffe*, a Monograph, 1853 ; p. 64, especially p. 87. Comp. also *Brit. Quart. Rev.*, 1858, October.

5. Woodford, 72 *Questiones de Sacramt. Altaris* ; see above. Prof. Shirley is quite correct in maintaining in his edition of the *Fascic. Zizan.* XIII. that the view hitherto held upon this point of Wiclif's biography is an unfounded one.

6. A considerable portion of this tract, which is of the highest interest, was included by Lewis in the Appendix to his *Hist. of Wiclif*, No. 30. The text is unfortunately in a very imperfect condition, owing, in part at least, to the state of the MS. from which it was derived. But that the tract may have been written very soon after the May Parliament of 1366, and perhaps still earlier in that year rather than in 1367, is the impression which it leaves upon me as strongly as upon the editors of the Wiclif Bible, vol. I., p. vii., note 10, and Prof. Shirley, *Fasc. Ziz.* XVII., note 3.

7. As it has been used by Vaughan, *John de Wycliffe*, a Monograph, 1853, p. 105.

8. The latter fact had been already remarked upon by Vaughan in his earlier work, *Life and Opinions*, etc., I., p. 283.

9. The tribute amounted to 700 marks for England, and 300 for Ireland, making together the sum of 1000 marks usually given.

10. *In quodam concilio*. The Parliament is no doubt intended, but Wiclif designedly makes use of a general expression.

11. We would not say, with Boehringer, in his *Vorreformatoren*, I., Wycliffe, p. 63, that the standpoint taken up by this lord was that of natural right, for there is certainly a distinction to be taken between natural right and the right of the strongest.

12. De Ruever Gronemann. *Diatrise in Joh. Wiclif Vitam*. Traj. ad Rhen., 1837, p. 93.

13. We entirely agree with Vaughan on this point, who, both in his earliest and latest works on Wiclif, considers the speeches of the lords to have been actually spoken in Parliament.

14. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, etc., I. 291, drew this conclusion from the words in Wiclif's tract, *Quam audiui in quodam consilio a dominis secularibus* ; but the words *esse datam*, used in connection with these, at once exclude this understanding of them.

15. The piece entitled *Modus tenendi Parliamentum*, dating according to recent investigations from before 1295, ed. Hardy, mentions, p. 6, that the bishops were to appoint for every archdeaconry two experienced men as representatives, *ad veniendum et interessendum ad Parliamentum*. Comp. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, IV., p. 670, note 1.

16. Comp. Parry, *Parliaments and Councils of England*, Lond. 1839, p. 129.
17. *De Ecclesia*, c. 15. MS. 1294 of the Vienna Library, f. 178, col. 2. *Unde episcopus Roffensis dixit mihi in publico parlamento stomachando spiritu, quod conclusiones meae sunt dampnatae, sicut testificatum est sibi de Curia per instrumentum notarii.* The words *dixit mihi* forbid us to understand that the Bishop had only spoken of him in his absence; rather he must have spoken to him and launched his charge against him face to face. Let me only add that the words *publicum parlamentum* do not pre-suppose *publicity* in the modern sense of the term, but only lay stress upon the circumstance that, instead of a private communication, the charge was made publicly in the hearing of many witnesses.
18. Si autem ego assererem talia contra regem meum, olim fuissent in parlamento minorum Angliae ventilata, in Lewis, p. 356. According to the connection, the emphasis appears to lie not on *ego*, but upon *contra regem meum*.
19. Ego autem cum sim peculiaris regis clericus talis qualis, volo libenter induere habitum responsalis, etc., in Lewis, p. 349.
20. Lewis, 20; Vaughan, *Life*, I., 284; *John de Wycliffe*, 106; Shirley, *Fasc. Ziz. XIX.*; Björnström, *John Wiclif*, Upsala, 1867, p. 36.
21. Boehringer, as above, p. 32.
22. Wiclif, *l. c. Domini Civilis*, II., c. 1, Vienna MS., No. 1341 (Dénis, CCCLXXXII., not CCCLXXX. as Shirley gives it), f. 155, col. 1. Shirley has given the passage in the Introduction to *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 21.
23. Comp. the signatures of all the King's ministers under the protocol on the oath taken by Arnold Garnier, in Appendix IV.
24. The royal passport is printed in Rymer's *Foedera*, ed. 4. London, 1830, vol. III., P. 2, f. 1007. The Pope's letter of introduction is printed by Lowth in the appendix of original documents to his life of Wykeham.
25. The textual form of the oath is printed in Norman French in Rymer, III., f. 933. The Latin text was prefixed by Wiclif to the inquiry of which we are to speak immediately; and as the latter would not be intelligible without the former. I have also communicated the form of the oath in Appendix IV.
26. This paper, which has hitherto been known only by its title, is preserved in two MSS. of the Imperial Library of Vienna, namely, No. 1337 (Dénis, CCCLXXXVIII.), f. 115, and No. 3929 (Dénis, CCCLXXXV.), f. 246. From the latter MS., which leaves much to be wished for in point of accuracy, I give in full with the exception of a portion at the beginning, which is of inferior importance, in Appendix IV. The conclusion seems to have fallen away, for the text terminates in an etc.
27. Constat ex facto ejus notorie quod sic facit, Art 5. But that this memorial cannot have been written before 1377 is clear from the circumstance that near its end reference is made to *regi nostro, licet in aetate juvenili florenti*, which can only apply to Richard II., not to Edward III., who died in June 1377.
28. *Ut a multis creditur—executio sui officii—si non fallor, displiceret majori parti populi Anglicani; regnum nostrum jam sensibilibiter percipiens illud gravamen de ipso conqueritur.*
29. Compare the first paragraph in Wiclif's Illustration of the Oath, near the end, in Appendix IV.
30. Compare the last paragraph of do.
31. *Cum dominus papa sit satis peccabilis.*
32. Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana*, Ed. Riley, I., 316.
33. Boehringer, *Vorreformatoren*, I., 45, makes Guter Dean of Sechow, although in all England no town or any other place of residence so named exists. It is rather the city of Segovia, in Old Castile, that is meant. The English priest, John Guter, had no doubt obtained a Spanish prebend through the Duke of Lancaster, who, after the death of his first wife, Blanche of Lancaster, had married Constance, a daughter of Peter the Cruel, King of Castile, and afterwards put forward claims

to the crown of Castile and Leon in her right. Compare John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, Ed. Townsend, II., 916, App.

34. When Richard II. ascended the throne in 1377, Robert Belknappe was chief judge on the Bench of the Common Pleas, but was deposed in 1388, and banished to Ireland, for having set himself in opposition to the absolutistic designs of the King.—*Vide* Walsingham, Ed. Riley, II., 174; Knighton, 2694.

35. Rymer, *Foedera*, III., 2, f. 1007; Lewis, 304.

36. Under date 31st July he acknowledged receipt of 60 pounds 20 shillings per day paid to him out of the Royal Treasury for the costs of his journey and maintenance abroad. See Oxford edition of the Wiclif Bible, I., p. vii, note 13. It is a mere misunderstanding when Charles Werner, in his *History of Apologetic and Polemical Literature*, III., 1864, p. 560, speaks of Wiclif making a journey to Rome. He was never even in Avignon, to say nothing of Rome, where indeed he could have had no business to transact at this time, for it was not till 1377 that Gregory XI. left Avignon for Italy.

37. According to Barnes—*History of King Edward III.*, p. 866—referred to by Lewis, p. 33.

38. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, IV., 487.

39. *Historia Anglicana*, Ed. Riley, I., 318.

40. Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. III., P. ii., fol. 1037.

41. *Hist. Angl.*, I., 317.

42. *Quod bonum merito vocabatur*.—Walsingham, I., 324.

43. Considerable extracts from this petition, although not in a satisfactory arrangement, have fortunately been preserved, and were printed by Foxe in the *Acts and Monuments*, Ed. Townsend, II., 784. What Lewis communicated from other MS. is not free from errors.

44. I do not for a moment doubt that the Papal Collector here several times named was the same Arnold Garnier already known to us, for the description given of him by Parliament applies to Garnier in every particular of chief moment. He is a French subject, he has a head office in London, and has already been employed in London for a series of years. The only objection that can be taken is that Garnier's commission in England dated only from February 1372, so that in the spring of 1376 he had only been four years, not five, in the kingdom. But this difference is too small to shake the identity which I have assumed.

45. We had matter-of-fact proof of this above. After the death of Archbishop William Whittlesey, in 1374, Gregory XI. nominated the Bishop of London, Simon of Sudbury, to be Archbishop; the Bishop of Hereford, William Courtney, to be Bishop of London; and the Bishop of Bangor, John Gilbert, to be Bishop of Hereford. On this occasion, therefore, he translated at the least three bishops, and possessed himself of the first year's revenues of four newly-filled sees.

46. Edward III. succeeded to the crown after the dethronement of his father, Edward II., 25th January 1327. The year 1376 was therefore exactly the fiftieth of his long reign. It was a happy thought that the King's jubilee could not be better celebrated than by carrying out the necessary ecclesiastical reforms.

47. In May 1343.

48. Foxe, *Acts*, etc., II., 789, from the royal archives.

49. Tit. 94. Against the usurpations of the Pope as being the cause of all the plagues, murrains, famine, and poverty of the realm. Comp. Tit. 100.

50. This must have been Thomas Trillek, who became Bishop of Rochester in 1363, and was still in office at the accession of Richard II., in 1377. Comp. Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I., 299, 332.

51. Lowth, *The Life of William of Wykeham*, p. 81. Pauli, *Geschichte von England*, 4, 489.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER IV., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

ON THE LATE DATE AT WHICH WICLIF BEGAN HIS ATTACKS UPON THE MENDICANT ORDERS.

It is one of the most valuable contributions which Dr. Lechler has made to the biography of Wiclif that he has been able to produce from the Reformer's unpublished writings "direct proofs" of the fact "that Wiclif continued to speak of the Begging Orders with all respectful recognition during the twenty years which elapsed between 1360 and 1380, and that it was in connection with the controversy opened by him on the subject of Transubstantiation, and therefore after 1381 at the earliest, that he began to oppose himself to the Mendicants, who had come forward as his antagonists on that fundamental question."

I am happy to be able to bring forward an important testimony to the historical accuracy of this representation from the same contemporary source which was laid under contribution in a previous note to chapter iii., viz., the *Chronicon Angliæ* of the Monk of St. Alban's. At p. 118 occurs the following remarkable passage. Describing Wiclif, the hostile chronicler writes:—*Erat utique non solum facundus, sed simulator et hypocrita solidissimus, ad unum finem intendens omnia, ut videlicet ejus fama et opinio se inter homines dilataret. Simulabatque se spernere temporalia tanquam instabilia et caduca, pro æternorum amore; et ideo non erat cum possessionatis ejus conversatio, sed ut magis plebis mentes deluderet, ordinibus adhaerent mendicantium, eorum paupertatem approbans, perfectionem extollens, ut magis falleret commune vulgus.*

The distinction here taken between Wiclif's bearing towards the *possessionati*, the "monk's possessioners," or the old endowed orders, with whom he had little or no familiarity, and his good opinion of the Mendicant Orders, with whom he cultivated personal intercourse, agrees exactly with the view taken by Professor Lechler, and is a weighty corroboration of its historical truth. This view, however, is of so recent a date, and the opposite view that Wiclif had begun as early as 1360 to take up the old quarrel of *Armachanus* with the Franciscans, has been so long received that it is not surprising that both Professor Shirley and Mr. Thompson have regarded this passage of the *Chronicon* as one which throws grave doubt on the authority or the accuracy of the compiler. Referring to the chapter on Wiclif as it stands in the old translation of the *Chronicle* from which he quotes, Shirley speaks of the single sentences which I have given above in the original as enough to set aside the authority of the whole chapter (*vide* p. 523 of the *Fasc. Zizan.*). This is the more unaccountable on his part, as he had previously remarked (*Introduction*, p. 14), that the "story which connects Wiclif with the controversies of 1360 is implicitly contradicted by contemporary authority, and receives, to say the least, no sanction whatever from the acknowledged writings of the Reformer;" that, in short, "it is a part of Wiclif's life only by courtesy and repetition." The editor of the *Chronicon Angliæ* has naturally and justly a much higher respect for the authority of its author than Prof. Shirley, who had never seen it in its original text, but he is not a little embarrassed by the very statements about Wiclif, which, from Dr. Lechler's point of view, create no difficulty at all, but are welcome confirmations of historical truth. "It is curious to note," he remarks, in his *Introduction*, p. 53, "that our Chronicler, either from ignorance, or perhaps from a natural hostility to the Mendicant Orders, has represented Wycliff as a favourer of their views. It is, indeed, almost hopeless to account for such a glaring perversion of facts, otherwise than by an assumption of the writer's ignorance; and yet one hardly dares to allow such ignorance in a contemporary writer. His further statement that the Duke of Lancaster appointed four friars to plead Wycliff's cause at his trial may have some truth in it; and it is possible that this fact led him to assume that Wycliff was not now opposed to his former antagonists."

The discovery of the truth of the case by Dr. Lechler puts an end at once to all these embarrassments. It vindicates the accuracy of the *Chronicon*, as to the important point now before us; while the testimony of the *Chronicon* becomes a valuable corroboration of the biographical *datum* which Lechler has ascertained from the unpublished writings of Wiclif.

CHAPTER V.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HIERARCHY AGAINST WICLIF IN 1377 AND 1378.

SECTION I.—*Wiclif Summoned before the Convocation.*

AT the very time when Wiclif stood in the highest estimation with his countrymen, and had reached a position of the greatest influence, a storm burst suddenly upon his head.

As a resolute, far-sighted, and experienced patriot, he possessed the confidence of the nation, as well as the favour of the King. Edward III. had already bestowed upon him more than one prebend, and what was still more important as a mark of his royal grace, had, as we have seen good reason to believe, repeatedly summoned him to serve in Parliament, as a man thoroughly conversant with ecclesiastical affairs. How the men of Oxford had previously distinguished him by office and honours, has been already related. After he had been Seneschal of Merton College, we have seen him in the position of Master of Balliol; and in 1361 this college nominated him to the parish of Fillingham. Seven years later he exchanged this parish for that of Ludgershall, in Buckinghamshire, for no other reason, doubtless, than that the latter was situated in the neighbourhood of the University. On 12th November 1368, Wiclif entered upon his pastoral charge at Ludgershall. In 1375 he obtained a prebend at Aust, a place romantically situated on the south bank of the Severn, and connected with the endowed church of Westbury, near Bristol, where, in 1288, a foundation in honour of the Holy Trinity had been instituted for a dean and several canons.¹ It was not a parish church, but a chapel; the prebend was evidently regarded merely as a sinecure and place of honour, the holder being at liberty to appoint a substitute to read the masses required by the terms of the foundation. Wiclif however, seems to have resigned the prebend immediately after obtaining it, for in November of the same year, 1375, as appears from an entry in the rolls of the King's Chan-

cery, the prebend was bestowed upon a certain Robert of Farrington.²

His nomination to the rectory of Lutterworth, in the county of Leicester, appears, from documentary evidence, to have been an expression of the royal favour. The patronage of this parish did not, indeed, belong properly to the Crown, but to the noble family of Ferrars of Groby, which was owner of the land. But as the heir, Lord Henry Ferrars, was still a minor, the right of collation to the existing vacancy devolved on the Crown, and the King presented John Wiclif in April 1374.³ We shall return to this subject in the sequel. We only remark further at present, that Wiclif appears to have immediately resigned his previous charge at Ludgershall, upon his being appointed to the Rectory of Lutterworth. At least, as early after that appointment as May 1376, a certain William Newbold is named as the parish priest of that village.⁴ On more than one occasion Wiclif expressed himself strongly enough on the subject of the pluralities which were held by many of the priests and prelates; and he had good reason for doing so. The abuse must have gone very far, when even a Pope spoke of the accumulation of church-offices in one and the same person, as a mischief to the Church, as Urban V. did in a bull of May 1365; in consequence of which Papal censure, a sort of statistical inquiry was set on foot, by requiring of every beneficed man to make an official return to his Bishop of all the different church-livings which he held.

From such a return made to the Bishop of London by William Wykeham, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, but now Archdeacon of London, it appears that he was the holder of not fewer than twelve livings, some of them of very considerable value, while he was not in a position to serve one of these spiritual offices in his own person, being obliged to live continually at Court in the capacity of the King's private secretary.⁵ This single example speaks loudly enough of the state of things. Wiclif therefore was justified, as matters stood, in strongly censuring such an abuse; but still we should have been compelled to challenge his personal moral right to complain of it, if he had himself been guilty of what he censured in others. And doubtless his opponents, in this case, would not have spared to cast in his teeth the reproach, that he blamed in other men what he allowed in himself. But he never so acted. Never in any instance did he hold, at the same time, two places involving the cure of souls.

But all this disinterestedness could not protect him from

the opposition of the hierarchy. In the course of a single year, 1377, he was twice summoned to appear before the spiritual tribunals; in the first instance, before Convocation, and in the second, before several prelates as commissioners of the Pope himself. His summons before Convocation is involved in much obscurity, with respect to its immediate occasion and the subjects on which he was required to answer. We find nowhere any documentary information as to what doctrines of Wiclif were meant to be submitted to investigation before that tribunal. On the other hand, we have some information of the course which the proceedings took on the occasion of this appearance of Wiclif before his spiritual judges; and from these the conclusion is plain that the hostile step now taken against him was closely connected with the political partisanship of the day. The prelates were embittered against the Duke of Lancaster, who was labouring with all his might to put an end to their political influence. For the moment they were no match for him in the political arena; but all the more readily on this account they seized the opportunity of indirectly humbling him in the ecclesiastical province, in the person of a theologian who stood in intimate relations to his person.

The Parliament opened on 27th January 1377. A few days later, on 3rd February, the Convocation—the clerical parliament—also met, and the Convocation summoned Wiclif before its tribunal. The Bishop of London, William Courtenay, was no doubt the instigator of this proceeding. He was a younger son of the Earl of Devonshire; a great grandson of Edward I. on the side of his grandmother; closely related to several families of the high nobility; and a man, besides, of imperious nature, and an arrogant, hierarchical spirit. He had been promoted, in 1375, from Hereford to the important see of London, and was a man of superior energy to his predecessor, Simon Sudbury, now Archbishop of Canterbury. The nobleman and the hierarch were united in him; and he represented in his own person the coalition of the nobility with the prelacy in opposing the ambitious designs of the Duke of Lancaster.

But in view of the fact that political rather than ecclesiastical motives had to do with the citation of Wiclif, the Duke considered it his imperative duty to afford him his powerful protection. He resolved to accompany him in person to the assembly of the prelates. On Thursday, 19th February 1377, the Convocation assembled in St. Paul's, and at Wiclif's side appeared the Duke of Lancaster and

Lord Henry Percy, the Grand Marshall of England, followed by a band of armed men, and attended by several friends of the learned divine, in particular by five bachelors of divinity of the five Mendicant Orders, who, by the Duke's desire, were to stand forward in case of need as the advocates of Wiclif.⁶ The Lord Marshall led the way to clear a passage through the crowd for the Duke and Wiclif; but even with his aid it proved a difficult matter to get into the Cathedral and to press through the Church to the Lady Chapel where the bishops were assembled. This, of course, was not effected without a considerable amount of disturbance in the sacred building, upon which Courtenay declared to Lord Percy that if he had known beforehand the style in which he was going to play the master within the church, he would have barred his entrance. Whereupon the Duke of Lancaster answered the Bishop in a rage that he was resolved to be master there in spite of the bishops.

After much pushing and hustling they forced their way at last into the Chapel, where dukes and barons were seated with the Archbishop and other bishops. Here, then, stood Wiclif before his judges awaiting his examination—a tall, thin figure, covered with a long light gown of black colour, with a girdle about his body; the head, adorned with a full, flowing beard, exhibiting features keen and sharply cut; the eye clear and penetrating; the lips firmly closed in token of resolution—the whole man wearing an aspect of lofty earnestness, and replete with dignity and character.⁷

The Grand Marshall now turned to Wiclif, and requested him to be seated. "He had need to rest himself, for he would have many questions to answer." "No!" exclaimed the Bishop of London, beside himself with rage, Wiclif must not be seated there; it was neither lawful nor becoming that when summoned to answer before his judges he should sit during his examination—he must stand. The dispute between them on this point became so violent as to end in the use of abusive language on both sides, by which the multitude of people who witnessed the scene were much disturbed. And now struck in the Duke, assailing the Bishop with angry words, and the Bishop paying him back in full with taunts and insults. The Duke finding himself overmatched in this line, passed to the use of threats, and declared that he would chastise not only the Bishop of London, but all the prelates of England for their arrogance. To Courtenay, in particular, he said: "You

talk boastfully of your family, but they will be in no condition to help you; they will have enough ado to protect themselves." To which the Bishop replied, that if he might be bold enough to speak the truth, he placed his trust neither in his family nor in any other man, but singly and alone in God. Hereupon the Duke whispered to the person who stood nearest to him, that he would sooner drag the Bishop out of the Church by the hair of the head than put up with such an affront at his hand. But this was not spoken in so low a voice that several citizens of London did not overhear it. They were highly incensed, and cried out that they would never consent to see their Bishop so shamefully handled; they would rather lose their lives than he should be seized by the hair of the head.

As the business, before it was well commenced, had degenerated into a violent quarrel and tumult, the sitting of the Court was suspended before nine o'clock in the forenoon. The Duke and the Lord Marshall withdrew with Wiclif, without the latter having spoken a single word. But the citizens of London, who saw themselves insulted in the person of their Bishop, were still more enraged when, on the same day, a motion was made in Parliament that the government of the city should no longer be left in the hands of the Mayor, but should be handed over to a royal commissioner, the imprisoned Lord Latimer. Thus a menace to the municipal liberties and self-government of the capital was added to the affront done to their Bishop. No wonder that the wrath of the citizens found vent for itself in action as well as in word. On the following day they held a great meeting to deliberate upon the double wrong which had been done them—the imperilling of their autonomy, and the insult to their Bishop. At the same moment it came to their ears that the Lord Marshall had imprisoned one of the citizens in his own house in the heart of the city; they rushed instantly to arms; they stormed the house of the Marshall, and set at liberty their imprisoned fellow-citizen, and they searched the house through for Lord Percy himself. Not finding him there, they rushed off to the mansion of the Duke of Lancaster in the Savoy, where they thought they should find both the Lords. But they were a second time disappointed; and to make amends, the crowd vented their rage partly upon a priest, whom they mortally wounded on their way back to the city, and partly upon the armorial coat of the Duke, which they had pulled down from his palace in

the Savoy, and now hung up in a public place of the city reversed, in token that the Duke was a traitor. They had even a design to demolish the Duke's palace, but Bishop Courtenay himself interposed, and entreated them to return to quietness and good order.⁸ The Princess of Wales, also, widow of the Black Prince, and mother of Richard the young heir to the throne, came forward to mediate between the Duke and the citizens, and a reconciliation was at length effected, in which the Duke consented that the Bishop of Winchester, who had been banished in disgrace from the Court, and Peter de la Mere, formerly Speaker of the House of Commons, who was still in prison, should be brought to trial before their peers; while on his side the Duke obtained the concession that the present Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the city should be replaced by others. And further, as the instigators of the riot, and the circulators of abusive rhymes against the Duke could not be found, it was agreed, in satisfaction of these wrongs, that a colossal wax candle should be bought at the expense of the city, and carried in solemn procession, with the Duke's arms attached to it, to St. Paul's, and there kindled before the image of the Virgin Mary.⁹

The citation of Wiclif before Convocation had thus ended in a manner quite unexpected. Wiclif himself had never opened his mouth. The incident seems to have passed away without affecting him personally in any way. But the scene which took place in the cathedral, and the popular uproar which resulted from it, brought the already high-pitched irritation between Lancaster and the English bishops to an open rupture, in which Wiclif was by no means the chief person engaged. To Wiclif himself it must have been a source of sincere pain that he should have been the occasion of such a scene, and that, too, in a consecrated place. It would certainly have been more agreeable to him if he had been allowed to answer to the accusations which might have been laid against him. But who will hold *him* responsible for the fact that his person was made use of for ulterior objects, both by his enemies and his friends? In citing him before Convocation, the prelates wished to strike a blow, in his person, at the Duke. And the Duke took up the gauntlet as thrown down to him, and was glad to have found an opportunity of humbling the Bishop of London and the English prelates as a body. But when the citizens of London were exasperated against the Duke on account of his doings in St. Paul's, this was no proof that they were also opposed to the cause of Wiclif.

Within less than a year afterwards, they espoused his interest in the most earnest way; but I am not disposed to lay stress upon that fact, as it might easily be attributed to the fickleness of the multitude. More weight is due to the circumstance that the sole cause which roused so powerfully the feelings of the citizens, was partly the heinous affront offered to their Bishop, and in part their alarm for the safety of their municipal rights and privileges; and neither the one nor the other of these causes of offence can with reason be laid to the blame of Wiclif.

SECTION II.—*Papal Bulls against Wiclif.*

IF the citation of Wiclif before Convocation had been entirely without consequences for his own person, there was no abandonment of the designs of his church-adversaries against him on that account. The political friends and patrons of the man were too powerful to allow of the prelates carrying out their wishes for his humiliation; they had recourse therefore to the Papal Court, in order to put him down by the right of the highest authority which existed in the Catholic Church. No doubt the first steps in this direction had already been taken some considerable time before. The occurrence in St. Paul's would now be a reason for pushing the matter to a more rapid decision.

Who were the principal accusers of Wiclif in Rome? John Foxe's answer to the question is, that it was the English bishops who collected articles of his and sent them to Rome.¹⁰ But since Lewis's time it has been regarded as pretty well established that it was the monk party, and especially the Mendicant Orders, who appeared in the Curia against him.¹¹ We prefer to agree with Foxe. It is entirely due to a confounding of dates, when it is assumed that, so early as the period now before us, a controversy had already broken out between Wiclif and these Orders on the principles of Monachism. And even if this had been the case, it was not single Orders and their representatives who would have been recognised as competent public accusers in matters of doctrine, but only the bishops of the English Church. And we find, in point of fact, that Wiclif himself considered not the monks but the bishops as the parties who had pressed for a condemnation of his doctrine in Rome.¹²

The Anglican Episcopate, therefore, is, in our opinion, to be regarded as the prime mover of the proceedings of

the Roman Court against Wiclif, as an alleged teacher of heresy; and they took care to prepare and manage the net in which they hoped to take him, with such skill and precaution, as to make sure that the man whom they dreaded, and who had hitherto been shielded by such powerful protectors, should not be able to escape. They had collected the requisite number of doctrinal propositions which Wiclif had publicly propounded, either in lectures and disputations delivered in the University, or in his published writings, and the dangerous tendency of which, menacing the well-being of Church and State, must, as they deemed, be manifest to every eye. But it was also of importance so to weave and intertwine the lines of the net, that the game should be snared, and finally secured. It seemed, too, that this difficult problem had been skilfully solved; for no fewer than five bulls were issued on one day, all aimed at one and the same point. On 22nd May, 1377, Gregory XI, who had shortly before removed from Avignon to Italy, and on 17th January had made his solemn entry into Rome, put his hand to five Bulls against Wiclif in the magnificent Church of St. Maria Maggiore. One of the five, and that which appears to contain the essence of the whole number, is addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London.¹³ It conveys to the two prelates apostolic commission and plenary powers, first of all to ascertain, by private inquiry, whether the propositions contained in a schedule appended to the bull had been actually put forth by John Wiclif;¹⁴ and if this should be the case, then to cause him to be put in prison, and to be kept there until such time as they should receive further instructions from the Pope, to follow upon the report made to him of their proceedings.

A second bull contains only a supplement to the principal bull.¹⁵ It is also directed to the Primate and the Bishop of London, and appoints what course should be taken in case Wiclif should get secret intelligence of the process with which he is threatened, and should save himself by flight from impending imprisonment. To meet this eventuality, the two prelates are commissioned and endowed with full apostolic powers to issue out a public citation to Wiclif to present himself in person before Gregory XI. within three months from the date of citation. A third bull, also addressed to the same prelates,¹⁶ requires them, either personally, or by theologians of unsuspected orthodoxy, to bring the condemned doctrines of Wiclif to the notice of King

Edward, and his sons, the princes, as also the Princess of Wales, Johanna, the widow of the Black Prince, and other great personages of the realm, and privy councillors, to satisfy them of the erroneous character of these doctrines, and of the dangers which they threatened to the interests of the State; and thus to engage them to assist with all their might in rooting out these errors from the kingdom. The fourth bull, directed to the King himself, informed him of the commission relating to Wiclif, which had been conveyed to the Archbishop and the Bishop of London; and while warmly commending the zeal which he and his predecessors upon the throne had displayed for the Catholic faith, earnestly entreated and required him to extend his royal grace and assistance to the Archbishop and Bishop in the execution of their commission. Last of all, the fifth bull is addressed to the Chancellor and the University of Oxford,¹⁸ to require of them in the most emphatic manner, and even upon pain of the loss of their privileges, not only to guard against the setting forth and maintaining of erroneous doctrines, but to commit Wiclif and his obstinate followers to prison, and to deliver them over to the Pope's commissioners, the Archbishop and the Bishop of London.

The plan of operations, it is plain, had been ripely considered. The attainment of the end in view seemed to be assured, by the King and the royal princes, the Privy Council and the chief nobility, and the University of Oxford being all drawn into the interest of the Church. It was, therefore, to be expected that the Government, the power of the nobles, and the resources of so important a corporation as the University of Oxford, would contribute their aid to the two commissioners of the Roman Court to bring Wiclif under the Church's power. For that was the point aimed at. It was not meant that the Primate and Bishop Courtenay should conduct the investigation in chief against Wiclif, and pronounce judgment upon him. It was only a preliminary inquiry that was committed to them, viz., to satisfy themselves, in a manner entirely secret and confidential, that the theses communicated to them from Rome had really been put forward and maintained by Wiclif. But the process for heresy proper the Pope manifestly reserved for himself. It was a well-considered policy on the part of the Pope to make his appeal to England's sense of honour, in order to gain all parties having interest for the object in view. To the King he represented what high reputation both he and his ancestors and his kingdom had ever acquired by their piety and soundness in the faith.

The University of Oxford must remember that its celebrated name is dishonoured when it looks on in inactivity, while tares are sown and grow up among the wheat in the field of renown committed to its care. Even the two bishops, whom Gregory entrusts with plenary powers, are not spared a word of admonition. They are reminded that the English bishops of former times ever stood upon their watch tower, and took careful heed that no heresy should spread around them. But now-a-days such is the lack of watchfulness on the spot, that men in far distant Rome are aware of the secret devices and open attacks of the enemies of the church, before any measures of defence against them have been taken in England itself. Further, it appeared to the Pope advisable to point out this fact to the bishops, that some of Wiclif's propositions appeared to agree in sense with the views of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, whose book had already been condemned by Pope John XXII.

Let us now examine the condemned Articles themselves. They are nineteen in number, but they are not arranged in a strictly logical order. This, of course, is not Wiclif's fault, for it was not he who put them together as they appear in the schedule attached to the Papal bulls, but his opponents. The first five Theses were placed at the head of the whole number, with the calculated design that from the very first of the series the statesmen and nobles of the kingdom should receive the impression that Wiclif held revolutionary views, not only in Church matters, but also in political and municipal affairs, and even called in question the rights of private property and hereditary succession. For in Theses 1-5 the subjects treated of have nothing to do with Church life, but refer exclusively to legal and municipal matters, such as property, right of possession, heritages, and so on. It has always, indeed, been assumed hitherto that the topic here spoken of is the temporal dominion of the Popes, and the political power and secular property of the Church in general. But this is not the fact; this is a view which rests entirely upon misunderstanding and prejudice. Upon an unprejudiced examination it comes out with certainty that it is only municipal and legal relations which are here in question.¹⁹ Wiclif's proposition is, that all rights of inheritance and property are not to be considered as inherently unconditioned and absolute, but as dependent upon God's will and grace. Then in Nos. 6 and 7 he lays down the bold proposition, "In the event of the Church falling into error, or of churchmen

persistently abusing the property of the Church, it is competent for kings and temporal rulers to withdraw from them, in a legal and moral manner, the temporal property."

However strongly the endowment may have been secured on the part of the founder, it is still, in the nature of things, necessarily a conditioned endowment, and one liable to be annulled by certain derelictions of duty. Whether the Church is or is not, in point of fact, in a condition of error, Wiclif will not himself inquire. He leaves it to princes to inform themselves upon that point; and in the event of the case being such, they may confidently proceed to take action—they are even bound under the pain of eternal damnation to withdraw, in this event, its temporalities from the Church. Allied to this, and only treated more as a question of principle, is the last Thesis, the 19th, where he maintains that "a man of the spirituality," even the Roman Pontiff himself, may lawfully be put right, and even be accused by his subjects and by laymen. The group of Theses, 8-15, is designed to guard against the abuse of the power of the keys, in binding and loosing, especially in so far as Church-discipline and the bann of excommunication should be used to secure certain revenues to the Church, and to deter the laity from meddling with Church property. In this sense Wiclif, in Thesis 14, contests the pretended absoluteness of the Pope's power of the keys, and makes the effective power of the same dependent upon its being used in conformity with the Gospel.²⁰ At bottom it is only another form of the same thought when it is said (Thesis 9), "It is not possible for a man to be put under the bann unless he has before and principally been put under it by himself." In Nos. 10, 12, 13, Wiclif declares that only in God's matters, and not in matters of temporal goods and revenues, ought church censures to the extent of excommunication to be applied. With some appearance of isolation from the rest of the propositions, and yet in a certain degree of connection with the Thesis touching the power of the keys, stands, last of all, the 16th Thesis, which claims for every lawfully ordained priest the full power to dispense every sacrament, and consequently to impart to every penitent remission of all manner of sin.

The nineteen Theses, accordingly, in their chief substance, fall into three different groups. I. 1-5, concerning rights of property and inheritance. II. 6, 7, 17, 18, concerning Church property and its rightful secularisation in certain circumstances, to which No. 19 is a supplement. III. 8-15, concerning the power of Church discipline and its necessary limits, to which No. 16 also belongs. We shall fix our

attention below upon the larger connections of thought from which these single Theses have been separated; but first we follow the course of external events.

SECTION III.—*First Effects of the Five Bulls in England.*

THE Papal bulls, which were based upon these nineteen Theses of Wiclif as the *corpus delicti*, were signed in Rome by Gregory XI., as before stated, on 22d May 1377; but it was an abnormally long time before they were made public in England. Not till 18th December 1377 did the Pope's commissioners named in them—the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London—put their signatures to a missive to the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, enclosing the commission directed to him in the matter of Wiclif, which was seven months all but four days after the date of the Papal bulls. How is this delay to be explained? Possibly the bulls had been long detained on their way from Rome. But, as is now well known, the intercourse between Rome and England was at that time so constant, and, as a general rule, so rapid, that we cannot think it probable that the arrival of those documents had been really delayed by exceptional circumstances for more than half a year. No doubt they must have reached their destinations at a much earlier date. It was entirely the act of the Pope's commissioners themselves that the publication and the execution of their commission were so long delayed. Nor is it difficult to understand the reason why. These bulls of Gregory XI. arrived in England at a time when Edward III., given up by the physicians, was approaching his end. This state of matters was generally known in the kingdom; and on 21st June 1377 the aged monarch breathed his last at Shene.

The bull addressed to the King thus became inept; and yet without the help of the State, proceedings against Wiclif could not take the course which Rome desired. Besides, the weeks next ensuing, during which all public interest was engrossed by the change of the throne, the entry of the boy-King into London, and his solemn coronation as Richard II. in Westminster, were of all seasons the least appropriate for bringing before the public this present from Rome. Then, again, everything depended upon the spirit which was to animate the Government during the King's minority, and upon the position which the regency should take up in relation to ecclesiastical affairs. To all this were added, in August, attacks of the French upon the south coasts of the

kingdom, and threatening movements of the Scots in the north. In October, the first Parliament of Richard II. assembled, and in the House of Commons, at least, there prevailed so outspoken a feeling of antagonism to Rome, that it appeared every way advisable to wait till the prorogation of Parliament, which followed on 25th November, before measures were put in operation against Wiclif. As the most pressing business in this session of Parliament was the raising of supplies for the war, and above all, for the defence of the kingdom, the attention of the Legislature was once more drawn to the systematic draining of the country in behoof of the Roman Court and of foreign Church dignitaries, and to all questions besides which were connected therewith; the effect of which was, that the Commons addressed several petitions to the King, in which they renewed their complaints against the Papal provisions and reservations. They proposed to put a stop to these usurpations by which the *Convention* of 1374 between Gregory XI. and Edward was violated, by the enacting of severe penalties upon all persons who should obtain any Church office by the way of Papal provision, or who should rent from any foreigner land which was an English Church-fief. They proposed that from 2nd January of the ensuing year, all foreigners alike, whether monks or seculars, should leave the kingdom, and that during the continuance of the war all their lands and properties in the country should be applied to war purposes. The income of French clergy alone, accruing from English livings, was estimated at 60,000 pounds a-year. In this Parliament also, the question of the right of the State was mooted and discussed with great earnestness of feeling. "Whether the kingdom of England, in case of need, for the purposes of self-defence, is not competent in law to restrain the treasure of the land from being carried off to foreign parts, although the Pope should demand this export of gold in virtue of the obedience due to him, and under the threat of Church censures."

Upon this question, if we are rightly informed, Wiclif drew up, by command, an opinion for the young King and his great council. In that paper he gave a decided affirmative to the question, taking his stand partly upon the law of nature, in virtue of which every corporate body, and therefore also such an incorporation as the kingdom of England, possesses the power of resistance, in behoof of its own self-defence; partly upon "the law of the Gospel," according to which all almsgiving (and into this all Church-property ultimately resolves itself), in case of necessity, ceases of

itself to be a duty binding by the law of love. In support of which latter assertion, he appealed to several expressions of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, in his memorial to Pope Eugene III., *De Consideratione*.²¹ Herein Wiclif also lays stress upon considerations of what is due to the national welfare. If things go on as they have been doing hitherto, England must be impoverished, and her population decline, while the Curia, by the superfluity of wealth flowing in upon it, will become arrogant and profligate. The enemies of England, by means of her own gold, would be put in a position to make her feel the effects of their malice, while Englishmen would be laughed at by foreigners for their "asinine stupidity," etc.²² Last of all, he appeals to the "Law of conscience;" making, in all, three different standards of law (*lex naturæ, lex Scripturæ, and lex conscientiæ*). In the second part of the Opinion, he replies to the apprehension of dangers which might possibly arise from the adoption of the measures in question.

After the Parliament thus anti-Romish in its temper was prorogued, no obstacle any longer stood in the way, and it seemed now to be high time to carry out the Pope's commission, by taking steps against Wiclif.²³ Accordingly, under date 18th December, the two commissioners issued a mandate to the Chancellor of Oxford, in which the bull addressed to the University was enclosed. The mandate, which Edmund Stafford presented in person, was to this effect. 1. That the Chancellor, calling to his aid learned and orthodox doctors of Holy Scripture, should ascertain whether, as a matter of fact, John Wiclif had set forth the Theses in question, which were contained in the collection drawn up in Rome, and a schedule of which was appended. The result of this inquiry he was instructed to report to the commissaries in a sealed letter. 2. The Chancellor was to cite Wiclif to appear in thirty days after the opening of the citation before the Papal commissaries or their delegates in St. Paul's Church in London, there to answer concerning his Theses, and for the purpose of further procedure against him. Touching the steps which were taken in this direction by the Chancellor, the Commissaries expected to receive notice from him in an open letter.²⁴

Two things are worthy of remark in this mandate: first, its essential departure from the terms of the Papal bull. Gregory XI. had instructed his commissaries, as we have seen, that in the event of its being found that Wiclif had actually set forth the Theses in question, they were to cause him to be put in prison, and thereupon wait for further in-

structions from Rome. The mandate, on the contrary, says not a word about imprisonment, but only requires that Wiclif should be cited to present himself (upon the footing of a man at large) at the bar, and then, it is true, to await what was to follow. This is something quite different from the other. But the commissaries must have had very good reasons for departing from the stringent instructions which they had received. Doubtless they had convinced themselves that a prosecution of a man who was so highly considered at Court, as well as by the people, would be not only a dangerous measure, but, as matters stood, a matter of impossibility. And so they resolved at least to do something, and cited Wiclif to appear at their bar. Another thing in the mandate is worth consideration—the tone in which the commissaries address the Head of the University. Once and again they impress upon him his duty, from a motive of reverence and submission to the Holy See, punctually and faithfully to carry out the instructions which have been sent to him. This sounds suspiciously, and leaves the impression that they had some reason to stand in doubt beforehand of the good disposition of the University.

And, in point of fact, the upshot proved that the state of feeling in Oxford was entirely unfavourable to the object contemplated. Thomas Walsingham informs us with great displeasure that the men who were then at the head of the University hesitated long whether to receive the Papal bull with honour or to discard it with total disrespect. The chronicler pours out his feelings in an apostrophe to the University, in which he laments how deeply fallen she has become from her former height of wisdom and learning, seeing that now, under a dark cloud of ignorance, she was not ashamed to stand in doubt of things which could not be doubted of even by a Christian layman.²⁵ The representatives of the University resisted, it appears, for some time the bull which Gregory himself had addressed to them. The case was different with the archiepiscopal Mandate which accompanied the bull, for in this nothing was required of them save an inquiry into the question of fact, whether such and such propositions had been actually set forth by Wiclif, and the citation of this man to appear before the episcopal tribunal. Neither of these requirements touched too nearly either the honour or the rights of the University. It was otherwise with the Papal bull. This reflected upon the honour of the University at its very outset, by sharply animadverting upon its remissness in opposing the erroneous doctrines which had been introduced into it. It appeared,

besides, to be a proceeding injurious to the rights of the corporation, when it was required of them to make Wiclif a prisoner, and deliver him up to the commissioners, and to do the like with several of his followers if they should manifest any obstinacy in the way of resistance.

No wonder, if the heads of the University found it opposed to their dignity and even to their rights, that they should be called upon to play, so to speak, the part of constables who, at the bidding of a third party, were to be compelled to make prisoners of members of their own corporation, and deliver them over to a tribunal with which they had nothing to do. Even apart, however, from the formal and legal point of view, sympathy with Wiclif and esteem for his person were no doubt strong enough in Oxford circles (as the Pope himself presupposed) to have awakened an animated opposition to the Papal demand. What conclusion was taken in the end has not been expressly handed down to us; but there is no difficulty in conjecturing that the University conformed its action to what was demanded in the more temperate mandate of the commissioners, and as much as possible passed over in silence the bull itself.

SECTION IV.—*The Process against Wiclif.*

BY the mandate to the Chancellor, Wiclif was cited to appear in St. Paul's in London thirty days after the service of the citation. There appears to have been a subsequent adjournment to a later date, and to a different locality, viz., the Archbishop's palace of Lambeth. Many councils had been held in the chapel of this palace since the days of Anselm of Canterbury. There Wiclif was appointed to appear before the Pope's commissioners. When this took place cannot be exactly determined. The month of April 1378 has generally been assumed to have been the time, since Lewis attempted to fix this approximate date, which, however, he himself regards as uncertain.²⁶ And, in fact, we have rather to think of a date somewhat earlier, for, according to Walsingham's account, Gregory XI. must have been still alive at the time of this examination.²⁷ But Gregory died on 27th March 1378. It follows that the transaction must have taken place in March at latest, perhaps even in February of that year. If so, this date was not much later than the term for which Wiclif was originally summoned by the Chancellor of Oxford. Wiclif, without hesitation, presented himself before the Archbishop Simon Sudbury, and the Bishop of London, William Courtenay. The Duke of Lancaster, who had stood forward in St. Paul's

as his defender, was no longer, since the change on the throne, in possession of ascendant influence. But Wiclif stood in no need even of this high protection. He possessed courage enough to place himself, without it, before the commissioners of the Pope.

In defence of the nineteen Theses, condemned by the Curia as erroneous, he put in a written answer, in which he set forth the point of view from which he had proceeded in these Theses, and at once expounded and justified the sense of them, one by one.²⁸ This answer was meant to be communicated to the Pope himself. This was Wiclif's own intention, at least, as may be seen from the manuscript passage quoted in the note.²⁹ Meanwhile, however, the business of this occasion, as before, did not pass over entirely without disturbance. Sir Henry Clifford, an officer in the Court of the widowed Princess of Wales, appeared in the session, and demanded of the commissaries, in name of the Princess, that they should abstain from pronouncing any final judgment respecting the accused. Citizens of London, too, forced a passage into the chapel, and loudly and menacingly took part with the theologian, who was a patriot so much beloved and honoured. This double intimidation, from above and from beneath, the spiritual tribunal was unable to withstand. To save appearances, at least, Wiclif was prohibited any longer to deliver in lectures and sermons the Theses in question, because, as was pretended, they would give offence to the laity (not, therefore, because they were in themselves erroneous; such was the impression it would seem which was made by his defence). He was allowed, however, to leave the tribunal as free as he had appeared before it, quite contrary to the intentions which had been conceived in Rome, and directly in the teeth of the instructions which had been given to the commissaries.

No wonder that the zealous adherents of Rome were displeased in the highest degree with this result of the process. We have still a lively echo of this feeling in the utterances of the chronicler Walsingham on the subject. In great wrath he pours himself forth against the glorious boastings with which the prelates began the business, and against the fear of man with which they closed it. When they were appointed the Pope's commissaries against Wiclif, they had declared, in the fulness of their courage, that by no entreaties of men, by no threats or bribes, would they allow themselves to be drawn aside from the line of strict justice in this affair, even if their own lives should

be menaced. But on the very day of hearing, for fear of the wind which blew the reed hither and thither, their words had become smother than oil, to the public humiliation of their own dignity and to the loss and prejudice of the whole Church. Men who had vowed not to bend to the princes and peers of the realm till they had punished the arch-heretic for his extravagances, are seized with such terror at sight of a certain knight of the Court of Princess Joanna, that one would have supposed that they had no horns on their mitres more; when "they became as one that heareth not, and who has no word to say against it in his mouth" (Ps. xxxviii. 15). And so the crafty hypocrite, by his written defence of those godless Theses of his, had the better of his judges, and got clear off.³⁰

Thus, then, was a second attack upon Wiclif happily repelled. The first had been an independent attempt of the English Episcopate; the second had proceeded from the central power of Rome itself, whose organs for this occasion were two English prelates. But on the first occasion a prince of the blood had made use of his influence in the Government to thwart, in a violent way, the design of the prelates. On the second occasion, a powerful sympathy from different circles in the country served as a shield to cover the bold Reformer; the learned Corporation of Oxford bestirred themselves to guard in his person their own autonomy; the mother of the young King put in a powerful word for him; and the burghers of London, in a tumultuary manner, manifested their sympathy with the honoured patriot. We see how widely among the higher and lower strata of the population, esteem for Wiclif and the influence of his spirit were then diffused. It is true that, in the Chapel of Lambeth, the Papal commissaries formally prohibited him any more to publish in the pulpit or in the chair the doctrine condemned by the Pope. But no formal promise was given by Wiclif to that effect; and should he resolve to persevere in his own path, in spite of this prohibition, the prelates were destitute of power to arrest his progress.

But all these considerations apart, the relations of the Western Church at large were assuming such a form just at this time, that an earnest and free spirit like Wiclif could only be set on fire still more to press for reformation with all his strength. For not long after the trial in Lambeth, Gregory XI. died (27th March, 1378); and a few months later was developed that great and long continued Papal schism which exercised an influence of the

greatest importance upon Wiclif's inner and outer life.³¹ Thus the year 1378 forms a turning point in his career. A storm which menaced his safety had been turned aside, and on this occasion it had been brought to light how many hearts were beating in sympathy with him and his efforts. Then befell the great church schism which shook violently the moral prestige of the Roman Church, so far as it has any such still remaining, paralysed its power, and put a spur into every good man to do his utmost to help the necessities of the case, and to raise up again the fallen Church. It is easy to understand that Wiclif, after having applied himself till now, preponderantly, to matters of mixed ecclesiastical and political interest, should from henceforth devote himself to interests of a purely ecclesiastical kind, without of course renouncing the character of the patriot. From that time he first stood forward in the specific character of a Church Reformer.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V.

1. Vaughan states that it was the King who presented him to this prebend, but all that is certain, from documentary evidence, is that Edward III. confirmed the nomination, 6th November 1375.

2. *Rotuli patentes* 49, Edw. III., 1, M. 11. Wiclif Bible, Pref. vii.

3. That this was the history of the affair is made certain by an entry in the register of the see of Lincoln, in the place where it records the nomination of Wiclif's successor in the rectory. On this occasion Lord Henry Ferrars exercised personally his patronate right; and it was stated at the same time that the last preceding nomination had been made by King Edward, by reason of the minority of Lord Ferrars. *Vide* entry in Lewis, p. 44, with note; and in Vaughan, *Monograph*, p. 180, with note.

4. According to entry in the *Registrum Bokyngham* of Lincoln.

5. Lowth, *Life of William of Wykeham*, p. 31.

6. This last circumstance Foxe (*Acts and Monuments*, II., p. 800, ed. Townsend) takes from the MS. chronicle of a monk of St. Albans, which was lent to him by Archbishop Parker, and from which he derived the whole detailed account of the incident. More recent writers passed over the circumstance in silence, after Lewis had maintained that it is in the highest degree improbable that the Mendicant Friars should have undertaken the defence of a man who had exposed their superstitions and immoral practices. But this last assumption touching Wiclif's relations at this date to the friars rests upon error. And we have no good reason to doubt the fact as stated by Foxe, especially as he does not say that Wiclif himself had associated these four friars with him for his defence, but that the Duke had required them to accompany him to the tribunal; and of Lancaster it is well known that he was as pronounced a friend of the Mendicant Orders as he was a sworn enemy of the prelates.

7. This description of the personal appearance of Wiclif is taken from several portraits of undoubted originality still existing, all agreeing in the main. The portrait which is prefixed to Lewis's life was engraved from a picture in possession of the Earl of Denbigh. That given by Vaughan in both forms of his work was taken from the portrait which belongs as an heir-loom to the personage of the village of Wiclif in Yorkshire. More recently (1861) a remarkable portrait has been brought to light, which is in the possession of a family named Payne, in Leicester, which is a sort of palimpsest; for the original picture, which is a portrait of Wiclif, and seems to have been produced in the fifteenth century, was painted over before the Reformation and converted into a likeness of a Dr. Robert Langton, of whom nothing is known. But the original picture has been detected under the second, and this represents Wiclif as a somewhat younger man, and with fuller and firmer features than he is represented withal in the other portraits. Comp. Vaughan's article "Wycliffe" in the *British Quarterly Review*, October 1858.

8. *Walsingham*, I., 325.

9. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, II., 804. Comp. *Walsingham*, I., 325.

10. *Acts and Monuments*, III., 4.

11. Lewis, 46; Shirley, *Fasc. Zix.*, XXVII.; *Bähringer*, Wycliffe, 53.

12. *De Ecclesia*, c. 15; Vienna MS., 1294, f. 178, col. 2.

13. *Walsingham*, I., 350; Lewis, *Appendix*, 15; Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, I., 429.

14. *Walsingham*, I., 358; *Lewis*, 316, No. 18; *Vaughan, Life*, etc., I., 457.
15. *Walsingham*, I., 348; *Lewis*, 308, No. 14. "Nuper per nos, etc."
16. "Super periculosis admodum erroribus," etc., *Walsingham*, I., 347; *Lewis*, 307, No. 13; *Vaughan, Life*, etc., I., 427.
17. *Regnum Angliæ quod Altissimus*, etc. *Walsingham*, I., 352; *Lewis*, 312, No. 16; *Vaughan, Life*, etc., I., 430.
18. "*Mirari cogimur et dolere*," etc. *Walsingham*, I., 348; *Lewis*, 305, No. 12; *Vaughan, Life*, etc., I., 425; *Shirley, Fasc. Ziz.*, 242. That the date given in this document (30th May 1376) is false, was discovered by Shirley; *vide* Introduction, xxviii, note I., after having declared his preference for A.D. 1377, at p. 244, note 17, in the body of his work.
19. Lewis set the example of referring these articles to ecclesiastical property and jurisdiction, p. 46, and he is followed in this by Vaughan and all later writers. The error attached itself to the words in the first article, *Petrus et omne genus suum*—words which it was thought could only be understood of the Apostle Peter and his successors in the Roman See. But to say nothing of the extreme strangeness of using the word *genus* for *successores*, Wiclif often makes use, in his unprinted works, of the name *Petrus*, as also of the prænomens Caius, Titus, etc., in the way of example. But quite decisive of the point is the fact that in the book, *De Civili Dominio*, I., c. 35, from which I am convinced the article was taken, the connection clearly and necessarily leads to the general sense which I have indicated.
20. No. 15. *Credere debemus, quod solum tunc solvit vel ligat (sc Papa) quando se conformat legi Christi*.
21. Foxe has incorporated an extract from this memorial with his work, as well in its Latin as its English form. *Acts and Monuments*, III., 54. The complete original is found in MS. in a volume made up of several pieces, in the Bodleian, from which it has been published by Shirley in the *Fasc. Zizan*. He has compared with it a second copy, which is found in one of the Vienna Wiclif MSS. (Dénis, 358, now numbered 1337, f. 175). The title of it in the Oxford MS. is, *Responsio Magistri Joannis Wycliff ad dubium infra scriptum quaesitum ab eo per Dominum regem Angliæ Ricardum secundum, et magnum suum Concilium, anno regni sui primo*.
22. Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan*, 263.
23. That the commissaries had at their own instance delayed the execution of the Papal commission, which appears to have reached their hands in due time, is evidently presumed by Walsingham when he says, "How disrespectfully, how negligently they acted in executing their commission, is better past over in silence than expressed." *Hist. Angl.*, ed. Riley, I., 356.
24. The mandate is printed by Lewis in his Appendix, No. 17, p. 314, as also in Wilkins' *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, III., p. 123; only in the latter the date given is V Cal. Januarii, instead of XV Cal., i.e., 28th December, instead of 18th December. This is the solution of the discrepancy remarked upon by Hoeffer, in his *Anna von Luxemburg*, p. 53, note 3.
25. *Walsingham, Hist. Anglic.*, I., 345.
26. *Life of John Wiclif*, p. 58.
27. *Walsingham, Hist. Angl.*, I., 356, says in reference to the upshot of the transaction, "*Wiclif escaped, amplius non compariturus coram dictis episcopis, citra mortem Gregorii Papæ*."
28. This short "Defence" is incorporated by Walsingham in his Chronicle, I., 357-363. It is also given by Lewis in his Appendix, No. 40, p. 382; and by Vaughan, *Life*, etc., I., 432. In the Chronicle its title is *Declarationes*; in Lewis, *Protestatio*. I find that Wiclif himself in his work *De Veritate S. Scripturæ*, o. 14, f. 40, col. 4 (Vienna MS., 1294) gives to this piece the latter title, *Protestatio*. Another justification of the same nineteen articles, differing in point of form, and bearing to have been presented to the Parliament, is given by Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 245.
29. *Walsingham*, I., 356; comp. 362. We may here find a place for the remark

that the two examinations of Wiclif before the English prelates, treated of in this chapter, have not always been rightly viewed by historians. Foxe, indeed, in the sixteenth century, and his Romish contemporary, Nicolas Harpsfield, placed the examinations in St. Paul's in the days of Edward III., and at a time antecedent to the appearance of the five Papal bulls. They follow, in this point, the account of Walsingham (which, however, is not entirely consistent with itself), and of other chroniclers of the period between Wiclif and the Reformation. But Lewis, pp. 46, 56, assumed that both the examinations, at St. Paul's and at Lambeth, took place in consequence of the Papal bulls, and not before, and that not only the later, but the first also took place under Richard II., after King Edward's death. He was followed in this not only by Mosheim, Schröckh, Gieseler, and Neander, but also by English scholars, such as Lowth, Baber, and a writer in the *Westminster Review*, 1854. The last-named author believed that he was able to bring positive proof that Walsingham must have been in error when he placed the appearance of Wiclif at St. Paul's at the beginning of 1377, instead of the year 1378. But Vaughan in the *Life*, etc., I., 357, note 23, 2 edit., has proved, by weighty arguments, that that event took place as early as 1377 (19th February), and that the Papal bulls were not issued till a later date, so that the event cannot have been a consequence of the bulls, but much rather the occasion of their issue on 22d May 1377. To Vaughan, undoubtedly, belongs the merit of having placed this subject in a clear light, both chronologically and pragmatically. The following facts are decisive in support of this view :—1. The popular tumult in London directed against the Duke of Lancaster and Marshall Percy, which was undoubtedly a consequence of what occurred in St. Paul's, is always and persistently placed in the year 1337, and not in the year following, 1378. 2. Lord Percy, in the beginning of 1378, was no longer Marshall, but in 1377 he was, without doubt, invested with this dignity. 3. The day of the week which is assigned by the English contemporary chronicler, viz., Thursday before the Feast of St. Peter's, 19th February, corresponds with this day of the month only in the year 1377, but not in the year 1378.

30. The Chronicler of St. Alban's appears to have felt this himself, when he says of Gregory XI's death, "*Cujus obitus non modicum fideles contristavit sed in fide falsos, ipsum Johannem (Wiclif) et ipsius assecclas, animavit.*" Walsingham, I., 356.

CHAPTER VI.

WICLIF AS A PREACHER; HIS EFFORTS FOR REFORM IN PREACHING AND FOR THE ELEVATION OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

SECTION I.—*Wiclif as a Preacher; his Homiletical Principles.*

WICLIF not only made use of scientific lectures from his chair in Oxford, nor only of learned works and small fugitive tracts; he also availed himself of preaching as a means of battling with the evils which he saw in the religious condition of the National Church, of implanting sound Christian life, and of thus serving, according to his ability, the interests of his Church and people.

It is characteristic of the man and his way of acting, that in this extremely important matter he commenced by doing his duty at his own personal post, from which he afterwards extended his influence to wider circles.

This comes out with the greatest clearness from his remaining sermons, for these divide themselves into two great groups—the Latin sermons and the English. The latter are partly sermons which he may be presumed to have preached to his congregation at Lutterworth, as parish priest, and partly outlines of sermons which he prepared as a kind of model for itinerant preachers of his school; we shall return to these in the sequel. The Latin sermons were, without doubt, delivered in Oxford before the University, perhaps in St. Mary's.¹ This is antecedently probable, but it is also manifest from the form and contents of the sermons themselves. Not unfrequently we find learned matters mentioned in them in a way which makes it certain that the audience must have consisted of people of culture and scholastic learning—as, for example, when, in the first of the “Miscellaneous Sermons,” he speaks of the manifold varieties then received of the sense of Scripture, and, in particular, of the *sensus tropologicus* and *anagogicus*; when quotations are introduced, not only from the Fathers, but from the Canon Law; and when abstract questions of logic and metaphysics are investigated, such as that which refers

to the relation of soul and body, etc. What sort of audience must a preacher have before him when he speaks of the imitation of Christ, as Wiclif does in the third of his Sermons for Saints' Days, and asks, What does it help us in the imitation of Christ to pore over the pages of the logicians? or what aid comes from the knowledge of the natural philosophers acquired at such a cost of labour? or from the well-known method of reasoning adopted by the mathematicians? Plainly the preacher has people of learning before him—the professors and students of the University. This was long ago correctly noted by a reader of the Vienna manuscript of these sermons, who writes on the margin, opposite this passage, the words, "*Magistri et studentes notate.*"² The preacher, in fact, in one instance mentions Oxford by name;³ and one of his sermons from beginning to end is simply an address delivered on occasion of a Doctoral promotion in the University.⁴

The Latin sermons of Wiclif known to us belong to very different years, as may be gathered with tolerable certainty from several internal marks. The most of these collections, indeed, belong to the latest years of his life, but one of them, containing forty miscellaneous sermons, consists of earlier discourses, all delivered before the year 1378,⁵ and these are all instructive and valuable for the insight they give into the course of Wiclif's development. At present we say nothing of what is to be learned from this source of the progress of his mind in the matter of doctrine; we confine ourselves, in the meantime, to what we have been able to gather from it with respect to the views he took of the object of preaching, and of the actual condition of the preacher's office at that period.

In the last named collection of Latin sermons, belonging to the period of his academic life and work, he expresses himself in different places on the subject of preachers and preaching. Two sermons in particular—those on Luke viii. 4-15, the Parable of the Sower—the Gospel of the Day for Sexagesima Sunday—supply us with important information as to his views on this point.⁶

Before everything else Wiclif holds up the truth that the preaching of the Word of God is that function which subserves, in a degree quite peculiar to itself, the edification of the Church; and this is so, because the Word of God is a seed (Luke viii. 11, "The seed is the Word of God"). In reflecting upon this truth, he is filled with wonder, and exclaims, "O marvellous power of the Divine Seed! which overpowers strong men in arms, softens hard hearts, and

renews and changes into divine men, men who had been brutalised by sins, and departed infinitely far from God. Obviously such a high morality could never be worked by the word of a priest, if the Spirit of Life and the Eternal Word did not, above all things else, work with it."

But the grander and more exalted the view which Wiclif takes of the preacher's office, so much the more has he an open eye for the faults and deficiencies of the actual average preacher of his own time. As the worst of these, he censures the evil practice of not preaching God's Word, but setting forth stories, fables, or poems, which were altogether foreign to the Bible. He refers again and again to this subject in sermons both of his earlier and later years, as well as in treatises and tracts.⁷ We have no ground to assume that sermons of the kind he censures were not preached upon some Bible text. It is rather to be supposed that the preachers, after giving out a text from the Scripture for form's sake, were none the less accustomed to draw the main contents of their sermons from other sources. There were not even wanting instances of preachers who were bold enough to dispense with a Scripture text, and to choose something else. Even an Archbishop of Canterbury, and a learned scholastic and cardinal, Stephan Langton, †1228, saw nothing offensive in taking for the text of a short Latin sermon which still exists, a dancing-song in old French, allegorically applying, indeed, "the Fair Alice," and all that is said of her, to the Holy Virgin.⁸ Things of this sort, however, may have been of comparatively rare occurrence; but in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it had become almost a prevailing pulpit-fashion, instead of opening up Bible thoughts, and applying them to life, to draw the materials of sermons from civil and natural history, from the legendary stores of the Church, and even from the fable-world of the middle ages, and the mythology of the heathen gods. If a priest, on a Saint's Day, recounted the miracles of the saint as set out in his legend, this had still some claim to be listened to as a piece of sacred history. But the *Gesta Romanorum*, and all manner of tales and fables, taken from profane sources like Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,⁹ were made use of by preachers, if not for the edification, at least for the entertainment of their hearers.

The taste for allegorical interpretations and applications, as these gradually came into general use, helped men over every objection to the practice, and the craving for entertainment of this description grew always the stronger the less preachers were able to supply the souls of men

with wholesome refreshment from the eternal fountain of the Word of God. No wonder that sermons often became a web whose woof and weft consisted of all other threads save those of Bible truth. And it was precisely those men of the fourteenth century who were specially trained for the work of popular preaching—namely the Dominicans and the Franciscans—who humoured the corrupt taste of the time, and flavoured their pulpit addresses with such stories and ✓buffooneries. If the multitude were amused for the moment, and the begging friar who tickled their ears got his reward of a collection,¹⁰ the end aimed at was gained, and the Penny-Preacher (as Brother Berthold of Regensburg, as early as the thirteenth century, calls this set of preachers) could go on his way rejoicing.

It is nothing wonderful that even Catholic literary historians, like the learned continuators of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, condemn a style of pulpit eloquence such as this; or that even in the beginning of last century a Dominican like the learned Jakob Eckard, pronounced the stories with which the brethren of his Order were accustomed to amuse their audiences, to be “stale and absurd.”¹¹ But if a contemporary like Wiclif was able to see these serious evils in their true light, and condemned them in so decided a tone, we have here a proof that his judgment had been enlightened and sharpened by the Word of God; and all the more so that he was himself a large sharer in many of the pulpit faults of his own time in other respects.

✓ The second objection which he took to the prevailing pulpit fashion of his age, was that even when the Word of God was preached this was not done in the right way. Preachers were in the habit of breaking down the Bible-✓thoughts into the smallest and finest particles, and of making moral applications of them in a style so loaded with ornaments of all kinds, including even the use of rhyme, that the language of Scripture was thrust into the background, and the language of the preacher came alone to be regarded, as if he were himself the author and discoverer of God's truth. This practice, he remarks, comes from nothing else but the pride of men, every one seeking his own honour, every one preaching only himself and not Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 5). On all such preaching Wiclif pronounced the judgment that it is a dead word, and not the word of our Lord Jesus Christ—not the word of eternal life (John vi. 68). And it was this prevailing want of the true seed of the word of life which was to blame, in his view, for the spiritual deadness of the

people, and for the wickedness which, as the fruit of this deadness, prevailed in the world.

These were weighty truths, having a bearing much wider than a mere reform of preaching, and looking in the direction of a reformation of the Church at large, yea of a regeneration of Christendom from the life-seed of the Word of God. Meanwhile, let us limit ourselves to the pulpit, and take a close view of the strictures which Wiclif makes on the prevalent preaching of his time. Even in cases where God's Word is preached, and not matters of quite another kind, he censures, as already remarked, the manner in which this is done, and what he disapproves of is twofold—first, the scholastic form of preaching; and next, its rhetorical ornamentation.¹²

As to the former, Wiclif takes notice of the method of endless logical distinctions and divisions.¹³ This practice had found its way into the pulpits from the lecture rooms of the scholastics. It was connected with the whole dialectic habit of the middle age, a habit which appeared in frequent definitions, hair-splitting divisions and sub-divisions, and in endless syllogistic processes of proof. Hence arose a series of treatises on Method, in particular of helps to the preparation of sermons; e.g., a treatise by an anonymous author of the year 1390, under the title of *The Art of making Sermons*, in which the syllogism is held up as the ground form to which everything else is to be reduced.

As to the other point, the rhetorical and poetical ornament with which preachers thought they were bound to set off their sermons, Wiclif repeatedly returns to it.¹⁴ He goes into this subject so minutely as to enumerate and set in their true light the grounds upon which men sought to excuse if not to justify the practice, in order to bring into the light the self-conceit which lay at the bottom of it, and to warn preachers against it.

The first ground which was alleged in support of the practice was that there was a necessity to give up the old style of preaching and introduce a new one, otherwise there would be no longer any difference between a thoroughly-schooled divine and a poorly-educated priest of the middling sort. To this ground Wiclif allows no weight whatever. It savours, he justly remarks, of nothing else but vain glory, and a desire to take precedence of others. "Not so, beloved. Let us rather follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was humble enough to confess, 'My doctrine is not mine, but the Father's who sent me. He who speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory.'"

The second ground upon which men took their stand was this: every subject treated of must have a form answerable to itself. Now, theology is the most perfect of all subjects. It behoves, therefore, to be clothed in the most honourable and beautiful form, and that is the dress of oratory and poetry. Wisdom only becomes perfect when it is set off with eloquence. But to these ideas Wiclif opposes himself in the most decided manner. This ornamental speech upon which men so plume themselves is so little in keeping with the subject of God's Word that the latter is corrupted by it, and its power paralysed for the conversion and regeneration of souls. God's Word, according to Augustin, has a peculiar and incomparable eloquence of its own, with all its simplicity and modesty of form.

The third ground relied upon was an appeal to the poetical form of several books of the Old Testament, from which it was argued that it is the duty of a theologian to be guided by this precedent, especially as poetry has a charm of its own, and is further of advantage for helping the memory. To which Wiclif replies—"It is one thing to sing a spiritual song and another to speak a word of warning. The measure of verse has, it is true, a certain charm, but only a sensuous charm, which rather draws off the soul of the hearer from the spiritual and eternal subject of discourse, and destroys his taste for spiritual nourishment."

How sound and good, and worthy of being laid to heart even at the present day, these thoughts of Wiclif are, it is hardly necessary for us to point out at any length. But his criticism has a positive as well as a negative side, and bears upon both the two questions which have here to be distinguished—what to preach, and how to preach it. To the first he replies, as what precedes shows, it is God's Word that should be preached, for God's Word is the bread of souls, the indispensable, wholesome bread; and therefore, he thinks, to feed the flock, in a spiritual sense, without Bible truth, is the same thing as if one were to prepare for another a bodily meal without bread.¹⁵ God's Word is the life-seed which begets regeneration and spiritual life.¹⁶ Now, the chief business of a preacher is to beget and to nourish up members of the Church.¹⁷ Therefore it is God's Word he must preach; then only will he succeed in these aims. This was why the Church of Christ grew so mighty when the Gospel was preached by the Apostles, whereas at the present day the Church is continually decreasing for the want of this spiritual seed.¹⁸ If the prophets of the Old Testament

preface their prophecies with "Thus saith the Lord," and if the Apostles proclaim the Word of the Lord, so must we too preach God's Word and proclaim the Gospel according to the Scriptures.¹⁹ There is one point in particular to which Wiclif draws attention—that believing Christian men, who are really preaching the Gospel, must necessarily give the first place to the preaching of the Gospel *history*, for in that holy history lies the faith of the Church, which the congregation is bound to learn and know.²⁰ "The priests learn and teach holy Scripture for this purpose, that the Church may learn to know the walk of Christ, and may be led to love Christ himself."²¹

To the question, How ought the Word of God to be preached? Wiclif replies in general terms, that the truth which edifies ought to be uttered aptly. Of course this taken alone does not amount to much. Coming close to the subject, he calls to his aid the general rule, that every mean subservient to an end is so much the better adapted to that end, the shorter and completer the way is in which it leads to it (*compendiosius et copiosius*). As now the sowing of God's Word is the appointed mean for the glory of God and the edification of our neighbour, it is plain that the sowing is all the more aptly done the more shortly and completely it fulfils that end. But, without doubt, this is the case with a plain and simple mode of address (*plana locutio*), and this mode is therefore that which ought to be made choice of.²² In another place Wiclif expresses his preference for a humble and homely proclamation of the Gospel, and by this he no doubt meant nothing else than this plainness and simplicity of language. And he proceeds on the same principle when he remarks—"It was because a flowery and captivating style of address cannot fail to be of little account wherever the right substance of preaching is present, that Christ promises to His disciples (Matt. x. 19) no more than that it would be given to them *what* they should say. The *how* must then follow in a manner suitable to the *what*."²³ That the *admonitions* which occur in a sermon should be suitable to the state of the audience is a self-evident deduction from the same principle. The utterance given to the truth ought to be apposite and fitting (*apte loqui veritatem*). Only one thing must never on any account be wanting—genuine devout feeling—the *fidelis sermonis ministratio*—from which everything in the sermon is the outcome. "If the soul is not in tune with the words, how can the words have power? If thou hast no love, thou art sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."²⁴ Still there is nothing inconsistent with this in

the requirement that the preacher should use sharpness of speech (*acuti sermones*) upon proper occasions. Wiclif remarks that it must not be supposed that sharpness includes in it malice or ill-feeling. Christ contended sharply with the Pharisees, but he did so out of a pious heart and from love to the Church.²⁸ His last observation on the subject is the crowning one, that "in every proclamation of the Gospel the true teacher must address himself to the heart, so as to flash the light into the spirit of the hearer, and to bend his will into obedience to the truth."²⁸

Such are the positive requirements which Wiclif lays down for preaching and preachers. Let us see how far he complied with them himself as a preacher, taking into view his Latin as well as his English sermons.²⁹ What does he preach? He will preach God's Word, not man's; not worldly things will he preach, but the saving truth. This is what we feel to be his spirit everywhere. That he always takes his texts from the Bible, either from the Church lessons or freely chosen texts, according to circumstances, is a matter of slight importance. But he is also fond of connecting one Bible text with another—one lesson for the day with another, *e.g.*, to combine one Sunday Gospel with the Gospel for the preceding Sunday, or with the epistle for the same; and while doing so, he dwells with admiration upon the excellencies of the Word of God, as when he observes in one place, that Scripture truths stand in such an intimate connection with each other, that every one of them lends support to every other, and all of them unite in the revelation of God.³⁰

Further, in all cases where he pronounces a judgment upon any doctrine which is before him, or upon any ecclesiastical custom and institution, it is always the Bible which he employs as the standard. He goes back to the teaching of the Redeemer; he points to the Apostles and their procedure; the authority of the Primitive Church is everywhere appealed to. To bring out the doctrine of the Scriptures (*fides Scripturæ*) as of supreme authority, is his highest aim. And how much his sermons are saturated with Bible thoughts and interwoven in their whole tissue of thinking and presentation with Bible reminiscences, the sermon marked No. III. in the Appendix, may be taken as a proof, which is given as a sample. And with reference to Wiclif's advice mentioned above, that the Biblical history especially should be preached to the people, it should not pass without mention that he very frequently narrates, in a clear and simple style, the history contained in the Gospel for the day, interweaving the story with explanatory remarks.

After doing so, it is true, he not unfrequently passes on to set forth the "mystical sense" of the passage. On one occasion he justifies this with the words, "To get at a meaning of this history, which will be good for the edification of the people, its mystical sense has to be considered."³¹ I find, however, that Wiclif's "mystical interpretation," as he makes use of it in the Latin sermons, sometimes consists in nothing more than a simple bringing out of religious truths, and a moral application to his hearers, and to the present time, of the features of the history which he takes for his text.

There are many things, indeed, largely handled in these sermons, which are far from being Biblical subjects, such, *e.g.*, as the Standing and the Rights of the Papacy, the Landed Endowments of the Church, Monachism, and particularly the Mendicant Orders, etc. In this way much matter is brought into discussion, and polemically handled, which is ecclesiastical and even ecclesiastico-political; and this seems at first sight to be out of keeping with his own principle, that the matter of preaching should be God's Word. But when I look into the scope and object of these polemical and ecclesiastico-political discussions, I come to this result, that it is always the Bible which the preacher applies to these questions as his rule of judgment, and that he has never any other aim in view but to establish Apostolic doctrines, and to realise again, in the present, the conditions of the primitive Church. It would be an injustice, therefore, to look upon all these parts of his sermons as digressions, by which Wiclif became untrue to his own principle, that the Gospel is the proper subject of all preaching. There is only one thing about his sermons which must at once be conceded, and that is that the innermost kernel of the Gospel (according to the conviction of evangelical Christendom in our own time) is not to be met with in them, *i.e.*, the doctrine of reconciliation through Jesus Christ and the way of salvation, especially of the justification of the sinner through faith. But this is not the proper place to go into this fact, to which we shall hereafter return in our analysis of Wiclif's doctrine.

When we examine the sermons of Wiclif in reference to their form, their manner of presentation, style, and tone, we meet also here with appearances which cannot but seem strange to us when put alongside of his own principles respecting the form of preaching. For we find scholastic formulæ, abstract ideas, formal definitions, learned investigations, syllogistic and dialectical argumentation, all in a measure which we should not have expected from him in

view of the homiletic maxims which he has himself expressed. But there are two things here which we must not leave out of sight: first, the circumstance that the Latin sermons, as remarked above, were probably preached in Oxford before the University, or at all events, before audiences made up of men of learning. In such circumstances the preacher had no need to let himself down to so plain a style as would have been necessary in addressing a rural congregation. On the contrary, Wiclif did right to keep in view the requirements of a University church, and the style of preaching to which such hearers were accustomed. No wonder, then, that we find so much in the form of these sermons, which, to our feeling, appears more suitable to the lecture-room than the Church—to the chair of the professor than to the pulpit. And secondly, in order to form a just judgment, we ought not to under-estimate the force of custom and influence which the forms of thought and style prevalent throughout the whole of a period, exercise, sometimes unconsciously, even upon the most distinguished genius.

On the other hand, however, we remark that even in these sermons there is no lack of that *plana locutio* which Wiclif recommended to preachers. The style is very often simple and clear, the mode of expression not without vividness, sometimes picturesque and apposite to popular taste, and here and there too, especially in polemical passages, not without a touch even of banter and raillery. The tone is by no means uniformly didactic; on the contrary, it rises every now and then into considerable animation—into moral pathos, as, *e.g.*, where he is speaking of prayer, and is commending general prayer in comparison with intercession for particular prayers. The preacher, after referring to an argument which was used on the other side, exclaims, "O! if the Apostle had heard this piece of subtle hair-splitting, how much would he have despised it." ³²

✓ In the English sermons, we find still more frequently a plain and popular, even a drastic style of speaking, and a moving heart-felt tone, especially when the preacher anticipates the judgment-seat and the last reckoning. In the sermon on the second Sunday of Advent, we meet with this passage, *e.g.*, "Faith in earnest in this third coming of Christ ought to draw men away from sin and attract them to virtue. For if they had to appear to-morrow morning before an earthly judge, and might either win or lose great revenues as the result, they would surely prepare themselves with all diligence for the trial. How much more so if they were to win or to lose their life itself! Lord, as we are

certain of this, that the day of the Lord will come, and we know not how soon, and as judgment will then pass upon us, to adjudge us either to life in heaven or to everlasting death in hell, how diligent do we behove to be to make ready for the event! Verily, it is our lack of faith which is to blame for our indolence; let us therefore make fast in our convictions the articles of the truth; these become loose in us like nails in a beam of timber, and so we need to drive them home with the hammer and make them fast," etc., etc.³³

Lastly, as concerns the tone of these sermons, and the moral spirit which dictates their whole contents, it will not be easy for any one who allows them to work upon him without prejudice, not to receive the impression that there is here a veritable zeal for the glory of God—a pure love to the Redeemer, and a sincere concern for the salvation of souls. There reigns throughout them a truly godly mind, whose habit is to view all that is earthly in its relations to a higher world, and to deal with it all in the light of eternity. It is impossible to think otherwise of such a preacher, so full of earnest godliness and Christian conscientiousness, but that he must have made a deep impression upon all men who did not deliberately stand aloof from the sphere of his influence and power.

SECTION II.—*Wiclif's Itinerant Preachers.*

IF Wiclif's work as a preacher in the University was important, it may be expected beforehand that he also did a true and blessed work among his flock at Lutterworth, as a parish priest. In the last years of his life, as we shall see below, he was shut out from the University of Oxford, and was thus able to devote to the pastoral office the whole time and strength which yet remained to him.

First, let us be allowed to introduce here a picture whose original has been conjectured, not without good grounds, to have been no other than Wiclif himself. Geoffrey Chaucer, the father of English poetry, as he is commonly called, was a younger contemporary of Wiclif; but though he satirises the sins and infirmities of his time without sparing even those of the clergy, he was certainly not a man whose spirit was congenial with Wiclif's. He was entirely a man of the world, of æsthetic culture, enlightened, and an enemy to all superstition, but also to all religious earnestness a stranger. He knows, however, how to value what is good and worthy of honour wherever he finds it. And so, in the prologue to his *Canterbury Tales*, which are an imitation of

Boccacio's *Decamerone*, he has interwoven the following beautiful description of a country priest, which includes, at all events, some lineaments of Wiclif:—

“ But rich he was of holy thought and work,
 He was also a learned man—a clerk,
 That Christ's Gospel truly would preach,
 His parishens devoutly would he teach.
 Benign he was, and wondrous diligent,
 And in adversity full patient ;
 And such he was yproved often sithes (times),
 Full loth were him to answer for his tithes,
 But rather would he given, out of doubt,
 Unto his poor parishioners about
 Of his offering, and eke of his substance.
 He could in little thing have suffisance.
 Wide was his parish, and houses far asunder,
 But he ne left nought for ne rain nor thunder.
 In sickness and in nischief, to visit
 The farthest in his parish, much and lit (great and small),
 Upon his feet, and in his hand a staff.
 This noble example to his sheep he yaf (gave),
 That first he wrought and afterward he taught.”

There are several features of this portrait which agree with the character of Wiclif, and not a single feature can be detected in it which does not suit him. The humility, the contentment, and the unselfishness; the moral spotlessness, the compassionate love, the conscientious and diligent faithfulness in his office, and the Biblical matter of his sermons,—these lineaments are all apposite. The learning of the man is also made prominent. Pre-eminently like him also is the oneness of teaching and conduct exhibited in the picture; the doing of the good going before the teaching of it. The remark of Vaughan, indeed, has some ground, that in these characteristics of a country priest, the grand features of Wiclif as a Reformer are entirely wanting. But this circumstance by no means tells against the conjecture that the poet intended to paint Wiclif as a pastor, and nothing else. For it is not merely doubtful, but in the highest degree improbable, that Chaucer had any appreciation of the great Reformation-thoughts and strivings of Wiclif, or ever gave them any recognition in a practical form. Chaucer took up a position in reference to ecclesiastical matters which may most readily be compared with the mode of thought of many of the humanists at the beginning of the sixteenth century—an open eye and a mocking laugh for all clerical failings and weaknesses, but no heart for the earnestness and the sanctity of the subject. But undoubtedly he had a sense for moral excellence in humble life.

If Wiclif, by his conscientious faithfulness in the pastoral cure, stood forth as a model preacher and pastor, he worked in this way effectually for the elevation of the office, even if he had done nothing more. But he did not confine himself to this: both by word and deed he laboured to promote everywhere the right preaching of the Gospel, and the most effective instrumentality which he used for that end was the institution of a Preaching Itinerancy.

It has long been known that Wiclif sent out itinerant preachers of the Gospel. Lewis, it is true, only touches the subject incidentally, in so far as he mentions one or another English tract in which Wiclif speaks of "poor priests," and in their defence. Vaughan, on the other hand, has gone fully into the subject, and has given a clear and distinct picture of those diligent and devoted men.³⁴ Shirley also has determined several interesting points of view in regard to the whole institution.³⁵ The subject is now well understood to a certain extent. There are still, however, certain questions of importance relating to it, which have never yet received an answer, or rather it has hardly yet occurred to any one to propose them. The questions are these: At what date did Wiclif begin to send out itinerant preachers? And how was he led to entertain the idea of such a step at all? It happens in this case, as so often in history—an important phenomenon steps, mature and in full form, into the light. While it was preparing itself in the silence it was never thought of; all at once it stands revealed before the world.

At the end of May 1382, the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Courtenay, in a mandate addressed to the Bishop of London, spoke of "certain unauthorised itinerant preachers who, as he had unhappily been compelled to learn, set forth erroneous, yea, heretical assertions in public sermons, not only in churches, but also in public squares and other profane places," and "they do this," as he adds with special emphasis, under the guise of great holiness, but without having obtained any episcopal or papal authorisation."³⁶ That the Primate means by these men real Wiclifite itinerants, appears with certainty from the twenty-four articles of doctrine annexed to the mandate, all of which, with hardly an exception, belong to Wiclif. To this same date must also belong several English tracts in which Wiclif undertakes the defence of the proceedings of the itinerants.

It is clear that in May 1382, the preaching itinerancy was already in full swing. But we should like to know its first beginnings, for it is only there we can get an insight into

the motives and causes which conspired to give it birth. On that subject Wiclif himself could best have given us information; but he was not the man to speak much of a matter before he took action in it. At the utmost he justified and defended afterwards what had been done.

It might be supposed that it was first at Lutterworth, in his quiet rural charge, that Wiclif began to send forth itinerant preachers. In this case the presumption would have readily offered itself, that he had sought and found in this new institute a substitute for the wider and more stirring sphere of work from which he had been cut off. To me, however, it appears, on more than one ground, that Oxford was the cradle of the new institution. First of all, it lies in the nature of the subject that the sending forth of itinerants could only have developed itself gradually, and in the course of several years. But as in May 1382, the public attention was already drawn to it, and the itinerancy had manifestly been already for some time in full operation,³⁷ this takes us several years farther back, to a date when Wiclif resided in the University for a good part, at least, of every year. Besides, the work did not consist merely in the sending out of the preachers; they must be prepared beforehand for their calling. This was the capital point, and this again could not be done in a hurry. This consideration carries our eye naturally to the University, especially as in the small town of Lutterworth we can hardly imagine such a circle of educated theologians being collected round the parish priest, even though the priest was a Wiclif. It is far easier to suppose that Wiclif, while still in Oxford, entered into close relations to a number of young men who were in part graduates in Arts and in part youths under age who were still in their undergraduate course. It is independently probable that a personality of such high distinction, as well in the field of learning as in practical church work, should have drawn around himself not a few susceptible young men, who desired to carry on their culture still further under his guidance.

What we could not fail to conjecture beforehand is found to be confirmed by positive proof. An enthusiastic follower of Wiclif—William Thorpe—in his examination before the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Arundel, gave the following information concerning the course of his own studies, and his relation to Wiclif: "I begged my parents for permission to go to such men as were reputed to be wise and virtuous priests, in order to receive their counsel, and to be instructed by them in the office and calling of

the priesthood. As my father and mother gave their willing and hearty consent to this, I betook myself to those priests of whom I had heard that they bore the best names, and led the holiest lives—the most learned too, and the wisest in point of heavenly wisdom. And I remained long enough in intercourse with them to be convinced, by their constant occupation in what was virtuous and good, that their works, so rich in charity and worthy of all honour, even exceeded the fame which I had earlier heard of them. It was then my endeavour, after the example of their doctrine, but principally of their godly and blameless works, to come to a perfect knowledge of God's law, to the best of my ability, with the will and desire to frame my life accordingly." In the further course of his examination the Archbishop inquired, Who then were those holy and wise men whose instruction he had engaged? Whereupon Thorpe replied, "Magister John Wiclif was held by right many for the greatest scholar of that day; he was spoken of, at the same time, as a man of strict religious principles, and blameless in his walk." But, besides Wiclif himself, Thorpe names several of his admirers, such as John Aston, Nicolas Hereford, John Purvey, and others, and then continues thus,—“With all these men I was right-well acquainted, and for a long time had much intercourse with them, and received instructions from them; but from Wiclif himself most of all, as the most virtuous and most godly wise man whom I ever heard of, or whom I ever in my life became acquainted with.”³⁸

The whole account sounds as though Thorpe had enjoyed the instruction of all these men at the same time. If this is so, then we cannot think of Lutterworth, but only of Oxford, as the place where Thorpe had cultivated intercourse with those worthy men, and especially with Wiclif himself. This confession, therefore, leads us directly to the assumption that Wiclif had already begun in Oxford to train younger men to the priestly office, and in particular to the office of preaching. We shall scarcely err, if we assume that Wiclif, as long as he worked in Oxford as a Doctor of Theology, and was in the habit of preaching frequently, if not regularly, before the University, formed there a training school of preachers,—a sort of Priest Seminary, which, however, was of an entirely private and voluntary character. I have not a moment's doubt, that while he was still in Oxford, Wiclif sent out as voluntary itinerant preachers, young men belonging to this circle, which had attached itself so

closely to his person, and had embraced his theological views and convictions as well as his practical Church principles. Perhaps the entrance which the first preachers of his school found among the people, and the warm acceptance which their sermons obtained in the country districts, gave fresh courage to himself and his scholars, so that the first itinerants were followed by ever increasing numbers, and the whole undertaking gradually took root and extended itself. Wiclif, of course, when, at a later period, he withdrew entirely to Lutterworth, did not give up this agency, but carried it on with all the more zeal, the more painfully he felt that, by his dismissal from the University, a field of richly blessed work had been closed to his ministry.

But how was this agency meant? and how did the affair develop itself in actual life? Was it meant that a systematic rivalry and opposition should be made by the itinerants against the parochial clergy? The opponents of the movement naturally viewed it in this light, and even at the present day there are not wanting Roman Catholic historians who have admitted to their minds this idea.³⁹ But how can this view of the subject be even thinkable, when the itinerants, on this supposition, would have pronounced sentence of condemnation upon the venerated master himself, who was never himself one of the itinerant preachers, but preferred to work precisely in the character of a parish priest among his own flock. Moreover, the hierarchy would certainly not have omitted to accuse the itinerants of hostility to the parochial clergy, and the calumination of their characters; but of this I find not a single trace. All they are accused of is that they promulgate erroneous doctrine, and that they preach at their own hand without episcopal sanction. This, indeed, is only an *argumentum ex silentio*. But I am able to appeal, in support of the opposite view, to express testimonies as well, and these from Wiclif's own mouth. In his little book, *Of the Pastoral Office*, he does battle, indeed, with much degeneracy among the parochial clergy, with their worldliness, with their neglect in preaching the Gospel, with the evil custom of non-residence in their parishes.⁴⁰ Already, too, he appears as the advocate of "the simple priests," i.e., the evangelical itinerants; but he stands up at the same time for the parish priests, if they only do their duty in some sort. He defends their rights against the encroachments of the begging monks, and also in the face of the incorporation of parish tithes with foundations and monasteries, he roundly and clearly lays down the

principle, that all parishes should be able to pay for the ministrations which their pastors in humility render to them.⁴¹ Also in his Latin sermons, Wiclif blames, it is true, those parish priests who are "dumb dogs, and cannot bark" (Is. lvi. 10), or who preach only for selfish ends and ambition;⁴² but still he expects also great things from true and prudent pastors,⁴³ and lays upon the heart of the parochial clergy, the Redeemer's admonition, "Watch." It is their duty to keep watch over their flocks. And at the end of the tract to be mentioned below—*Why Poor Priests have no Tithes*—Wiclif gives the express assurance, that these priests, notwithstanding this difference in their position, pronounce no condemnation upon those pastors who do their duty and teach truly and steadfastly the law of God in opposition to the prophets and the decrees of the wicked fiend.⁴⁵ According to all this, there is certainly no ground to assume that the Wiclifite itinerants allowed themselves to run down the parochial clergy as such without distinction; although it cannot of course admit of a doubt that with regard to unconscientious and worldly-minded pastors and preachers, they were in the habit of expressing themselves in no very measured language.

The sending forth of these itinerant preachers was a measure which, so far as I see, passed through several stages of development. In its first stage, the preachers were exclusively men who had already received orders. This appears from the title which Wiclif is wont to apply to them. In his work on *The Pastoral Office*, he calls them sometimes "presbyters," sometimes "priests," and yet in such a way as to indicate clearly by the connection, or by the use of epithets like *faithful* or *simple* priests, or presbyters, what description of clergy he means. However much his opponents may have looked down upon such men, as "uneducated" and "stupid"—a reproach which Wiclif bravely takes to be levelled against himself as well as others⁴⁶—they must still have been men who had received ordination, otherwise Wiclif would certainly never have applied to them the names of priests. And yet this name occurs both in his Latin writings and in his English sermons and tracts.⁴⁷ With this also agrees the justification of the free preaching of every priest, which William Thorpe put forth in his examination before Archbishop Arundel a quarter of a century later, and which, without doubt, originally proceeded from the teaching of Wiclif himself. Thorpe expresses himself

in the following terms:—"By the authority of the Word of God, and also of several saints and doctors, I have been brought to the conviction that it is the office and duty of every priest, faithfully, freely, and truly to preach God's Word.⁴⁵ Without doubt, every priest, in determining to take orders, behoved to do so chiefly with the object of preaching the Word of God to the people to the best of his ability. We are accordingly bound by Christ's command and holy example, and also by the testimony of his holy apostles and prophets, under heavy pains, to exercise ourselves in such wise, as to fulfil this duty of the priesthood to the best of our knowledge and powers. We believe that this is the chief duty of every priest: to make God's will known to his people by faithful labour, and to publish it to them in the spirit of love, to the best of our ability, where, when, and to whomsoever we may; this, by the high warrant of God's Word, is our true duty."

Thorpe, who was an itinerant of Wiclif's school, speaks in this passage as a priest himself, and in the name of others like-minded with himself, who were also in priest's orders.

But even in this first stage, where only priests went out as itinerants—two sub-stages must, I think, be distinguished from one another. At the beginning of the movement, it was scarcely laid down as a principle, that no one was to accept a pastoral charge. At a later stage, men made a virtue of necessity, and the principle was adopted, that even if such a charge might be obtained, it was better not to accept it. This is the position taken in the tract, *Why Poor Priests have no Benefice*,⁴⁶ and the principle just named is justified on three grounds. 1. Generally speaking, no benefice is to be obtained without simony, whether the right of collation be in the hands of a prelate or a temporal lord. 2. That the beneficed priest, by reason of his dependence upon his ecclesiastical superiors, will be compelled to give up to them, contrary to right, all that portion of his revenues which exceeds his own necessities, and which by God's law and public right, ought to be expended upon the poor. 3. A priest without benefice, not being bound to a particular parish, and being free of the jurisdiction of sinful men, is left at liberty to preach the Gospel wherever he can be of use, and can also without hindrance flee from one city to another, according to Christ's instruction, in case he should be persecuted by the "clergy of Antichrist."

But in the second stage of the matter, a step full of

importance was taken in advance. The adoption of lay preaching was resolved upon, as it had been practised before among the Waldensians, with whom lay preaching had been a powerful factor of their whole movement; and yet, (so far at least as I know the writings of Wiclif), he was not at all aware of this precedent, and acted quite independently of it.

That lay preachers appeared among the Lollards after Wiclif's death does not admit of a doubt, but that even in his lifetime, and with his knowledge and approval, laymen were employed as itinerant preachers, I believe I am able to prove. It is certainly no accidental circumstance that Wiclif in sermons of his latest years, when he refers to his beloved itinerants, no longer speaks of them as poor priests, or *simple* or believing priests, but on all occasions applies to them the names of *evangelical men*, or "apostolic men."⁵⁰ It looks as if, in such places, he intentionally avoided the name of priests, because this was now no longer applicable to all the itinerants. But still more clearly does this appear from a passage in the "Dialogus," or "*Speculum Ecclesiae Militantis*." In this piece, which was written, certainly not earlier than 1381, and probably not before 1383, when comparing the beneficed clergy with the itinerants, he makes use of these words: "And as respects the fruits of preaching, it appears certain that a single unlearned preacher effects more, by the grace of God, for the edification of the Church of Christ than many who have graduated in schools or colleges, because the former scatters the seed of the law of Christ more humbly and more abundantly both in deed and in word."⁵¹ But the most convincing passage of all, to my mind, is that which occurs in one of his later sermons, where Wiclif shows with great emphasis that for a ministry in the Church the Divine call and commission are perfectly sufficient; there is an installation by God Himself, although the bishop has given in such a case no imposition of hands, in accordance with his traditions.⁵²

If the fact was so, as we have now, we believe, shown to be probable, that the "Itinerancy" began at a time when Wiclif still belonged to the University, we are justified in further assuming that Oxford was the starting-point, and that the country immediately surrounding this city was the first theatre of the new movement. It then spread itself from thence more widely in the land. From several facts, attested by written documents, it appears that the town of Leicester was a second centre of the Wiclifite itinerancy—a fact which was, no doubt, connected with the

circumstance that in the last years of his life Wiclif had his settled residence in Lutterworth, which lay in the county of Leicester. One of the first who appeared as an itinerant preacher was John of Aston. He was followed, also in Wiclif's life-time, by William Thorpe, already mentioned, and others. These men went forth in long garments of coarse red woollen cloth, bare-foot, and staff in hand, in order to represent themselves as pilgrims, and their wayfaring as a kind of pilgrimage; their coarse woollen dress being a symbol of their poverty and toil ("poor priests"). Thus they wandered from village to village, from town to town, and from county to county, without stop or rest, preaching, teaching, warning, wherever they could find willing hearers, sometimes in church or chapel, wherever any such stood open for prayer and quiet devotion; sometimes in the church-yard when they found the church itself closed; and sometimes in the public street or market place.⁵³

Their sermons were, before everything else, full of Bible truth. This was to be expected from them, for these men had all gone forth from Wiclif's school, had imbibed his principles, and had all formed themselves as preachers upon his model. They had learned to regard as their chief duty "the faithful scattering of the seed of God's Word;" and their sole aim was to minister sound nourishment to the people.⁵⁴ "God's Word," "God's Law," therefore, was not only their text, but their theme; and it agrees perfectly with the picture which we could not fail beforehand to draw for ourselves, when the Leicester chronicler, who tells us that he had more than once been a hearer of their preaching, testifies that the preachers were continually enforcing that "no man could become righteous and well-pleasing to God who did not hold to God's law, for that," says he, "was their favourite expression—'Goddis lawe,'⁵⁵ to which they were ever appealing in all their addresses." Wiclif himself, in his English tract, *Of Good Prechyng Prestis*, sets forth, that their first aim was directed to this, that God's law should at all times be known, taught, applied, and highly regarded.⁵⁶

But that these sermons or exhortations⁵⁷ were less of a dogmatic than an ethical character, we may gather not only from the name which, after Wiclif's example, they were in the habit of applying to the Word of God,—viz., God's law,—but also from the confirmatory statements of Wiclif and their opponents. In the tract just mentioned, Wiclif states that the second aim of the "good preaching priests" was that all gross open sins prevailing among different ranks, and

also the hypocrisy and erroneous teaching of Antichrist and his followers, *i.e.*, the Pope and the Popish clergy, should be done away; while, in the third place, they strove to promote true love in all Christendom, and especially in England, and so to help men to reach securely the blessedness of heaven.⁵⁸

The form and language of these addresses behoved, according to Wiclif's principles, to be plain and simple.⁵⁹ But these men, according to all the notices which we possess of them, must have been in the habit of using language of a very emphatic and trenchant description: and this, as well when they laboured directly for the awakening and moral regeneration of the people, setting eternity before their eyes, and exhorting them to live in Christian brotherhood and peace and beneficence, as when they depicted the prevailing sins of the time, held up before all ranks their vices and lusts, and especially exposed to reprobation the vices of the clergy—their hypocrisy, sensuality, avarice and ambition. From the description given of these popular discourses by the ear-witness of Leicester, entirely adverse as he was to the movement, one receives a vivid impression both of the winning attractiveness and unction, and of the arresting and subduing power by which they must have been characterised.⁶⁰ When we remember the moral earnestness, and the crushing power which we have felt in Wiclif himself as a preacher, we cannot wonder that his scholars also, men in earnest with "God's Law," should have rebuked the prevailing sins of the time without reserve and with all sharpness. Of course this severity of speech, especially when they directed it against the hierarchy, offended the latter in the highest degree, and slanders were spread about the preachers, that the only thing they were able to do was to abuse the prelates behind their backs; they were undermining the whole frame of the Church; they were serpents casting forth deadly poison.⁶¹

Against these calumnies Wiclif defended his followers in a tract entitled *The Deceits of Satan and his Priests*. "Almighty God who is full of love, gave commandment to his prophets to cry aloud, to spare not, and to show to the people their great sins (Isaiah lviii. 1). The sin of the common people is great, the sin of the lords, the mighty and the wise, is greater, but greatest of all is the sin of the prelates, and most blinding to the people. And therefore are true men by God's commandment bound to cry out the loudest against the sin of the prelates, because it

is in itself the greatest, and to the people of greatest mischief." ⁶²

Wiclif, as we before had occasion to see, sent forth a considerable number of tracts which related exclusively, or at least chiefly, to the itinerant preachers of his school. There are still extant both English and Latin writings of this kind. Those in English are all defences of the preachers, some of them taking the form of controversy against their opponents. To this class belong, *e.g.*, the following tracts:—*Of Good Preaching Priests*,⁶³ *Why Poor Priests have no Benefices*,⁶⁴ *Of Feigned Contemplative Life*,⁶⁵ *Of Obedience to Prelates*,⁶⁶ *Mirror of Antichrist*.⁶⁷ These writings, it is true, are all placed by Arnold among the works of doubtful authenticity. Among the Latin writings is, *e.g.*, the small tract, *Of Academic Degrees*, including a defence of the itinerants; the sole object of which is to prove that the preaching of the Gospel by men who are not graduates is justified by the Scriptures, and allowed by the Church.⁶⁸

While the tracts hitherto named treat chiefly of the itinerants, but were in the first instance intended less for them than for the people, and in part for the learned class (such as the tract last mentioned), there is also a small book which I find among Wiclif's writings, which was composed primarily and directly for those simple preachers themselves. I refer to the tract of *The Six Yokes*. For as to the so-called *Letter to the Simple Priests*, it is neither, as I have been convinced for some years, a real letter in form (although it occurs under this title in two catalogues of Wiclif's writings made at the beginning of the fifteenth century), nor does it relate to the itinerants, but obviously treats of ordinary parish priests. The whole appears to me to be a fragment either taken from some tractate, or (which I think quite possible) from a Latin sermon.⁶⁹

The tract of *The Six Yokes*, on the other hand, appears to me to have been designed by Wiclif for those of his friends who devoted themselves to the itinerancy. Its very commencement indicates this,—“In order that unlearned and simple preachers, who are burning with zeal for souls, may have materials for preaching,” etc. And as this is the only tract of Wiclif known to us which was written for this purpose, and is besides fitted to give us some insight into the substance of these popular preachings, and particularly into their moral exhortations and reproofs, I think it advisable to publish it at full length, in Appendix No. 7. I must here remark, however, that the materials of this tract

were originally interwoven with several of his Latin sermons, and were only subsequently formed into an independent whole. For I find in the *Saints' Day Sermons*, some of the same portions which now form several chapters of the tract.¹⁰ The English sermons, too, lately issued by the Clarendon Press, leave the impression, at least in several places, of being sketches intended by the author for the use of others rather than his own. At the end of the very first of them, *e.g.*, occurs the remark, "In this Gospel of the day priests have occasion to speak of the false pride of the rich, and of the luxurious living of great men of the world, and of the long-enduring pains of hell and the blessedness of heaven; and may so extend the sermon as circumstances require." Still more characteristic is the concluding remark of the second sermon. "Here the preacher may touch upon all manner of sins, especially those of false priests and traitors of God, whose duty it is to deal faithfully with the people for their salvation, and to show them the way of the law of Christ, and the deceitful wiles of Antichrist."¹¹ These and other passages, of which we could mention several more, lead us to the conjecture that these sermons of Wiclif were composed by him, in part at least, for the benefit of the itinerants of his school, in the way of helps and guides, and collections of materials. At all events the fact is certain that no inconsiderable part of the literary labours of Wiclif centred in the Institute founded by him for this preaching itinerancy, and was designed to be serviceable to the preachers, either in the way of defending them from attack, or assisting them in their work.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI.

1. Comp. Shirley, *Fasc. Zizan.*, 305. *Cum Magister Nicolaus* (Hereford) in *Quadragesima prædicasset publice in Ecclesia B. Virginis in lingua latina coram toto clero*, etc.

2. *Evangelia de Sanctis*, No. 3, fol. 5, col. 2 of the Vienna MS. 3928. (Dénis CCCC.)

3. Twelfth Sermon, fol. 28, col. 4 of the same MS.:—*Nam frater alienigena, de regno suo portans pecuniam paucam, ut theologiam discat Oxonia, etc.*

4. No. 24 in the Twenty-four Miscellaneous Sermons, fol. 185 f. of the same MS.

5. The two oldest extant catalogues of Wiclif's writings, found in two Vienna MSS., dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century, agree in giving this collection the title XL. *Sermones compositi dum stetit in scholis*, in contrast to another collection which is entitled, *Sermones XX. compositi in fine vite sue*. This confirms the correctness of an observation which I had made before this notice was known to me.

6. This collection of sermons stands beside a collection of Sermons for Saints' Days (written later), and of twenty-four Miscellaneous Sermons (also dating from Wiclif's last years), and also beside a few short essays, in the Vienna MS., 3928 (Dénis CCCC). The collection of forty sermons (which, however, number only thirty-eight) begins at fol. 193 of the MS., and the two sermons on Luke vi. 4 are the eighth and ninth in number of the collection, fol. 206-210. The second of these two is of sufficient importance, in our view, to be printed at full length in the Appendix, No. 5.

7. In the sermon last mentioned (comp. preceding note), Wiclif reminds his hearers of the exhortation of the Apostle Peter, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God;" and declares that men now-a-days in preaching do not preach the Word of God, but *gesta, poemata vel fabulas extra corpus Scripturæ*, fol. 208, col. 1. He says the same thing in the sermon preceding, fol. 208, col. 3. In a later collection of sermons, 61 *Evangelia de Sanctis*—in sermon 56 he speaks of *tragoediarum vel comoediarum et fabularum vel sententiarum apocripharum, quæ sunt hodie populo prædicatæ*. And in the work *De Officio Pastoralis*, Leipzig 1863, v. II., c. 5, p. 37, he says of the Mendicant Monks, *Et tota sollicitudo est eorum, non verba evangelica et salutis subditorum utilia seminare, sed fraudes, joca, mendacia, per quæ possunt populum facilius spoliare*. Also in the Treatise, *De Veritate S. Scripturæ*, Wiclif lays down the principle: *Theologus debet seminare veritatem Scripturæ, non gesta vel chronica mundiales*.

8. Sermo magistri Stephanus de Lungeduna, Archiep. Cantuar. de Sancta Maria, in the Arundel MSS. of the British Museum. Wright gives the whole sermon in his *Biographia Britannica* Lit. II., 446 f.

9. An elder contemporary of Wiclif, Thomas Wallays, an English Dominican, †1340, published a book, entitled *Metamorphosis Ovidiana Moraliter Explicata*, which was printed six times at least onwards from the end of the fifteenth century. Comp. *Histoire Littéraire de la France. Quatorzième siècle. Tom. XXIV.*, p. 371 and Ll. And another Dominican, an Oxford Doctor, John Bromyard, drew up a collection of histories, alphabetically arranged under certain heads, which were all intended for the use of preachers (hence the title of the work: *Summa Prædicatorum*); but his histories are in good part taken from the popular story-tellers. *Hist. Liter. de la France, XXIV.*, 372.

10. Wiclif — *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., 5 — thinks that the people should despise such monks as preachers, for an additional reason—viz., because it was their custom to make a collection immediately after their sermons.

11. In 1719, the French Dominican, James Echaré, published vol. I., and in 1722 vol. II., of a collection, in historical order, of the works of his Order, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, etc. in which he speaks strongly enough of the Dominican style of preaching in the fourteenth century, and censures those *historiolas ineptas et insulas*, II. 762.

11. In the sermon referred to above, fol. 208, col. 1, it is said of the modern preacher: *Praedicando Scripturam dividet ipsam ultra minuta naturalia, et allegabit moralizando per colores rhythmos quousque non appareat textus Scripturae*.

12. In the same sermon, fol. 208, col. 2—*Inanis gloriae cupidus est qui in nititur divisionibus verborum. Illi invicem invident qui nedom divisiones thematicas sed cujuslibet auctoritatis occurrentis ingeminant*.

13. *Arte faciendi sermones*. The tract begins with the proposition—*Haec est ars brevis et clara faciendi sermones, secundum formam syllogisticam, ad quam omnes alii modi sunt reducendi*. Comp. Hist. Liter. de la France, XXIV., 365.

14. He censures the ambitiousness which aims to exalt itself by the use of *grandia verba*, and disapproves of the attempt to give a more beautiful form to the sermon by the *color rhetoricus* and by *colligantia rhythmica*, i.e., rhymes; he goes the length even of maintaining that by this *declamatio heroica*, etc., God's Word is only falsified.

15. The twenty-second of the Sermons for Saints' Days (61 *Evangelia de Sanctis*). *Idem est spiritualiter pascere auditorium sine sententia evangelica, ac si quis faceret convivium corporale sine pane*. Vienna MS., 3928, fol. 42.

16. Miscell. Sermons, No. 8. *Verbum Dei habet vim regenerativam*. In the same MS. as above, fol. 206, col. 3.

17. The twelfth sermon of the same collection has these words—*Praecipuum officium viri ecclesiastici est gignere membra ecclesiae*, etc., fol. 52, col. 1. Again, in ninth sermon, p. 207, col. 4—*Sacerdos Domini missus ad gignendum et nutriendum populum verbo vitae*.

18. Sermons for Saints' Days, No. 22. *Quando praedicatum est ab apostolis evangelium crescit ecclesia in virtute, sed modo, ex defectu spiritualis seminis, continue decrescit*, fol. 42, col. 3.

18. In sermon 20 of a Collection of Miscellaneous Sermons—MS. 3928, fol. 176, col. 2—Wiclif says: *Auditus tam praedicantis quam etiam sermonem audientis debet fieri verbo Christi; et hinc est quod propheta legis veteris dixerunt, "haec dicit Deus," et apostoli praedicaverunt verbum Domini*. Farther on he mentions that the whole congregation testifies their veneration for the Gospel, "for when the Gospel is read the people rise to their feet and remain standing—they remove their hats and bonnets, cross themselves, and listen with attention, and kiss the wall of the church; while the men of rank lay aside their swords. And all this is done to show their devotion before the Gospel of Jesus Christ, while men oft-times deny the Gospel by their deeds.

19. In the twenty-second of the Sermons for Saints' Days, fol. 42, col. 2.

20. *Sacerdotes ad hoc discunt et docent Scripturam sacram ut ecclesia cognoscat conversationem Christi et amet eum*. MS. 3928, fol. 202, col. 4, Sermon VI.

21. Sermon 9. Appendix 3.

21. Sermons for Saints' Days, No. 31. MS. 3928, fol. 65, col. 1.

22. In the same sermon, fol. 61, col. 4.

23. No. 30 in the same collection, fol. 60, col. 3. *Verba exhortationis sunt congruentiae auditorii applicanda*.

24. XL. Miscell. Sermons, No. 8, fol. 206, col. 2.

25. XXIV. Sermons, No. 4. MS. 3928, fol. 138, col. 4.

26. Same collection, No. 20, fol. 176, col. 1.

27. Vaughan in his *Life and Opinions*, etc., published some extracts from Wiclif's English sermons, upon the basis of which Engelhard wrote his "Wykliffe as a Preacher. Erlangen 1884." But these sermons, which, in their complete form, had remained till lately in MS., have been recently given to the world in an excellent form by Thomas Arnold from the Clarendon Press, forming two volumes of Wiclif's *Select English Works*.

28. XL. Sermons, No. 11, fol. 213, col. 1.

29. Comp. XL. Miscell. Sermons, No. 5, fol. 201, col. 1.

30. XXIV. Miscell. Sermons, No. 10, fol. 153, col. 3.

31. Sermon on the Gospels, ed. Arnold, v. I, 27th serm., p. 70.

32. *Life and Opinions*, etc., II., p. 139 f.

33. Do. II., 163 f. John de Wycliffe—a monograph. 1853, p. 275 f.

34. In the preface to his edition of the *Fasc. Zizaniorum*, p. xl f. He justly remarks there that this feature of Wiclif's practical church reform has engaged the attention of his biographers much less than it ought to have done.

35. The document is printed in Wilkins' *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, III., fol. 158 f. Comp. the Missive of the same Prelate, dated two days earlier, and running in about the same terms, to the Carmelite, Peter Stokes, in Oxford. *Fasc. Ziz.*, p. 275.

36. Sane frequenti clamore et divulgata fama ad nostrum pervenit auditum, etc. *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 275.

37. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, edit. by Townsend, v. III., 256 f.

38. *E.g.*, Lingard—*History of England*, v. IV.—maintains that the Wiclif preachers thought very meanly of the whole body of the parish priests.

39. In one place—*De Officio Pastoralis*, I., c. 17—he refers to them as *pseudo-pastores*.

40. In the same treatise, II., 5, he says: *Appropriationes ecclesiarum cathedralium defraudant parochias a praedicatoribus legitimis verbi Dei. Deberet parochiis cunctis sufficere servitium, quod sacerdotes proprii humiliter subministrant.*

41. XL. Miscell. Sermon. No. 29, MS. 3928, fol. 283, col. 3.

42. Sermons for Saints' Day, No. 56 as above, fol. 117, col. 1.

43. XL. Miscell. Sermon. as above, fol. 194, col. 2.

44. Comp. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., 169.

45. *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., c. 10, p. 45. *Nobis rudibus*, comp. II., c. 4, p. 36; *dicunt de talibus presbiteris, quod sunt stolidi ac rudes.*

46. *Treue Preestis* (True Priests). Sermons published by Arnold, v. I, p. 176, f. II., p. 173, 182; *poore prestis* (poor priests), tract *Lincolniensis* in Miscellaneous Works, p. 231. *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars*, c. 36, p. 393. *Great sentence of ours expounded*, c. 9, p. 293; comp. *De ecclesia et membris ejus*, c. 2, in three Treatises, by John Wycklyffe; ed. Todd, p. xi. *This moveth por prestis* (poor priests) to speke now hertily in this mater.

47. That it is everie priest's office and duty for to preach busilife, freely, and truelie the worde of God. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, v. III., p. 260.

48. Vaughan, in *Life and Opinions*, etc., v. II., p. 164 f., has given large extracts from this tract, which he regards as an indubitable work of Wiclif; but Arnold, in his *Select Works*, vol. III., p. xx., places the tract—*Whi pore prestis han no benefice*, at least among the works of doubtful authenticity.

49. Sermons for Saints' Days, Nos. 31, 37, 53, MS. 3928, fol. 61, col. 2 and 3; fol. 76, col. 4; fol. 109, col. 1.

50. *Dialogus, or Speculum Ecclesie Militantis*, c. 27, Vienna MS. 1387 (Dénis CCCLXXXIV.), fol. 157, col. 1; and the like words again occur in full in the short piece, *De graduationibus Scholasticis*, c. 3, MS. 3928 (Dénis CCCLXXXV.), fol. 249, col. 2. The words run thus—*Quantum ad fructum, certum videtur quod unus ydiota, mediante Dei gratia, plus proficit ad edificandam Christi ecclesiam,*

quam multi graduati in scholis sive Collegiis, quia seminat humiliter et copiosius legem Christi, tam opere quam sermone.

51. Sermons for Saints' Days, No. 8, MS. 3928, fol. 17, col. 1. Videtur ergo, quod ad esse talis ministerii ecclesiae requiritur auctoritas acceptationis divinae, et per consequens potestas ac notitia data a Deo ad tale ministerium paragendum, quibus habitis, licet episcopus secundum traditiones suas non imposuit illi manus, Deus per se instituit.

52. This description rests upon several attestations of friends and foes—the latter of an official as well as private character. A document both official and of certain date is the missive given above of William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, of 30th May, 1382, directed against certain itinerant preachers, alleged to be both unauthorised and heretical, published in Wilkins' *Concilia*, and in Shirley's *Fasc. Zizan.*, p. 275. Among other things it is said—*Quidam, aeternae damnationis filii, sub magnae sanctitatis velamine, auctoritatem sibi vindicant praedicandi—tam in ecclesiis quam in plateis et aliis locis profanis dictae nostrae provinciae, non verentur asserere, dogmatizare et publice praedicare.* Wiclif himself defends the practice of his friends in preaching everywhere without distinction of place, in the 37th of his Saints' Day Sermons. *Videtur mihi quod sacerdos zelans pro lege Domini, cui negatur pro loco et tempore praedicatio verbi Dei, debet usque ad passionem martyrii, in casu quo non debet esse sibi conscius, praedicationem vel hortationem, in quocunque loco auditorium habere potest, asserere verbum Dei.* Sic enim Christus non solum in sinagogis sed in castellis (Mat. ix. 35) constantius praedicabat. *Locus enim non facit sanctum populum, sed e contra.* Vienna MS. 3928, fol. 75, col. 3. The Chronicler of St. Albans, Thomas Walsingham, narrates under the year 1377, that Wiclif, partly to disguise his heresy, and partly to spread it more widely, entered into alliance with other men as associates, living partly in Oxford, and partly in other parts of the kingdom, and he describes them *talariibus indutos vestibus de russeto, in signum perfectionis amplioris, incedentes nudis pedibus, qui suos errores in populo ventilarent*, etc. He remarks, col. 2657, that he had himself heard several of these men preach.

53. *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., c. 3, p. 34. *Salubriter populo praedicantes.*

54. Knighton *De Eventibus Angliae*, col. 2664. Talem enim habebant terminum in omnibus suis dictis semper praetendendo legem Dei, *Goddie laue.*

55. *Of Good Prechyng Prestis.* Comp. Shirley, *Original Works of Wiclif*, p. 45. Lewis—*History of John Wiclif*, p. 200—gives the commencement of the piece, which indicates, at the same time, its chief substance. Arnold in *Select English Works*, III., p. xix., places this piece among the works of doubtful authenticity.

56. In more than one passage which treats of the Itinerants, Wiclif puts together *praedicationes* and *exhortationes*.

57. *Of Good Prechyng Prestis.* Comp. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, etc., II., p. 187.

58. *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., c. 3, p. 34. Debet evangelisator praedicare plane evangelicam veritatem.

59. Henr. Knighton, *De Eventibus Angliae* in Twysden's *Historiae Anglicae Scriptores*, v. III., col. 2664. *Doctrina eorum in quibuscumque loquelis in principio dulcedine plena apparuit et devota, in fine quoque invidia subtili et detractatione plena defloruit.* Comp. col. 2660. *Frequenter in suis sermonibus—clamitaverunt, Trece Prechoures, False Prechoures.*

60. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his Mandate of the year 1382, mentioned above.

61. *On the deceits of Satan and his priests*, after Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, etc., v. II., p. 184 f.

62. Comp. Lewis, *History*, p. 200; Shirley, *Catalogue*, p. 45, No. 32.

63. *Of feyned contemplatif lif*, Shirley. Comp. Lewis, p. 198. No. 107, 42, No. 26.

64. Shirley, 40, No. 12.

65. Shirley, 41, No. 17. Vaughan, *Life and Opinions*, II., p. 188 f, under the title, *On the Four Deceits of Antichrist*.

66. *De graduationibus scholasticis*, in three chapters, in Vienna MS., 3929 (Dénis CCCI.KXXV., fol. 247, col. 2, 250, and in other MSS).

67. The *Epistola Missa ad Simples Sacerdotes* is mentioned in both the Catalogues drawn up in Bohemia, which Shirley printed in his "Catalogue"—the first from the Vienna MS., 3933 (Dénis CCCXCI), fol. 195; the second from Dénis CCCXCIII., fol. 102. Comp. especially pp. 62, 68 in "Catalogue." Shirley placed too much confidence in these notices when he printed in his Introduction to the *Fasc. Zizan*, the supposed letter (to which he gave, at his own instance, the name of a circular), p. 41, note. The text which he gives requires, indeed, some not inconsiderable corrections, and yet it proves clearly enough that it has no reference to the Itinerants, and in no case was a letter addressed to that class.

68. The first chapter of the treatise forms the close of the twenty-seventh sermon in the *Evangelia de Sanctis*, in Vienna MSS., 3928, fol. 53, col. 4; fol. 54, col. 2. The second and third chapters make up the greatest part of the twenty-eighth sermon, from fol. 54, col. 4 onwards. The fourth chapter, again, forms the concluding part of one sermon, viz., the thirty-first, fol. 62, col. 3. The fifth chapter makes the second half of the thirty-second sermon, fol. 63, col. 3.; fol. 64, col. 3; and even so does the last chapter form the second half of the thirty-third sermon, fol. 65, col. 3; fol. 66, col. 2. It is not, therefore, quite accurate when Shirley observes of the tractate, *De sex jugis*, that it is an extract from the Sermon II., No. 27; for in this sermon only the beginning of the tractate is to be found, at least in the MS. which I have made use of.

There is also observable a difference in the ways in which these several sermons are manipulated to make out the several chapters of the tractate; for while what is used of the first sermon is closely interwoven with the contents of the first chapter, the portions of the other sermons made use of are only mechanically attached to the following chapters, inserted into them, so to speak, like fragments of exploded stone.

69. Sermon on the Gospels, v. I., 3-6.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CHAPTER VI., BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THE POPULARITY OF WICLIF AND HIS EARLIEST DISCIPLES AS PREACHERS IN LONDON.

If Wiclif had confined his teaching to the schools of Oxford, it would have been only slowly and indirectly that his Reformation principles would have reached the ears and the convictions of the general public. But there is some evidence to show that he was occasionally a preacher in the pulpits of London, and that he spoke out as boldly in the crowded churches of the capital of the kingdom as he had done for many years before in the learned disputations of the University. Nor is proof wanting as to the effects which his preaching produced among the London citizens. The *Chronicon Anglie*, referred to in a former "Additional Note," is again available here, and supplies us, in particular, with some curious facts, which are new to history, touching the moral and religious influence which the Reformer's preaching began to exercise even upon the municipal administration of the city, during the mayoralty of John of Northampton.

At p. 116 of the *Chronicon* we read as follows:—"Hæc et his multo graviora," referring to the new doctrine, "cum palam non tantum Oxoniæ tractasset in scholis, sed etiam in civitate Londoniarum publice prædicasset. . . . invenit quod diu quæsierat, videlicet quosdam regni dominos, vel magis recte diabulos qui ejus amplecterentur deliramenta. . . . Quorum suffultus patrocinii multo audacius et animosius communicavit excommunicatam materiam, ita ut non solum dominos sed et simplices quosdam Londoniensium cives secum

attraheret in erroris abyssum. Erat utique non solum facundus sed simulator, etc. (*vide* Additional note to Chapter V.), ut magis falleret commune vulgus. Qui profecto nullis argumentis, nulla scientia in Deo fulciebatur et floruit, ut opinionibus suas probabiles demonstraret, sed sola compositione verborum quas satis eructavit. Unde intricavit minus doctorum aures audientium et ventos pavit inaniter sine fructu. Dux tamen et dominus Henricus Percy ejus sententias collaudabant, et scientiam et probitatem coelotenus extollere satagebant. Accidit que ut eorum elatus favore, suas vanitates multo amplius dilatare non pertimesceret, sed de ecclesia in ecclesiam percurrendo auribus insereret plurimorum insanias suas falsas. Unde, licet sero, episcopi stimulati, excitarunt patrem suum archiepiscopum quasi de gravi somno, et quasi potantem crapulatum a vino, vel potius mercenarium avaritiæ inebriatum toxico, ut ovem errantem revocaret a tam manifestæ perditionis pabulo, et curandum committeret stabulario, aut, aliud si res exigeret, uteretur abscissionis ferro."

Here, then, we learn, for the first time, what it was in Wiclif's doings that first stimulated the bishops to take public action against him—not so much his quiet teaching at Oxford, nor his learned judgments given to the King and Parliament on the points in debate between the kingdom and the Curia, but the wide-spreading effects of his preaching in the churches of London, *de ecclesia in ecclesiam percurrendo*. He was gaining the ears of the multitude, and was making proselytes not only among the highest nobles of the land, but among the masses of the common people.

Nor was it long before his preaching began to tell even upon the proceedings of the mayor and common council of the city. One of Wiclif's loudest complaints in the pulpit was directed against the corrupt remissness of the clergy, in the exercise of the discipline of the Church against adulterers and fornicators of both sexes. Transgressors of the seventh commandment had been long allowed to compound for their immoralities, and the clergy put money into their pockets by betraying the interests both of public and domestic virtue. The Reformer's indignation passed into the hearts of his London congregations. Many of the citizens resolved to take steps to reform so clamant a social disorder, and the Monkish Chronicler of St. Albans has handed down to us the following long-forgotten record of the rough-handed discipline which was brought to bear upon a batch of the most notorious offenders.

"Londonienses into tempore coeperunt ultra modum inolescere in perniciosum exemplum urbium aliarum. Revera freti *Majoris* illius anni (1382), *Johannis Northampton* auctoritate superciliosa, præsumperant episcopalia jura, multas dehonestationes inferentes in fornicationibus vel adulteris deprehensis. Captas nempe mulieres in prisa que vocatur *Dolium* apud eos primo seclusas incarcerationarunt, postremo perductas ad conspectum publicum, descissa cesarie ad modum furum quos appellatores dicimus, circumduci fecerunt in conspectu inhabitantium civitatem, præcedentibus tubicinis et fistulatoribus, ut latius innotescerent personæ earundem. Nec minus hujusmodi hominibus pepercerunt, sed eos injuriis multis et opprobriis affecerunt. *Animati enim fuerant per Joannem Wylyfe et sequaces ejus ad hujus modi perpetrandum, in reprobationem prelatorum*. Dicebant quoque se abominari curatores non solum negligentiam, sed et detestari avaritiam, qui studentes pecuniæ, omisissis poenis a jure limitatis, et receptis nummis, reos fornicationis et incestus favorabiliter in suis criminibus vivere permiserunt. Dicebant se utique pertimescere, ne propter talia peccata in urbe perpetrata sed dissimulata, tota civitas quandoque, Deo ulciscente, ruinam pateretur. Quapropter velle se purgationem facere civitatis ab hujusmodi inquinamentis, ne forte accideret eis pectus aut gladius, vel certe absorberet eos tellus."—*Chronicon Anglie*, p. 349.

I add the Monk-Chronicler's portrait of the Lord Mayor of the time, John of Northampton, by whose authority these disciplinary severities had been carried out. He was evidently a follower of Wiclif, and an admirer of his preaching; and the influence of this first Lollard Lord Mayor was, upon the Chronicler's own showing, of great account in the city.

"Erat autem Major eorum homo duri cordis et astutus, elatus propter divitiæ et superbus, qui nec inferioribus acquiescere, nec superiorum allegationibus sive monitis flecti, valeret, quin quod inceperat proprio ingenio, torvo proposito ad quemcumque finem perducere niteretur. *Habebat plane totius communitatis assensum ad nova molenda.*"

CHAPTER VII.

WICLIF AS BIBLE-TRANSLATOR, AND HIS SERVICE DONE TO THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

SECTION I.—*The Novelty of the Idea of an English Translation of the whole Bible.*

IN the preceding chapter we have seen Wiclif laying down the principle, that in preaching, God's Word must be taught before everything else, because this Word is the wholesome and indispensable household bread, the seed of regeneration and conversion. Nor was it only in theory that he laid down this principle. How he knew to establish and elucidate it as a matter of doctrine we shall have opportunity to see by and bye when we come to represent his whole dogmatic system. But he also carried out the principle in life and action: first, in his own person as a preacher; and next, by sending out itinerant preachers to proclaim the Divine Word. But the same principle led him also to the work of Bible-translation. Wiclif was a character who had no love for doing anything by halves. When once he recognised a principle to be right, he knew how to carry it out completely on all sides; so here in particular. The principle that God's Word should be preached to the people, be expanded into the principle that Scripture must become the common good of all. And as a means to this end, he saw the necessity of the Bible being translated into the language of the country, with the view of giving it the widest possible diffusion among the population.

This was a thought so great, so new, and so bold for that age, that we become eager to learn what were the preparatory middle stages through which Wiclif was conducted to that great plan and its execution. But in order to understand the undertaking in its peculiarity and greatness, we must first have before us a clear idea of what was the position of this matter before Wiclif took action in it.

Sir Thomas More, the well-known statesman under Henry VIII., repelled the charge laid against the hierarchy at the time of the Reformation, that it had withheld the Holy

Scriptures from the people during the Middle Ages, by the assertion that it was not true to fact, and that Wiclif was by no means the first man who had undertaken a translation of the whole Bible into English for the use of the laity, for complete English translations of it had existed long before Wiclif's time. He had himself seen beautiful old manuscripts of the English Bible, and these books had been provided with the knowledge of the Bishops.¹ Nor was More the only one who claimed to have knowledge of English translations of the Bible before Wiclif; several Protestant scholars of the seventeenth century were of the same opinion. Thomas James, the first librarian of the Bodleian, a very diligent and indefatigable polemic against the Papists, had held in his own hands an English manuscript Bible, which he judged to be much older than the days of Wiclif.² Archbishop Usher followed in the same line, when he assigned this alleged pre-Wiclifite version to about the year 1290.³ And Henry Wharton, the learned editor and completer of Usher's work, even believed himself able to show who the author of this supposed translation was, viz., John of Trevisa, a priest in Cornwall.⁴

But all these suppositions rest upon error, as was seen several years later by the last named investigator himself, who corrected both his own text and that of Usher.⁵ Those manuscripts of the English Bible seen by Sir Thomas More, and later by Thomas James, were, it is certain, nothing more than copies of the translation executed by Wiclif and his followers. There is documentary evidence to show that at the time of the Reformation there were several manuscripts of this translation in the hands of Roman Catholic Prelates. Bishop Bonner, *e.g.*, was possessor of one which is now preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library of Lambeth, and a second copy is now in Magdalen College, Cambridge, which belonged in 1540 to a Knight of St. John, Sir William Weston.⁶ Besides, if the fact were correct, that there ever existed any older English translation of the whole Bible, some sure traces of it on the one hand would not have been wanting, and on the other we may feel very certain that, in that case, the Wiclifites would not have omitted to appeal to that fact in justification of their own undertaking. But it is quite clear from their writings that they knew nothing of any older translation; but, on the contrary, regarded their own version as the first English version of the whole Bible.⁷ Only in one solitary instance, in a tract of the years 1400-1411, is mention made, in defence of the right of possessing the Bible in the English tongue, of the fact

that a citizen of London, of the name of Wering, was in possession of an English Bible, which many had seen, and which appeared to be 200 years old.⁸ Assuming that this statement of age was trustworthy, the translation in question could only have been one belonging to the Anglo-Saxon period. And how stands the case with regard to translations of that period?

All the attempts at Bible-translation and commentary which are known to date from Anglo-Saxon times belong to that period which is called, by linguists and literary historians, the *old* Anglo-Saxon period, reaching down to A.D. 1100; while the *new* Anglo-Saxon or Half-Saxon period extends from 1100 to 1250. Now, the old Anglo-Saxon literature is comparatively rich in productions which treat of biblical subjects, both in verse and prose. To these belong the poems which go under the name of the monk Caedmon († 680, Bede, *Hist. Eccl. gentes Anglorum*, IV. 24), containing editions of several Old Testament passages.¹⁰ Bishop Aldhelm, of Sherborn, † 709, according to the testimony of Bale, translated the Psalter; and an Anglo-Saxon paraphrase of the Latin Psalter, which was discovered in the royal library of Paris at the beginning of the present century, is considered to be in part the work of Aldhelm. The Venerable Bede, also, while producing works for the learned, comprising all the erudition of the age, was not forgetful of the wants of the common people. We know, under his own hand, that he made a translation of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer into Anglo-Saxon, and presented copies of it to the less educated among the priests with whom he was acquainted; indeed, his latest work was an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Gospel of John, which he had no sooner finished than he expired, in the year 735.¹¹

The greatest of the Anglo-Saxon princes, King Alfred, is known to have entertained at least the design of making parts of Scripture accessible to his subjects in the mother tongue. Not long after his time there existed a Saxon translation of the Gospels, of which several MSS. have been preserved; and if the Psalter attributed to Bishop Aldhelm should not turn out to have been his work, its date, at least, cannot be later than the tenth century. In addition, two Latin MSS. of the Gospels, with interlinear Saxon glosses, reach up to the days of Alfred, who died in 901.¹² Similar glosses upon the Psalter and the Proverbs are known to scholars, which are conjectured to belong to the same century.

Towards the end of the tenth century, the monk and

priest, Aelfric, had the extraordinary merit of executing a translation of selected parts of the Books of Moses, with Joshua and Judges, Kings, and Esther; and, in addition, of Job and the apocryphal books of Maccabees and Judith; while in his eighty Homilies he greatly promoted Bible knowledge by his renderings of the text, and by quotations from the Bible at large. The writings which have descended to the present time are sufficient to prove that the Anglo-Saxon Church was in possession of a very considerable amount of biblical material in the mother tongue. But when we reflect how much of this literature must have perished during the Danish incursions and conquests, and at a later period, in consequence of the Norman Invasion, we must form a very different conception of its extent from what is suggested by its existing remains. These Saxon glosses and translations, however, continued to be in use among the Saxon part of the population during the Norman Period—a fact which is gathered with certainty from the circumstance that several of the MSS. in question were not executed till the twelfth century.

In little more than a century after the Norman invasion, the Norman population possessed a prose translation of the Psalms, as well as of the Latin Church hymns, in their own language, the Anglo-Norman. This was the case even before the year 1200; and towards the middle of the thirteenth century the Normans had not only a Bible history in verse reaching down to the Babylonish captivity, but also a prose translation of the whole Bible. It is a remarkable fact, indeed, attested by men of special learning in this field, that the French literature of the mediæval age was extremely rich in translations of the Bible—that it surpassed indeed in this respect the literature of all the other European peoples.¹³ Still it must always be borne in mind, as respects England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, that the Norman tongue was only the language of the dominant race, of the higher classes, spoken at Court, in the seats of the nobles and bishops, in the courts of justice, the churches, and the garrisons, while the Saxon lived on among the middle and lower strata of the population, the traders, artizans, and peasantry. The Anglo-Norman translations of portions of the Bible could only therefore be of use to the privileged classes, while the mass of the people enjoyed none of the benefit, but on the contrary were all the less considered and provided for the more those classes were satisfied who had the power of the country in their hands.

But from the middle of the thirteenth century the Saxon

element grew in strength, both in the population and the language. From that date the English language takes its development in three periods: Old English from 1250-1350, Middle English to 1500, New English from the sixteenth century downwards.

As in Anglo-Saxon and most languages, so also in Old English, the earliest attempts in Biblical subjects are of a poetical kind. Such is the "Ormulum," a Gospel harmony in verse without rhyme,¹⁴ a work, however, not of a kind to make way among the common people. Another form somewhat later describes the chief facts of the First and Second Books of Moses.¹⁵ To the end of the thirteenth century belongs a translation of the Psalter in verse, the language of which is simple and full of expression.

The oldest prose translation of a Bible book into Old English dates from the fourteenth century—about 1325—and, what is remarkable, two translations of the Psalms in prose appeared almost simultaneously. The one was executed by William of Shoreham, a country parish priest, in the county of Kent; the other was the work of an Eremit, Richard Rolle, of Hampole, who died in 1349. The former wrote the Psalter, verse by verse, in Latin and English, the translation being in general faithful and verbal, except that the author often substitutes the words of the gloss in place of the text. The other, the so-called Hermit of Hampole, had written in the first instance a Latin Commentary to the Psalms. This occasioned him afterwards to translate the Psalter, and to publish it with an English Commentary.¹⁶ According to a notice in English verse, found in one of the numerous MSS. of this work, and which dates from the fifteenth century, the author undertook the work at the request of a worthy nun, Dame Margaret Kirkby. The author's original was still to be seen in the nunnery at Hampole; but many copies of it had been vitiated by the Lollards in the sense of their doctrines—an imputation which the editors of the Wiclif Bible have found destitute of all confirmation, although they have examined many MSS. of this translation and commentary on the Psalter.¹⁷ A third translation of the Psalter—which is found in a Dublin MS. of the fifteenth century, and has been supposed to be the work of a certain John Hyde, because the book was at one time his property—appears from the specimens given of it to be nothing more than a revision of the language of the translation of Shoreham.¹⁸ To state the whole result for the period, as well of the Anglo-Saxon as of the Norman and the Old English tongues, it stands as follows:—

1. A translation of the entire Bible was never during this whole period accomplished in England, and was never even apparently contemplated.

2. The Psalter was the only book of Scripture which was fully and literally translated into all the three languages—Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Old English.

3. In addition, several books of Scripture, especially Old Testament books, were translated partially or in select passages, *e.g.* by Aelfric, laying out of view poetical versions, and the Gospel of John, translated by Beda, which celebrated work has not come down to us.

4. Last of all,—and this fact is of great importance,—in none of these translations was it designed to make the Word of God accessible to the mass of the people, and to spread Scriptural knowledge among them. The only object which was had in view was partly to furnish aid to the clergy and to render a service to the educated class.

SECTION II.—*How Wiclif came to engage in this Undertaking.*

CONSIDERING that this was the state of things down to the middle of the fourteenth century, the fact becomes one of a highly important character that only thirty or forty years later a translation of the whole Bible had been executed, and that, too, with the destination of becoming the common good of the nation. And this was the work and merit of Wiclif. To what extent he did the work of translation with his own pen, it will hardly ever be possible to ascertain with perfect certainty; but so much as this is certain, that it was he who first conceived the idea of the work, that he took a personal share along with others in the labour of its execution, and that the carrying through of the work was due to his enthusiastic zeal and judicious guidance.

This fact is so strongly attested by manifold testimonies of friends and foes as to be put beyond all doubt. Knighton, a chronicler of the period, in a passage which was probably penned before the year 1400, laments the translation of the Bible into English, and ascribes it quite categorically to Wiclif. He maintains that Christ gave the Gospel, not to the Church, but only to the clergy and doctors of the Church, to be by them communicated to the weaker sort and the laity, at need; whereas Wiclif has rendered the Gospel from the Latin into English, and through him it has become the affair of the common people, and more accessible to the laity, including even the women who are able to read, than it used to be to the well-educated clergy. The pearl is now thrown

"before swine and trodden under foot," etc.¹⁹ When the chronicler speaks of "the Gospel" here, we are not to understand him in a restricted sense, as though he meant the translation of the New Testament only as distinguished from the Old, or even the Gospels only in distinction from the other New Testament books. We are rather to understand that that name, as is so often the case, is used for the whole of Holy Scripture. If this is so, it needs no further proof to show that Knighton regarded the translation of the Bible as the work of Wiclif.

We also find the idea and plan of a Bible-translation attributed to Wiclif in a document of official character. Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury and his suffragan bishops, in the year 1412, addressed a written memorial to Pope John XXIII., with the petition that in the exercise of his plenary apostolic powers he would pronounce sentence of condemnation on the heresy of Wiclif and his party. In this document Wiclif is charged among other things with having contended with all his power against the faith and the doctrine of the Church, and, to make his malice complete, with having devised the plan of a translation of the Holy Scriptures into the mother tongue.²⁰ The language here made use of, it may be remarked in passing, is a clear proof of the fact that before Wiclif's time there was no English translation of the Bible in existence. It is also evident from the words that it was not merely single books, but the whole Bible that had now been translated. The document, however, speaks only of the idea and the plan of the work, without ascribing to Wiclif himself its execution in detail, or the translation of the Bible in all its parts.

By the side of these testimonies proceeding from opponents may be placed the language of one of Wiclif's admirers—John Huss—who says, in a polemical tract against John Stokes of the year 1411:—"It is plain from his writings that Wiclif was not a German, but an Englishman. For the English say that he translated the whole Bible from Latin into English."²¹

The fact is certain, then, that Wiclif was the first to conceive the great idea, then entirely new, of a translation of the *whole* Bible, and of the Bible for the use of the whole people. What, then, we are led to ask, were the intermediate thoughts and preliminary stages by which Wiclif was led to the conception of this grand design?

As a great number of his writings have come down to us, it is natural that we should first look into these for

information on this point. If Luther in his day takes occasion, in letters from the Wartburg and later writings to refer every now and then to his Bible-translation, it might be supposed that Wiclif, too, must have had occasion to refer to a work whose importance and greatness lay so near his heart, and that such reference would be found to throw light upon the preliminary stages of the undertaking. But, in point of fact, it is very rare to find, either in his Latin or his English writings, any allusions to the work either while in progress or after its completion. The condition of things at that time, it must be remembered, was very different from what it was in the third and fourth decades of the sixteenth century. In Wiclif's day men could not conceal from themselves that the business was one attended with danger; and therefore it was the part of prudence not to talk loudly of the matter, so long as it was only in progress. But, notwithstanding the almost total silence of Wiclif respecting his own work, one circumstance, at least, is made probable, viz., that it was through the translation of several single books of the New Testament that he was gradually led to contemplate a complete version of the whole Bible.

The editors of the Wiclif Bible—Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederick Madden—are of opinion that the earliest translation of a Biblical book executed by Wiclif was the Commentary upon the Revelation of St John.²³ Now, it is true that, as early as the sixteenth century, Bishop Bale included among Wiclif's works an Explanation of the Apocalypse; and Shirley has admitted the same without hesitation into his list of Wiclif's genuine writings.²⁴ But for my own part, I do not see my way to attribute this Commentary to Wiclif; and all the less so, that the translation of the text contained in the oldest manuscripts of the work does not agree with Wiclif's translation of it in his acknowledged version.²⁴

The case is different, indeed, with the single Commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, as the English version of the Vulgate text given in these writings agrees with the Wiclif translation in its earliest form. But, in my judgment, the Commentary on the Gospel of Luke cannot be recognised as Wiclif's work, because the author in the preface writes of himself in a manner which is not at all applicable to Wiclif. The writer first introduces some words of Scripture, and then proceeds as follows:—"Therefore it is that

a poor, insignificant man (a caitiff), who, for a time, has been inhibited from preaching, for causes known to God, writes the Gospel of Luke in English, for the use of the poor people of his nation, who understand little or no Latin, and are poor in wit and worldly wealth, but none the less are rich in good will to be well pleasing to God."²⁵ It is impossible to point out a moment in Wiclif's life when "for a time he was hindered from preaching the Gospel." For the allusion here has no appearance of being to a time of sickness, but rather to some hindrance on the part of ecclesiastical superiors. Thus understood, the side hint that the causes of the hindrance are known to God becomes all the more appropriate, as it hints at the wisdom of God's permission of the hindrance. The whole mode of expression appears to me to be of such a character as to indicate one of Wiclif's itinerant preachers as the writer, but not Wiclif himself.²⁶

Nor does the preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of John speak for the authorship of Wiclif, when the author gives for his determination to write it the following reasons :—"Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, came into the world to save poor humble men, and to teach them the Gospel. Hence the Apostle Paul says that he and the other apostles of Christ are the servants of Christians for the sake of Jesus Christ; and again he says, 'Let every one bear another's burdens, and so shall you fulfil the law of Christ.' Therefore it is that a simple creature of God, willing to help to carry the burden of simple, poor men who hold with the cause of God—writes a short gloss upon the Gospel of St. John in the English tongue, and only the text of the Holy Scriptures, and the plain, short sayings of holy doctors, Greek and Latin,"²⁷ etc. This description of his own person suggests that he was writing anonymously; whereas Wiclif, so far as I know, in all cases took the personal responsibility of what he wrote, not to mention the fact that, while he is always glad to have the support of passages in the fathers and later doctors of the Church, Wiclif never confines himself to a mere reproduction of the earlier authorities, as is done in the productions now in question, which, in substance, only give again in English what already stands in the "Catena Aurea" of Thomas Aquinas. However, as I have not been in a position to examine the manuscripts for myself, and can only rest my judgment upon the short extracts which are given in the preface to the Wiclif Bible, I do not pretend to be able to give an

authoritative judgment upon the subject. Only so much as this appears to be beyond doubt, that the writer or writers of these Commentaries must have belonged to Wiclif's school.

The same thing must also be said of the author of a Commentary on the first three Gospels, who gave, in the same way, a translation of the Vulgate text, with commentaries from older fathers and doctors; for "The Servant of God" who encouraged the author to undertake the work gives utterance to precisely such principles as Wiclif maintained. In the preface to Matthew the author writes as follows:—"I was induced some time ago to begin this work by a man whom I take to be truly a servant of God, and who often requested me to undertake this work on the ground that the Gospel is the rule according to which it is the duty of every Christian man to live. Now, several writers had already translated this Gospel into Latin, a language which only the learned understand, and there are many people who would willingly know the Word of God if it were rendered into the English tongue. This would be of great utility to the soul of man, and to labour heartily for this useful end is the duty of every man who stands in the grace of God, and to whom God has given the needful knowledges," etc.²⁸

Thus far, then, we have found nothing which can be regarded with an adequate degree of confidence as a preliminary labour of Wiclif in the work of Bible-translation. There is more reason for recognising as a work from Wiclif's hand the English translation of the Latin Harmony of the Gospels (entitled "Series Collecta") of Prior Clement of Lanthony in Monmouthshire, written in the second half of the twelfth century. For (1) this translation has always, from the sixteenth century, especially since Bishop Bale, been attributed to Wiclif, and never to any other man. (2) It varies very little from Wiclif's translation of the Gospels. (3) The preface of the translator (to be carefully distinguished from that of the Prior) is a double one, the one being identical with the preface which stands before the Commentary on Matthew's Gospel mentioned above, while the other was evidently intended from the first to be the preface to the translation of this Gospel Harmony; and this latter preface has the unmistakeable stamp of thought and expression which is characteristic of Wiclif.

The author of the Preface takes his start from the saying of Christ, "Blessed are they who hear the Word of God and keep it;" and he draws from it in particular

the conclusion that "Christians should labour day and night upon the text of holy Scripture, especially upon the Gospel in their mother tongue.²⁹ And yet," he remarks, "men will not suffer it that the laity should know the Gospel, and read it in their common life in humility and love." Hereupon he continues word for word as follows:—"But pleasure-loving learned men of this world reply and say, laymen may easily fall into error, and therefore they ought not to dispute upon questions of Christian faith. Alas! alas! what cruelty it is to rob a whole kingdom of bodily food because a few fools may be gluttonous, and may do themselves and others mischief by their immoderate use of such food.³⁰ Quite as easily may a proud worldly priest fall into error contrary to the Gospel which is written in Latin, as a simple layman may err contrary to the Gospel which is written in English. When a child makes a slip in his first day's lesson, would there be any sense in making that a reason for never allowing children to come to lessons at all? Who then in this way of it would ever become a scholar? What sort of Antichrist is this who, to the sorrow of Christian men, is so bold as to prohibit the laity from learning this holy lesson which is so earnestly commanded by God? Every man is bound to learn it that he may be saved, but every layman who shall be saved is a very priest of God's own making, and every man is bound to be a very priest.³¹

But worldly priests cry out that holy Scripture in the English tongue would set Christians by the ears, and would drive subjects into rebellion against their rulers; and therefore it should not be suffered among the laity. Woes me! how can they more manifestly blaspheme God, the Author of peace, and His holy law, which everywhere teaches humility, patience, and brotherly love? So the false Jews, especially the high-priests, and scribes, and Pharisees accused Christ of breeding contention among the people. O Jesus Christ! Thou who didst suffer death to establish Thy law and to redeem Christian souls, put a stop to these blasphemies of Antichrist and worldly priests. Help that Thy holy Gospel may be known and held fast by Thy simple brethren, and cause them to grow in faith and hope, in love and humility and patience, and with joy to suffer death for Thee and for Thy law. Amen! Lord Jesu, for Thy mercy sake!"

I repeat, these are through and through genuine thoughts of Wiclif, spoken with godly warmth in his own simple but sharp and original style. The whole preface is

nothing else than a pleading for the translation of the Gospel into English, and for its diffusion among the laity. And if this preface was written properly for the translation of the Gospel Harmony, it lets us see that at that date, whatever that date was, Wiclif had already grasped the idea, "the Bible for the people!" At the same time, this theological vindication of the idea could not fail to lead on to the plan of a *complete* Bible version. It is to be regarded as a kind of temporary substitute for the latter that to that Gospel Harmony in English there was added an appendix containing first portions of the Catholic epistles, and then selected extracts from other parts of the Bible. This collection presents variations in the different manuscripts in bulk, and also in the arrangement of the several pieces.³² In how far, however, this appendix is the work of Wiclif, it has not hitherto been possible to ascertain.

The second half of the fourteenth century produced another work of the same kind which is well worthy of attention, viz., a complete translation of all the epistles of Paul, in which the Latin and English follow each other paragraph by paragraph, or even verse by verse, in such a way that along with a very literal translation there are interwoven occasional explanations of single terms. The circumstance, however, that the full Latin text always stands first is a clear proof that the work could not have been prepared for the people, but rather for the less educated class of priests.³³

All the writings hitherto mentioned were preparatory labours by which the proper landing-place to which they all tended was more and more nearly reached, viz., a pure and at the same time a complete English version of the whole Bible.

SECTION III.—*The Wiclif Translation.*

THE New Testament was naturally translated first. Luther followed the same order nearly 150 years later. But the main difference in the two cases was that Luther translated from the Greek original, Wiclif from the Latin of the Vulgate. There is no need to prove this latter fact. Wiclif had no knowledge of Greek, and everywhere it is Latin, not Greek, which is spoken of as the language out of which the version is made. That the translation of the New Testament was Wiclif's own work we may assume with a good degree of certainty, for this is the point upon which the testimonies of friends and foes, as given above, most

undoubtedly agree. If Huss speaks of the whole Bible as translated by Wiclif, we shall yet find immediately that a great part of the Old Testament was done by one of his friends, and our attention is thus directed chiefly to the New Testament as Wiclif's part of the work. And if Knighton speaks of "the Gospel," and "the Evangelical Pearl," the reference here is of course primarily to the New Testament. Add to this that there is a close resemblance of expression and style in the Gospels as compared with the other parts of the New Testament. The whole version has the appearance of being one casting.

Prefaces are attached to the several Books. These, however, are not original productions, but merely translations of the same prologues which usually precede the different books of Scripture in the manuscripts of the Vulgate of the fourteenth century. Whether these prefaces were translated by the same hand as the text has not been ascertained; and there is some reason to suppose that they were not attached to the text at first, but were added afterwards—at least they are wanting in some manuscripts in the Gospels, and in other copies in the other books. Not unfrequently short explanations of words are admitted into the text. The different manuscripts, however, of this original version of the New Testament vary considerably from one another, as the Biblical text in several of them has undergone a considerable number of corrections and changes.

The execution of the Old Testament of the work was taken in hand either while the New Testament was still in progress, or shortly after the completion of the latter,—and this not by Wiclif himself, but by one of his friends and fellow-labourers. The original manuscript of this part of the work, remarkably enough, has been preserved.³⁴ A second manuscript, which was copied from this one before undergoing correction, contains a remark which ascribes the translation to Nicolas of Hereford; and this remark, which was manifestly added no long time after, is worthy of full credit. Now, it is a peculiar circumstance that both these manuscripts break off quite unexpectedly in the middle of a sentence,—namely, in the Book of Baruch, cap. 3, v. 20,³⁵—a fact which can only be explained by the supposition that the writer was suddenly interrupted in the work. And this supposition admits of being combined, without any pressure, with the fact attested by existing documents, that Nicolas of Hereford, Doctor of Theology, and one of the leaders of the Wiclif party in 1382, after a sermon preached by him before the University on Ascension day, was cited, in June of that

year, to appear before a Provincial Synod in London, to answer for his teaching on that occasion.

The result of his examination was that on 1st July sentence of excommunication was passed upon him. Against this sentence he appealed to the Pope, and, according to Knighton's Chronicle, went in person to Rome to prosecute his appeal, but was there thrown into prison, in which he remained for some years, when he was at length discharged, and returned to England.⁸⁸ It is easy, therefore, to understand how Nicolas of Hereford came to be so suddenly interrupted in the middle of his work, and as it was impossible for him to carry on the work for several years, the fragment remained as it was when he was unexpectedly compelled to lay down his pen.

If these combinations and conjectures rest upon any good ground, they furnish us at the same time with the advantage of a fixed date; for supposing the above facts to be correct, we shall then be able to assume with some confidence that in June 1382, at the latest, the translation of the New Testament by Wiclif's own hand must have been completed, if his fellow-labourer Hereford had already in the Old Testament advanced as far as the Apocrypha and was now in the middle of the Book of Baruch. The version itself affords proof that it was continued and finished by another hand; and it is not improbable that the continuator was Wiclif himself. From Baruch iii. 20 the style is one characteristically different from Hereford's, as we shall have occasion to show in the sequel. The prologues to the books of the Old Testament, as in the case of the New Testament, are only a version of those which were then commonly found in the manuscripts of the Vulgate. For the most part they consist of letters and other pieces of Jerome.

It must have been a heartfelt joy and deep satisfaction for Wiclif when the translation of the whole Bible was completed, and the great plan accomplished which he had so long cherished and pushed forward with so warm a zeal. This in all probability took place in the year 1382. But Wiclif was not the man to betake himself to rest in any single object attained by him, and least of all in this sacred cause. To him the translation of the Bible was not its own end, but only a means to an end, that end being to put the Bible into the hands of his own countrymen, to bring home the Word of God to the hearts of the English people. His next care, therefore, after the translation was ready, was to make it as useful as possible. For this purpose copies of it were now made, and in such a way that not only the whole

Bible, but also portions of it, and even single books, were copied out and circulated. Moreover, in many of these copies there were inserted a table of the Bible lectures for Sundays and all the feast and fast days of the ecclesiastical year, which table is still to be found in several of the existing manuscripts. And in order to put these lectures into the hands of many at a cheap price, books were also copied out which contained no more than these gospels and epistles. Of this sort are two manuscripts still remaining, which were written at all events before the close of the fourteenth century.

But a still more important work became necessary. As soon as the English Bible was complete and came into use, the imperfections which clung to it began to be manifest; and in truth it was not to be wondered at that the work should have considerable blemishes. It was a work of uncommon magnitude, especially for that time, considering that it was executed under unfavourable circumstances by different hands, and without any firm basis of clear and consistent principles of translation having been previously laid down. The portion executed by Hereford, embracing the Old Testament books, had a character of its own, differing much from Wiclif's version of the New Testament in its method of translation, and in the form of its English idiom. These and other blemishes could not escape the notice at least of Wiclif himself. And without doubt it was he who suggested a revision of the whole work, perhaps undertook it with his own hand. Just as Luther, too, after his complete German Bible appeared in 1534, began ere long to revise it, and never ceased till his death to improve and polish it, partly by his own hand and partly with the assistance of Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Cruciger, and others. No marvel if the case was not otherwise with the English Bible of the fourteenth century.

The revision was a work of time. Wiclif did not live to see it completed. The revised Wiclif Bible did not appear till several years after his death, and the improved form which it now assumed was essentially the work of one man who was a trusted friend of Wiclif, and in his last years his assistant in parochial work, John Purvey. This fact has been made not merely probable but certain by the learned editors of the Wiclif versions of the Bible, who have also shown that the probable date of the completion of the revision was the year 1388—i.e., four years after Wiclif's death.⁸⁷ Before the appearance of the collected edition of the Wiclif translations just referred to, very confused and

mistaken ideas of the oldest English versions of the Bible prevailed. Not to speak of the already-mentioned and now exploded assertion of Sir Thomas More, that long before Wiclif's day there were already in existence complete translations of the Bible in English, it was a common error, since Lewis's day down to 1848, to take the older translation of Wiclif for the later revised one, and to take the later for the older, i.e., for the genuine or unrevised work of Wiclif. More than this, down to the year 1848, no part of the older translation had appeared *in print*, with the exception of the Song of Songs, which Dr. Adam Clark had printed in his Bible Commentary from a manuscript in his own possession.³⁸ The fact that the older genuine Wiclif translation had had the fate of being so long ignored is closely connected with the circumstance that it had been thrown into the shade and almost entirely superseded by the later improved version. For the later form of the text of the translation was eagerly sought after. Copies of it came into the hands of people belonging to all classes of society. These copies must have been multiplied with extraordinary rapidity, for even at the present day there are still about 150 manuscripts remaining which contain Purvey's revised version either in whole or in part, and the majority of these copies were executed within forty years after the year 1388.

It would, however, be extremely short-sighted and hasty if we should undervalue or entirely overlook the work of Wiclif by reason of Purvey's work. Was, then, Purvey's Bible translation anything more than a uniformly executed revision of Wiclif's work already published, and an edition of it improved, in point of language, in respect to its superior legibility? The revision was, indeed, carried through in a consistent manner under the guidance of distinctly conceived principles, but this was a work of far less difficulty than the task of originating the translation itself, especially when we consider the grandeur and the novelty of the first idea of the work, and the tenacious persistency and steady industry which were absolutely required for its execution. Last of all, we point again to the probability before referred to—that it was Wiclif himself who was first sensible of the need of a revision of the finished translation; so that it was only the carrying out of the task which fell to Purvey, whose relative merits, however, we have no wish to undervalue.

What, now, is the peculiar character and importance of the earlier version, in so far especially as it was Wiclif's personal work? Its peculiarity becomes clearer to the eye

when we compare the New Testament in the older version with the Old Testament as rendered by Hereford. Hereford's translation is excessively literal, and keeps as close as possible, almost pedantically, to the Latin expression and order of the Vulgate. This makes the version very often stiff and awkward, forced and obscure. The translator kept only the original in his eye, which it was his wish to render with the utmost possible fidelity; on the spirit and laws of the English tongue he seems scarcely to have bestowed a thought, and as little on the qualities of intelligibility and legibility which it was his business to impart to the translated text. The case is quite different with Wiclif in the books which he translated, and above all in the New Testament. He ever keeps in view the spirit of his mother tongue and the requirements of English readers, so that the translation is so simple as to be thoroughly readable. Nay more, it is a remarkable fact that Wiclif's English style in his Bible-translation, compared with his other English writings, rises to an uncommon pitch of perspicuity, beauty, and force.⁹⁹ ✓

But if we compare Wiclif's Bible, not with his own English writings, but with English literature in general before and after his time, a still more important result is revealed. Wiclif's translation of the Bible marks an epoch in the development of the English language almost as much as Luther's translation does in the history of the German tongue. The Luther Bible opens the period of the new High German; Wiclif's Bible stands at the head of the Middle English. It is usual, indeed, to represent not Wiclif, but Chaucer—the father of English poetry—as the first representative of the Middle English literature. ✓ But later investigators of the history of languages—such as Marsh, Koch, and others—rightly recognise Wiclif's Bible prose as the earliest classic Middle English. Chaucer, indeed, has some rare features of superiority—liveliness of description, a charming way of clothing his ideas, genuine English humour, and a masterly command of language. But such qualities of style address themselves more to the educated classes—they are not adapted to make a form of speech the common property of the nation. That which has the destiny to promulgate a new language must be something which concerns closely the weal and the woe of man, and which for that reason takes hold irresistibly of every man in a nation, the lowest as well as the highest. In other words, it must be moral and religious truths, grasped with the energy of a genuine enthusiasm, and

finding acceptance and diffusion for themselves in fresh forms of speech. If Luther, with his translation of the Bible, opened the epoch of the High German dialect, so Wiclif, with his English Bible, stands side by side with Chaucer at the head of the Middle English. But in the latter dialect are already found the fundamental characters of the new English, which reached its development in the sixteenth century.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII.

1. Thom. More, *Dyalogues*, fol. cvlii. cxi. cxiv.
2. *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture*, Lond., 1612, p. 74. Vide Forshall and Madden's *Wycliffite Versions of the Bible*, VI., p. xxi.
3. *Historia Dogmatica Controversiae de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis*. Lond. 1690, 4to, p. 155.
4. *Auctorium Historiae Dogmaticae* J. Usserii, p. 424.
5. H. Wharton (under the pseudonym Ant. Harmer), *Specimens of Errors in the History of the Reformation*. Lond., 1693. Vide Vaughan, John de Wycliffe, 334, Note I.
6. *Wycliffite Versions of the Bible*, I. Pref. xxi. lvii.
7. Do. I., p. xxi., Note 9.
8. Printed at the time of the Reformation as *A compendious olde treatyse shewynge how that we ought to have the Scripture in Englyshe*. Vide *Wycliffite Versions*, I. Pref. xxxiii., Note, and xxi., Note 9.
9. Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*. Leipsig, 1863, I., p. 349, Note. C. Friedrich Koch, *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*, I., p. 8.
10. The only MS. of these Poems, dating from the tenth century, and belonging to the Bodleian Library, does not name the author. Francis Junius, who published the first edition of the Paraphrase in 1655, in Amsterdam, was the first to put forth the conjecture that Caedmon was the author. New editions have been brought out by Benjamin Thorpe, Lond. 1832, and by Bouterwek, Elberfeld, 1849.
11. Cuthberti Vita Bedae.
12. Namely, the so-called Durham book and the Rushworth Gloss in the Bodleian.
13. Reuss, *Revue de Théologie*, II. 3; Les bibliothèques de la seule ville de Paris contiennent plus de manuscrits bibliques français que toutes les bibliothèques d'Outre Rhin ne paraissent en contenir d'allemands.
14. Called *Ormulum*, after the author, whose name was either Orm or Ormin, and who was an Augustinian Canon. Edited, with Notes and Glossary, by Wright, Oxford University Press, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo.
15. The Story of Genesis and Exodus, an early English song, about A.D. 1250. Edited by Richard Morris for the Early English Tract Society. 1865.
16. For our first reliable information concerning the person and life of this remarkable man we are indebted to the documents published by Mr. Perry in the preface to the English Prose Treatises of Richard Rolle de Hampole. Lond., 1866, p. xv. f. Vide *Legenda de Vita Ricardi Rolle*, preserved in the Cathedral Library of Lincoln. According to these he was born at Thornton, in Yorkshire, studied at Oxford, and returned home in his nineteenth year, where he immediately took to a hermit's life. Later in life he laboured as an itinerant preacher in the northern parts of Yorkshire, and he closed his life in Hampole in 1349.
17. *Wycliffite Versions of the Bible*, VI., Pref. iv. f. At all events one such remark drawn from a single MS. is not sufficient to support the conjecture made by Humphrey Wanley that this translation of the Psalms in its shortest form was a juvenile work of Wiclif himself.

18. *Wycliffite Versions*, etc., Pref. v. and vi., and particularly Note 1. All the preceding statements regarding the Bible translations which were anterior to Wiclif rest upon the learned investigations of the editors of the Wiclif Bible, found in their preface.

19. Henricus Knighton, *Chronica de Eventibus Angliæ* in Twysden's *Historiæ Anglicæ Scriptores*, X. Lond., 1652. Col. 2644, *Hic magister Joannes Wyclif Evangelium quod Christus contulit clericis et Ecclesiæ Doctoribus, ut ipsi laicis et infirmioribus personis secundum temporis exigentiam et personarum indigentiam cum mentis eorum curie dulciter ministrarent, transtulit de Latino in Anglicam linguam non Anglicam; unde per ipsum fit vulgare, et magis apertum laicis et mulieribus legere scientibus, quam solet esse clericis admodum literatis et bene intelligentibus, et sic evangelica margarita spargitur et a porcis conculcatur, etc.*

20. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, III., f. 350, Joannes Wycliff—et ipsam ecclesiæ sacrosanctæ fidem et doctrinam sanctissimam totis conatibus impugnare studuit, novæ ad suæ malitiæ complementum Scripturarum in linguam maternam translationis practica adinventæ, etc.

21. Replica contra Jo. Stokes. Quod autem Wicliff non fuit Teutonicus sed Anglicus, patet ex suis scriptis—nam per Anglicos dicitur quod ipse tota Biblia transtulit ex Latino in Anglicum.

22. *Wycliffite Versions*, I., Pref., p. viii.

23. Catalogue of the Original Works of J. W., p. 36.

24. *Wycliffite Versions* as above, Note Z.

25. Do. I., Preface, p. ix., Note d. The words run thus:—*Herfore a pore caitif lettid fro prechyng for a tyme for causes knowun of God, etc.*

26. Arnold in his Introduction to the First Volume of Wiclif's English Sermons, p. 5, concludes against the Wiclif authorship of this Commentary on partly the same grounds as those upon which I had come to the same conclusion some years before; only he conjectures that its true author may have been a Monk.

27. *Herfor a symple creature of God writeth a schort gloss in English, etc.*

28. *Wycliffite Versions*, I., Preface, pp. ix., x., and particularly Note f. "One that I suppose veraly was God's servant, seyand to me that sethyn the gospels is rewle, be the whilk ich Cristen man owes to lyf—ilk man that is in the grace of God—owes hertely to byay him.

29. It is to be regarded as a quite peculiar merit of the Editors of the Wiclif translations of the Bible that they have given in the Preface so rich an anthology of extracts from English manuscripts. One of the most valuable of these communications, in my opinion, is the second preface, printed in full from two MSS., to the English translation of the Gospel-harmony of Clemens, in vol. I., p. xiv., col. 2, and p. xv., col. 1. The sentence last quoted in our text is worded in the original, thus—*Cristen men are moche to travelen nyght and day aboute text of holy writ, and namely the gospel in her moder tunge.*

30. Here "unmesurable" is to be read according to the other MS., not "mesurable" which the editors have preferred.

31. *Wycliffite Versions*, vol. I., p. xv., col. 1. *Thanne each lewed man that schal be saved is a real prest maad of God, and eche man is bounden to be suche a verri prest. But worldly clerkis crien that holy writ in English wole make Cristen men at debate, and therfor it schal not be suffred among lewed men.*

32. *Wycliffite Versions of the Bible*, v. I., XI. XII.

33. Do. do. v. I., p. xiii. In an English tract, which may well have come from Wiclif's pen, p. xiv., Note, it is expressly said that "as the parish priests are often so ignorant that they do not understand Latin books so as to be able to instruct the people, it is necessary not only for the ignorant people, but also for the ignorant priests, to have books in the English language containing the necessary instruction for the ignorant people."

34. It is preserved in the Bodleian Library, No. 950 (3093), and is distinguished

by the circumstance that very often alterations are made in the middle of a sentence; not unfrequently a word has been cancelled as soon as it was written, or before it was written fully, in order to put another in its place. Wycliffite Versions, I., p. xvii. and xlvii.

35. The second MS. is in the Bodleian, marked *Douce* 369, and ends with the words, *and othyr men in the place of him risen. The Yunge*. Then on the next side stands written by another but contemporary hand, *Explicit translacion Nicholay herford*, v. I., p. xvii. and l., where a *facsimile* of these words with the preceding lines is given.

36. *Fasc. Zizan*, ed. Shirley, p. 289 f. Knighton, *Chronica*, col. 2656 f.

37. To have established this fact, and brought clear light into the manifold darkness which rested upon these subjects, is one of the numerous merits of these two men who, with the liberal support of the delegates of the University Press of Oxford, carried on their investigations for twenty-two years long, made a thorough search of the most important public and private libraries of Great Britain and Ireland, and on the basis of a critical comparison of numerous MSS. published the earlier as well as the later translations, along with prefaces. The work has this title, *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal books, in the earliest English versions made from the Latin vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers; edited by the Rev. Josiah Forshall, F.R.S., and Sir Frederic Madden, K.H., F.R.S., Keeper of the Manuscripts in the British Museum*. Oxford University Press, 1850, 4 vols. large 4to, with a copious Preface in vol. I. (from which we have drawn much of what we have given above), and a Glossary to these translations in vol. IV. The two translations are throughout printed side by side in double columns—the older to the left, the later to the right. The various readings are given in Notes.

38. Henry Wharton, in the *Auctarium to Usher's Historia—controversiae—de Scripturis et sacris vernaculis*, London, 1690, p. 424 f., had rightly perceived which was the older and which the later translation, and while rightly attributing the older to Wiclif, had incorrectly assigned the later to John of Trevisa. Dr. Waterland had come to see that the Translation, with the "General Preface" to the Bible, was the work of John Purvey; but he had not held fast to this view, and had even fallen back to the old opinion that the later Recognition was the earlier. He was followed in this by John Lewis, Wyclif's first Biographer, when he published, on the basis of two MSS., the later translation of the New Testament as the work of Wiclif—*New Testament, translated out of the Latin Vulgate, by John Wiclif, about 1378*. Lond., 1731, fol. This same translation has been twice printed in the present century—in 1810, by H. H. Baker, *New Testament, translated from the Latin, in the year 1380*, by John Wyclif, D.D.; and in 1841 upon the basis of one MS. in Bagster's English Hexapla, 4to (*The Bible Translations of Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, and others*). On the other hand, the New Testament in the older translation was first published in 1848 by Lea Wilson, after a MS. in his own possession, under the title *The New Testament in English, translated by John Wycliffe, circa 1380*. Lond. 4to. Last of all, Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederick Madden gave to the world the Two Translations of the whole Bible, with critical exactness, in the work already mentioned.

39. This remark was first made by Sharon Turner in his *History of England during the Middle Ages*. 1830. Vol. V. p. 425 f. Comp. p. 447 f.

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 *Triologus*, 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.¹ 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 oftentimes, 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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 *Logica 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 theological 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 Augustin 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.¹⁸ 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 irreconcilable 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 *a 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 it²¹) 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵

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.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ 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. *Triologus*, ed. Lechler. Oxford, 1869. Liber III., c. 8, p. 155; L., a. 10, pp. 69, 70.

3. *Responsiones ad argumenta Radulphi de Strode*, Vienna MS., 1338, f. 116, col. 3. Et aliae conclusiones, quas 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. 8, col. 1: De ista vana gloria confiteor 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: Constat 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 beleuchtet," 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 *Triologus*. He investigates Wiclif's doctrine in its most important heads, following the order and carefully analysing the reasonings of the *Triologus*. 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 *Triologus* 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 Logica* 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. *Triologus*, ed. Lechler, Book I., c. 8, p. 62; L., 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. *Triologus*, 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. *Triologus*, 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. *Triologus*, I., c. 9, p. 67.—Comp. Lewald's *Theol. Doctrin Wyckliffe'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 *Triologus*, 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 Scripturae Sac.*, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 18, 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. *Libri Mandatorum*, Vienna MS., 1339, fol. 139, col. a: Cum visio creaturarum in proprio genere sit tam imperfecta et tantum distraheus 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 aeternitatis, 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 universalis 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 subject 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 Scripturæ Sacræ*).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 mediæval 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 behave 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 Rule⁶³—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 authority," 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'—*virī 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 *Triologus*, 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.¹ 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 continues, 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 ἑαυτῶν (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."⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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.*, *Triologus*, I., c. 8, p. 61: Nec ratio, nec auctoritas hoc convincit; and similarly in other places.

34. *De Veritate Scripturæ*, c. 12, Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 31, col. 4. Here he is speaking of violence 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 conscientie et naturaliter insite 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. *Triologus*, 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 terra, 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. *Triologus*, B. III., c. 31, p. 239.

46. *Triologus*, III., 31, p. 238 : Non sincere credimus in Dominum Jesum Christum, cum hoc dato ex fide fructuosa teneremus, quod scripturæ a.—sit infinitum major auctoritas quam auctoritas alterius scripturæ 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 exortia*, in Walch, *Monimenta mediæ 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 Scripturæ 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 ceremonias 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 evanescent, sed os et sapientia, quam dedit apostolis in die pentecostes, manet in æternum, cui non poterunt 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. *Triologus*, I., 9, p. 65 : Sicut sacrae scripturae sententia, sic et ejus logica est a fidelibus veneranda, III., 31, p. 242 ; cum logica scripturae sit rectissima, subtilissima et maxime usitanda. Comp. *Supplementum Triologi*, 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 cartae impossibile est quod maneat dignitas ad privilegium vel aliquod bonum gratuitum capiendum. *De Veritate Scripturae* s., c. 12, fol. 82, 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 ecclesiae. *De Ecclesia*, c. 8, fol. 152, col. 3 : Omnis lex utilis sanctae matri ecclesiae docetur explicito vel implicito 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. *Triologus*, III., 31, p. 239 : quod scriptura s. sit infinitum magis autentica et credenda, quam quaecunque 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 evangelicae tanquam regulae essentialiter divinae.

64. *De Veritate Scripturae* s., c. 15, fol. 48, col. 2 : Impossibile est, ut dictum Christiani vel factum aliquod sit parvis 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 impermixta. *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 (ecclesiae) regulari pure lege scripturae, quam quod traditiones humanae sint sic commixtae cum veritatibus evangelicis, ut sunt modo.

68. *De Veritate Scripturae*, c. 7, fol. 17, col. 3 : ut quidam Dr. traditionis humanae 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 atomi (sic) antichristi.

70. *Sermons for Saints' Days*, 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 *virii 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*, Frankfurt, 1663, II., fol. 398-957. Opus nonaginta dierum contra errores Joannis 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 1., *De Dominio Divino*, MS. 1389, fol. 1, col. 1: Innitar . . . in ordine procedendi rationi et sensui scripturæ, cui ex religione et speciali obedientia sum professus. . . . Sed ut sensum hujus incorrigibilis scripturæ sequar securius, innitar ut plurimum duobus ducibus, scilicet rationi philosophis revelatæ, et postillationi sanctorum doctorum apud ecclesiam approbatæ.

77. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 28, MS. 1340, fol. 253, col. 2: Spiritus sanctus docet nos sensum scripturæ, sicut Christus aperuit apostolis sensum ejus.

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

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

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

82. *De Veritate Scripturæ 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 scripturæ videtur ex hoc necessarium (*sic*), quod saepe una pars scripturæ exponit aliam. Prodest crebro legere partes scripturæ pro habendo conceptu suæ concordantiæ. In the *Miscellaneous Sermons*, No. XL. MS. 3928, fol. 213, col. 1, Wiclif observes: Sunt enim veritates scripturæ quæ sunt verba Dei, sic connexæ, quod unumquodque juvat quodlibet.

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

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

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

86. *De Quatuor Sertis Norcellis*, MS. 3929, fol. 232, col. 4: Non valet saltus

a literali sensu scripturae ad sensum mysticum, nisi ille sensus mysticus 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 Pastoralis*, II., c. 7, p. 39: Christus renuit iudicium 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. 115, 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 *Triologus*, 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*.¹⁰⁸

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.¹⁰⁸ 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.¹⁰⁸

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 *Triologus* 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 *Triologus*, 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 inclusive 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. *Triologus*, 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. *Triologus*, 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 maximæ potentiaæ positivæ, 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 adæquantur.
101. *De Dominio Divino*, III., c. 5, MS. 1340, fol. 30, col. 1: phantasiantes de Dei potentia absoluta.
102. *Triologus*, I., 5, p. 52.
103. *Ib.*, I., 9, p. 67.
104. *Ib.*, I., c. 2, p. 42: Aeternitas, quæ est omnino indivisibilis, et cum sit ipse Deus, non accidentaliter sibi inest, nec habet prius et posterius sicut tempus.
105. *De Veritate s. Scripturæ*, c. 19. Vienna MS., 1294, fol. 62, col. 2: Deus non potest mutare sensum—vel intellectum suum, sed omne quod sentit, intelligit . . . æternalliter 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. *Triologus*, I., c. 6 f., especially p.
108. *Ib.*, 6, p. 54.
109. *Ib.*, p. 56.
110. *Ib.*, c. 7, p. 53, applying the Aristotelian distinction between proofs

which come to a *dióti*, and such as come to a *óti*, 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. *Triologus*, 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. 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 it 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 determining 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 Innocentie*—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 Sacre*—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.¹²⁷ 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.¹²⁸

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
113. *De Dominio Civili*, IIL, c. 5, MS. 1840, fol. 29, col. 1: Impossibile fuisse ipsum fecisse mundum majorem, pulcriorem, etc.
114. *Triologus*, 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 communis)*, 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. *Triologus* 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 Zisaniorum*, 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 IIL, 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.*, IIL, 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 unmistakably, 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 *Triologus* 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 peculiar 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. *Triologus*, 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 praecepti 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 acciderenter 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 aliquid (aliud, MS. 1339) nec aliquid, 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., *Para 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. *Triologus*, 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. 284, col. 3.

159. *Triologus*, 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 system 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 Re-

deemer.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 develops 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 develop 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.¹⁸³

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 Puri-

fication, 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?"¹⁸⁹ 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 both¹⁹² 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 sin¹⁹⁵—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 unmistakably 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 *Triologus* 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 apostasy 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 unmistakable 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 behaviour 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 imagination²³⁴ (*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 Melancthon, 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. *Triologus*, III., 29, p. 230 f., cf. IV., 39, p. 336.

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 conqueror 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. *Triologus* 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 Pontifex 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. *Triologus*, III., 30, p. 234 f.

176. *Triologus*, III., 30.

177. *Triologus*, 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 humanitatem 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. *Triologus*, 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 a Scripturae*, c. 29, MS. 1194, fol. 101, col. 4: Vita Christi tanquam communissima et toti ecclesiae notissima super verticem montium posita, est in scholis, 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 impecabilis 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 dost thou for me?"

189. *Triologus*, IV., 12, p. 238: Non dubito quin passio Christi tam ad pos-

terius 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 sufficit 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 praedestinos, quos ordinavit ad gloriam.

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

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

196. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. VI., MS. 3628, fol. 143, col. 4 : Verum concluditur, 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. *Triologus*, 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 XIII^o 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 . . . quodcumque 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 quoniam possibile peccare, nisi propter defectum fidei. *Triologus*, III., 2, p. 135. Cum impossibile sit quoniam 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. 148, 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. *Triologus*, 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 11^o 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 regeneratos in via virtutum vivificat; 2, vianes ad invadendum inimicos excitat et confortat; 3, protegendum impugnantem 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 prophetæ: "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 fortunæ quæ sunt minima, bona naturæ, quæ sunt media, bona virtutis et gratiæ, quæ sunt maxima.

208. *Triologus*, III., 29, p. 229. *De Ecclesia*, a. 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 gratiæ, quo justii sunt omnia.

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

211. *Id.*, III., 10, p. 168: Tota radix cujusalibet speciei superbiæ 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 implicate blasphemia. Quum homo superbit, negat implicate se habere superiorem, legibus cujus obediat.

213. *Triologus*, III., 11, p. 164 f.: Humilitas est aliis virtutibus fundamentum. Quicumque 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 connexæ sunt fundamentum religionis Christianæ. 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, ever the better 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. *Triologus* III., 2, p. 132, 136 f.

215. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 26, MS. 1340, fol. 247, col. 2: Ars præcipua, quam in schola virtutem addicimus, est ars diligendi Deum. *XL. Miscel. Sermon.*, No. I., MS. 3928, fol. 194, col. 2: Nullus actus hominis meritorius est, nisi in quo Deus superseminenter diligitur. In one of his English sermons Wiclif 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*, a. 31, MS. 1339, fol. 126, col. 2.

217. *Triologus*, 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 diligit suos domesticos, etc. *De Ecclesia*, c. 15 MS. 1294, fol. 177, col. 2: Patet, quod de lege caritatis et spiritualis elemosinæ—

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 *solicite*), 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 heroicis, 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 Pastoralis*, 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., tiber 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. 80, 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 quodcumque peccatum, cum ad satisfactionem requiritur gratia infinita specialis.

232. *Triologus*, III., 7, p. 153. Et patet vanitas nostrorum loquentium, qui

ponunt, quod gratia talis datur homini. . . de congruo, ut facilius 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. *Triologus*, 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 agriculator 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. *Triologus*, IV., 32, p. 158. Supponunt, quod in cullis sint infinita sanctorum supererogata merita. . . . et super totum illum thesaurum Christus papam constituit, etc.

239. Preface to *Sententiae veterum de cōna 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. 167, cols. 3 and 4. In both sermons I find the above sequence introduced. Comp. Daniel, *Theaurus 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 communion 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 (*praedestinati 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 life²⁶³—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. *Triologus*, 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 praedestinationum . . . et istam ecclesiam necesse est esse sponsam capitula, quam ratione praedestinationis ac promissionis non potest ipsam (*sic*) deserere. *Liber Mandatorum (Decalogus)*, c. 23, MS. 1339, fol. 184, col. 1: Omnes Christiani praeordinati simul collecti constituunt unam personam, quae est sponsa Christi. *De Ecclesia et membris ejus*, c. 1, p. 4, and this church is moder to eche (each) man that shal be saved, and conteyneth no membre but only men that shulen be saved.

244. *Triologus*, 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. 153, 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 understonden anoon prelati and prestis, monki, and chanouns, and freris, and alle men that han crownes (that have the tonsure) though thei lyven nevere so cursedly agens Goddis lawe, and clepen not ne holden secularis 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 hevane 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. *Triologus*, II., 14, p. 122. Praedestinationis aut praescientiae divinae est causa indubie ipse Deus, cum nulla creatura causat, formaliter intelligendo, hoc actus sive notitias Deo intrinsecas atque aeternas.

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

250. Comp. the whole 14th chap. of 2d Book of the *Triologus*, 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 iudicii 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 Triologi*, 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 prae-

destinati 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 apparatusibus, 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. *Triologus*, 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 Augustina*, 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. *Triologus*, 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 self, i.e., whether he is one of the members of Christ.

264. *Triologus*, 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 evidentialia capta ex opere, quo sequerentur dominum Jesum Christum.

266. *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 14, MS. 1294, fol. 83, 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 marvel 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, inasmuch 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 *Dialogus*. 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 canonisa-

tions 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 advance 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 *Triologus* 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."²⁸⁶ "For my part I condemn no act of this kind, but at the same time there are few or none which I can positively commend, 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."²⁸⁶

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 keep 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 archetypes 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.²⁶⁹

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.²⁷¹ 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.²⁷²

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."²⁷³ 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. 184, col. 2: Utinam non multiplicarentur tot cerimonie et signa in nostra ecclesia!

270. *Ib.*, c. 19, MS. 1294, fol. 192, col. 1: Sed in isto stat periculum militantis ecclesie, quod judaizando secundum sensum carnalem signa illa cum traditionibus humanis plus suis signatis praeponderet, vel etiam legem Dei plus attendat iudicio sensus corporis, 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 cōllestia 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 sumptuosius, auditum, campanis organis et novo modo disciendi 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. 86, 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 peccatorum.

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 sa. monachi et fratres sint in beatitudine altiores quam dati sancti, quorum festa solemnitas ecclesiae, verumtamen discretio hujus in particulari excedit humanum iudicium. Ideo standum est determinationi ecclesiae.

281. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2, MS. 1294, fol. 134, col. 1 and 2 : Absit christianum credere, quod de necessitate salutis oportet omnem fidelem credere explicito 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. *Dialogus*, III., 30, p. 237 : Insuper videtur multis, quod curia ista sic canonizans sanctos blasphemie praesumit, cum subducta revelatione tam plene 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 solemnitas 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 quocunque Deus contemnerit, 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 penam peccati populum multum falli. Unde in multis patriis cupido pecuniae facit in multis ecclesiis, quod pars personae, sanctae ut canonizetur pro confessore vel martyre, plus honoretur peregrinatione, sumptuosa oblatione et sepulcri oratione 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

sepulchris 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. 3923, fol. 203, col. 3: Licet mortuis prosint suffragia ecclesiae, verumtamen quantumlibet opus meritorium . . . factum a superstitibus 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. 816, 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 praeposita, 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 fornicibus.

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 unchastity 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 stage 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 hierarchy, including the Papal Primacy itself.³¹⁵ Hence Wiclif in numberless places speaks of the *imperial* plenary power of the Pope—e.g., *Triologus*, 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 devel-

opment. 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, reformatory 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 spoliation 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 re-

forming 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."²³³ Wiclif'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 reformatory 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.²³⁴

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 ban, 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.³²⁵

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.³²⁶ 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 *Triologus* 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 spoliation 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 Con-

stantine.”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 include 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 *Tri-alogus*, 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 notwithstanding 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 contradicted 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 develops 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.²³⁷ 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*).²³⁸ In the enumeration of these three classes the Mendicants are conspicuous 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. Manifestly 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 (*sophista 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, notwithstanding 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.”³⁵⁴ 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.³⁵⁵ 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.³⁵⁶ 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 develop 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 good³⁶³—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" (*virī evangelicī*)—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 stead-

fast, 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 *Dialogus*, 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, and 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. Scripturæ*, c. 24, MS. 1294, fol. 78, col. 2: Omnem christianum oportet esse theologum, quia necesse est omnem Christianum addiscere fidem ecclesiæ, 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 iudex optimus.

295. *Triologus*, IV., 5, 261: Sed Deus sicut semper servat notitiam naturalem in laicis, sic semper servat sensum catholicum in quibusdam clericis, ut in Græcia 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. Scripturæ*, c. 25, MS. 1294, fol. 82, col. 4: Ex istis colligi

potest sententia, quam saepe inserui, hoc sit mundo odibilis, quod licet laicis in casu tam subtrahere quam auferre bona ecclesiae a suis praepositis. Et voco praepositos quoscunque, qui debent iuvare 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 Pastoralis*, 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 Wifs 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 Pastoralis*, 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 Wifs 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 qualibet sacramenta conferendi . . . absolvendi, nec aliter potest papa absolvere. Nam quantum ad potestatem ordinis omnes sacerdotes sunt pares, licet potestas inferioris rationabiliter sit ligata.

312. *Dialogus*, 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 Dialogi*, c. 6, p. 438 : ut olim omnes sacerdotes vocati fuerunt episcopi. *De Officio Pastoralis*, I, 4, p. 11 : Apostolus voluit episcopos, quos vocat quoscunque curatos.

313. *Dialogus*, IV., 16, 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.

316. *Saints' Day Sermons*, No. XLVI., MS., 3928, fol. 93, col. 3. Tertio introducta est secundum ordinationem caesaream praesidentia episcoporum. Comp. *Dialogus*, 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 infetment 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. 8.

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 (impliciter, papam esse impecabilem, et sic Deum ; potest ergo errare in iudicio). 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 terra, etc.

322. *De Veritate a. Scripturæ*, 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 nostræ, qui nostræ peregrinanti juvenulæ (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 nostræ ecclesiæ. 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 suæ finalis perseverantiæ. . . . 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 obediunt papæ nostro Urbano VI. tanquam humili servo Dei, sicut schismatici obediunt Clementi propter dominium et potestatem secularem: quis dubitat, quin ut sio 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 ecclesiæ, utroque istorum carere.

326. *Cruciata*, c. 8, 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 ecclesiæ sanctæ 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 pugandum, 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-papæ "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 scripturæ et facto hominum, quod in Curia romana sit radix hujus blasphemiae, scilicet homo peccati antichristus insignis loquitur, quod sit summus Christi vicarius, in vita et opere inter mortales eibi simillimus. *Trialogus*, IV., 32, p. 359: Extolitur—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 habetur.

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 præcipuus in acie spiritualis pugnae virtuosæ procedere, et posteris, ut faciant simpliciter (Conj.; Hs. similiter), exemplare. Sic enim fecit Christus in humilitate et passione, et non in seculari dignitate vel ditione. Et hæc 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 Satanæ et præcipuus

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 as 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. 8.

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. Scripturæ*, c. 20, MS. 1294, fol. 65, col. 3: Religiosi autem possessionati, ut defendant (instead of defending) in vita et verbis legem scripturæ patenter apostatant, cum laboribus et expensis laborant ad curiam romanam pro damnanda sententia dicente, multas cartas humanitus adinventas de hereditate perpetua esse impossibiles. Et tamen Oxoniæ tam publice quam procuratorie dicunt testamenta Dei et legem Christi impossibilem et blasphemam. Quodam legem scripturæ diligenter 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 sæpe 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 fishing 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: Necessæ fuit Spiritum s. fratres de ordine Dominici et Francisci statuere ad ædificationem ecclesiæ, etc. Comp. c. 1, fol. 5, col. 1.

341. *Dialogus*, IV., c. 33, p. 362. Comp. *Supplementum Dialogi*, c. 8, p. 444 *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., c. 16, castra Cainitica. Hence the name he gives to the mendicant monks at large, Cainitici, 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. *Dialogus*, 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 ædificabunt 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 abcondite seorsum elemosyna, ut dissolvantur colligationes impietatis, et reducantur ad perfectionem religionis primaevæ.

343. Comp. *On the Co-operation in Reformation Efforts of the Augustinians in the Netherlands, the Lower Rhineland, and Westphalia*, C. A. Cornelius, Geschichte des

Münsterischen Auftruhre, 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 Reformation*, 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. Böhlinger, *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 für 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 primitivæ ecclesiæ*). 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 Moisaica 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. Scripturæ*, 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 credendum 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 *Triologus*, 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. 81, p. 240; B. IV., c. 2 and 38, 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 church. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 22, MS. 1340, fol. 193, col. 2: Ecclesiae ad primam perfectionem restitutio. *De Ecclesia*, c. 8, MS. 1294, fol. 135, col. 1: Correctio nostra secundum statum primaeum.

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 expropriarium facere, et ordinationem Christi quoad suam ecclesiam innovare, etc. Comp. *De Officio Pastoralis*, II., 11, p. 45; *Triologus*, IV., 28, p. 310; *Dialogus*, c. 84, MS. 1387, fol. 159, col. 2: Si autem ipsi episcopi . . . et alii dotati praepositi conciperent in hoc vitam et legem Christi, et sic gratis renunciant omnibus mundanis dominiis, foret illis magis meritum et gloriosior triumphus ecclesiae militantis super diabolum et alia membra sua. The whole tractate *De Officio Pastoralis* turns in like manner upon the thought that it would be more wholesome for the pariah 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. *Triologus*, IV., 18, p. 310: Nos autem dicimus illis, quod nedum possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia habitualiter delinquente, nec solum quod licet illis hoc facere, sed quod debent, etc. *De Civili Dominio*, c. 22, MS. 1340, fol. 183, col. 2: Licet dominis temporalibus auferre 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 rationabilia, 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: Claustorum dissipatio . . . posset verisimilius esse eorum (claustralium) correctio, etc.

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

358. *De Simonía*, 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 IVith 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., 89, MS. 1341, fol. 95, col. 2: Et quum notabiliter delinquant, peccatum esset ipsos defendere, specialiter contra pios principes catholice cohercentes, qualiter praelati non sufficiunt.

362. I bring into view here two particulars—first, The way in which Wiclif emphasises 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 irreconcilable with the *integritas regaliæ 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 papæ 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 præsentis constanter defendere. Doctores evangelici*. *De Civili Dominio*, III., 19, MS. 1340, fol. 163, col. 1.

365. *Supplementum Trialogi*, c. 8, p. 447: *Tunc foret facilis . . . erroris corrigere, et statum ecclesiæ ad ordinationem Christi pure secundum legem suam reducere, quod attendere desidero*. Comp. *Dialogus*, c. 18: *Intendimus purificationem et perfectionem clari, 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. 3923, 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 assistant, quia nihil illis et dictis apostatis.

368. *De Veritate s. Scripturæ*, 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 præsentem 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. *Dialogus*, IV., 4, p. 258. Comp. *Dialogus*, c. 25, MS. 1387, fol. 156, col. 1 : Dicam ergo istam sententiam pro bono papæ atque ecclesiæ, et si occasio 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 versutias antichristi. Sic enim incipiendo a femina convertit per paucos apostolos totum mundum.

371. *Ib.* (one of Wiclif'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 abconditis 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 *Dialogus* 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 particular 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, Wiclif 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.³⁸² 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 some time 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 *Dialogus*, 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;" ²⁹² 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 *naïve* 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 principalities 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 *Dialogus* 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.⁴⁰³ 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 accord-

ing 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 humorous 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."⁴⁰⁹ 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; ⁴⁴³ again, because God Himself is thereby dishonoured, as though He, the Eternal, were created anew day after day; ⁴⁴⁴ 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.” ⁴⁴⁵

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. ⁴⁴⁶

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. ⁴⁴⁷ 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, inasmuch 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 *Triologus*, 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*),⁴³⁵ 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 outcome.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 behaved 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 unbelieving, 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 par-

taking 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. *Triologus*, 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 specificè? . . . p. 245: Mille autem sunt talia sensibilia signa in scriptura, quae habent tantam rationem sacramenti, sicut habent communiter ista septem.

375. *Ib.*, 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 poenitentiae, 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

fideles, 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 Fugient.*, 1536, fol. CXXXIII. Mansi, *Conciliorum Nova Collectio*, Vol. XXVII., 632 f.

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

386. *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei Ecclesie 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.: . . . quodocumque Christus operatur cum homine, et solum tunc conficit sacramentum, quod reputari debet de nostris sacerdotibus et supponi.

389. *Ib.*, c. 12, p. 286: *Reputamus . . . absque dubitatione, quod infantes rite baptisati flumine sint baptisati tertio baptismate (scil. baptismo fluminis), 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 a. 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 oculo actuali, ministrat fidelibus, licet sibi damnabiliter, tamen subjectis utiliter sacramenta.* Wiclif expresses himself to the same effect, and quite unmistakably 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: These (these) Antichristis sophistres (sophisters) schulden knowe well, that a cursed man doth fully the sacramentis, though it be to his dampnyng, for they ben not autours (authors) of the 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 acmuli 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. 86, col. 2: Proportionabiliter de eucaristias 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. 56). 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 abijciunt 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. *Triologus*, IV., c. 2, Oxford, 1869, p. 248: Inter omnes haereses, quas 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 multipliciter 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.

400. *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 cujusdam aemuli veritatis*, c. 16, MS. 1338, fol. 114, col. 3: Fides scripturae, cum rationes humanae hic deficient, 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. *Ib.*, IV., c. 4, p. 256, and more fully, c. 9, p. 247 f.

404. *Wyckett*, p. 18, in the new reprint, Oxford, 1823.

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 makynge of Christes bodye, etc.

406. *Triologus*, IV., c. 2, p. 249: Ipsa curia ante solutionem diaboli cum antiqua sententia . . . planius concordavit . . . et sic est de omnibus sanctis doc-

toribus, qui usque ad solutionem Sathanæ 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 Elvidium, qui indubie plus scrivit de sensu evangelii, quam omnes sectæ modernæ noviter introductæ. *Dialogus*, c. 15, MS. 1387, fol. 153, col. 1: The reader is reminded of what was 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. *Trilogus*, 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 baptisauerunt terminum, etc.

408. *Ib.*, IV., 4, p. 257: Ideo vel oportet veritatem scripturæ suspendere, vel cum sensu ac iudicio humano concedere, quod est panis. Comp. c. 5, p. 259: Inter omnes sensus extrinsecos, quos Deus dat homini, tactus et gustus sunt in suis iudiciis magis certi; sed illos sensus hæresis 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 ipse 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., *Trilogus*, 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. *Trilogus*, 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 subit 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 suæ 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 præsumunt propter pecuniam benedicere a Domino maledictis.

417. *Ib.*, 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 hostiam 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 patriæ 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 host—sacred host).

419. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 4, col. 2: Et forte multi christiani nomine infidelitate pagani peiores; nam minus malum foret, quod homo id quod primo videt manere, 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. *Triologus*, 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 indubiè 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. *Triologus*, IV., c. 10, p. 281: Visa hostia adoro ipsam conditionaliter, et omnimode deodoro corpus Domini, quod erat 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 quacunq[ue] substantia creata est Deitas realius et substantialius quam corpus Christi in hostia consecrata. XXIV. *Miscel. Sermons*, No. L, MS. 3928, fol. 132, col. 2: Ipsi autem dicunt, quod est (scilicet 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 *Triologus*, 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 abomination of dyscomforte that is sayd in Daniel the prophete standyng 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, 1646, 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 "Nuremberg" 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 immolamus 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 1416; 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 implissimus 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, Augustine, 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 for 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 (Docetiam). Alii autem sensibilibus crediderunt, quod Christus fuisset vere et pure homo, sio quod non Deus. . . . Et proportiona-

liter, 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. *Triologus*, 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 fuero, sensum subtiliorem credere.

436. *Ib.*, IV., c. 4, p. 255: Et sicut virtute verborum fidel 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,
Etal 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 cōlo, scil. modus essendi substantialiter, corporaliter et dimensionaliter. . . . Nullo istorum modorum trium est corpus Christi in sacramento, sed in cōlo.

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. *Triologus*, 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. *Triologus*, IV., c. 8, p. 272: Non est intelligendum, corpus Christi descendere ad hostiam in quacunque ecclesia consecratam, sed manet sursum in cõlis stabile et immotum; ideo habet esse spirituale in hostia et non esse dimensionatum et cetera accidentia quae in cõlo. *De Eucharistia*, c. 1, MS. 1387, fol. 2, col. 1: Ipsum (corpus Christi) est totum sacramentaliter 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 vacillet, 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. *Triologus*, IV., c. 8, p. 269 f.

447. It rests entirely on a misunderstanding when the Carthusian prior, Stephen of Dolan, in his *Medulla Triticæ seu Anti-Wiclefius*, 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*: Configis tibi (so he apostrophizes Wiclif) adinventionis terminos novo prevernitatis loquendi modo . . . impanationem videlicet corporis Christi tibi fabricans, referring to the words in *Triologus*, 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 Ortwinus 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. *Triologus*, 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 passione animae ex fructuosa fide.

451. *Confessio*, in Lewis, 325 : Cum ergo fidelis non optaret comedere corporaliter sed spiritualiter corpus Christi, patet quod Omnis sciens aptavit illum modum spiritualem essendi corporis sui cum hostia, quae debet comedi a fidei, 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 *Pasc. 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 cōlum a terra, tantum differt manducare panem sacramentalem spiritualiter et manducare ipsum corporaliter. Stat enim, suum 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. 928—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 superflus 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, Bartholomæus 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.³ 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,⁴ 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, indeed, 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-by 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 Christendom. 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 *Triologus*, 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 anti-christian 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 *Triologus*. In two places there, Book IV., c. 36, 37, pp. 373, 377, he speaks of Clement VII. (*Robertus Gibbonensis*), 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 *Triologus*; while in the *Triologus* 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 *Triologus*, 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 Antichrista," 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 ecclesiae 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 zizania, totque pestiferis plantavit erroribus, tot denique suae sectae procreavit haeredes, quod, sicut probabiliter credimus, absque mordacibus sarculis et censuris asperimis 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 tran-

substantiated, 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 hierarchal 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.⁸⁰ 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. Wiclei 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.; *Pasc. Zisan.*, Shirley, p. 105 f.

Conclusiones Wyccliff 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 abjectionis ac imperfectior pane equino.

(11.) Quicumque pertinaciter defenderit quod dictum sacramentum sit accidens, qualitas, quantitas, aut earum aggregatio, incidit in haeresin supradictam.

(12.) Panis triticus, in quo solum licet conficere est in natura infinitum perfectionis pane fabino vel ratonio, 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 abjectionis* 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 Wyccliff*, 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 revolted 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. Albans, 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 2d 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 irreconcilable 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.⁸⁷ 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."⁸⁸ 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 antagon-

ism 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. 3993, fol. 158, col. 4: Patet nobis Anglicis de isto lamentabili conflictu, quo archiepiscopus prior (Simon Sudbury) et multi alii crudeliter sunt occisi. . . . Temporales possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia delinquente, quod foret tolerabilis, quam quod rurales sufferant 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*, IIL, 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. Tryden, fol. 2644: Hic habuit praecursorem Jo. Balle, etc., fol. 2656: Hic magister J. Wiclif in suo adventu habuit Johannem Balle suae pestiferæ inventionis praemeditatorem, etc.

34. Walsingham, *Hist. Anglicana*, ed. Riley, Vol. I., 454 f.

35. *Ib.*, 457.

36. *Ib.*, Vol. II., 41 f.

37. *Ib.*, *Hist. Angl.*, ed. Riley, II., 9 : qui fuit, post Walterum Tylare, 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 sufficessent 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 de-

scended 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.⁴⁶ 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 baptise.

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 parishioners, 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 Province 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—20th 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, inasmuch 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 calendae 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. *Triologus*, 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 a 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 freiris at London was with erthe dyn. For thei putt an hereise upon Christ and seyntis in heven; wherefore 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 Bodily*, cap. 6. Ther counsel 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.

49a. 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 baptizat.

(5.) Item quod si homo fuerit debite contritus, omnis confessio exterior est sibi superflua 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 iudicii 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 inceptor et inhabilis ad observantiam mandatorum Dei.

(21.) Item quod sancti instituentes religiones privatas quascunque, tam possessionum quam 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 *Triologus* 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. 366 f.

53. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 158 f.: Knighton *De Eventibus Angliæ*, 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 Wilkins' *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 notariaily. 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, 5th 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.⁶⁵

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.⁶⁶ 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, enchaind 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.⁷⁵ 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 doctrines. 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.⁷⁶ 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;⁷⁷ 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."

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 Crompt, 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 Crompt'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 haereticae 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. Courtney 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 Oxford. 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.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

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 Crompt 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 Crompt 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 Braybrooke 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 Parliament, 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 23d 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.*, pp. 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.*, pp. 309-311.

78. *Ib.*, p. 311.

79. *Fasc. Zizan.*, 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 Wilkins' *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 regium, in Rymer, *Federa*, VII., 363; *Fasc. Zizan.*, 314 f.; Lewis, p. 365; Foxe, III., 43.
94. *Triologus*, 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. Lincolnensis episcopi contra Willelmum Swynderby Wyoclevistam, 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 presupposes 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 recantation, 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 guard¹¹¹—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 Courtney 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 Crompt. 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 Angliæ*, fol. 2649). He asserts, it is true, that Wiclif made a complete recantation (*eis conclusionibus sive opinionibus omnino renunciatis, 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 retraction, 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 *Concilien Geschichte*, 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—"Please it to our noble and most worthy King Richard," of which two manuscripts are still extant, the one perfect, in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the other 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 peasants' 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, out 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 for vengeance out 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.¹³³

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."¹³⁴ 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 unbecoming 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 Anti-christ pretends that they are absolved from all sin and penalty and have entrance into heaven.¹²⁵

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.¹²⁶ 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.”¹²⁷

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 fear-

less 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 conjectures. 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 *Dialogus* 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.¹⁵³ 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,¹⁵⁴ 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 *Triologus* 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 estimation 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.¹⁶⁰ 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*, pp. 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., 480.
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 republished 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 Wiclifite 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 Tetzels.
132. Wilkins, *Concilia*, III., 177: *Præcipue contra Francigenas, ipsorum schismaticorum principales fautores, et domini nostri regis et regni Angliæ capitales inimicos pro pace ecclesiæ acquirenda et defensione regni . . . quod neque pax ecclesiæ 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. *Ib.*, 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 audent stare. Non enim quietatur persecutio in multis millibus corporum occisorum, nec solum in fraudulentis spoliacionibus 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 pœna ad cœlum ascendere, moriuntur infideliter in hac persecutione perfida jam regnante.

136. *Ib.*, 2, fol. 233, col. 3: Videtur quod eorum interest prudenter aufferre hoc disensionis 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 sacrae 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 Missae 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 Missae 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. *Dialogus*, III., 15, p. 181, f.: Sed praedicemus constanter, legem Christi, etiam praelatis Caesaris, 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 Boemos 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 praeteream, voluntarium exilium petisse, ac magno postea apud Boemos in pretio fuisse? etc. The modern Vergil 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 poeta fuit.

155. This fact is attested by Dr Thomas Gascoigne: Et iste Wyleff 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, Normannica*, etc., ed. Camden, Frankfurt, 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 vallet 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 sermons 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., 380 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 Church. 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 Wyckliffe, 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 Lyttryworth circa elevationem sacramenti altaris decidit percussus magna paralysi*, says Gascoigne, from the mouth of John Horn, in Lewis, 386.

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 Wyckliffe*, 468: He does not speak, nor even seems to be conscious.

167. Gascoigne's 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 *Triologus* 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 course 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 (*argutiae fictitiae*) 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 solidae 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.¹⁸³ 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.¹⁸⁸ 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 episodal 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 jurisdictio*;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."¹⁸⁵

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."¹⁸⁶

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."¹⁸⁷

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.¹⁹⁹ 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."²⁰⁰ 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 *Triologus*, as, e.g., when he said of the Mendicants and their letters of brotherhood, that "they sell the cat in a bag."²⁰¹ 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."²⁰² 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.²⁰³ 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 transubstantiation. 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 transcendere. *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-Fabdn 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., *Triologus*, 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, 1890, 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 perpressio foret argumentum efficacius infideli, quam disputationes scolasticæ, 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. *Triologus*, III., c. 22, p. 206 f., where he deals with the sin of Onanism with impressive earnestness.

189. *E.g.*, *De Veritate s. Scripturæ*, 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, quas audivi non occurrit mihi aliquod difficilius aut detestabilius. . . . Ego quidem horrerem introducere scolam istam tanquam doctor mendaci*, etc.

190. *De Veritate s. Scripturæ*, 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. Scripturæ*, 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 jurisdictio 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. Scripturæ*, 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 Ecclesiæ Militantis*, c. 23, MS. 1387, fol. 155, col. 2.

199. *XXIV. Sermons*, No. IV., MS. 3928, fol. 138, col. 3.

200. *Triologus*, 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. Scripturæ*, c. 12, MS. 1294, fol. 34, col. 4: *Testis ait mihi Deus, ego principaliter intendo honorem Dei et utilitatem ecclesie*, etc.

203. *De Veritate s. Scripturæ*, 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.

A P P E N D I X.

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 apocalyptic 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 Denis.

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 Dotations 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 *Summu 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 numerous. 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* (Grossetête), 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 *Triologus* 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 *Triologus*, *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 Ydels*, 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.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) <i>De Mandatis Divinis</i>. (2) <i>De Statu Innocentiae</i>. (3) <i>De Dominio Civili</i>, Lib. I. (4) <i>De Dominio Civili</i>, Lib. II. (5) <i>De Dominio Civili</i>, Lib. III. (6) <i>De Veritate Sacras Scrip- turae</i>. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (7) <i>De Ecclesia</i>. (8) <i>De Officio Regis</i>, (9) <i>De Potestate Papae</i>. (10) <i>De Simonia</i>. (11) <i>De Apostasia</i>. (12) <i>De Blasphemia</i>.
--	---
3. *Triologus*.
4. *Supplementum Triologi 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 Pastoralis*, 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 Determinatio*, 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 Domini-calia*, 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 in 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 Sermones 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 Mynystrie 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*, Vol. 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. Hannah'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 *Quicumque*, 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 Orations 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 bodily*; 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 Wiclif, 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., pp. 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 Wives, 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*, pp. 258-271, Shirley's *Catal.*, No. 65.

2. *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 Parlamentum Regis*, Shirley, No. 50. Published first by Lewis, p. 382, and then by Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*.

2. *Declarationes Johannis Wicliff*, 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., pp. 481-492.

4. *De Eucharistia Confessio*, Shirley, No. 19. Printed in Lewis, pp. 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.*, pp. 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, Nos. 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, Nos. 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. 380 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 *Dialogus* 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 *Triologus*; for, first of all, the *Dialogus* is a simpler form of colloquy than the *Triologus*, and, secondly, the speakers introduced in the *Dialogus* are more than in the *Triologus* 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 *Triologus*, 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 *Triologus* 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 *Triologus*. 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 *Triologus*.

2. *On the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture* (a fly-leaf), Shirley, No. 60. *Select Works*, III., 186.

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 Prælatorum, 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. Nos. 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 rules, and ordynances of synful men*. Shirley, No. 30.
11. *Rule of St. Francis*, and
12. *Testament of St. Francis*. } Shirley, Nos. 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 *Thres Treatises by John Wycliffe*, pp. 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 *Thres Treatises*, and in Arnold's *Select Works*, III., 430-440. Let us not omit to mention here that the piece entitled *Of Antecrist and his Meynes* (Shirley, No. 48), which Todd also published in the *Thres Treatises*, was pronounced ungenueine by Vaughan in his *Monograph*, p. 539, and has also been referred to by Arnold in *Select Works*, I., Introduction vii., to a later date.

3. *Antecrist and his Clerkis travelen to deströie Holy Writt*. Shirley, No. 33.

4. *How Sathanas and his Prestis casten to deströie alle good lyynges*. 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 bisynesses 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 constreyns 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 Simples 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, Nos. 61-65), 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 Denis.

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 Sacre Scripturæ*, pp. 1-127. At the end occurs this notice, *Correctus guaviter, anno Domini 1407, in Vigilia purificationis S. Mariæ, Ozonii per Nicolaum Faulstich et Georgium de Kaychnia*. 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, pp. 258, 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 Innocentie*.

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 boot-maker 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* CCXCII.), 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 *Triologus*, 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 *Triologus*, 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 *Triologus*, which is followed by the *Dialogus*, and next by sermons and tracts.

10. No. 3933 (*Dénis* CCCXI.), fol. pp. 196. This volume was once the property of a certain Paul von Slavikowich. 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 CCOXCXVIII.), 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 Innocentie*, 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 Prizibram, 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 Ecclesie*; p. 53-74, *Pastorale*, or *De Officio Pastoralis*; and pp. 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 Comuni*; p. 167, *De Ente Primo*; p. 190, *De Ente Particulari*. The MS. bears the name of the copyist, Peter von Czaław, 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 Basile*.

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 Grossetête, *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 CCCCH.), 4to, pp. 227. This MS. contains only Wiclif pieces, especially the following:—(1) The *Decalogus*, (2) the *Triologus*, (3) the Supplement to the *Triologus*. Comp. Lechler's edition of the *Triologus*, 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 Pastoralis*.

19. No. 4515 (Dénis CCCCH.), 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, p. 156. This MS. contains only writings of Wiclif, and these exclusively on philosophical subjects, viz., the *Logica*, the *Continuatio Logice*, 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 Daemone 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, CCCC.V.), f. 180, col. 2.

Quinto arguitur per deducens ad *familiares 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 bonum¹ moraliter, et tamen cum hoc et in hoc peccare venialiter, ut ista pars habet dicere, "*in familiariori exemplo* : " Nam Dominus Simon Hyslep, archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, fundavit unum collegium in Oxonia,² plus pia intencione, ut evidencius creditur, quam de fundacione cuiuscunque abbathe in Anglia ; et ordinavit, quod in ea⁴ sub forma laudabili studeant ad utilitatem ecclesie *pure clerici seculares*, quod et factum est ; et tamen⁵ pso mortuo, symoniace cum commentis mendacii eversum est tam pii patroni propositum, et illis expulsis pauci alii non egentes sed divitiis 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 divitiis." Et cum pretextu⁷ illius fuci⁸ 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 nortificata, quin appropriatio sapuit peccatum altrinsecua.

¹ bonum, bene, Shirley, *Fasc. Zisan.*, 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, quæstio 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 reddituum temporalium mortificatio, scilicet quod totus clerus vivendo pure expropriarie, de decimis, oblationibus et privatis elemosinis sit contentus.

IV.

FORMA JURAMENTI ARNALDI PAPE THEZAUARIL

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 a patris nostri domini pape intra vestrum regnum Anglie promitto et iur ad sancta Dei evangelia, quod ero fidelis et legalis vobis et vestre corona.

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 deteccionem 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 viva.

Nullum thesaurum 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 aliquam² literas quas-cunque mandabo extra predictum regnum vestrum, antequam super hoc habuero specialem licenciam de vobis aut vestro concilio.

¹ MS.: Granario.

² *aliquam*. This reading is conjectural, as the MS. has only the con-

traction *aliqua*, and the French text, in which this clause is wanting, is of no assistance here.

Honerem 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 XIII^o die Februarii Anno domini MCCCLXXII,

praesentibus domino Roberto Thorp cancellario,

domino Ricardo de Scrop, thesaurario Anglie.

domino J. Nevyle, Senescall,

Nicol. Caren, custode sacraei sigilli,

domino Joh. Knyvet, iusticiario Regis,

domino Henrico Wakfeld, thesaurario domus Regis,

domino Henrico Snayth, cancellario stactarii (?)

domino Ricardo de Rauenesaher, clerico de Haneper,
J. de Burnoester

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 thesauri ad curiam sine recompensa corporalis aut spiritualis suffragii sit tam preiudiciabile aut dampnosum? Videtur, quod sic; cum regnum nostrum iam sensibilibiter percipiens illud gravamen de ipso conqueritur. Quantum ad retributionem *corporalis* suffragii, dicunt experti, quod non nostri sed inimici nostri cum thesauro 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 potius 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 prebitero sibi assistenti commissam potestatem ad absoluendum eum, quotiescunque in ipsum incurrerit, ita plene, sicut absoluerit dominus noster papa.

Quoad *primum*, videtur quod sapit¹ calumpniam, cum dominus papa sit satis peccabilis, imo per idem, si voluerit, conquereretur 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 nostro¹ 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 dispartiretur exercitui suo stipendium, qui hostes invaderet et regnum regis ac pape ecclesiam a destructione defenderet. Utrum autem talis paucitas pecunie possit regno nostro contingere ex substractione thesauri 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 thesaurum regis, eidem regno preiudicialis fuerit vel dampnosa. Item cum regni prosperitas stat in complectione pie elemosine, secundum formam qua rex et domini regni nostri dotarunt singulariter ecclesiam, quomodo non foret preiudiciale et dampnosum extrahere elemosinas predictas ad curiam, ex quarum defectu foret ocompleteo 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 thesauri regni extraccio eclipseat 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 externa¹ 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 excommunicationis 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; *personis* autem, quia sunt legii homines regis nostri, non defenduntur in pristina *libertate*, cum ex uno latere necessitati sunt ultra solitum³ 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 isti⁴ licet parvipenduntur a superioribus, qui ipsa non senciunt, decrescit regni prosperitas, quia secundum sapientem "qui contempnit modica, paulatim decedit."⁵

Item iuxta *quintum* articulum iuramenti dictus collector non debet exequi literas vel mandata papalia per se vel per alium, que possent esse⁶ displicencia aut preiudicialia 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 executio sui officii regi nostro, licet in etate iuvenili florenti, et omnino⁷ 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 correptionis fraternae urget regnum nostrum, prevaricatori tam intoxicabili resistere et radicem tanti⁸ 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 paciencie 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 mendicantem excommunicationibus vel tradicionibus aliis¹ extorquere. Sic enim posset papa christianismum paupertate et paciencia martirum conquistum 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 subtractionem, postquam fuit gratis⁴ 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 pœnam 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 Palaestinarum 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 *velit, libet*, or some similar word, has been omitted by the transcriber.

³ Bernhard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*.

⁴ *gratis*, MS., *gratius*.

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 natatiliū,¹ quorum semen est constans, cum non habet appropriatum receptaculum, sive formale et liquidum ut semen grossibilem 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 multiplicatur⁴ 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 spiritualom 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: "Quicumque fecerit voluntatem patris mei qui in cõlis 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 cōlestis, 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 meritum active concurrere, sed oportet matrem coagere² ad formationem suae prolia. 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 distantes⁴ renovat et transmutans in homines facit deiformes! Non dubium, quin tam summum mirabile non posset verbum sacerdotis perficere, nisi principaliter cōficiat 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 pro dolor! his diebus est verbum sacerdotis quasi semen decisum a mortuo! Et cum influentia cōlestis 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 pernicioosa 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 praedicantis⁷ 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., *contl*.

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 fuco¹ 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 praedictam peccatum jactantiae magis appareat et cautius caveatur, quod tam latenter et nequiter perdit oves Christi fame refectionis spiritualia, recitabo *tres evidencias* 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 sacerdotem⁴ 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 divisiones⁷ 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 confusibilis 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 praepondere, et dare occasionem extraneando et se ipsum exaltando per grandia verba et commenta, ne simplices audeant praedicare? Non dubium quia 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, *in 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 pulcherrima sit sibi tribuenda; sed hujusmodi¹ 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 formam, qua sapientia theologica a nostris³ 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," nisi clara intentione, nude et apte loqui veritatem quae aedificat? Tunc enim praedicator loquitur "*ex Deo*" et non de extraneo sibi⁴ 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 caret⁷ 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 canonem⁹ nobis saluberrima auctoritate fecerunt, sapientes tantummodo aut eloquentes¹⁰ nuncupandi sunt?"¹¹ Quae quidem quaestio aput me ipsum et aput eos, qui mecum quod dico¹² sentiunt, facillime solvitur. Nam ubi eos intelligo, sicut eis nichil sapientius ita etiam nichil eloquentius michi videri potest. Et audeo dicere, omnes qui

¹ hujusmodi. Conjectural; MS., hujus.

² Isa. v. 20.

³ a nostris. MS., amra. Under nostri auctores Wickliff, 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 canonem.

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 debuissa. Sicut enim est eloquentia, quae magis aetatem juvenilem decet, est quae senilem, nec jam¹ 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 hymnici² et prophetici Veteris Testamenti contexti sunt metricae, 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 obversatur³ ex modernis sermonibus nisi pro tempore⁴ auditoris⁵ titillans delectatio et forte praedicatoris de sua subtilitate ventuosa laudatio.

De tali igitur dyscrasia morali populi christiani potest⁶ 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., ymnidici.

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.

infirmis¹ firmum defensorium contra hostes, tanquam tarris 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 Lincolniensem³ "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 lucro⁴ 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 ad⁵ 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 sigum mortis.

Patet igitur cuilibet nutrito⁶ 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 huiusmodi, ideo ista est eligenda, declamatione heroica⁷ postposita. Idem enim secundum Jeronimum⁸ est loqui sic populo et miscere semina cum floribus ne radicient.⁹ Et secundum Lincolniensem cum praedicatores sint ubera sponsae, sic loquentes¹⁰ deludunt populum, ac si nutriti divariativam 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 *nutrito*, MS., utrumque nutrito.

⁷ *heroica*, MS., eroica.

⁸ Hieron.

⁹ *ne radicient*. Conjectural; the MS. has *ne ut dicent*.

¹⁰ *loquentes*. Conjectural; the MS. has *loquendi*.

tritici daret familias domini sui;¹ non enim rutilante cortice verborum sed adipe frumenti satiavit nos Dominus.²

Sic ergo consumto calore caritatis ad intra, et relucente nitorem verborum ad extra, sunt praedicationes modernae tenebritatae³ 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 in⁵ Novo Testamento correspondenter ad figuram habundant in spiritualibus et specialiter in fidei dispensatione divini semina. Sicut enim inter omnes actus hierarchicos⁶ ecclesiae militantis est⁷ fidelis seminis ministratio Deo maxime placita: sic fraus in illa seminatione est maxime pernicioosa 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 quilibet⁸ fidelis christianus, et specialiter praedicator, et constanter et mere substatere divino beneplacito; et quamvis de se non habeat qualitatem, oportet tamen ipsum *quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus* spiritaliter indui. Et primo *prudencia*, 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 principaliter¹⁰ vel mixtim captetur applausus populi! Idem enim est sic facere et commutare amicitiam Dei¹¹ 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 commutatio¹² 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 cautela 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 cessipet in serendo. Unde exemplar dicit: "Castigo corpus meum et in servitutem redigo,¹ ne forte, cum aliis praedicaverim, ipse reprobos 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 iustum est, quod mens sacerdotis *elevetur in Deum* per notitiam et amorem et alias latrias Deo debitae.

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 desertum⁴ locum, ut sic doceret discipulos suos *prudentiam* ad evitandum adulatorios applausus populi; ubi etiam jejunavit⁵ 40 diebus naturalibus, ut ipso 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 beatam 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*, correspondentem ad *Deum patrem*; potentem quidem non in divitiis nec in potestate mundi vel corporis, sed in opere et sermone. Oportet secundo esse ipsum *sapientem*, correspondentem ad *filium*, non in sapientia hujus mundi, quae est stultitia apud Deum,⁶ sed sapientia quae vincit malitiam populi acerbè fortiter increpando peccata, et suaviter disponendo ac nutriendo bona opera. Sed tertio oportet ipsum esse *benevolentem*, correspondentem ad *spiritum sanctum*; benevolentem dico, non injuste conferendo indignis, propter affectionem carnalitatibus, 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 servitutem* 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 aucte oculos."¹ Sed secundum imaginationem apostoli seminantes sunt bifarii, ut quidam in carne quidam in spiritu;² et hi proportionabiliter duplici sapientiae³ tanquam vasa sui seminis colla subijciunt. 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 subijciant, vel de praeda possessiones vel pingua beneficia sibi perquirant, vel ut lites pro temporalibus protenter suscitent et foveant. Nec dubium quin tales, cum dormierint somnum suum, inveniant pro tali semine acerbis 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 praelatiam vel officium in ecclesia suscipit, ut "semen" spiritualiter "fratri suo" seniori "suscitet," sed magis ut laute vivat et gloriosius appareat. Sed cum durum iudicium 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 Psalms:-

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. xxi. 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 exultatione portantes fructum³ divini seminis, qui quidem fructus est sempiterna fruitio beatæ Trinitatis, quam nobis concedat Deus dominus noster! Amen.

VI.

EPISTOLA MISSA AD SIMPLICES SACERDOTES.

First printed by Shirley from the Vienna MS. 1837, *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, Introd.

XLI. not. 1, from the Vienna MS. 1837 (Dénis CCCLXXXVIII.), f. 52

MSS., A. - Vienna MS., 1837. (Dénis CCCLXXXIV.) f. 105, Col. 2.

" B. - " " 3929. (" CCCLXXXV.) f. 207, Col. 2.

Videtur meritorium mihi⁴ bonos colligere sacerdotes, cum Christus exemplar cujuslibet boni operis sic fecit. Sed elemosynantes caverent de talibus sacerdotibus præcipue in his tribus. *Primo* quod sint amovibiles et non hæredati, cum jam non sint in merito⁵ confirmati, sed sub conditione, quod vivant digne et juste, habeant de temporali elemosyna in mensura. *Secundo*, quod sint in numero loco et⁶ tempore competenti, quia abundantia et defectus in isto peccatum inferunt secundum sententiam sapientum. *Tertio* quod sint solliciti in officio congruo sacerdoti,⁷ cum tam insolertia⁸ quam ostiositas ipsos inhabilitat ad hoc opus, nec quaelibet occupatio pertinet sacerdoti, sicut tabernæ exercitatio, ferarum venatio, ad⁹ tabulas vel ad scaccos occupatio, sed attentata legis Dei informatio, clara verbi Dei prædicatio et devota oratio.

Praecipuum¹⁰ autem istorum est evangelii¹¹ prædicatio, 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 prædicat publice, hortetur private, sic quod si quis loquitur,¹³ loquatur secundum Petri sententiam verbum¹⁴ Dei.¹⁵ Per

¹ Pa. lxxvii. 7, 8.

² Comp. Gal. vi. 9, 10.

³ Comp. Pa. 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*, sacerdoti, Shirley.

⁸ *insolertia*, insolentia, A.

⁹ *ad*, vel *ad*, B.—*scacci* = chess.

¹⁰ *Praecipuum*, primum, Shirley.

¹¹ *evangelii*, Christi evangelii, Shirley.

¹² *injunxit*, injunxit, 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 quicumque 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 sacerdotes¹ zelo animarum succensi² habeant materiam praedicandi, notanda sunt *sex juga* secularis brachii, quae trahunt efficacius curram Christi : *Primum* est inter Christum et fideles simplices viatores, *secundum* est inter conjuges secundum legem Dei³ 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 debet⁶ columba ecclesiae⁷ canticum pacis et caritatis canere et optare. Cum autem⁸ ista *sex juga* secundum istam levitatem et suavitatem⁹ sunt fundabilia in scriptura, evangelisans sic animatus¹⁰ a domino debet animose atque viriliter ista per ordinem praedicare. Illud autem *jugum*, quod debet esse *sacerdotum* ad Christum vel populum,¹¹ vel est¹² in lege domini plene instructum vel ex antichristi perfidia plene disparatum.¹³

Jugum autem *primum*, quod est¹⁴ tocus ecclesiae ad Christum, stat in observantia mandatorum, nam quicumque 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 veteri² 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 ceremonias legis veteris multipliciter onerata, ut dicit Petrus Act. 15^{mo}. Cum ergo totum hoc onus ex libertate christiana deponitur, patet primum.⁵ Sed heu antichristus tantum difficultavit⁶ legem gratiae per suas traditiones caesareas, quod tolerabilior fuerat⁷ lex antiqua. Sed prudens et simplex christianus debet traditiones illas⁸ 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 hominis¹⁰ 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 Deus¹³ est in ecclesia militante. Et quantum ad omnes argutias vitulaminum spuriorum,¹⁴ patet, quod omnia Christi consilia faciunt ad observantiam mandatorum. Et illi qui stulte et private sine¹⁵ 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 turturis¹⁸ sancti Pauli ad Colossenses 3^{to}. Quamvis enim Christus sit turtur praecipue Matthaei 5^o miscens luctum cum gaudio: "Beati, inquit, qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur," tamen¹⁹ membra ejus turtures²⁰ 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 *hominia, homines, A.*

¹¹ *tertium, secundum, B, D.*

¹² *millia exultantium, sunt multi exultantium C; comp. Pa. lrviii. 18.*

¹³ *Deus, dominus, C.*

¹⁴ *spuriorum, spiriorum C. Comp. De officio pastoralis, 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, turtures C.*

cum¹ 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 nostri⁴ Jesu Christi. Ipse enim est prima natura et gracia, in qua natura subducto peccato oportet fieri *creatum quodlibet* naturale. Tolle inquam⁵ peccati vetantiam, et in virtute ejus ac gratia est qualibet creatura; multo evidentius quidquid *homo* fecerit, qui Christi ministerio tam specialiter deputatur.

Isto itaque⁶ 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 enim⁷ mulieres de natura et ex mandato trinitatis esse subditae viris suis, in cujus signum ordinatae sunt esse in natura inferiores, unde philosophi vocant eas viros⁸ in naturalibus defectivos. Genesis autem tertio⁹ legitur, quomodo¹⁰ 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 subditas¹¹ viris suis. Sed signanter modificat, quod sint subditae¹² “*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 domino¹⁴ esse vetitum, tunc non debent¹⁵ in completionem hujus¹⁶ esse subditae viris suis, quia tunc non forent illis subditae¹⁷ *in domino*.

Et per locum a majori, si superior vel praelatus ecclesiae subjecto suo quidquam praeceperit¹⁸ quod dissonat legi Christi, tunc debet ex obedientia debita Christo et illi praelato humiliter rebellare. Quum enim duo praelati quorum unus esse superior et alter,¹⁹ inferior, mandant contraria, superiori in rationali²⁰ 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. 28.

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 voluntati¹ suae contrarium papa quicumque praelatus quantumcunque stricte mandaverit suo subdito, debet viriliter² contra illud rebellare, nam faciendo oppositum peccaret graviter. Ex quibus patet quod tam³ praelatus quam subditus debent cognoscere beneplacitum domini⁴ Jesu Christi; nam sine obedientia sui *privati* praepositi potest salvari, cum non juvat nisi de quanto promovet⁵ 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 improvise⁷ obligati fuerint maledicto vel ignaro⁸ 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 quis¹⁰ praelatus praecipit, subjectum facere quod non est expeditius vitae¹¹ suae et Deo placentius, peccat graviter. Sed quid scit¹² ipse hic¹³ de subjecto, cujus statum et vitam ignorat, cum¹⁴ 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 caeci¹⁵ praecipitant se et suos.

In conjugatis autem, non sic temere obligatis istis consiliis, oportet virum praecipue mandata Dei cognoscere, et uxorem vel ab informatione conjugis¹⁶ vel a Christo mandata Dei cognoscere. Ideo mandat Christus in suo apostolo viros in caritate uxores suas diligere, et non illas amare tractare; ille autem amare 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, salvo 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 rationalibus 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 caeci, qui se in C.

¹⁶ conjugis, conjugis i.e., viri, A, B, which in any case is a Gloss.

caritatis. Et alii casus¹ 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 sive³ femineo, est⁴ notandum, quod parentes, plus tenentur providere de sua prole in spiritualibus secundum legem domini quam in carnalibus,⁵ licet ipsa carnalia⁶ propius et immediatius⁷ a parentibus sint causata.⁸ Probatur, quod⁹ 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 proli, et de maculatione peccato, quam de sua corporali¹³ esurie vel penuria mortali, quod raro vel nunquam eveniet? ¹⁴ Ergo debet ad illud¹⁵ bonum spirituale melius magis niti.

Ex isto patet, quod sinistre et inordinate multi parentes diligunt prolem suam; multi namque delectabiliter ipsos¹⁶ 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 converso¹⁷ diligere proximum quantumcunque extraneum, ergo longe evidentius prolem suam.¹⁸

Sed mundiales graviter et indignanter ferunt istam sententiam dicentes, quod juxta illam permetterent¹⁹ homines nedum proximos²⁰ sed proprios natos mori, quod cum contradicit legi naturae, manifestum est quod est contrarium legi Dei. Nemo enim scit, si ex tali educatione carnali²¹ 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 permetterent. 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 patres¹ dimittere sed debent² gratanter sufferre mortem proximi³ sive nati ut patet II. Regum 12,⁴ de David, quod hilariter sustulit⁵ mortem nati. Verumtamen isti non repugnat sed consonat, quod parens potens debet proli de vitae necessariis providere, licet in malum⁶ praeter intentum parentis, ex hinc quodocunque proli eveniat.⁷ Oportet tamen parentes⁸ 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 mala¹⁰ 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 prudentem¹¹ 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 ut¹² catholicis istam obedientiam modifiet ut priorem. Ideo dicit apostolus ubi¹³ 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 sit¹⁵ 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, qui¹⁶ est pater superior, dominus Jesus Christus. Talis autem irrationabilis praeceptio non ponit in numerum cum mandatis.¹⁷

Patres autem non debent nimis asperere tractare filios, ne postmodum fiant invalidi ad debite patiendum. Sicut enim Christus *paulative* introduxit suam humanitatem a deitate¹⁸ 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 19^{mo} dicitur:⁵ "Non morabitur opus mercenarii tui apud te usque mane." Quamvis autem istud exponatur communiter, quod post completionem laboris opus mercenarii non debeat remanere⁶ per tempus culpabile tenebrosum, tamen assistente indigentia mercenarii debet merces retribui *in completionis laboris*. Deus enim exemplar humane justitie semper gratoe 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 ex⁸ aliis circumstantiis exigendo. Ideo debet esse regula aequitatis in talibus illud⁹ Matthaei 7^{mo}: "Omnia quaecunque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, et vos facite illis!" Ista¹⁰ autem regula intellecta debite est principium communicationis moralis; quicunque enim juste voluerit aliquantulum sibi fieri, debet¹¹ similiter facere alii in casu simili;¹² et totum hoc intelligitur in hoc dicto: "ita et vos facite illis." Debent autem¹³ homines proportionabiliter facere proximis, ut dicunt¹⁴ velle illos facere sibi ipsis. Unde in isto principio fundatur quinta¹⁵ 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 hereditatis. Domino Christo servite. Qui enim injuriam fecit, recipiet id¹⁹ quod inique gessit, et non est personarum acceptio apud Deum." In quibus verbis manifeste sequitur cum isto principio fidei, quod omnia quaecunque fidelis fecerit²⁰ debet

¹ *et ei servientes*, wanting in B, while A erroneously has *ei* 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 *volueris . . . debet*, aliquantulum voluerit sibi, sicut debet C.

¹² *similis*, 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 servirent¹ solum apparenter in praesentia conducentis et in ejus absentia fraudantes ab opere, quia tunc servirent² 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 clarissime intueri. Si ergo mercenarius⁴ propter praesentiam *hominis* serviret⁵ fideliter, quantum magis propter praesentiam *Dei* infinitum majoris domini et totam qualitatem operis verius cognoscentis! Non enim subest⁶ ratio, nisi infidelitas excusaret.

Tertio patet, quod ministri debent⁷ pensare laborem secundum rationem qua Christo serviunt.⁸ Ista enim est ratio potissima maxime attendenda, quia si serviunt Christo fideliter, quomocunque sit de locante, non possunt a mercede Christi deficere. Et haec ratio, quare ministrando infidelibus vel quantumcunque discipulis debent mercenarii fideliter ministrare, quia secundum rationem, qua Christo serviunt, mercedem⁹ infallibiliter ab ipso capiunt.¹⁰ Quanto magis nos sacerdotes, Christi servi, tam specialiter et comminatorie ab ipso conducti!

(c. 5.) Quintum.¹¹

Circa¹² quintum jugum, quod est¹³ inter *dominos seculares* et suos *servos et tenentes*,¹⁴ hortanda est utraque pars ad observantiam caritatis. *Domini* enim debent tractare suos subditos¹⁵ tanquam fratres in domino, et nichil facere servis suis nisi quod appeterent¹⁶ *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 praestare, scientes quod et vos dominum habetis in cōlo." Unde postponenda sunt jura civilia¹⁸ momentanea et infundabilia in ista materia. Cum certum sit ex fide, quod domini non debent tractare servos¹⁹ nisi in *caritate* et *defensione* quoad mundanas repugnantias ac *directione viae ad patriam*. Unde ad Ephesios 6^{to} 20 "Vos domini eadem facite servis vestris remittentes injurias,²¹ scientes quia²² illorum et vester dominus est in colis, et personarum acceptio non est apud Deum." Cum enim Deus librat²³ et acceptat quem-

¹ *servirent*, 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 6^{to}, Ephesios dicitur C.

²¹ *injurias*, misericordias B.

²² *quia*, quod et C.

²³ *librat*, liberat C. erster Hand.

cunque secundum ejus virtutem aut humilitatem,¹ et non secundum statum quem occupat² apud mundum: manifestum est quod servus humilior et virtuosior de tanto acceptior est apud Deum. Unde videtur multis, quod servorum subjectio sit catena³ superbiae a veritate sive⁴ virtute retardans et saepe impediens dominos seculares; debent enim providere servis suis de vitae necessariis secundum congruentiam sui status.

Secundo debent ipsos⁵ defendere a⁶ raptoribus tam ecclesiasticis quam secularibus irrationabiliter insultantibus. Et *tertio* debent eos⁷ in caritate tractare tam verbis quam opere, ut patet ex praedicto morali principio.

Servi autem non debent remurmurare⁸ 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 pñam 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: "Quicumque sunt sub jugo servi, omni¹⁰ honore dominos suos dignos arbitrentur ne nomen domini et doctrina blasphemetur." Christus enim ordinavit genus suum adjici¹¹ 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 sint¹² domini, servi debent voluntarie eis subdi. "Qui, inquit apostolus, fideles habent dominos, non contemnunt, quia fratres sunt et¹³ dilecti, qui beneficii¹⁴ 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 sinistre¹⁷ 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 tyrannia, non sub ratione quod¹⁸ tales, sed sub ratione quod serviunt domino Jesu Christo. Et si discipuli diaboli obijciunt contra istem patientiam et colorant¹⁹ 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 non¹ resisterent injuriantibus² ut . . .³ et serpentes? Item Deus movet propter demeritum inhabitantium ad conquestus; quare ergo non moveret⁴ subditos, ut contra deprimentes ipsos recalcitrarent? Hoc ergo ex instinctu naturali habet quilibet, ut, sicut appetit vivere, sic appetat libertatem.

Sed hic dicitur scolae⁵ 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 atque⁷ resistendi difficilis atque ambigua. Ideo scola foret diaboli, priorem relinquere et istam ambiguum acceptare. Et hinc Christus eam⁸ 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 est¹¹ dominis secularibus et civilibus christianis,¹² quod non consentiant facinori sacerdotum rebellionem legi Christi, hoc est enim inseparabiliter malum sicut consensus ad istud. Ideo cum subtractio juvenum 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 augebit¹⁵ facinus tam ex¹⁶ 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* proprio propter excellentiam sui capitalis dominii activam,¹⁸ nec est michi evidenter 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, discolae 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 complexionem³ 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 corporales⁴ domini super suos subditos tyrannisent, quod propter hoc eadem mensurā debeat⁵ remitti, quia scola Christi est,⁶ propter malum bonum⁷ retribuere.

(c. 6.) Sextum.⁸

Sextum jugum, quod est amor inter proximos, est⁹ paululum pertractandum. Quamvis autem apostolus 1 Corinth. 13^{mo} narrat conditiones sexdecim caritatis, ex quibus juxtapositis¹⁰ conversationi nostrae caritas nostra extinguitur, hypocritice fingimus, quod observamus caritatem, quae sufficiat¹¹ ad salutem. Quis enim est sufficienter "*patiens*" injurias atque molestias? quis secundo "*benigne*" dolet¹² alienas injurias, ita ut vere dicere possit¹³ cum apostolo :¹⁴ "quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor?"¹⁵ quin potius gaudet¹⁶ de molestiis proximorum? Quis tertio "*non invidet*" sectae¹⁷ procurans et sectis sibi contrariis improperans ac de contentione¹⁸ 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*" tangere¹⁹ montes ad habendum experientiam, et fumigabunt?²⁰ Sexto cujus vianis 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 obmittam²¹ cupiditatem secularium, cujus clerici caritas non extinguitur hoc peccato? nam *possessionati* plus laborant pro proprietate quam beatitudine, *mendicantes* vel expropriarii laborant pro multiplici proprietate damnabili, ut quod illorum²² 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. Pa. civ. 82.

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 iudicium de rectoribus, de vicariis et² 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 de³ talibus vitiis "*non*" contra dicentem licet benevole "*irritatur*"? Tangat hortator in quantacunque caritate voluerit, et videbit quod⁴ cunctum genus viatorum, etiam fratres, succumbent in ista macula caritatis. Nono caritas "*non cogitat*," quomodo "*malum*" ponas vel culpae sit proximo irrationabiliter⁵ inferendum. Sed quis, licet extinxerit⁶ alias caritatis maculas, in isto senserit se immunem? Omnes enim cogitamus superflue, quomodo vindicta caperetur de hostibus Christi atque ecclesiae, et potius cogitamus imprecando⁷ 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 de⁸ proximo et⁹ denigratione famae personae, cui invident; gaudent audire peccata proximi et gaudentius publicant malum suum mendaciter dilatando. Undecimo caritate formatus "*congaudet rectitudini iustitiae*" proximorum, ut quum audit zelare quemcunque pro iustitia sine personarum acceptione, hoc approbat et de hoc gaudet. Sed suscitata ista conditione caritatis diffamatio¹⁰ et detractio deliterent. Duodecimo "*caritas omnia*" genera tam bonorum quam malorum "*suffert*" cum gaudio moderato. Numquid credimus impetuosos¹¹ 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 iustitia, quam somniant¹⁵ 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.

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 caritate¹ sustinent omnia ista in opere et sermone, non solum quoad suas injurias sed omnia quae illata fuerint cuicumque, scientes quod justus² 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, nisi forte fuerit sibi revelatum. Et ut breviter dicam, non video quomodo quicumque⁶ 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 sinistre⁷ 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 de⁸ laicis, quomodo eorum caritas hodie refrigescit.⁹ Si enim habent talem habitum, tum inclinant¹⁰ ad actus proprios caritatis. Ista autem regulae praedicandae sunt instanter populo, ut cognoscant, si ipsi vel clerici plene servaverint caritatem. Nec dubito quin¹¹ 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 quicumque*, 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, *Takem chytel*. 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 ecclesiae*, 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 diligentia, 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*] mallet sub silentio praeterire.

A. Reportatum est autem mihi a tribus personis gravibus auditori satis sagacia, scilicet magistris artium, religionis possessionatis et similibus, quod doctor ille assumit, *me inniti 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 haereticus 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 haereseis, possit astruere. Vidi enim protestationem suam,¹ quam misit Domino summo pontifici, in qua fatetur se velle stare iudicio Dei et ejus universalis ecclesiae, sibi tamen cavendo diligentius, ne iudicio ecclesiae romanae vel iudicio summi pontificis sit subjectus; quae protestatio videtur mihi valde suspecta eo quod, si ejus conclusiones catholicas et pro utilitate ecclesiae reputaret, subiceret 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 iudicio alicujus nisi iudicio Dei et proprio; quia, ut patet in *protestatione*, "submitto me iudicio sanctae matris ecclesiae;"³ et iste modus loquendi est scripturae a. 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 nec⁷ sibi consonat, cum in his, quibus maxime videretur a fide devius, Doctor iste⁸ 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 haereseis dicit, quod subterfugi iudicium summi pontificis et romanae ecclesiae, cujus iudicio "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 *attivum*. *Accidus*, derived from *accidia* (*ἀκηδία*), means indolent, indifferent.

³ a. 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 *Hokkam*.

⁷ *nec scit probare nec*, nescit probare. Nec, Shirley.

⁸ *Doctor iste*, the opponent to whom Wiclif is replying.

⁹ *Doctor de Aureolis*, Petrus de Vereria, called Aureolus, † 1345. Comp., Prantl, *Gesch. der Logik in Abendlande* III., 319.

¹⁰ *humiliter me submitto*, from the "*Protestatio*" a. Lewis, 382.

nosco, est romana ecclesia, sicut patet ex jure canonico et conformitate¹ ecclesiae, et patet respicienti protestationem meam, quod nimis sinistre conclusum est, quod soli iudicio Dei et meo proprio me submitto, cum ex protestatione formaliter sequatur oppositum.

Sexto committitur² 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 *romanas ecclesias*. Nam posset esse, quod dominus papa foret ignarus legis scripturae, et quod *ecclesia anglicana* foret longe praestantior in iudicio veritatis catholicae, quam tota ista romana ecclesia collecta de istis papa³ et cardinalibus. Imo ex facto meo colligitur, quod non sum suspectus de formidine istarum conclusionum, cum transmissi illas per magnam partem Angliae et Christianismi, et sic⁴ usque ad curiam romanam, salte mediate, examinandas. Imo cum dictus Doctor viderit protestationem, et illi⁵ patebit per Dei gratiam, quod non timebo⁶ respondere sibi et omnibus suis complicitibus, vel in facie vel in scolis, quod posset manuducere etiam inimicos, quod nec⁷ 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 iudicio 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 patet⁸ 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 Bavaro⁹ 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 quam 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 *papia*.

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 *patech*, conjecture; *potest*, MS.

⁹ *Bavaro*, Lewis of Bavaria.

non timeo, nisi de quibusdam conclusionibus voluerit emendari, finaliter iudicabitur 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 spreto sacerdotibus, scribis et pharisaeis adhaesit dominis secularibus, ex quorum¹ 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 2^o. 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 haeticus.

Conformiter dicitur de *apostolo*, qui spreto submissione summi pontificis appellavit Caesarem, non beatum Petrum papam, licet causa sua fuerit fidei, ut patet Actorum 25^o ; non tamen ex hinc sequitur, quod fuit tunc haeticus, sed perfectus Christianus. Et idem patet de *Jeremia*, qui fuit sinistre accusatus a sacerdotibus et prophetis reputantibus ex condicionali prophetae sententiam de inesse ;³ sed principes seculares, quibus *Jeremias* adhaeserat, eum liberarunt, ut patet *Jeremiae* 26^o, 38^o, 42^o, et 43^o capitulo. Imo de *Nabuchodonosor* pagano habuerat *Jeremias* et *Daniel* plus amicitiae quam de perversis sacerdotibus sui generis, ut patet *Jeremiae* 40 et *Daniel* ; a sacerdotibus autem et pseudoprophetae 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 apocryphis,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 haeticum, et non turpiter arguere ex fallacia consequentis a communi⁶ 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 haeticus."

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 apocrypha, MS., apocrysis.

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 a contrariae, tunc ipse est haeticus, quia adversarius legis.

Sed hucusque nec Doctor iste nec alii priores, qui multiplicarunt contra me¹ argumenta, potuerunt convincere, quod aliqua conclusio- num, quas impugnant, sit scripturae sacrae contraria; sed ex inven- tione 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 exprobrationem¹ *Inceptoris Occam*, quem dicit me sequi nec aliquid novitatis invenire nisi quod in libris suis inse- ritur, hic dico *tria*: *primo*, quod ego nescio ipsum probare fuisse hae- reticum, sicut forte nec Doctor, sicut pateret eis, qui volunt opiniones suas defendere vel ad Doctoris evidencias in ista materia respondere. *Secundo* dico, quod conclusiones meae nec ab ipso nec a me sumpse- runt originem, cum sint in *scriptura* sacra infrangibiliter 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, Doctor³ 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 haereticas, 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 inju- rias ex instigatione mea illatas clero per dominos, videtur mihi pericu- losum 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 *con- sequens 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 accep- tant 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 progeni- tores ecclesiae contulerunt. Istud dictum indubie cum verbis impli- cat, ipsos esse haereticos, et potissime caperet veritatem de monachis *francis* translatis de *Anglia*, et de thesauro regis, propter necessitatem

¹ *exprobrationem*, MS., *exprobrationem*. ing has not hitherto been ascertained.

² What was this nature of the writ- 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 *Francias* 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 poenam 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 haeticam, et docere scriptura vel ratione, quod sit haeretica, vel in scholis 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 impugnatur Doctor, quod sacerdotes Christi debent vivere in paupertate et persecutione propter iustitiam. Unde ad docendum, quod Doctor iste sit in inimicitia crucis Christi profundior, deliberatione magna cum suis complicitibus ordinavit, ut unus frater minor, qui gravavit eos ex praedictione paupertatis et status primitivae ecclesiae, per modum revocationis, confiteretur publice in ecclesia beatae Virginis³ 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 ipsum⁴ habere,

¹ *Corpus juris canonici.*

² *De Veritate s. Scripturae*, c. 13.

³ *Virginia*, 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 assertionem 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 ecclesiae¹ 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 impropertant. Sic enim invenimus, quod *Arrius* vocavit *Athanasium*² haeticum, et quia *Athanasius* docet trinitatem personarum esse *omosion*,³ unius substantiae, *Arrius* cum suis complicitibus 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 opprobriosa⁴ ac contumeliosa ipsis inferimus, quum nobis deficiunt argumenta, et sic more meretricum ad litigia nos convertimus, ut omnino ultimum verbum impropertorium sit nobiscum. Ex istis, inquit, verisimiliter sequi videtur, quod *ego cum secta mea* tam in conclusionibus quam doctrina sapiam haeticam 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 impropertoriis et calumniis defamatoriis et in subterfugiis frustratoriis, quam alias sectae nostrae. Ideo si per se ex tali conditione argueretur haeticus, ex *phuri* illius conditionis argueretur *major* haeticus, 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 haeticus; 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 haeticus; 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*, ὁμοουσίαι.

⁴ *opprobriosa*, MS., *impropria*.

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 subijci romanae ecclesiae nec cuiquam nisi Deo, quia volo subijci 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 alternando¹ sibi imponere haeticam 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 haeretici. *Tertio* miror, quomodo Doctor concludit ex dictis, quod sapimus haeticam 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 haeticos, cum ipsi sint copiosius conditionis, per quam nimis levis discernit haeticum. Miror insuper, quomodo dicit, se non adhuc nobis imponere haeticam pravitatem, cum saepe prius inculcat, verum esse quod sumus haetici. Et revera, ut dixi superius, propinquius est contradictioni dicere, quod "verum est me esse haeticum, 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 haeticos, 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, haeticos ista diabolica calliditas inolevit, ut in gestu et exteriori habitu simularent quandam sanctitatis imaginem, ut perversam doctrinam² 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 colaratus 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 obicimus 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 comprobata, 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 quantumcunque 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 a matrem ecclesiam jure et libertatibus suis privare satagunt toto nisu, sicut, inspicienti eorum doctrinam luce clarius elucescit. Insuper et ad divisionem ecclesiae per subtractionem obedientiae ab ecclesia romana totus viribus elaborant, et sic ex consequenti corpus Christi mysticum, praecedentes domini caput a corpore, amputare desiderant totam ecclesiam destructis⁴ suis compagibus, quantum in eis est, dissolvere et ruere (*sic*) moliantur. Unde digne haeretici sunt consendi, dicente *Decreto* dist. 22: "Omnis quisquis cuilibet ecclesiae privilegium ab ipso summo omnium ecclesiarum capite traditum auferre conatur, hic procul dubio in haeresim labitur, et cum *illo* notetur injustus, *hic* est dicendus haeticus." 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 gratiam 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 croniois, quod *Arriani* nimiam pœnalitatem exterius inferebant, sed nimis modicam, cum indigni fuerant vivere super terram. Ideo debuerunt macerasse carnem suam, quousque fuissent noscentes veritatem scripturæ, quam totis viribus depravarunt; et insuper fuissent impotentes ad sinistre seminandum suas hæreses et ad palliandum ipsas mendaciis contra scripturam per catervas infidelium, quas illudunt. Unde nullus christianus reputaret eos sanctissimos, nisi ex ignorantia et inadvertentia scripturæ 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 pœnalitatem et abjectionem cum apparentia virtutum objicio conspectibus incautorum; nam inter alia peccata, de quibus timeo, hoc est unum præcipuum, quod consumendo in excessivo victu et vestitu bona pauperum, deficio dando exemplum aliis, ut lux et regula sanctitatis vitæ, 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: hæretici communiter adhaerent infidelibus et tyrannis pro defensione sui perversi dogmatis; et ego adhaereo christianis principibus pro defensione catholice veritatis; ergo sum hæreticus.

Tertio videtur mihi mirabile, ex quo spiritu Doctor imponit mihi tantam victus et vestium parcatem, specialiter cum hoc non didicist ex sensu vel testimonio, nec credo hoc sibi fuisse revelatum ex spiritu prophetiæ. Ideo non occurrit mihi locus, quo illud crederet, si non per locum ab insufficienti similitudine: "Tu sic facis, eo quod *Arrius* hæreticus, cum quo in aliquo convenis, ita fecit." Sed si locus a tali similitudine attendi debeat, evidentius sequeretur: "*Arrius* hæreticus 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 hæreticus." Nam quantum ad pœnalitatem et vitæ austeritatem attinet, non dubium quin Baptista apostoli et multi sancti primitivæ ecclesiæ superaverant *Arrianos*, imo beatus *Jeronymus*, beatus *Martinus* et ceteri sancti, qui *Arrianis* in facie restiterunt; ideo si ex nuda similitudine pœnalitatis cum *Arrianis* arguendus foret hæreticus, isti sancti Doctores ex majori in ista similitudine arguendi forent hæretici plus quam ego.

Quarto videtur mihi non sanum iudicium, quo dicit nos cavere *juramenta* extrinseca et laborare intrinsecus invidia et rancore. Nam licet nobis judicare de manifestis criminibus, de occultis autem nequam; sed de operibus bonis de genere, nisi docto in facie ecclesiæ,

¹ *Falsum quidem est . . . commensales* number of the chapter, however, is 14, given by Shirley as above, p. XLVI., not 12, as there marked.
Note 1, from the Bodley MS. The

quod fiant *mala intentione*, non debemus ad deterius judicare; hoc enim foret temerarium iudicium 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 iudicium quod ostendit, quia nec servatur forma correctionis fraternae in forma iudicii, nec dictum illud videtur consonum confessioni priori. Quum autem dedit ista signa incompleta sub quodam involuero verborum communium, per quae discernit haereticum, scripsi sibi, cum aliqua pars scholae 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 materia¹ 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 enim³ quod nimis crebro immisceo zelum sinistram vindictae cum intentione dextra, si quam habuero. Ideo quoad⁴ illud, quod imponit⁵ 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, quod⁶ 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 detractio⁸ deficiat, non conscius mihi de crimine manifesto⁹ imposito patienter sufferam maledictum, quia 1 Cor. 4^o dicit apostolus: "mihi autem pro minimo est, ut a vobis iudicer 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 *detractio*, conjecture, Shirley;
obtractione, Vienna MS.; *subtractione*.

sum mihi conscius quoad ista, cum intendo tam in universali quam in particulari, quod destruiam peccatum scandalum 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 per nae sequatur ex primo, et quantumlibet apparens prosperitas ex secundo. Apparet ex III^o Regum 18^a dicto Heliae: "Tunc 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 pñnalis 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, etnum rum adversus socrum suam." Venit itaque Christus ad dissolvendum confederationem 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 pñnitentiam 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 23^o: "Commovet, inquit, 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 pugandum secundum fidem scripturae contra diabolum; ergo est haereticus; cum sit signum oppositi.

Ex istis perpendi potest fructus sententiae, quam per tempus solcite seminavi. *Primo* discerni potest, qui clerici conjugati cum seculo et per consequens cum Mammona ut socio 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, quorum 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.

Uterius 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 appetietur 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 haeticum: ideo dico, ut supra, quod omnis talis et solum talis est haeticus, 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 bonae² effici voluntatis. Ideo signanter legitur Lucae 16: "Habent Moysen et prophetas; audiant illos!" Lex, inquam, scripturae sufficit pro instructione ecclesiae, et sic omnis haeticus est adversarius legis et prophetarum, ut saepe exposui. Unde beatus *Gregorius* tertio *Moralium* super libro Job 2º: "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 quicumque voluerint, et non invenient in sanctis Doctoribus vel ratione fundatum, quod quicumque 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 haeticum, 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 haeticos, 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 condemnabunt 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 gratias agere debeamus ; ideo cum plurima turba sequeretur Christum in via, 12 apostolos tulit (*sic*) secreto et *eis* tantum suae mortis nuntiavit misterium, quia semper pretiosiore thesaurum in melioribus vasis includimus ; plebs ergo propter incapacitatem et mulieres propter naturae suae molliem excluduntur. Sed post tradit iste sanctus¹ ex praedictis verbis evangelii sensum magis mellifuum.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^o. Et sic utrobique vel ad bonum meum vel malum dogma meum proderit sponsae Christi et erit cum paribus ad resurrectionem multorum a velutabre voluptatum.

¹ *sanctus*, scil. Chrysostomus.

² *mellifuum*, mellifusum MS.

Quantum ad *dilectionem* quam Doctor jurat se *erga me* gerere plus quam credo, si veritas ita se habeat, Deus sibi retribuatur; si sophistic 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 adiaceat bono extrinseco. Constat quidem¹ ex testimonio *Crisostomi* omelia 17^{ma} 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 suspitione ambigua et occulta. Quae videntur multis in ista correptione deficere, cum notum sit mihi, quod cum duplicitate verborum ad partem³ in publico falsum fingitur, et caritativa communicatio in scriptis patule denegatur. Ideo timens de malo, quod Doctor meus⁴ posset ad verificandum pronosticationem suam disponere, licet fuerim citatus ad comparendum⁵ nunc coram domino archiepiscopo in quocunque loco fuerit suae provinciae, timui illo ire; audiui 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 combustionem,⁷ occisione vel morte alia sim extinctus in tantum, quod ista argumenta, quae Doctor jam fecerat, notantur communiter in ore multorum clericorum episcopaliū, 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 Wielif'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, combusive*, Shirley, who, however, conjectures *combustivus*.

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 ævi*, 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 cuicumque fidem² 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 corporis³ legis Dei; Christum autem, qui evangelium illud immediate dederat, credo esse verum Deum et verum hominem, et in hoc legem evangelii omnes partes scripturae alias⁴ excedentem.

Suppono iterum, quod Romanus pontifex, cum sit⁵ summus vica-

¹ A. The title in B is, *Copia cujusdam literae Magistri Johannis Wycllyff wisae papae Urbano VI. ad excusationem de non veniendo sibi ad citationem suam*, a. d. MCCCLXXXIV.—Lewis, *Life of Wiclif*, ed. 1820, 184, 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 terra, sit ad istam¹ 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 corde² legis Domini patenter elicio, quod Christus fuit pro statu³ hujus viationis homo pauperrimus, omnem dominationem mundanam abiciens. Patet per fidem evangelii, Matth. viii. 20, et 2 Cor. viii. 9.

Ex istis communiter elicio, quod nec papam⁴ nec aliquem⁵ 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 consequenter⁸ 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 Dominum⁹ cujusalibet creaturae, quod sic excitet papam nostrum Urbanum sextum, sicut inceperat, ut imitetur cum clero suo in moribus¹⁰ Dominum Jesum Christum, ut ipsi efficaciter doceant populum in hoc ipsos fideliter imitari, et rogemus spiritualiter papam nostrum a maligno concilio¹¹ praeservari; quod certum¹² cognoscimus, quod "*Inimici hominis domestici ejus*,"¹³ et "*Deus non permittit nos tentari supra id quod possumus*:"¹⁴ multo magis Deus¹⁵ 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 aient.

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.

ERRATUM.

P. 107.—For *John Scotus Erigena*, read *John Duns Scotus*.

COLSTON AND SON, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

