Jean Gerson

ON THE MARRIAGE OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

De nuptiis Christi et Ecclesiae

From the Latin of Dupin's edition of his works (Antwerp, 1706)

English translation

Contributed to Mind of the Church by a friend of the library who wishes to remain anonymous

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About this translation · 3
The Theme and the Six Questions · 3
The First Question: The Wine of Sacred Scripture · 3
The Other Questions: The Bride, the Bridegroom and His Vicar; Marriage as a Sign; the Church of Stone; the Figures in Scripture · 7
The Second Consideration: Mendicancy and Property · 10
The Third Consideration: The Petition on the Nine Assertions · 14

About this translation

Translated from the treatise *De nuptiis Christi et Ecclesiae* in *Joannis Gersonii Doctoris Theologi et Cancellarii Parisiensis Opera omnia*, edited by Louis Ellies Du Pin, tome II (Antwerp, 1706), cols. 365–379. On Sunday 17 January 1417, the feast of Saint Anthony, Gerson preached before the Council of Constance on the wedding at Cana, letting the four senses of Scripture speak in turn; for lack of time he left unanswered the questions that Studiositas had put to Allegory about the marriage of Christ and the Church, and he answers them here: the Church's dowry, which is the wine of sacred Scripture; the Bride, her Bridegroom and his Vicar; marriage as a sign; the church of stone; and the figures of these nuptials in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The second part turns to the Council itself: the quarrel of Mendicancy and Property, and the plea, in twelve causes, that the nine assertions of Jean Petit be examined by the nations.

The columns of Du Pin's edition are given in the text as (col. N).

The Theme and the Six Questions

(col. 365) **Tractatus** of Jean Gerson, Doctor and Chancellor of Paris,
in which he solves the questions raised in the preceding sermon,
which then, under pressure of shortness of time, were left unsolved.

(Collated to the same manuscript.)

"A wedding was held in Cana of Galilee, and the Mother of Jesus was there," etc. (John 2:1).

Be present with us also, O pious Mother of Jesus, so that at your asking there may be ministered to us today the wine of saving wisdom and of holy devotion. That this may be done, we greet you saying *Ave*, "A wedding," etc. (John 2:1).

On the fourfold unfolding of this theme before the holy Synod of Constance we formerly held not the manner of a dialogue alone, but of a tetralogue—just as it was then noted that sacred Wisdom has four daughters, whose names and offices this double hexameter opens:

> *The letter teaches deeds; Allegory, what you should believe;*
>
> *The Moral, what you should do; Anagogy, whither you should tend.*

Studiositas (Studiousness), the speculative handmaid of Wisdom—not Industry—was then brought in: she had asked of these sisters many questions concerning today's nuptials, especially of Allegory. And when devotion, concerning the most glorious Anthony among the anchorites (whose feast was then being kept), had wrung out a word of Faith, and love of brevity had commanded that many things already dictated be left aside, the same Studiositas—eager to know—repeated again and again her request that the omitted matters be brought forward. Familiarity, carried with her as from childhood, persuaded her to have her way.

Her question to Allegory was sixfold:

1. With what dowries is the Church, the Bride, adorned by Christ her Bridegroom?
2. What is the relation of Christ the Bridegroom to the Church his Bride?
3. Conversely, what is the relation of this Bride to her Bridegroom and to his Vicar, whom we call the Supreme Pontiff?
4. How, and how usefully, did God will carnal marriage to be the sign of this spiritual union?
5. How does the material Church signify the spiritual, so that they exchange mutual praises and names?
6. *(col. 366)* In what modes and places of sacred Scripture are these nuptials of Christ and the Church figured?

The First Question: The Wine of Sacred Scripture

Allegory handed over a Church dowered by Christ with the goodness of wine—not material wine, which when drunk in quantity, as the Wise Man says (Ecclus. 31:28), "causes irritation and anger and many quarrels," and "at the last bites like a serpent" (Prov. 23:32)—the very wine from which the Wise Man proposed to withdraw his flesh, that he might transfer his soul to Wisdom.

We understand, therefore, not that kind of wine, but the most elect, spiritual, and theological wine: wholly the best, most joyful, and most healing—which the half-dead man cured by the Samaritan tasted. It is the wine of sacred Scripture, refreshing, vivifying, and gladdening the heart of man with a marvelous joy of spirit, when it is drunk in sobriety according to the Apostle's warning: "Not to be wiser than one ought, but to be wise unto sobriety" (Rom. 12:3)—and that sobriety is humility.

This wine had once failed at the nuptials which God, according to the purpose of his will, had arranged to celebrate from just Abel—indeed from Adam—so that one might rightly say, "They have no wine" (John 2:3). A very few, we do not deny, possessed this wine of saving Wisdom. But what was that among so many and so great? Most drank everywhere the wine of prostitution from the golden cup of Babylon, with which that great harlot—secular vanity—in the Apocalypse makes the kings of the earth drunk; and which Moses calls "the gall of dragons and the incurable venom of asps" (Deut. 32:33), and again "their grapes are grapes of gall, and their clusters most bitter" (Deut. 32:32). This wine, if you do not know it, is the wisdom of the earth—animal and diabolical—mixed with impious errors, heresies, and blasphemies as with so many venomous reptiles. "Of whose poisoned cup the dregs are not emptied; all the sinners of the earth shall drink of it" (cf. Ps. 74:9).

But when Christ came with his disciples to the mystical nuptials of the Church, and the Mother of Jesus was there—she who is interpreted "illuminated," or "illuminatrix"—there was poured the good wine of the Wisdom that is from above, by revelation held in reserve until now: that is, until the fullness of time came, when grace and truth were made through Jesus Christ; when, further, he turned the water of sadness and tribulation into the wine of spiritual joy. How? "Because I have spoken these things to you," he says, "sorrow has filled your heart" (John 16:6). Behold the water-jars filled with water to the brim. There follows the wonderful conversion when he adds: "But your sorrow shall be turned into joy." He had already foretold this when he said: "Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted" (Matt. 5:5). And this mourning, these tears, are induced by the wine of sacred Wisdom's compunction—because "in much wisdom is much indignation," says Ecclesiastes (1:18), and "he who adds knowledge adds labor."

Wisdom shows, and makes one taste, how we are born by nature children of wrath, children of death and of darkness, not knowing our entrance or our exit—because "no one knows whether he is worthy of love or hatred" (Eccles. 9:1)—in this valley of tears, however many ascents he may arrange in his heart. These things are hidden from the wise and prudent of this age (Matt. 11:25); therefore they lead their days in good things (Job 21:13) and seek their consolation here; and so it follows that it is the worst and most wretched of all omens when they "have passed into the affection of the heart" (Ps. 72:7), while the bitterest wine of iniquity grows sweet in them: they drink erroneous, impious, and blasphemous doctrines in place of the true, "for stolen waters are sweeter, and hidden bread" which dares not show itself openly "is more pleasant" (Prov. 9:17).

Is that the wine whose failure you complained of, O most merciful Mother of Jesus, saying and implying "They have no wine" (John 2:3)? By no means. You were asking another wine for the nuptials of Christ your Son and the Church: namely the wine of sacred Scripture, the theological wine which your Son, Brother and Bridegroom poured for his Church from the beginning. But behold, alas! this wine of evangelical doctrine, once unmixed, has become *(col. 367)* as it were full of manifold mixture. Avarice mixes into it a turbid and muddy water of earthly wisdom—such as the sons of Achar sought (1 Chron. 2)—according to the traditions of men: a burning caution and cunning in heaping up riches, loading itself with thick clay in gold and silver, by right or by wrong, with frauds, perjuries, usury, and simoniacal wickedness. "Whoever drinks of this

water will thirst again" (John 4)—and more violently. Avarice causes a dropsical thirst: "The more they drink, the more they thirst for waters."

Luxury mixes a foul, bituminous, and sulphurous water of animal wisdom: the burning cunning of reaching the alluring pleasures of the flesh, which do not quench but increase the thirsty itching of the flesh—like the dipsas serpent that thirsts in the midst of waters, as Lucan says. Pride pours and mixes the water of diabolical wisdom: the curious lust of knowing subtle but useless, superfluous, or harmful things—"knowledge puffs up" (1 Cor. 8:1)—and by its violent draught generates torments and kills the hearts of the proud. Hence the invention of magical arts; hence the defense of new and foreign doctrines.

But against these, the wine of sacred Scripture frees from cares, and therefore may be called most pure, cleansing from defilement; sober, suppressing all pride of mind and taking every intellect captive into the obedience of Faith. Concerning this wine let the solution of the first question be finished under a threefold consideration.

Consideration I

In the mystical nuptials of Christ and the Church, theological wine—as the best and soberly inebriating—ought to be set first. The steward in the Gospel gives the reason: that when they have become merry they may not care for, nor seek, what is worse, content with the taste of the earlier wine which satisfies, which gladdens, which even turns bitter things into consolation. "The judgments of the Lord are true… gladdening hearts" (Ps. 18). The Wise Man had felt this: "Nothing is sweeter than to look upon the commandments of the Lord" (Ecclus.). Hence the Prophet's cry: "How sweet are your words to my palate, sweeter than honey to my mouth" (Ps. 118:103). Therefore Wisdom cries: "Drink, friends, and be inebriated, O beloved" (Cant. 5:1). The soul had obeyed that once gloried to say in the epithalamium of Bridegroom and Bride: "The King has brought me into his wine-cellar" (Cant. 2:4). And the Prophet: "My cup which inebriates me—how excellent it is!" (Ps. 22). Finally there is that ecclesiastical word in the person of the faithful: "Let us drink the sober drunkenness of the Spirit."

Peter had drunk this drunkenness on the mountain, and was made thereby "not knowing what he said" (Luke 9:33). The Apostles drank it on the day of Pentecost in the tavern of the great and furnished upper room, when they were drenched with the most superabundant wine of supernatural Wisdom and taught all saving truth. But the foolish people

> *Counts them drunk with new wine*
>
> *Whom the Spirit had filled.*

Do you wish to know how much Moses taught in shadow and figure that the wine of the Decalogue, which is the wine of Faith, is to be set first? "Keep," he says, "the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you" (Deut. 4:2). It follows: "For this is your wisdom and understanding before the peoples, that, hearing all these precepts, they may say: Behold a wise and understanding people, a great nation" (Deut. 4:6). Excellently indeed, and with a divine voice, one man is reported to have answered in a certain general Council, when new Constitutions were being sought: "What is the meaning of such a multiplication of Constitutions, to be laid on the necks of the faithful, when the Gospel is neither known nor kept? Let the Gospel first be known and kept." What else, I ask you, does such a saying sound than this: "Every man sets forth the good wine first" (John 2:10)? Truly so it is; so it befits the Church synodally gathered to do.

(col. 368) Someone will say: Do you then reject the Decretals and decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the synodal constitutions of diocesans, and so abandon the rest? I do not reject them, I confess. I know it was said by Christ: "He who hears you hears me" (Luke 10:16). I know the Gospel Law is established. Moreover, in natural principles and universal rules he left to the Apostles and disciples and their successors the determinations of particular things to be done.

But what madness it is now to desert the Law of the King, to desert the fountain of the wine of saving Wisdom, so that the law of subjects may first be established, and so that there be ministered beforehand—I will not say any wine at all, but the water of animal and earthly wisdom—whence for the most part the commandment of God is made void, as Christ, conforming himself to the words of Isaiah, argued against the Pharisees. You will find among those who have appropriated to themselves the name of Religion that transgressions of a rather frivolous human constitution—about the wearing of this or that garment, or the use of this or that food—are punished more than if someone by blasphemy had denied God, forsaken him, violated his Sabbaths and all the precepts of the Decalogue. And what you ought to think of prelates, their courts within synodal councils, their lawsuits, punishments, and excommunications will teach you. Why? Because the inquisitors of this age loathe that wine of sacred Scripture—"for the animal man does not perceive the things that are of God; for it is foolishness to him" (1 Cor. 2:14). And as when the spirit is tasted the flesh loses its savor, so when the flesh is tasted the spirit loses its savor, and becomes as it were at the setting of the light of truth; for further the mind swelling with arrogance disdains to take its own intellect captive into the obedience of Faith, and again shrinks from seeming a disciple under the mastery of the theologians—whom it therefore despises, lest while it is conscious of not knowing what they know, it should appear less wise in its own eyes or in others'; and so it consoles its ignorance by contempt of theology.

Consideration II

In the nuptials of the growing Church, while the wine of sacred Scripture—or the theological wine—was set before the princes reclining at table and the other stewards, who were the theological doctors, the Church was then dowered with ample temporal goods. So it is to be feared, from contempt of this wine, that such temporal dowries may be taken away from the same Church, or notably diminished.

Consideration III

In the nuptials of the Church, theological wine—which is the wine of Faith—can never be lacking until the consummation of the age. Yet among many of those reclining and serving at these nuptials this wine can be turned into contempt, or into nausea, or into various diseases, into madness, and into death.

These considerations I would have set out more fully in the aforesaid sermon, and the zeal of the house of God, the zeal of the Faith, the zeal of the present Council, the zeal of the theological profession urged me not to leave them out—zeal which seemed "like a mighty man surfeited with wine" (Ps. 77:65), fearing nothing, but striving to pursue whatever vices or errors stood in its way. But Sobriety, the moderator, said: Let another time be awaited, another place, and another occasion; it is better to say nothing than to say little, given the greatness of the matter. Many things would have to be said, as you see, and the hour does not suffice; at the same time that saying of Sallust, recalled by Jerome, must be observed: "To strive in vain, and by wearying oneself to seek nothing but hatred, is the height of madness." Against this Zeal, in a vehement spirit, maintained that there must be neither delay nor dissembling, but that the truth of doctrine must be pressed home in season and out of season, even upon the unwilling. Let each free his own soul who has been set as preacher or doctor in a chair—not of pestilence, but of the Christian religion. What to me are detractions, what hatreds, what mockeries, what scorn, what persecutions? Happy the death which truth has brought forth. More sparingly with these things, answered Sobriety; remember the falls of Peter, of Thomas, and of others without number—of whom the first said to Christ: "Even if I must die with you, I will not deny you" (Matt. 26:35); the other to his fellow apostles: "Let us also go, that we may die with him" (John 11:16).

(col. 369) Do you think the King has brought you into his wine-cellar? See that he has ordered charity in you according to knowledge. "Therefore let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. 10:12). With this and much other speech Sobriety at last scarcely restrained fervid zeal—not so as to give peace to errors (far be it!), but so that it might seek a war the more capital and effective the more moderately it regards times, persons, and places. So it is necessary that meanwhile zeal tolerate the errors and vices it cannot

remove from the house of God, and groan in pity at the Church's horrible plight, if at her nuptials to serve the good wine of Faith to the guests symbolically assembled is either not free, or not lawful, or not expedient—when it is found not to profit but to harm, because no small part either rejects that best wine with abomination and will not drink; or, having drunk, soon vomits it with nausea; or, if it is retained in the bowels, turns it into a gall-like poison, anger, fury, hatred, and dissimulation causing this, as noxious humors with which the drinker's spirit is infected.

The Other Questions: The Bride, the Bridegroom and His Vicar; Marriage as a Sign; the Church of Stone; the Figures in Scripture

Studiositas the speculative, then brought in again for forming the questions already proposed, seemed to demand in my meditation their solution, protesting that there was in them nothing of biting acrimony, nothing of odious or bitter truth. Allegory consenting said: Accept, for the second question first, that the Bridegroom of the Church, Christ Jesus, did not find her worthy of himself, but made her so—"not by works of justice which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us" (Titus 3:5); "and he first loved us" (1 John 4:19)—so that "he who glories may glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. 1:31), "serving him with fear and rejoicing with trembling" (Ps. 2:11).

Accept second, that Jesus the Bridegroom of the Church, departing from this world, did not so abandon her—any more than his own Mother while he lived—that she should lack a continual guardian: himself principally, and ministerially through those to whom he said, "Behold, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age" (Matt. 28:20).

Accept third, that when the Bridegroom of the Church, Jesus, committed her to Peter to be kept, he marked him with a greater privilege and authority in this respect than he gave to Joseph the just or to John the Evangelist when he committed to him his own Mother in the care of custody.

Accept fourth, that the Bridegroom gave all things into her hands by the power of that love than which no one has greater—that he should lay down his soul for her; and how, as the Apostle argues, if he gave himself, did he not also with himself give all lesser things? (Rom. 8:32). Let them therefore fear and tremble who have held this Bride in contempt or hatred or reproach by words or works, who have not blushed to detract from the fullness of his power—because "the jealousy of her husband will not spare in the day of vengeance" (Prov. 6:34); "I am jealous," says the Lord of hosts.

But now, as you frame the other question, O Studiositas—what is the relation of this Bride to her Bridegroom and to his Vicar—I hand over to you first, that for the honor of the Bridegroom the Church, whether gathered in synod or not, ought to treat the Supreme Pontiff reverently and honorably, with all good will, if the Pontiff himself treats her laudably, or even tolerably. I say tolerably, because "in many things we all offend" (James 3:2); and before he is cast off, the judicial sentence of divorce must be awaited, as the discretion of the Fathers before us has hitherto observed in the case of the lesser bishops.

I hand over next, that for reverence of the Bridegroom the Church ought to call the Vicar and Guardian given her Father, and diligently to anticipate him, by herself and by her children, with honors and services as her Lord and head; and likewise the Roman Church, joined to her in a certain special fellowship. Nor is it fitting to expose such a Father to detractions or injuries, but to cover his shame so far as it is lawful. Let the example be taken from the blessed Virgin, who called Joseph her lord, revering him and putting him before herself in speaking: "Behold," she says, "your father and I have sought you sorrowing," etc. (Luke 2:48).

(col. 370) I hand over nevertheless, thirdly, that if such a Vicar has been cold, or "bewitched," so that he is unfit for the spiritual generation of children, he ought not to be judged a suitable spouse of the Church, or the Bridegroom's Vicar. And the seed of this generation is the holy word of God, or of Faith—not the shifting tradition of the sons of this age.

I hand over again that if the Church finds her Bridegroom's Vicar a fornicator or adulterer—taking a widow, a repudiated woman, a sordid woman, a harlot, against the command of the Law in Leviticus; if he has treated the Church harshly; if he has stripped her of her clothing by dilapidation; if he has wished to abuse her by simony; if he has smothered her offspring within or outside the womb by the ruin of example; if he has slain them with the sword of deadly and scandalous doctrine or of pestilent work, or of harmful dissimulation in the correction of vices and heresies—to such a one a bill of divorce ought to be given, especially if he has added incorrigibility to his vices, lest retention be to the shame and insult of her Bridegroom and to the ruin of the children, and lest she seem the nurse of her own malice.

You asked further, fourthly and principally, O Studiositas, how and how usefully God willed carnal marriage to be the sign of the spiritual. I will settle it in a few words. Nothing, first of all, seems to a devout soul a sweeter, higher, and kinder consideration than if, in pure simplicity and humility of heart, she meditates herself as the Bride of Christ. For as among human affections the love of a bodily spouse for her spouse surpasses—and reciprocally—the love of father and mother, so mutual love of the soul toward God and of God toward the soul could not be handed down under a more tender, fervent, and inward name or example than that of Bridegroom and Bride. Hence that epithalamium of the Song of Songs which Solomon, then beloved of the Lord, composed for contemplatives and those rapt in anagogical excesses, as the sincerity of the holiest doctors has expounded.

On the other hand, no meditation seems more dangerous than if a soul still stained with foul phantasms of thoughts and desires should presume that she may freely rise and think herself the Bride of Christ. For at once the base images of carnal nuptials intervene and breed fouler desires. Let such a soul rather reflect that "the God of vengeances" (Ps. 93:1) "is terrible in his counsels upon the sons of men" (Ps. 65:5). Let her say to him: "Who knows the power of your anger, and for fear of you can number your wrath?" (Ps. 89:12). Let her set before herself things that strike fear. Then the soul, if meanwhile she has made more progress, learns and has Christ as Father, the Church as Mother, crying in the Holy Spirit, "Abba, Father"; and at last she will come to the kisses and embraces of the Bridegroom. Jerome reports that among the Hebrews this custom was held: that no one under thirty years of age was admitted to hearing the Song of Songs, lest, abusing the spiritual songs, he should turn them to carnal lasciviousness.

Add, second, that the marriage of Adam, had he not sinned, would not have been a Sacrament of Christ and the Church, but rather of God and the rational creature, graciously espoused by him. Hold, lastly, that the virginal marriage of Joseph and Mary, though it was not consummated by carnal union, was nevertheless a true Sacrament of Christ and the Church: both because in this marriage there was true motherhood together with virginity, and fruitfulness of offspring, as there is in the Church—not so in the consecration of virgins, where there is no fruitfulness, nor in the consummation of carnal marriage, where virginity ceases; and because, further, by reason of the offspring there was a true conformity of the divine nature with the human. And here many things concerning this virginal and most sacred marriage offer themselves to be meditated wholesomely and devoutly by souls purified in Faith and morals; these I pass over, said Allegory, leaving them to Anagogy, her most divine sister.

Again, to the other thing you ask, O Studiositas—in what way the material Church signifies the spiritual. The reason is plain and easy from the institution of her consecration and dedication. Whence it becomes clear what honor, and how great, how great a worship of reverence, is owed to the material Church: against the error of the Beghards; *(col. 371)* against the pride of those whom the Apostle addresses—"Do you despise the Church of God?" (1 Cor. 11:22)—and against the indecent dissolutions of those who serve God with chatter, with most inept vanities and false insanities. Finally it is not without cause that Christ is read to have cast out of the Temple those who sold and bought (Mark 11; Luke 19), thundering that prophetic word: "My house shall be called a house of prayer, but you have made it a den of thieves" (Isa. 56:7). They make even now, O saving Christ, your house a sty of grunting pigs, or of barking dogs, or of ridiculous apes, not

recalling in their minds what Jacob cried after the vision of the mystical ladder on which angels were ascending and descending: “How terrible is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and the gate of heaven” (Gen. 28:17). Here most fittingly the sacred banquet of the nuptials of Christ and the Church is celebrated and received. Here prayers are more effective, other things equal, than in a private or profane place. Solomon’s prayer after the dedication of the Temple, on bended knees and with hands raised, when he praised God and blessed the people, beautifully gives this to be understood. Likewise in the varied adornment of the Temple, in the order of the ministers, in the manifold cult of ceremonies, it ought to be received—in each of which there are as many mysteries as there are words, signs, or works.

Let us come to what was asked last: in what modes and places of sacred Scripture these nuptials of Christ and the Church are figured. Note the threefold marriage which sister Letter hands down in the three patriarchs—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Attend mystically in like manner: for God weds Humanity in the Incarnation; he weds the singular soul in Faith and devotion; he weds the universal Church in the perfect dowering of every charism and in the bestowal of goods both of the way and of the homeland. Whence, though there is one Bride, yet “there are seventy queens and three hundred concubines, and of young maidens there is no number” (Cant. 6:7). This threefold nuptial conjunction is figured in the marriages, as we said, of the three patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Do you wish to know how? Abraham was certainly joined to Sarah, who by interpretation of the name means the same as “coal”—but hear: not an extinguished coal but a kindled one. When fire is incorporated into coal, it becomes as it were one from both, because the coal receives the actions of fire, made burning and bright. I ask you: was there not something of the kind in human nature when, united to the divine Person, it was made like a kindled coal—burning by charity, shining by honesty? There was also made a communication of idioms, by virtue of which a man is said to have created the heavens, and God to have suffered our pains. Note further that Abraham had from Sarah one only son named Isaac, which is interpreted “laughter” or “joy,” in whom the whole hope of the inheritance was placed. And we—have we not, from the marriage of God with human nature, received laughter, and the joy of our restoration, the hope of an everlasting inheritance? I am mistaken if the Angel did not announce this joy on the day of the Bridegroom’s birth, when he said to the shepherds: “I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people” (Luke 2:10). Nor were the wedding feast and the wedding gifts lacking, when it was proclaimed: “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will” (Luke 2:14); while in that mystery the vines of Engaddi are said to have flowered, with the other miracles.

Further, for the second nuptials, of Christ with the Church, let us subjoin the figure of the marriage of Isaac with Rebecca, the interpretation of whose name is “she receives much.” And what bride, I ask, receives anything greater from her bridegroom than the Church has received from Christ? Here her dowries or endowments could be numbered—supernatural, natural, spiritual and temporal—of which we have spoken above. What then? From this marriage there were two sons of different lot and temper: Jacob good and simple, Esau wicked, fierce and unruly; of whom it is said by God: “Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated” (Mal. 1:2). By these brothers what else is given to understand than that in the Church, which is the congregation of the faithful, there is a diverse generation of sons, *(col. 372)* of whom some are Christian in name only, others in reality and in name. The wicked then persecute the good, as Jacob suffered much from Esau. Scarcely is there a Jacob in the Church whom Esau’s malice does not exercise. Finally, Christ’s betrothal with the singular soul is figured by Jacob’s nuptials with the two sisters Leah and Rachel: Leah of the active life, Rachel of the contemplative—types in the devout soul. If we were to number their sons and carry them over into figure, that most beautiful little book of Richard *On the Twelve Patriarchs* would have to be opened again; to it we refer the reader.

Add that Jesus, wholly desirable, calls the holy soul by three names in the Canticles: sister, daughter, bride—sister, because of his conjunction with human nature; daughter, because of his conjunction with the

Church, who is Mother; bride, because of his conjunction by grace or glory with the holy soul herself.

Consider at last, and you will find that all these nuptials were made in Cana of Galilee. Hence Isaiah: “The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this” (Isa. 37:32)—namely these nuptials—and this in Galilee, which signifies “transmigration.” See how wonderful, how manifold the transmigration: when the rich becomes poor; the eternal, temporal; God, passible—in the first marriage. When in the second the Church dismissed her errors, her idols, the cults of the gods, the ceremonies of the Jews. When in the third the soul becomes, from a harlot, the Bride of Christ; becomes the wife of the most high King, who before had been the whore of the world, or of the flesh, or of the devil.

Studiositas, having heard these things, giving thanks, did not wish to weary Allegory further with questions or answers of any kind. Allegory therefore made an end of speaking in a prayer for a share in these nuptials of Christ and the Church, now and unto ages of ages.

The Second Consideration: Mendicancy and Property

But for me, returning to myself, zeal for the house of God did not fail—zeal which, obeying Sobriety’s warnings, had consented to silence, yet then demanded a declaration of the double consideration already set down concerning the wine of sacred Wisdom.

For zeal according to knowledge (Rom. 10:2) fled both the tedium of much speaking and, loving rebuke, awaited more conveniently another place, time, and action. Nevertheless it afterward spurred me often and much to be given a voice; and if that were denied, it asked that all things be put into writing. It brought forward the servant of the fabled Midas, who, seeing his master’s ass’s ears and fearing to publish them openly, murmured and buried them in the ground whence reeds sprang up, whispering Midas’s fault. Zeal urged that at least so much be done in the present purpose, declaring that it lacked neither knowledge, which looks about at times, persons and places, nor the charity of compassion. And rightly; for that zeal alone is praiseworthy which wills to take away whatever evils it sees in the house of God, but, if it cannot take them away, tolerates and groans—tolerates according to knowledge, groans through compassion. Knowledge without zeal, then, is languid; zeal without knowledge would be headlong; and both, if compassion were lacking, would be too embittering, leading not so much to the correction of vice as to the provoking of hatred. Zeal, then, belongs to moving the irascible power, discretion the rational, compassion the concupiscible, all with one mutual consent, so that the whole man may be ordered in himself—mighty through zeal, wise through discretion, benevolent through compassion—attaining in this the attributes appropriated to the most blessed Trinity: the vigor of power, the brightness of wisdom, the sweetness of benevolence, on which are founded in laudable works mode, species and order, and likewise measure, number and weight; and again unity, truth and goodness, each referred to each of the attributes appropriated to the most blessed Trinity, from which all things exist efficiently, through which exemplarily, in which finally, as it is for all things the cause of being, the reason of discerning, and the order of living. And when Zeal confessed to me that it was conscious of having knowledge and compassion as its companions—*(col. 373)* compassion above all, which would wish to say or write nothing by way of injury, nothing in anger, scandal, envy, hatred, or rancor against any person, but for the extirpation of errors and the amendment of those who err. I resolved to humor it, putting into writing what seemed worth noting around the twofold Consideration already treated—concerning the neglect of the wine of sacred Scripture and a wholesome warning.

The second Consideration, then, was that in the nuptials of the growing Church, etc. The fervor of devotion that moved princes and others to dower the Church—whence, I ask, was it begotten, if not from a preconceived heat of the spiritual wine of sacred Scripture, carrying their minds to eternal things, the love of earthly things being trampled underfoot? But now, if they see the cupbearers of this wine—prelates and doctors—sink utterly into the lower things of earth and take no care at all for spiritual things, why should

they not reclaim what they gave, the cause of conferring having ceased, or at least grow cool toward any new donation?

Behold, we have already seen many, even learned in the sacred Letters, who, irritated by the vices of prelates and zealous for the house of God not according to knowledge, have not feared to suggest to princes and peoples—even to the suffering of death—that it was lawful for them to take away the temporals of clerics habitually delinquent; again, that their goods were only pure alms; further, that they were handed over only under the condition of living and using well, which failing, the title of right perished, and nothing remained to such a cleric. Add that seculars have not been lacking, nor are lacking, who receive such things with greedy ears and assent: nothing is easier than to persuade those willing of the spoils of clerics, while either avarice or hatred or envy or indiscreet zeal draws them. Others oppose to prelates and clerics the poverty of the primitive Church in the Apostles and disciples; they authenticate a voice sent from heaven when, from Constantine, the Church was dowered more by divine than by human constitution, according to Daniel's prophecy of Christ's kingdom: "Today poison has been poured into the Church of God." What else do all these things say than that the Church is to be stripped?

And why recall only ancient things, known by reading alone? It has been preached solemnly in the most open words that mendicancy was the only, or the principal, means of preaching the word of God—because "the thorns of riches choke the word" (Matt. 13:22; Luke 8:14). And a little before, when the preacher himself asked, Who are the preachers? he answered outright: only the Mendicants, because "the poor," he said, "have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. 11:5). I pass over what one of the Mendicants had said before to the prelates: "We shall have the princes for us against the prelates"; another added, "and even women"; another with threatening face subjoined: "We will sow such seed in one day that you will neither know how nor be able to root it up in a year." If these and the like are counted as nothing by the secular prelates, and they cast off, neglect or oppress their defenders, the secular theologians (who minister the wine of sacred Wisdom in purity), what follows more naturally than that princes should say and resolve among themselves: If mendicancy is the only or the principal means for the preaching of the word of God—since nothing is more incumbent on the Prelates of the Church than such preaching, for which the Apostles said, "It is not right that we should leave the word of God and serve tables" (Acts 6:2), and Paul says, "The Lord did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1:17)—what is more desirable for us than to bring the Prelates back to mendicancy, taking away so many riches and endowments, in which they glory in idleness and grow proud above the power of Kings and Princes? Nevertheless, when these things and the like, subversive of the Church's endowment, are preached, there is applause; it is signalled that the sermon should run on. But when preaching is made for the due favor of the Prelates, for their liberties, for the defense of the Faith (which they have professed to guard even unto death), at once they yawn, grow restless, murmur, hiss, make an uproar, press for an end.

(col. 374) Let pastoral solicitude take heed, lest by impunity of such things there grow in the ecclesiastical hierarchy disorder, horror, and confusion. Whence if mendicancy, newly introduced after the Apostles and holy doctors, were today alone to minister the wine of preaching through the peoples at the Church's nuptials, then in many things, I confess, it is already ill with the Church—but in many worse things would come, as a plain argument can be drawn from what is to be said in the later consideration.

Behold, while the meditation of my heart was revolving such things with itself, it seemed to behold on this side the Mendicancy of the religious, on that the Property of the prelates, each of which was preaching its own praises, contending that it was to be preferred to the other's state. Mendicancy spoke first: "And who will doubt," she said, "that I am to be preferred to Property, or to the appropriation of temporal things? For wishing to be perfect, I went away according to Christ's counsel, and sold all that I had, and gave to the poor, that naked I might follow the naked Christ with speed. I excel indeed in many things, but it will be enough to have enumerated five prerogatives.

“Is not my mind freer for contemplation, because I am needy: unable to feast sumptuously and splendidly every day, and therefore I am weighed down neither by food nor by wine in gluttony and drunkenness, nor do I lie sleepy—

> *buried in sleep and wine.*

“I am moreover fitter for preaching, because I teach not only with words drawn most studiously from the inmost fountain of sacred Scripture and composed most artfully in allegations, rhythms, and reasonings, mixing secular authors, poets, and rhetoricians—but by my own example, which is the most effective kind of teaching, I preach that the riches, pomps, honors, and delights of the age are to be despised, following Christ who first began to do, afterward to teach.

“What third? That I am farther from flattery, because I seek not temporal gain, not the favor of the rich, not the applause of the peoples, but only the spiritual salvation of souls; for what is there for me upon the earth?

“What fourth? That I am freed from fear of those who resist the word of God, while I do not aspire to be made greater by them, but flee, seeking at the Church’s nuptials the lowest place, unwilling the first couches at feasts, or greetings in the marketplace, or to be called Rabbi by men, or the first seats in the synagogues (Matt. 23). Let the whole world rage against me: to what viler lot can it cast me down than that of a beggar? I will seek my bread.

“Finally it is clear that I am freed from all solicitude: why should I think of tomorrow? Having food sought from anywhere, and covering—even the vilest and patched sacks—I live content, considering the birds of the sky, which neither labor nor spin, nor gather into barns, and the heavenly Father feeds them” (Matt. 6:26; Luke 12:24).

Property on the other side contended, first, according to the judgment of Aristotle, who argues against the polity of Socrates and Plato, that she was the more expedient among men once sin is presupposed—otherwise in the state of glory, otherwise in the state of original justice, where all things would have been common, where no one by appropriating would have said, This is mine, but this is yours, since all things would have been made subject to each, under his feet. Let nothing be said of individual men, she said; let the discourse be only of the Prelates of the Church, to whom I, Property, offer much fruit of the spirit, above all a fivefold fruit, for the edification of their subjects. First, they have from me the support of temporal goods, with which to exercise mercy toward their subjects who are needy, afflicted and weak, toward orphans and widows; nor do they, under the appearance of piety and gain, seek the spoils of the sheep, nor milk them to the blood—and that he might be able to do this, Saint Thomas of Canterbury strove even to death to contend for the preservation of the Church’s revenues. Second, the Prelates have from me a becoming and honorable state, shining and reverend before the peoples, who, like animal men, *(col. 375)* neither sufficiently grasp heavenly things nor fully consider interior virtues, and therefore easily turn needy and ragged men—especially if they are importunately mendicant—into reproach or contempt, above all when heroic and miraculous works are not present in them as they were in the holy Apostles and many of their successors. Otherwise, if anyone blames splendid exterior adornment in prelates, let him consequently take away from the Church the most precious and illustrious rites and ornaments whatsoever, in which she walks as a Queen in tunics, chasubles, and other garments of gold, surrounded with variety.

Add thirdly that I, Property, strike fear into tyrants, when they observe me prepared and powerful and such as to suffice to resist them. Moreover upon unruly and insolent subjects I am able to exercise disciplined punishments, lest their unbridled iniquity prevail against the quiet life of the good, and that the authority of the ruler may be preserved. Finally I, Property, exclude from prelates and their households anxious solicitude and sometimes the pursuit of frauds, distributing to each as there is need, lest need compel them either to seize or to think beyond measure of tomorrow—of which need the Satirist and the Law say that there is little Faith.

This is the institution of the primitive Church; this is the golden mean which Solomon described in his wish: “Give me neither riches nor poverty, but only what is needful for my living” (Prov. 30:8). “It is of a little mind,” says Seneca, “not to be able to bear riches, and to declare hatred of gold or silver; let cupidity be restrained, and it is enough.”

Mendicancy was preparing to add a contentious reply, claiming that she too is such that mediocrity is her friend, because having nothing she herself by right of a proprietor possesses all things under the title of charity and sufficiency; for she seeks first the Kingdom of God and his justice (Matt. 6:33), and therefore all things are added to her. She further maintains that she fears nothing—indeed because she has nothing to lose—pressing that word of the Satirist:

> *The empty-handed traveler will sing before the robber.*

She concludes that Property is swollen, haughty, pompous, a boaster of herself, idle, blind, ignorant and dull; that because she touches the pitch of riches she is defiled by it, and is wounded and smothered by the thorns’ goads; nor does she feed her own sheep with the food of doctrine, because she is a hireling, but milks them even to blood, and flays them even to the inward parts of the bones and to the peril of life.

Property, for her part, bearing Mendicancy’s insults impatiently—it cannot be told what words, and how many, she was preparing to return. She called her first an apostate from every law, of nature, of Scripture and of grace; nor was there lacking a multiplication of allegations. She accused her besides as a seductress, deceitful, a wanderer, who creeps into houses under pretext—not only of long prayer, as the Apostle says, but of Confession—“leading captive silly women laden with sins” (2 Tim. 3:6); who again makes the humble name of poverty her instrument, and the means, under the veil of privileges, of obtaining all riches, delights and pomps, with the greatest leisure and without labor, more than the rest of men. Property went on of her own accord to bring forward authentic witnesses for herself: the Lives of the Fathers, Augustine On the Work of Monks, the book of William of Saint-Amour, the Propositions of the Lord of Armagh, with many like them. And these, which have sects among themselves according to the diversity of habits and doctrines, they join together for the attack on the other Prelates and Doctors, secular and regular. Then I shuddered, I confess, in my very meditation, when I perceived such a contentious hostility of Property and Mendicancy springing up—I who before had taken diligent delight in hearing the praises of both. I cry out at once: Go hence, I pray, and do not weary me with these quarrels. And so:

> *It is not ours to settle such great disputes between you.*

Go rather to Experience; for she *(col. 376)* cannot lie about the things she knows—and she knows all things, and does not suffer liars to go unrebuked. She therefore is the fitting witness, she the most incorruptible Judge; if she takes up this quarrel, let her suggest and intimate in the sacrosanct general Council what is to be thought further of the things alleged on both sides, and finally what is to be done. For if Mendicancy will prove by clear testimonies of works that she is an effective mediatrix for those things she has proposed, she will be judged altogether to be received and fostered. Likewise Property will be praised in prelates if she works in them such effects as she proposes.

But it has been excellently said by someone: a republic, or the Church, is not ruled by itself, nor is it governed by the dictate of speculative or imaginary reason alone; execution is required in the practice of works, so far as human affairs allow for places, times, and persons. Finally one cannot find a state—indeed scarcely a single man, except most rarely—in whom among the grains of virtues there are not mixed a greater number of chaffs of defects. For with the wheat grow the tares, which it is fitting either to tolerate, or so to root out that the wheat is not pulled up with them. Likewise the wine of devotion carries with it the grapeskins and dregs of certain defects of human corruption. Let each state strive to be such as it wishes to be esteemed, and with respect to the end of its constitution let it try to moderate the rest. Let Mendicancy, as she pretends, be freer for contemplation, fitter for useful preaching, farther from flattery, more remote from fear

and ambition, quieter from solicitude for all temporal things. But Property, as she boasts, let her exercise hospitality, and keep a decent and venerable state without superfluous pomp; let her strike fear into tyrants; let her coerce insolent subjects; let her cast far from herself and her household noxious and anxious solicitude. Let each finally remember, according to the Comic poet's saying, that all these things in mendicancy and in property are such as is the mind of the one who uses them. This is to be seen in the good wine of saving wisdom, whose odor, taste, and use become for some a sickness and death, but for others profit unto health and everlasting life.

With these words the second consideration is finished; let there be a passage to the third and last.

The Third Consideration: The Petition on the Nine Assertions

"In the nuptials of the Church [theological wine] can never be lacking," etc.

The first part of this consideration Christ the Priest forever confirms: whose Law if it failed, the Priesthood would consequently not stand; as conversely the Apostle says, "For the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation of the Law also be made" (Heb. 7:12). But would that the other part of the consideration were false!—yet it has been given us all too much to experience that it is most true: otherwise never should we have perceived so many errors, so many false madnesses, so many most monstrous heresies devised (even to the adulteration of the first moral principles, which belong to the first impressions and inscriptions of nature) in this Council, in whose bosom they are fostered, nourished, multiplied and increased by some, as we shall relate below. There are those for whom the wine of sacred Wisdom, and its odor, is turned into abomination; whose voice is this: What is talk of the Faith to us? It is enough that we are Christians; we believe as our parents did, in good simplicity; this suffices; for "he that is a searcher of majesty shall be overwhelmed by glory" (Prov. 25:27), nor is there need to seek things higher than oneself. These things are said not only by the simple and unlettered, but by great Prelates, to whom it belongs by their office to be ready always to give satisfaction to everyone that asks a reason of that Faith which is in them (1 Pet. 3:15). The voice of others, when it is sought that the wine of sacred Faith be poured or assigned, is: We seek peace, we seek union, and behold, trouble! For this wine troubles very many; it brings divisions, sects, hatreds and dissensions through the whole body of this sacred Council; would not dissimulation, or delay, be more wholesome, more discreet? There are others—I would not easily say whether *(col. 377)* worse than the former; I know that they are madder. Those indeed drink the wine of sacred Scripture, but because they are infected with almost feverish morals as with so many humors, they openly rave, and in the very doorways of principles, as they say, they stumble, strike, grope, and fall, running upon that word of the evangelical Prophet, if it be carried over to Allegory: "They have not known for wine, and they have erred for drunkenness: the priests and the prophets have not known for drunkenness; they are swallowed up with wine; they have erred in drunkenness; they have not known the seer; they have been ignorant of judgment." It follows: "For all tables are full of vomit and filth, so that there was no more place" (Isa. 28:7–8). This vomit and these filths—what do they more aptly signify than heresies proceeding from indigestion of the wine of sound Faith? by which the table of sacred Scripture is made abominable; and hence that prophetic imprecation of the Psalm seems fulfilled concerning such: "Let their table"—the table of sacred Scripture—"become a snare, and a retribution, and a scandal: let their eyes be darkened, that they see not" (Ps. 68:23–24). And again another Psalm: "They were troubled and staggered like a drunken man, and all their wisdom was swallowed up" (Ps. 106:27). Again in Jeremiah: "Take the cup of the wine of this fury"—because namely it makes the wicked rage, as appeared in the envious and greedy Jews raging at Christ's doctrine. It follows: "And you shall make all the nations to which I shall send you drink of it, and they shall drink, and be troubled, and be mad because of the sword which I shall send among them." It follows: "Drink and be drunken, and vomit, and fall, and rise no more because of the sword which I shall send among you" (Jer. 25:15–27). By this sword the word of God, as by wine the doctrine of Faith, is

mystically designated.

Alas, examples of this curse appear all too much among some even placed at the nuptials of this Council—of which take this one, or the greatest, cause: that for the examination of pestilent doctrines multiply vomited forth it has by no means been granted to theologians and jurists to meet often and freely for this matter. This has rather been sought by ways and examples excessively scandalous. Woe to those who hold the truth in falsehood! Of which Jeremiah (8:8): “Indeed the lying pen of the scribes has wrought a lie,” while in a profane cup there is a pouring of theological wine.

Wherefore let there be set here one of the petitions composed that an examination of the nine Assertions might be made through the several nations, for twelve causes.

First, because at last an examination of this doctrine must be made—whether it be true and sound so as to be dogmatized through Christendom both to people and to clergy, and whether it is to be wholesomely consulted in the forum of conscience—and let this be done in common through the several Nations and the sacred College, before a Sentence is carried in Session.

Second, because the matter is such that not only theologians but canonists and legists and good moralists—indeed generally all who have a sound and integral judgment of reason—can judge of it; for they concern the moral precepts which are first principles naturally implanted in the hearts of men, though they are also repeated by the divine Law and commanded, because of the cloud of malice which, darkening this Scripture, obscures it in the hearts of the wicked.

Third, because it is clear that scandals are continually multiplied by reason of the delay which is made, and has already been made for a year and a half and more in this sacred Council, while it has not been declared what truth holds concerning the aforesaid.

Fourth, that such delay seems to redound to the great disgrace of this sacred Council, many saying in various ways that the Council either does not dare to determine that matter—which is timidity and sloth; or does not know—which is blindness and ignorance; or does not will—which is not charity or justice.

Fifth, because if with so much solicitude errors and erring persons have been damned from the beginning of the Council until now from other lands and provinces, where many powerful of those lands not only did not seek this but with all their efforts by letters and otherwise opposed it—it would seem too grave and scandalous *(col. 378)* if errors sown in the Kingdom of France into notorious sedition and scandal of the whole Kingdom, to the incredible ruin of souls as of bodies, were not here declared or damned: especially when the most Christian King of France with his whole Council, and the most illustrious University of Paris, require this with such insistence, both by letters patent and otherwise, and with all too credible testimonies concerning the scandals and seditions continually arising from such doctrine. It is added here that princes could say: John Hus and his errors were damned because they were against prelates and clergy; but they dismiss those of Jean Petit because they are against princes and seculars—though in truth they touch ecclesiastics together with seculars, as the Emperor writes.

Sixth, because the most serene King of the Romans, both when present by words and when absent by letters, most attentively recommended this cause, and procured that this Assertion be damned: “Every tyrant,” etc.—in which virtually and sufficiently this doctrine of the nine Assertions is damned, as is clear to those who look, and will be declared more manifestly from inspection of the whole principal Proposition of Jean Petit produced on behalf of the King of France before the whole general Council, with most insistent petition for diligent examination of the same to be made.

Seventh, because even if perhaps according to some judgments this matter could from the beginning have been dissembled for a time, this delay or dissimulation no longer has place, because by the importunity of some—not to speak more harshly—it has been brought about that the doctrine is dogmatized here not only

by one, namely Master Jean Petit, but already by many in this Council and elsewhere on every side, and especially throughout the whole Kingdom of France, with multiplication of other errors no less dangerous, and with the authority of those who have subscribed themselves in the manner of a community or congregation—not to say of a monopoly or conspiracy—as is widely clear in the schedule of the mendicant Friars of the four Orders.

Eighth, because it is necessary to conclude that many are heretics, or at least hereticating, in this sacred Council and elsewhere: since many on the one side say and constantly affirm that this doctrine is erroneous in Faith and morals and multiply scandalous; others are on the opposite saying that this doctrine is true; others that it is opinable; others that it is probable to either side; others that it is perhaps true; others that it is not to be rejected by the judgment of Faith, because it does not pertain to Faith. But it is clear that Assertions so contrary cannot stand with the purity of Faith and without manifest scandal to the whole Church. It is therefore of the necessity of salvation that provision be made by this sacrosanct Council.

Ninth, because if it were done as some seek—a delay to a future Pontiff or Council—it would be a grave blot on this sacred Council; for it would be said, as has been set down before, that it either did not dare, or did not know, or did not will to finish this matter; indeed the future Supreme Pontiff could more reasonably pretend an excuse by casting the blame back upon the prelates of this Council, that they either feared, or did not know, or did not will to put an end to such a cause. And it is clear that one Pope will not have more clerics than this Council has, nor greater boldness.

Tenth, add that it is necessary to say that either the King of France and the University of Paris and nearly the whole clergy of France are deceived concerning this matter which they pursue with such zeal that it be damned; or on the other side those are deceived who tend to the opposite, seeking to be absolved and justified in this cause. But the present Council can put an end by declaring the truth, to which all and each say they are ready to obey—and so all discord will cease.

(col. 379) Eleventh, that already the due manner of treating the Faith seems multiply wounded to the pernicious example of the future, if provision is not made. For a cause of Faith ought to be treated simply and in summary fashion, without the noise and figure of a trial. And first of all, before everything, there ought to be inquiry and determination concerning the truth of Faith itself and its interest, rather than concerning the personal interest of anyone whatsoever. Anyone ought moreover to be freely heard in denunciation, without being sought to be entangled in lawsuits; examination ought moreover to be made not in secret, or by schedules, or by conspiracies, but in public before the skilled, that they may have mutual conference and a diligent, frequent, and free examination; nor ought votes to be published, at least outside the Council, especially with the authentic sign of notaries, before the matter has so stood. Finally, no skilled person, especially a theologian, can or ought in such a matter of Faith to be rejected as suspect so as not to take part in the examination and judgment, unless perhaps it is alleged and proved against him that he is deservedly suspect or infected in the Faith.

But whether the opposite of all the aforesaid has been done in the process of this cause is already notorious, and would be clear from the process: because personal interest was proposed, and the denouncers were sought to be entangled, and involutions of processes were made, not without heavy expenses. And the most Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Cardinal of Cambrai, the foremost theologian among his own, not suspect in the Faith by the grace of God, commissioned by this sacred Council, was rejected; and the Masters in Theology were able to make no examination among themselves; secret deliberations also were first put in a sack before they were examined, and were published through the whole Kingdom of France and elsewhere with the signs of notaries—where not only to the Faith but to persons a great scandal and danger impends, since this matter touches the great and powerful. And it appears clearly enough from the manner and form of each deliberating what person, or what persons, are deliberating, although the names of individuals are not written, but of some, and especially the four Orders of mendicants are expressed in the schedule containing

their deliberations. Attending also that some deliberations speak most injuriously against great and diverse and innocent persons, so that they are rather famous libels to be torn at once than deliberations to be received or promulgated.

Let it be said lastly and finally that by the letters of the most serene King of the Romans and of the King of France and of the University of Paris, and from the notoriety of the fact, it is established that the sentence of annulment which was passed against the sentence of the Bishop of Paris and of the Inquisitor, in no way explaining the causes of annulment, has generated and continually generates scandals against the Faith and against the good of peace through the whole Kingdom of France among the learned and the unlearned—while the principal matter of Faith was still pending, and is pending, before this sacred Council, and the accessory ought not to have been terminated before this principal. Moreover it is necessary, by the necessity of an affirmative divine precept and of eternal salvation, that to meet these and earlier scandals this sacrosanct Council (as quickly as it can conveniently be done—and it can conveniently be done at once) determine this principal matter, namely by declaring the truth; for when this is decided, the rest will easily either be decided, or will grow quiet and be settled. But it is necessary (as is premised and is insistently asked) that examination be made in the sacred College of the Lord Cardinals and through the several Nations, etc.

Let the following little work be subjoined for the completion of this last Consideration, where the pious and wise reader will see how great a necessity lies upon the most Reverend Fathers and God-beloved Bishops, with the illustrious Doctors and the other notable Lords of the Council, to apply provision—attending that they were called and gathered especially for the extirpation of heresies.